

# Determination of source terms in diffusion and wave equations by observations after incidents: uniqueness and stability

Jin Cheng<sup>1</sup> Shuai Lu<sup>1</sup> Masahiro Yamamoto<sup>2 3 4 5</sup>

July 20, 2021

---

<sup>1</sup>School of Mathematical Sciences, Fudan University, Shanghai, China, [jcheng@fudan.edu.cn](mailto:jcheng@fudan.edu.cn); [slu@fudan.edu.cn](mailto:slu@fudan.edu.cn).

<sup>2</sup>Department of Mathematical Sciences, The University of Tokyo, Komaba, Meguro, Tokyo 153, Japan, [myama@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp](mailto:myama@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp)

<sup>3</sup>Honorary Member of Academy of Romanian Scientists, Ilfov, nr. 3, Bucuresti, Romania

<sup>4</sup>Correspondence member of Accademia Peloritana dei Pericolanti

<sup>5</sup>Peoples' Friendship University of Russia (RUDN University) 6 Miklukho-Maklaya St, Moscow, 117198, Russian Federation

## Abstract

We consider a diffusion and a wave equations:

$$\partial_t^k u(x, t) = \Delta u(x, t) + \mu(t)f(x), \quad x \in \Omega, t > 0, \quad k = 1, 2$$

with the zero initial and boundary conditions, where  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  is a bounded domain.

We establish uniqueness and/or stability results for inverse problems of

- determining  $\mu(t)$ ,  $0 < t < T$  with given  $f(x)$ .
- determining  $f(x)$ ,  $x \in \Omega$  with given  $\mu(t)$

by data of  $u: u(x_0, \cdot)$  with fixed point  $x_0 \in \Omega$  or Neumann data on subboundary over time interval. In our inverse problems, data are taken over time interval  $T_1 < t < T_2$ , by assuming that  $T < T_1 < T_2$  and  $\mu(t) = 0$  for  $t \geq T$ , which means that the source stops to be active after the time  $T$  and the observations are started only after  $T$ . This assumption is practical by such a posteriori data after incidents, although inverse problems had been well studied in the case of  $T = 0$ . We establish the non-uniqueness, the uniqueness and conditional stability for a diffusion and a wave equations. The proofs are based on eigenfunction expansions of the solutions  $u(x, t)$ , and we rely on various knowledge of the generalized Weierstrass theorem on polynomial approximation, almost periodic functions, Carleman estimate, non-harmonic Fourier series.

**AMS subject classifications.** 35R30, 35R25, 35K20, 35L20

## 1 Introduction

In this article, we consider initial-boundary value problems for a diffusion and a wave equations:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \partial_t u(x, t) = \Delta u(x, t) + \mu(t)f(x), \quad x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ u(x, 0) = 0, \quad x \in \Omega, \\ u(x, t) = 0, \quad x \in \partial\Omega, t > 0. \end{array} \right. \quad (1.1)$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \partial_t^2 u(x, t) = \Delta u(x, t) + \mu(t)f(x), \quad x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ u(x, 0) = \partial_t u(x, 0) = 0, \quad x \in \Omega, \\ u(x, t) = 0, \quad x \in \partial\Omega, t > 0. \end{array} \right. \quad (1.2)$$

Here and henceforth  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  is a bounded domain with smooth boundary  $\partial\Omega$  and we set  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\partial_j = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}$ , and  $\Delta = \sum_{j=1}^d \partial_j^2$ . Let  $\nu = \nu(x)$  be the unit outward normal vector to  $\partial\Omega$  and let  $\partial_\nu u = \nabla u \cdot \nu$ . We mainly consider the zero Dirichlet boundary condition and can treat the Neumann boundary condition similarly but we omit the details. Moreover we can consider the inverse problems for (1.1) and (1.2) where  $\Delta$  is replaced by a suitable elliptic operator with time independent coefficients, but for simplicity, we mainly argue for  $\Delta$ .

The source is assumed to be represented in the form of  $\mu(t)f(x)$  where  $\mu(t)$  and  $f(x)$  describe changes in the time  $t$  and the spacial variable  $x$  respectively. Such a form of separation of variables is frequently used in modelling diffusion and wave phenomena.

The unique existence of solutions to (1.1) and (1.2) are standard results (e.g., Evans [9], Lions and Magenes [17], Pazy [18]), but we need more regularity of solutions. We sum up these results as Lemmas 1 and 2. We arbitrarily fix  $T_0 > 0$ .

**Lemma 1.**

Let  $f \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$  and  $\mu \in H^1(0, T_0)$ .

(i) To (1.1), there exists a unique solution  $u \in C([0, T_0]; H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)) \cap C^1([0, T_0]; L^2(\Omega))$  and we can choose a constant  $C > 0$ , dependent on  $f$ , such that

$$\|u\|_{C(\Omega \times [0, T_0])} \leq C \|\mu\|_{L^2(0, T_0)}. \quad (1.3)$$

(ii) To (1.2), there exists a unique solution  $u \in C([0, T_0]; H^2(\Omega)) \cap C^1([0, T_0]; H_0^1(\Omega)) \cap C^2([0, T_0]; L^2(\Omega)) \cap C(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, T_0])$  such that  $\partial_\nu u \in H^1(0, T_0; L^2(\partial\Omega))$  and (1.3) holds.

**Lemma 2.**

Let  $f \in L^2(\Omega)$  and  $\mu \in C^1[0, T_0]$ .

(i) To (1.1), there exists a unique solution  $u \in H^1(0, T_0; L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^2(0, T_0; H_0^1(\Omega))$ .

(ii) To (1.2), there exists a unique solution  $u \in H^1(0, T_0; L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^2(0, T_0; H_0^1(\Omega))$  such that  $\partial_\nu u \in H^1(0, T_0; L^2(\partial\Omega))$ .

Here we do not aim at the best possible regularity, and for completeness the proofs of the lemmata are given in Appendix II.

Throughout the article, we assume that  $\mu \in L_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R})$  satisfies

$$\mu(t) = 0 \quad \text{if } t > T$$

with some constant  $T > 0$ . This means that the a diffusion source for (1.1) and an external force for (1.2) continue to be activated only before the moment  $T > 0$ .

In our inverse problems, the measurements can be started after the time  $T > 0$ , and we are required to determine  $\mu(t)$ ,  $0 < t < T$  or  $f(x)$ ,  $x \in \Omega$  of the source term. For example, in the case where the explosion of some equipments such as nuclear power plant, causes diffusion of contaminants or dangerous substances, any measurements starting at  $t = 0$  are not realistic. Inverse source problems of determining  $\mu$  or  $f$  are well studied if the measurements of data are started at  $t = 0$ , but to the best knowledge of the authors, there are no publications on mathematical analysis by data starting after the time  $T > 0$ .

The main purpose of this article is to establish the uniqueness and the stability for inverse source problems for (1.1) and (1.2) by data from the time when the source stopped to be active.

Now we formulate several kinds of inverse source problems and state our main results.

### §1.1. Determination of starting time of decay of source.

In this subsection, in particular, for  $t_0 > 0$ , we consider

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u(x, t) = \Delta u(x, t) + \theta(t - t_0)f(x), & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ u(x, 0) = 0, & x \in \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu u(x, t) = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, t > 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.4)$$

where  $\theta \in L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R})$  is assumed to be known and monotone decreasing and satisfy

$$\theta(t) = \begin{cases} 1, & t \leq 0, \\ 0, & t \geq a \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

with arbitrarily fixed constant  $a > 0$ . Only in this subsection, we consider the zero Neumann boundary condition. The proof can be modified for the case of the zero Dirichlet boundary condition.

We note that the diffusion source  $\theta(t - t_0)f(x)$  does not act for  $t \geq a + t_0$ .

Then we consider

#### **Inverse Problem I.**

*Let  $f = f(x)$  be known. Let  $T > 0$  be sufficiently large and  $x_0 \in \Omega$  be arbitrarily chosen. Determine a starting time  $t_0 > 0$  of the source by  $u(x_0, T)$ .*

For known  $f$ , we assume

$$f \in C_0^\infty(\Omega), \quad f \geq 0, \neq 0 \quad \text{on } \bar{\Omega}. \quad (1.6)$$

By  $u_{t_0} = u_{t_0}(x, t)$  we note the solution to (1.4), assuming that  $\theta, f$  are fixed. We are ready to state the uniqueness and the stability as our main result for Inverse Problem I.

**Theorem 1.**

*We arbitrarily fix constants  $t_*, t^*, a > 0$  with  $t_* < t^* < T^* - a$ . Then we a priori assume that  $t_0, t_1$  are limited to an interval  $(t_*, t^*)$ :*

$$t_* < t_0, t_1 < t^*.$$

*Then there exists a constant  $C = C(t_*, t^*, a, x_0, T^*) > 0$  such that*

$$|t_1 - t_0| \leq C |u_{t_0}(x_0, T^*) - u_{t_1}(x_0, T^*)|.$$

This theorem asserts the stability in determining a starting time of decay by one-shot data  $u(x_0, T^*)$ , provided that the starting time is assumed to be in an a priori fixed interval  $(t_*, t^*)$ .

Now we return to (1.1) and (1.2). By  $u_\mu = u_\mu(x, t)$  and  $u_f = u_f(x, t)$  we denote the solutions to (1.1) or (1.2) in the cases where we discuss the determination of  $\mu$  and  $f$  with fixed  $f$  and  $\mu$ , respectively. The existence and the regularity of  $u_\mu$  and  $u_f$  are guaranteed by Lemmata 1 and 2.

Henceforth we will consider the following settings. First we assume that

$$\mu(t) = 0 \quad \text{for } t \geq T, \quad T < T_1 < T_2.$$

The exact description of the conditions of  $\mu$  and  $f$  are different according to several formulations of our inverse problems, and later is provided.

We understand that  $(T_1, T_2)$  is an observation time interval. Let  $\gamma, \Gamma \subset \partial\Omega$  be subboundaries. Now for convenience, we list our main results for the inverse source problems for (1.1) and (1.2).

**Determination of  $\mu(t)$**

**Diffusion equation**

- Theorem 2: data  $u(x_0, t)$ ,  $T_1 < t < T_2$

- Proposition 2: data  $\partial_\nu u$  on  $\gamma \times (T_1, T_2)$

### Wave equation

- Theorem 3 (the one-dimensional case), Proposition 1: data  $u(x_0, t)$ ,  $T_1 < t < T_2$
- Proposition 3: data  $\partial_\nu u$  on  $\Gamma \times (T_1, T_2)$

### Determination of $f(x)$

#### Diffusion equation

- The uniqueness is impossible in general dimensions by data  $u(x_0, t)$ ,  $T_1 < t < T_2$ .
- Theorem 4: data  $\partial_\nu u$  on  $\gamma \times (T_1, T_2)$

#### Wave equation

- The uniqueness is impossible in general dimensions by data  $u(x_0, t)$ ,  $T_1 < t < T_2$ .
- Theorem 5: data  $\partial_\nu u$  on  $\Gamma \times (T_1, T_2)$

In general dimensions  $d$ , the uniqueness does not hold with data  $u(x_0, t)$  for  $T_1 < t < T_2$ , because unknown  $f$  depends on  $d$ -variables, but the data depend only on one variable  $t$ .

Here we do not discuss inverse problems with final data  $u(\cdot, T)$ , and for the heat equations, we refer to Cheng and Liu [6], Choulli and Yamamoto [7] and the references therein.

### §1.2. Determination of $\mu(t)$ of the source term by pointwise data

In this subsection, we assume:

$$\mu \in H_{loc}^1(0, \infty), \quad \mu \not\equiv 0, \quad \mu(t) = 0 \quad \text{for } t \geq T \quad (1.7)$$

and

$$f \in C_0^\infty(\Omega), \quad f \not\equiv 0. \quad (1.8)$$

Here we set

$$H_{loc}^1(0, \infty) := \{\mu; \mu|_{(0, T_0)} \in H^1(0, T_0) \quad \text{with any } T_0 > 0\}.$$

We can relax the regularity of  $f$  but we assume (1.8) for simplicity.

Moreover, let  $T_1, T_2$  be given such that

$$T < T_1 < T_2$$

and let  $x_0 \in \Omega$  be arbitrarily chosen.

We consider

**Inverse Problem II.**

In (1.1) and (1.2), we are given  $f$ . Determine  $\mu(t)$ ,  $0 < t < T$ , by  $u(x_0, t)$  for  $T_1 < t < T_2$ .

By Lemma 1, we know that  $u \in C(\overline{\Omega} \times [T_1, T_2])$ , and so our observation data  $u(x_0, t)$ ,  $T_1 < t < T_2$ , are well-defined.

For the statement of our main results for Inverse Problem II, we introduce notations. Let  $\lambda_j$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  be all the distinct eigenvalues of the operator  $A = -\Delta$  with the domain  $\mathcal{D}(A) = H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ . We know that  $\lambda_j > 0$  for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . By  $d_j$  we denote the multiplicity of  $\lambda_j$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $\{\varphi_{jk}\}_{1 \leq k \leq d_j}$  is an orthonormal basis of  $\text{Ker}(\lambda_j - A) := \{v \in \mathcal{D}(A); Av = \lambda_j v\}$ , and we define the orthogonal projection  $P_j$  from  $L^2(\Omega)$  to  $\text{Ker}(\lambda_j - A)$  by

$$P_j f = \sum_{k=1}^{d_j} (f, \varphi_{jk}) \varphi_{jk}. \quad (1.9)$$

We set

$$\Lambda = \Lambda(x_0) := \{j \in \mathbb{N}; (P_j f)(x_0) = 0\}. \quad (1.10)$$

We are ready to state our main result for Inverse Problem II for the diffusion equation (1.1).

**Theorem 2.**

Assume that (1.8) holds and  $\mu_1, \mu_2$  satisfy (1.7). Let  $x_0 \in \Omega$  be arbitrarily chosen. Then

$$u_{\mu_1}(x_0, t) = u_{\mu_2}(x_0, t) \quad \text{for } T_1 < t < T_2 \quad (1.11)$$

yields  $\mu_1(t) = \mu_2(t)$  for  $0 < t < T$  if and only if

$$\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \Lambda(x_0)} \frac{1}{\lambda_j} = \infty. \quad (1.12)$$

**Corollary.**

The uniqueness holds for Inverse Problem II only if the spatial dimensions  $d \geq 2$ . The

uniqueness always fails for  $d = 1$ .

In the case of  $d = 1$ , our data  $u_\mu(x_0, t)$ ,  $t > T$  starting after the incident (i.e.,  $\mu(t) = 0$  for  $t > T$ ), cannot give the uniqueness. Moreover, as is seen by the proof in Section 3, even if we will take the perfect observation data  $u_\mu(x, t)$  with all  $x \in \Omega$  and  $t > T$ , we can determine at best

$$\int_0^T e^{\lambda_n s} \mu(s) ds, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

which is the same information determined by currently adopted pointwise data  $u_\mu(x_0, t)$ ,  $t < T$ . In other words, even the perfect observation data cannot augment any information of pointwise data  $u(x_0, t)$ ,  $t > T$  with fixed  $x_0 \in \Omega$ .

**Example of (1.12).**

Let  $d = 2$  and  $\Omega = (0, \ell_1) \times (0, \ell_2)$  with  $\ell_1, \ell_2 > 0$ . Then we can directly verify that

$$\{\lambda_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} = \left\{ \left( \frac{m_1^2}{\ell_1^2} + \frac{m_2^2}{\ell_2^2} \right) \pi^2; m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{N} \right\}. \quad (1.13)$$

For simplicity, we consider only the case where  $\frac{\ell_2^2}{\ell_1^2}$  is an irrational number. Then  $\frac{m_1^2}{\ell_1^2} + \frac{m_2^2}{\ell_2^2} = \frac{n_1^2}{\ell_1^2} + \frac{n_2^2}{\ell_2^2}$  with  $m_1, m_2, n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$  imply  $m_1 = n_1$  and  $m_2 = n_2$ , which means that the multiplicity of  $\lambda_j$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  is one. We re-number  $\left( \frac{m_1^2}{\ell_1^2} + \frac{m_2^2}{\ell_2^2} \right) \pi^2$  with  $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{N}$  as  $0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \dots$ . Then for  $\lambda_j = \left( \frac{m_1^2}{\ell_1^2} + \frac{m_2^2}{\ell_2^2} \right) \pi^2$ , we choose

$$\varphi_j(x) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\ell_1 \ell_2}} \sin \frac{m_1 \pi x_1}{\ell_1} \sin \frac{m_2 \pi x_2}{\ell_2}.$$

We choose a monitoring point  $x_0 = (x_0^1, x_0^2) \in (0, \ell_1) \times (0, \ell_2)$  such that

$$\frac{x_0^1}{\ell_1} \text{ and } \frac{x_0^2}{\ell_2} \text{ are irrational numbers.} \quad (1.14)$$

Then  $m_1 \frac{x_0^1}{\ell_1}, m_2 \frac{x_0^2}{\ell_2} \notin \mathbb{N}$  for all  $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ , and so  $\varphi_j(x_0^1, x_0^2) \neq 0$ . Thus,  $(P_j f)(x_0) = 0$  if and only if  $\int_\Omega \varphi_j(x) f(x) dx = 0$ , and so we see that  $\int_\Omega \varphi_k(x) f(x) dx \neq 0$  except for a finite number of  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , then we can conclude that  $\Lambda(x_0)$  is a finite set.

Under (1.14), we can verify that (1.12) is satisfied. Indeed, by Agmon [1] or Courant and Hilbert [8] for example, we know that  $\lambda_j = \rho_0 j + o(1)$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $\rho_0 > 0$  is a constant. Therefore,  $\sum_{j=1}^\infty \frac{1}{\lambda_j} = \infty$ . Thus if  $\frac{\ell_1^2}{\ell_2^2}$  is an irrational number and  $\int_\Omega \varphi_k(x) f(x) dx \neq 0$  except for a finite number of  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , then (1.12) is satisfied.



In the case where the measurement starts at  $t = 0$ , that is,  $T_1 = 0$ , the inverse source problem is even stable (e.g., Cannon and Esteva [5], Saitoh, Tuan and Yamamoto [19]). However, for  $T_1 > 0$ , to the best knowledge of the authors, there have been no publications, although such formulated inverse problems are practical.

We can expect to establish conditional stability which holds under suitable a priori boundedness condition on  $\mu(t)$ , and we conjecture that the rate is of weak type such as logarithmic rate.

Moreover, in the case where  $0 < T_1 < T_2 < T$ , that is, the observation starts after the activities of the source but before the stop of the activities, the uniqueness seems impossible, but here we do not discuss the details.

Next we consider the wave equation (1.2). For the uniqueness, we can prove positive results only for the one-dimensional case  $d = 1$ .

**Theorem 3 (uniqueness for time dependent factor of wave source).**

*We assume (1.8) and (1.7) for  $\mu_1, \mu_2$ . Let  $d = 1$  and  $\Omega = (0, \ell)$ . Then  $u_{\mu_1}(x_0, t) = u_{\mu_2}(x_0, t)$  for  $T_1 < t < T_2$  yields  $\mu_1(t) = \mu_2(t)$  for  $0 \leq t \leq T$  if and only*

$$\begin{cases} \frac{x_0}{\ell} \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}, & T \leq 2\ell, & T_2 - T_1 \geq 2\ell, \\ \int_0^\ell f(x) \sin \frac{n\pi}{\ell} x dx \neq 0, & n \in \mathbb{N}. \end{cases} \quad (1.15)$$

The assumption  $T_2 - T_1 \geq 2\ell$  in (1.15) means that we have to take measurements longer than  $2\ell$ , while the width of support of  $\mu(t)$  should not be long, that is,  $\leq 2\ell$ . We do not know the uniqueness for general dimensions  $d \geq 2$ .

For the case of  $d \geq 2$ , we can prove the uniqueness with different measurements of pointwise data  $u(x_0, t)$ . We recall that  $\Lambda(x_0) \subset \mathbb{N}$  is defined by (1.10).

We assume that  $\mathbb{N} \setminus \Lambda(x_0)$  is an infinite subset of  $\mathbb{N}$  and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty, k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \Lambda(x_0)} \frac{k}{\sqrt{\lambda_k}} > 0. \quad (1.16)$$

We remark that also the existence of the limit is assumed in (1.16).

**Proposition 1.**

*Let  $d \geq 2$  and  $f \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ , and*

$$T < \pi \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty, k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \Lambda(x_0)} \frac{k}{\sqrt{\lambda_k}}. \quad (1.17)$$

Then

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} |u_{\mu_1}(x_0, t) - u_{\mu_2}(x_0, t)| = 0 \quad (1.18)$$

yields  $\mu_1(t) = \mu_2(t)$  for  $0 \leq t \leq T$ .

If  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty, k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \Lambda(x_0)} \frac{k}{\sqrt{\lambda_k}} = \infty$ , then we interpret that (1.17) holds true for any  $T > 0$ .

The observation in (1.18) is concerned with the asymptotics of  $u_\mu(x_0, t)$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  and (1.18) requires that the data at  $x_0$  are asymptotically equal as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

We conclude this subsection with

**Remark on condition (1.16).**

We consider one sufficient condition for (1.16) in terms of the multiplicities of  $\lambda_k$ . We assume  $\Lambda(x_0) := \{j \in \mathbb{N}; (P_j f)(x_0) = 0\} = \emptyset$ . We recall that by  $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \dots$  we number the set of all the eigenvalues, not taking the multiplicities into consideration. On the other hand, by  $\sigma_k$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we number all the eigenvalues according to their multiplicities:  $0 < \sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2 \leq \sigma_3 \leq \dots \rightarrow \infty$ . In other words, the value  $\lambda_j$  appears  $d_j$ -times among the sequence  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3, \dots$ , where  $d_j := \dim \text{Ker}(\lambda_j - A)$ . More precisely, setting

$$m_k := \sum_{i=1}^k d_i, \quad k \in \mathbb{N},$$

we see

$$\sigma_j = \begin{cases} \lambda_1, & 1 \leq j \leq m_1, \\ \lambda_2, & m_1 + 1 \leq j \leq m_2, \\ \dots & \dots, \\ \lambda_k, & m_{k-1} + 1 \leq j \leq m_k. \end{cases}$$

By the definition, we note

$$\sigma_j \leq \lambda_j, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

As general information of  $\sigma_j$  the following is classical:

$$\sigma_j = \rho_0 j^{\frac{2}{d}} + o(d^{\frac{2}{d}}) \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty \quad (1.19)$$

(e.g., Theorems 14.6 and 15.1 in Agmon [1], Chapter 6 in Courant and Hilbert [8]). Here  $\rho_0 > 0$  is a constant determined by  $d$  and  $|\Omega|$ .

By (1.19) we have

$$\rho_0 m_{k-1}^{\frac{2}{d}} (1 + o(1)) \leq \lambda_k \leq \rho_0 m_k^{\frac{2}{d}} (1 + o(1))$$

as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . We here note that if  $j \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{k}{m_k^{\frac{1}{d}}} > 0 \quad (1.20)$$

yields (1.16). Indeed

$$\frac{k}{\sqrt{\lambda_k}} \geq \frac{k}{m_k^{\frac{1}{d}} \sqrt{\rho_0(1+o(1))}}$$

as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .

In the following two examples, we consider (1.20).

**Example 1:** Let  $d = 2$  and  $\Omega = (0, \ell_1) \times (0, \ell_2)$ .

First we assume  $\frac{\ell_1^2}{\ell_2^2} \notin \mathbb{Q}$ . By (1.13), all the eigenvalues are simple, that is,  $d_i = 1$  for  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Therefore  $m_k = k$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , that is,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{k}{\sqrt{m_k}} = \infty.$$

Consequently, we need not any assumption for  $T$ . Also in general domain  $\Omega$ , if all the eigenvalues are simple except for a finite number, then (1.16) is true in terms of (1.19), and (1.17) is satisfied for any  $T > 0$ .

Next we assume  $\frac{\ell_1^2}{\ell_2^2} \in \mathbb{Q}$ . Then all the eigenvalues are not necessarily simple, and we do not know suitable estimates of  $m(k)$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , but we have

$$\limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} d_i = \infty,$$

whose proof is found in Yamamoto [25] for example. We do not know how rapidly  $d_i$  tends to  $\infty$ . If they goes to  $\infty$  very rapidly, then  $\inf \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{k}{\sqrt{m_k}} = 0$  may happen, which breaks (1.20), and we do not know whether (1.16) holds.

**Example 2:** Let  $d = 2$  and  $\Omega = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2; |x| < 1\}$ .

It is known that  $d_i = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i = 1, \\ 2, & \text{if } i \geq 2. \end{cases}$ . Therefore  $m_k = 2k - 1$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and (1.16)

holds. We see that (1.17) holds for any  $T > 0$ .

### §1.3. Determination of $\mu(t)$ of the source term by boundary data.

In this subsection, for the inverse problems, we adopt data  $\partial_\nu u$  on a lateral sub-boundary.

We set

$$\tilde{\Lambda} := \{j \in \mathbb{N}; P_j f = 0 \text{ in } \Omega\}. \quad (1.21)$$

For the diffusion equation, we can show

**Proposition 2.**

Let  $\gamma \subset \partial\Omega$  be an arbitrarily chosen subboundary. We assume (1.7) and (1.8). Then  $\partial_\nu u_{\mu_1} = \partial_\nu u_{\mu_2}$  on  $\gamma \times (T_1, T_2)$  yields  $\mu_1(t) = \mu_2(t)$  for  $0 < t < T$  if and only if

$$\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \tilde{\Lambda}} \frac{1}{\lambda_j} = \infty. \quad (1.22)$$

The inverse source problem with boundary data is overdetermining because an unknown function depends only on one variable  $t$ . The condition (1.22) for the uniqueness is weaker than (1.12) for the uniqueness by the pointwise data  $u(x_0, t)$ ,  $T_1 < t < T_2$ .

In the one-dimensional case, Theorem 3 asserts the uniqueness for a wave equation by the pointwise data  $u(x_0, t)$  for  $T_1 < t < T_2$ , but we do not know the corresponding uniqueness for general dimensions. On the other hand, by boundary observations, we can conclude the uniqueness for general dimensions  $d \geq 2$ , as the following proposition shows.

**Proposition 3.**

Let

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty, k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \tilde{\Lambda}} \frac{k}{\sqrt{\lambda_k}} > 0. \quad (1.23)$$

We assume that there exists  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that

$$\Gamma \supset \{x \in \partial\Omega; ((x - x_0) \cdot \nu(x)) \geq 0\}, \quad T_2 - T_1 > 2 \max_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} |x - x_0| \quad (1.24)$$

and

$$T < \pi \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty, k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \tilde{\Lambda}} \frac{k}{\sqrt{\lambda_k}}. \quad (1.25)$$

Moreover, let  $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in C^1[0, T]$  satisfy  $\mu_1(t) = \mu_2(t) = 0$  for  $t > T$ . Then  $\partial_\nu u_{\mu_1}(x, t) = \partial_\nu u_{\mu_2}(x, t) = 0$  for  $x \in \Gamma$  and  $T_1 < t < T_2$  implies  $\mu_1(t) = \mu_2(t)$  for  $0 < t < T$ .

The condition (1.25) can be characterized similarly to (1.20). The observation time length  $T_2 - T_1$  should be longer, while the duration time  $T$  of the source needs to be bounded for the uniqueness for our inverse source problem.

**§1.4. Determination of  $f(x)$  of source terms by boundary data.**

In this subsection, we assume that  $\Gamma, \gamma \subset \partial\Omega$  are subboundaries, and  $T < T_1 < T_2$ ,

$$\mu \in C^1[0, \infty), \quad \mu(t) = 0 \quad \text{if } t \geq T \quad (1.26)$$

and

$$f \in L^2(\Omega). \quad (1.27)$$

We consider

**Inverse Problem III.**

*Determine  $f = f(x)$ ,  $x \in \Omega$  by  $\partial_\nu u$  on some subboundary over a time interval  $(T_1, T_2)$ .*

In the case of  $T_1 = 0$ , there are many researches on the uniqueness and the stability. Here we limit ourselves to a few works: for the diffusion equation (1.1), we refer to Xu and Yamamoto [21], Yamamoto [22], while we can consult Yamamoto [23], [24] for the wave equation (1.2).

First we consider the determination of  $f(x)$  for (1.1). Henceforth for arbitrarily chosen constants  $M > 0$  and  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , we define an admissible set of unknowns  $f$  by

$$\mathcal{F}_{M,\ell} := \{f \in \mathcal{D}(A^\ell); \|A^\ell f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq M\}. \quad (1.28)$$

**Theorem 4 (determination of  $f(x)$  in the diffusion equation).**

*Let  $\gamma$  be an arbitrarily chosen subboundary of  $\partial\Omega$ .*

(i) *We assume*

$$\int_0^T e^{\lambda_k t} \mu(t) dt \neq 0, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (1.29)$$

*Then  $\partial_\nu u = 0$  on  $\gamma \times (T_1, T_2)$  yields  $f = 0$  in  $\Omega$ .*

(ii) *We further assume*

$$\mu \geq 0, \neq 0 \quad \text{on } [0, T]. \quad (1.30)$$

*Then for  $0 < \theta < \ell$ , we can find a constant  $C = C(M, \theta) > 0$  such that*

$$\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C \left( \frac{1}{\log \frac{1}{\|\partial_\nu u\|_{L^2(\gamma \times (T_1, T_2))}}} \right)^\theta$$

*as  $\|\partial_\nu u\|_{L^2(\gamma \times (T_1, T_2))} \rightarrow 0$  for each  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{M,\ell}$ .*

In the case of  $T_1 = 0$ , we have the same estimate without assumption (1.29) (e.g., Yamamoto [22]).

**Remark.** We need the assumption (1.29). Indeed, let  $\varphi$  be an eigenfunction for  $\lambda_1$  of  $-\Delta$  with the zero Dirichlet boundary condition and let (1.29) fail, for example, let

$\int_0^T e^{\lambda_1 s} \mu(s) ds = 0$ . Then, we readily see that

$$u(x, t) := \left( \int_0^t e^{-\lambda_1(t-s)} \mu(s) ds \right) \varphi_1(x), \quad x \in \Omega, t > 0,$$

satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u = \Delta u(x, t) + \mu(t) \varphi_1(x), & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ u(x, t) = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, t > 0, \\ u(x, 0) = 0, & x \in \Omega, \end{cases}$$

and

$$u(x, t) = e^{-\lambda_1 t} \left( \int_0^T e^{\lambda_1 s} \mu(s) ds \right) \varphi_1(x) = 0, \quad x \in \Omega, t > T,$$

because  $\mu(s) = 0$  for  $s \geq T$  and  $\int_0^T e^{\lambda_1 s} \mu(s) ds = 0$ .

Therefore even  $u = 0$  on  $\bar{\Omega} \times (T_1, T_2)$  holds, and in particular,  $\partial_\nu u|_{\partial\Omega \times (T_1, T_2)} = 0$ . However,  $f = \varphi_1 \neq 0$ , that is, the uniqueness fails without (1.29).

Next we show

**Theorem 5 (determination of  $f(x)$  in the wave equation).**

We assume (1.24) and

$$\mu(0) \neq 0$$

and

$$\left| \int_0^T \mu(s) \sin \sqrt{\lambda_n}(T-s) ds \right| + \left| \int_0^T \mu(s) \cos \sqrt{\lambda_n}(T-s) ds \right| \neq 0 \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (1.31)$$

Then there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that

$$C^{-1} \|\partial_\nu u\|_{H^1(T_1, T_2; L^2(\partial\Omega))} \leq \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C \|\partial_\nu u\|_{H^1(T_1, T_2; L^2(\Gamma))} \quad (1.32)$$

for each  $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ .

In the case of  $T_1 = 0$ , we refer to the existing works: for example, Yamamoto [23], [24] which proves (1.32) only by (1.24) and  $\mu(0) \neq 0$ , not assuming (1.31).

**Example of (1.31).**

We verify that  $\mu(s) = T - s$  satisfies (1.31). Indeed we directly have

$$\int_0^T (T-s) \sin(T-s) \sqrt{\lambda_n} ds = \frac{-T\sqrt{\lambda_n} \cos T\sqrt{\lambda_n} + \sin T\sqrt{\lambda_n}}{\lambda_n}$$

and

$$\int_0^T (T-s) \cos(T-s) \sqrt{\lambda_n} ds = \frac{T\sqrt{\lambda_n} \sin T\sqrt{\lambda_n} + \cos T\sqrt{\lambda_n} - 1}{\lambda_n}.$$

Assume that both are zero for some  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ . Setting  $\xi = T\sqrt{\lambda_{n_0}} \neq 0$ , we see that

$$\xi \cos \xi - \sin \xi = 0, \quad \cos \xi + \xi \sin \xi = 1.$$

Hence  $\cos \xi = \frac{1}{1+\xi^2}$  and  $\sin \xi = \frac{\xi}{1+\xi^2}$ . By  $\cos^2 \xi + \sin^2 \xi = 1$ , we obtain  $\frac{1}{1+\xi^2} = 1$ , which yields  $\xi = 0$ , which is a contradiction by  $\xi = \sqrt{\lambda_{n_0}}T \neq 0$ . Thus  $\mu(s) = T - s$  satisfies (1.31).

This article is composed of 9 sections. In Sections 2 and 3, we prove Theorems 1 and 2 respectively. In Section 4, we prove Theorem 3 and Proposition 1. Sections 5 and 6 are devoted to the proofs of Theorems 4 and 5. In Section 7, we prove Propositions 2 and 3. For convenience, Section 8 provides proofs of standard uniqueness results for the case of  $T_1 = 0$  in determining  $\mu(t)$ . Section 9 gives the proofs of Lemmata 1 and 2.

## 2 Proof of Theorem 1

Without loss of generality, we can assume that  $0 < t_0 < t_1$ . For  $t \geq 0$ , we set

$$g(t) := \theta(t - t_1) - \theta(t - t_0) = 0 \quad \text{if } t \leq t_0 \text{ or } t > t_1 + a. \quad (2.1)$$

Setting  $y = u_{t_1} - u_{t_0}$ , we have

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t y(x, t) = \Delta y(x, t) + g(t)f(x), & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ \partial_\nu y(x, t) = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, t > 0, \\ y(x, 0) = 0, & x \in \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

Let  $G = G(x, y, s)$  be the Green function for  $\partial_t - \Delta$  in  $\Omega$  with the zero Neumann boundary condition. Then

$$G(x, y, s) > 0, \quad x, y \in \Omega, 0 < s < T$$

(e.g., Theorem 10.1 (i) in Itô [14]). Setting  $D := \text{supp } f$ , by (1.6) we see that  $D \subset \Omega$ . Note that  $D$  is a closed set and  $T^* > t^* + a$  by the assumption. Since  $G(x_0, y, s)$  is a

continuous function in  $y \in D$  and  $T^* - t^* - a \leq s \leq T^* - t_*$ , we can choose a constant  $C_0 = C_0(D, t_*, t^* + a) > 0$  such that

$$G(x_0, y, s) \geq C_0 > 0, \quad y \in D, T^* - t^* - a \leq s \leq T^* - t. \quad (2.3)$$

Moreover, we have

$$y(x, t) = \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} G(x, y, t-s) f(y) g(s) dy ds, \quad x \in \Omega, t > 0 \quad (2.4)$$

(e.g., [14]). In general, (2.4) holds for  $g \in C[0, T^*]$ , and we here do not assume that  $g$  is continuous. However, (1.3) in Lemma 1 asserts

$$\|y\|_{C(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, T^*])} \leq C \|g\|_{L^2(0, T^*)} \quad (2.5)$$

in view of  $f \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ . Therefore by taking an approximating sequence  $g_n \in C_0^\infty(0, T^*)$  to  $g$  in  $L^2(0, T^*)$ , we can verify that (2.4) holds for  $g \in L^2(0, T^*)$ .

By  $0 < t_* < t^* + a < T^*$ , (1.6), and (2.3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} y(x_0, T^*) &= \int_0^{T^*} \int_{\Omega} G(x_0, y, T^* - s) f(y) g(s) dy ds \\ &\geq \int_{t_*}^{t^*+a} \int_D G(x_0, y, T^* - s) f(y) g(s) dy ds \\ &\geq C_0 \left( \int_{t_*}^{t^*+a} g(s) ds \right) \int_D f(y) dy \geq C_0 C_1 \int_{t_*}^{t^*+a} g(s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Here, by (1.6), we used  $C_1 := \int_D f(y) dy > 0$ . On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{t_*}^{t^*+a} g(s) ds &= \int_{t_*}^{t^*+a} \theta(s - t_1) ds - \int_{t_*}^{t^*+a} \theta(s - t_0) ds \\ &= \int_{t_* - t_1}^{a + t^* - t_1} \theta(\eta) d\eta - \int_{t_* - t_0}^{a + t^* - t_0} \theta(\eta) d\eta \\ &= \left( \int_{t_* - t_1}^0 + \int_0^a + \int_a^{a + t^* - t_1} \right) \theta(\eta) d\eta - \left( \int_{t_* - t_0}^0 + \int_0^a + \int_a^{a + t^* - t_0} \right) \theta(\eta) d\eta = \int_{t_* - t_1}^{t_* - t_0} \theta(\eta) d\eta. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used  $\theta(\eta) = 0$  for  $\eta \geq a$ , and noted that  $a < a + t^* - t_1$  and  $a < a + t^* - t_0$ . By  $t_* - t_0, t_* - t_1 < 0$ , we obtain  $\int_{t_*}^{t^*+a} g(s) ds = \int_{t_* - t_1}^{t_* - t_0} \theta(\eta) d\eta = t_1 - t_0$ .

Noting that  $y = u_{t_1} - u_{t_0}$ , we complete the proof of Theorem 1.



### 3 Proof of Theorem 2

Let  $\mu = \mu_1 - \mu_2$  and  $u = u_{\mu_1} - u_{\mu_2}$ . By the eigenfunction expansion, we have

$$u(x, t) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \int_0^t e^{-\lambda_n(t-s)} \mu(s) ds \right) P_n f(x), \quad x \in \Omega, t > 0 \quad (3.1)$$

(e.g., [14]). In terms of  $f \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$  and Lemma 1 in Section 1, we can verify that the series in (3.1) is convergent in  $C(\bar{\Omega} \times [0, T_2])$ .

Let  $t \in [T_1, T_2]$ . Since  $\mu(s) = 0$  for  $s > T$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} u(x_0, t) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda_n t} \left( \int_0^T e^{\lambda_n s} \mu(s) ds \right) P_n f(x_0) \\ &= \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \Lambda(x_0)} e^{-\lambda_n t} \left( \int_0^T e^{\lambda_n s} \mu(s) ds \right) (P_n f)(x_0) = 0, \quad t > T. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

Here we recall that the set  $\Lambda(x_0) \subset \mathbb{N}$  is defined by (1.10).

We know

**Lemma 3.**

Let  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |a_n| e^{-\lambda_n T_1} < \infty$ . If

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n e^{-\lambda_n t} = 0, \quad T_1 < t < T_2,$$

then  $a_n = 0$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Proof of Lemma 3.**

For completeness, we provide the proof although the lemma is well-known. We set  $b_n := a_n e^{-\lambda_n T_1}$ . By

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |a_n| e^{-\lambda_n T_1} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |b_n| < \infty,$$

we see that the series  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n e^{-\lambda_n(z-T_1)}$  converges uniformly and absolutely in any compact domain in  $\{z \in \mathbb{C}; \operatorname{Re} z > T_1\}$ . Therefore  $h(z) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n e^{-\lambda_n(z-T_1)}$  is analytic if  $\operatorname{Re} z > T_1$ . Hence  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n e^{-\lambda_n(t-T_1)} = 0$  for all  $t > T_1$  by the analyticity. Since  $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \dots$ , we have

$$b_1 + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} b_n e^{-(\lambda_n - \lambda_1)(t-T_1)} = 0 \quad \text{for } t > T_1.$$

Since

$$\left| \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} b_n e^{-(\lambda_n - \lambda_1)(t-T_1)} \right| \leq e^{-(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)(t-T_1)} \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} |b_n|$$

and

$$\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} |b_n| = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} |a_n| e^{-\lambda_n T_1} < \infty,$$

letting  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , we see that  $b_1 = 0$ , that is,  $a_1 = 0$ . Continuing this argument, we reach  $a_n = 0$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Thus the proof of Lemma 3 is complete.  $\blacksquare$

We return to the proof of Theorem 2. Setting

$$a_n = \left( \int_0^T e^{\lambda_n s} \mu(s) ds \right) P_n f(x_0), \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

by (3.2) we obtain

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \Lambda(x_0)} a_n e^{-\lambda_n t} = 0, \quad T_1 < t < T_2$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \Lambda(x_0)} |a_n e^{-\lambda_n t}| &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left| \left( \int_0^T e^{-\lambda_n(t-s)} \mu(s) ds \right) (P_n f)(x_0) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \int_0^T |\mu(s)| ds \right) |(P_n f)(x_0)|, \quad t \geq T_1 > T. \end{aligned}$$

We recall that  $A = -\Delta$  with  $\mathcal{D}(A) = H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ . By (1.8) we see that  $f \in \mathcal{D}(A^m)$  with each  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since  $P_j f \in \mathcal{D}(A^m)$  and  $AP_j f = \lambda_j P_j f$ , choosing even number  $\beta > \frac{d}{2}$ , by Sobolev embedding, we obtain

$$|P_j f(x_0)| \leq \|P_j f\|_{C(\bar{\Omega})} \leq C \|P_j f\|_{H^\beta(\Omega)} \leq C \|A^{\frac{\beta}{2}} P_j f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = C \lambda_j^{\frac{\beta}{2}} \|P_j f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

and

$$\|P_j f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{d_j} |(P_j f, \varphi_{jk})|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{d_j} |(A^m P_j f, A^{-m} \varphi_{jk})|^2 = \lambda_j^{-2m} \sum_{k=1}^{d_j} |(A^m P_j f, \varphi_{jk})|^2.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} |P_j f(x_0)|^2 &\leq C \lambda_j^{-2m+\beta} \sum_{k=1}^{d_j} |(A^m P_j f, \varphi_{jk})|^2 \\ &\leq C \|A^m P_j f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \lambda_j^{-2m+\beta} \leq C \|A^m f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \lambda_j^{-2m+\beta}, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we choose

$$\beta_1 > \frac{d}{4} \quad \text{and} \quad m > \frac{1}{2} \left( \beta + 2\beta_1 + \frac{d}{2} \right),$$

and we re-number the eigenvalues  $\sigma_j$  according to the multiplicities:  $0 < \sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2 \leq \sigma_3 \leq \dots \rightarrow$  and we note that  $\lambda_j \geq \sigma_j$  by the re-numbering. Then  $\lambda_j \geq \sigma_j \sim \rho_0 j^{\frac{2}{d}}$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$  (e.g., [1], [8]) and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |P_j f(x_0)| &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^{-\beta_1} \lambda_j^{\beta_1} |P_j f(x_0)| \leq \left( \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^{-2\beta_1} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^{2\beta_1} |P_j f(x_0)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C \|A^m f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^{-2\beta_1} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j^{-2m+\beta+2\beta_1} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C \|A^m f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^{-\frac{4\beta_1}{d}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^{\frac{2}{d}(-2m+\beta+2\beta_1)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $m > \frac{1}{2}(\beta + 2\beta_1 + \frac{d}{2})$  and  $\beta_1 > \frac{d}{4}$  yield that  $\frac{2}{d}(-2m+\beta+2\beta_1) < -1$  and  $-\frac{4\beta_1}{d} < -1$ , so that we see that the right-hand side is convergent, that is,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |P_j f(x_0)| < \infty.$$

Hence, we can apply Lemma 3 to (3.2) for  $t \geq T_1$ , and we obtain that  $u_{\mu_1}(x_0, t) = u_{\mu_2}(x_0, t)$  for  $T_1 < t < T_2$  if and only if

$$\int_0^T e^{\lambda_n s} \mu(s) ds = 0, \quad n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \Lambda(x_0). \quad (3.3)$$

We set  $\eta = e^s$  and  $h(\eta) = \mu(\log \eta)$ , and we see that  $1 < \eta < e^T$  for  $0 < s < T$ . Then (3.3) is equivalent to

$$\int_1^{e^T} \eta^{\lambda_n} \frac{h(\eta)}{\eta} d\eta = 0, \quad n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \Lambda(x_0). \quad (3.4)$$

By the Müntz theorem (e.g., E.7 on p.184 of Borwein and Erdélyi [3]) as directly applicable version, we see that (3.4) yields  $\frac{h(\eta)}{\eta} = 0$  for  $1 < \eta < e^T$  if and only if (1.12) holds. Thus the proof of Theorem 2 is complete.

In the case of  $d = 1$ , we see that  $\lambda_j = \sigma_j$  because all the eigenvalues are simple. Therefore Corollary follows directly since  $\lambda_j \sim \rho_0 j^2$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ , which implies  $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda_j} < \infty$  if  $d = 1$ .

## 4 Proofs of Theorem 3 and Proposition 1

For general dimensions  $d$ , we have

$$u_\mu(x, t) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \int_0^t \frac{\sin \sqrt{\lambda_n}(t-s)}{\sqrt{\lambda_n}} \mu(s) ds \right) P_n f(x), \quad x \in \Omega, t > 0 \quad (4.1)$$

(e.g., Komornik [16]). Setting  $\mu := \mu_1 - \mu_2$  and  $u := u_{\mu_1} - u_{\mu_2}$ , since  $\mu(t) = 0$  for  $t > T$  and  $u \in C(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, \infty))$ , in terms of (1.8) and Lemma 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u_\mu(x_0, t) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \int_0^T \frac{\sin \sqrt{\lambda_n}(t-s)}{\sqrt{\lambda_n}} \mu(s) ds \right) P_n f(x_0) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\sin \sqrt{\lambda_n} t}{\sqrt{\lambda_n}} \left( \int_0^T \mu(s) \cos \sqrt{\lambda_n} s ds \right) P_n f(x_0) \\ &\quad - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\cos \sqrt{\lambda_n} t}{\sqrt{\lambda_n}} \left( \int_0^T \mu(s) \sin \sqrt{\lambda_n} s ds \right) P_n f(x_0), \quad t > T. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$u_\mu(x_0, t) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (a_n(P_n f)(x_0) \sin \sqrt{\lambda_n} t + b_n(P_n f)(x_0) \cos \sqrt{\lambda_n} t), \quad t > T, \quad (4.2)$$

where we set

$$a_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_n}} \int_0^T \mu(s) \cos \sqrt{\lambda_n} s ds, \quad b_n = \frac{-1}{\sqrt{\lambda_n}} \int_0^T \mu(s) \sin \sqrt{\lambda_n} s ds, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

The series is convergent in  $C(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, \infty))$  by (1.8) and Lemma 1 (i).

### Proof of Theorem 3.

In the case of  $\Omega = (0, \ell)$ , we know  $d_n = 1$ ,  $\lambda_n = \frac{n^2 \pi^2}{\ell^2}$  and  $\varphi_n(x) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\ell}} \sin \frac{n\pi}{\ell} x$ ,  $(P_n f)(x_0) = (f, \varphi_n) \varphi_n(x_0)$ . Therefore,

$$u_\mu(x_0, t) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( a_n \sin \frac{n\pi t}{\ell} + b_n \cos \frac{n\pi s}{\ell} \right) (f, \varphi_n) \varphi_n(x_0) \quad \text{for } T_1 < t < T_2 \quad (4.3)$$

for  $T_1 < t < T_2$ .

Since  $T_2 - T_1 \geq 2\ell$  by (1.15), we have (4.3) for  $T_1 < t < T_1 + 2\ell$ . Since (4.3) is convergent in  $C[0, \infty)$ , we see that (4.3) is convergent in  $L^2(T_1, T_1 + 2\ell)$ . Hence, taking the scalar products in  $L^2(T_1, T_1 + 2\ell)$  with  $\sin \frac{m\pi t}{\ell}$  and  $\cos \frac{m\pi t}{\ell}$ , we obtain  $a_m(f, \varphi_m) \varphi_m(x_0) = b_m(f, \varphi_m) \varphi_m(x_0) = 0$  for  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . By (1.15), we see that  $(f, \varphi_m) \neq 0$  and  $\varphi_m(x_0) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\ell}} \sin \frac{m\pi}{\ell} x_0 \neq 0$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Consequently,  $a_m = b_m = 0$ , that is,

$$\int_0^T \mu(s) \cos \frac{m\pi s}{\ell} ds = \int_0^T \mu(s) \sin \frac{m\pi s}{\ell} ds = 0, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We recall the assumption  $T \leq 2\ell$ . If  $T < 2\ell$ , then we set  $\tilde{\mu}(t) = \begin{cases} \mu(s), & 0 < s < T, \\ 0, & T \leq s < 2\ell. \end{cases}$

Then

$$\int_0^{2\ell} \tilde{\mu}(s) \cos \frac{m\pi s}{\ell} ds = \int_0^{2\ell} \tilde{\mu}(s) \sin \frac{m\pi s}{\ell} ds = 0, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Therefore,  $\tilde{\mu}(s) = c_1$ : constant for  $0 < s < 2\ell$ . In the case of  $T = 2\ell$ , we have  $c_1 = \mu(T) = 0$  by  $\mu(t) = 0$  for  $t \geq T$ . In the case of  $T < 2\ell$ , since  $\tilde{\mu} = 0$  in  $[T, 2\ell]$ , we see  $c_1 = 0$ . Hence  $\mu(s) = 0$  for  $0 < s < T$ , and the proof of Theorem 3 is complete.

### Proof of Proposition 1.

Since  $f \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ , we see (4.2), and the series  $u_\mu(x_0, t)$  is convergent in  $L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ , and so  $\gamma$  is an almost periodic function (e.g., Böttcher and Silbermann [4]). By a property of almost periodic functions (e.g., property (d) in p.493 in [4]) yields

$$\|u_\mu(x_0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} = \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} |u_\mu(x_0, t)|.$$

By (1.18), we see that  $\|u_\mu(x_0, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} = 0$ , that is,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n(P_n f)(x_0) \sin \sqrt{\lambda_n} t + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n(P_n f)(x_0) \cos \sqrt{\lambda_n} t = 0, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Substituting  $-t$  and adding and subtracting, we obtain

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n(P_n f)(x_0) \sin \sqrt{\lambda_n} t = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n(P_n f)(x_0) \cos \sqrt{\lambda_n} t = 0, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (4.4)$$

Now we can prove

#### Lemma 4.

Let  $0 < p_1 < p_2 < \dots \rightarrow \infty$ . Let  $\alpha_n \in \mathbb{R}$  satisfy

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\alpha_n| < \infty. \quad (4.5)$$

Then

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n \sin p_n t = 0, \quad t > 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n \cos p_n t = 0, \quad t > 0$$

yields  $\alpha_n = 0$  for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

For completeness the proof of the lemma is provided at the end of this section.

Now we complete the proof of Proposition 1. Applying Lemma 4 to (4.4), we obtain

$$a_n(P_n f)(x_0) = b_n(P_n f)(x_0) = 0, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

By the definition (1.10) of  $\Lambda(x_0)$ , we reach  $a_n = b_n = 0$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \Lambda(x_0)$ , that is,

$$\int_0^T \mu(s) \cos \sqrt{\lambda_n} s ds = \int_0^T \mu(s) \sin \sqrt{\lambda_n} s ds = 0, \quad n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \Lambda(x_0).$$

With the even extension of  $\mu$  to  $(-T, 0)$  for example, we see

$$\int_{-T}^T \mu(s) e^{s\sqrt{-1}\sqrt{\lambda_n}} ds = 0 \quad \text{for } n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \Lambda(x_0). \quad (4.6)$$

We can prove the following lemma, whose proof is given at the end of this section.

**Lemma 5.**

*Under assumptions (1.16) and (1.17), the system*

$$\{e^{s\sqrt{-1}\sqrt{\lambda_n}}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \Lambda(x_0)}$$

*is complete in  $C[-T, T]$ . In particular, (4.6) implies  $\mu(s) = 0$  for  $0 < t < T$ .*

Here we say that  $\{e^{s\sqrt{-1}\sqrt{\lambda_n}}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \Lambda(x_0)}$  is complete in  $C[-T, T]$  if  $g \in C[-T, T]$  and

$$\int_{-T}^T g(s) e^{s\sqrt{-1}\sqrt{\lambda_n}} ds = 0 \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \Lambda(x_0),$$

imply  $g(s) = 0$  for  $0 \leq s \leq T$ .

By applying Lemma 5 to (4.6), the proof of Proposition 1 is finished.

We conclude this section with

**Proof of Lemma 4.** It suffices to prove in the case  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n \sin p_n t = 0$  for  $t > 0$ . By (4.5), the series  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n \sin p_n t = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n (e^{\sqrt{-1}p_n t} - e^{-\sqrt{-1}p_n t})$  is convergent in  $L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ . Therefore, we can take the Laplace transform term-wisely:

$$0 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n \int_0^{\infty} (e^{\sqrt{-1}p_n t} - e^{-\sqrt{-1}p_n t}) e^{-\xi t} dt = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{2\sqrt{-1}\alpha_n p_n}{\xi^2 + p_n^2}$$

for  $\text{Re } \xi > 0$ . Setting  $\eta = \xi^2$ , we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha_n p_n}{\eta + p_n^2} = 0, \quad \eta \geq 0.$$

For  $\eta > 0$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , since  $|\eta + p_n^2|^k \geq p_n^{2k}$  and so

$$\left| \frac{\alpha_n p_n}{(\eta + p_n^2)^k} \right| \leq \frac{|\alpha_n|}{p_n^{2k-1}} \leq C|\alpha_n|, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

In view of (4.5), the series  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha_n p_n}{(\eta + p_n^2)^k}$  is uniformly convergent in  $\eta \in [0, L]$  with arbitrary  $L > 0$  for each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Therefore, we can term-wisely differentiate in  $\eta$ :

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha_n p_n}{(\eta + p_n^2)^k} = 0, \quad \eta > 0.$$

Substituting  $\eta = 1$ , we can write

$$\frac{\alpha_1 p_1}{(1 + p_1^2)^k} + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha_n p_n}{(1 + p_n^2)^k} = 0,$$

that is,

$$\frac{\alpha_1 p_1}{1 + p_1^2} = - \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \alpha_n \frac{p_n}{1 + p_n^2} \left( \frac{1 + p_1^2}{1 + p_n^2} \right)^{k-1}.$$

Since  $0 < p_1 < p_2 < \dots$ , we have

$$\frac{1 + p_1^2}{1 + p_n^2} \leq \frac{1 + p_1^2}{1 + p_2^2} =: r < 1$$

for each  $n \geq 2$  and  $\frac{p_n}{1 + p_n^2} \leq 1$ . Hence we see that

$$\left| \frac{\alpha_1 p_1}{1 + p_1^2} \right| \leq \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} |\alpha_n| r^{k-1} \leq C r^{k-1} \longrightarrow 0$$

as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  in view of (4.5). Therefore,  $\alpha_1 = 0$  by  $p_1 \neq 0$ . Continuing this argument, we can successively obtain  $\alpha_n = 0$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , so that the proof of Lemma 4 is complete. ■

### Proof of Lemma 5.

Considering the zero extension, we readily see that  $\{e^{s\sqrt{-1}\sqrt{\lambda_n}}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \Lambda(x_0)}$  is complete in  $C[-T, T]$ , then so is it in  $C[-\tilde{T}, \tilde{T}]$  with any  $0 < \tilde{T} < T$ .

We set

$$R := \sup\{L; \{e^{s\sqrt{-1}\sqrt{\lambda_n}}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \Lambda(x_0)} \text{ is complete in } C[-L, L]\}$$

and

$$D := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty, k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \Lambda(x_0)} \frac{k}{\sqrt{\lambda_k}}.$$

Since  $\sqrt{\lambda_k} > 0$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \Lambda(x_0)$  and is increasing in  $k$ , we can apply Theorem 13 (p.116) in [27], and we can obtain

$$\pi D \leq R.$$

Therefore, if  $T < \pi D$ , then we have  $T < R$ . Hence,  $\{e^{s\sqrt{-1}\sqrt{\lambda_n}}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \Lambda(x_0)}$  is complete in  $C[-T, T]$  if  $T < \pi D$ . We finished the proof of Lemma 5. ■

## 5 Proof of Theorem 4

### First Step:

We have

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u(x, t) = \Delta u(x, t), & x \in \Omega, t > T, \\ u(x, t) = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, t > T. \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

We can prove

$$\|u(\cdot, \tilde{t})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C \|\partial_\nu u\|_{L^2(\gamma \times (T_1, T_2))} \quad \text{for } T_1 < \tilde{t} < T_2. \quad (5.2)$$

### Proof of (5.2).

First we show a Carleman estimate. For it, let  $d \in C^2(\overline{\Omega})$  satisfy  $d > 0$  in  $\Omega$ ,  $|\nabla d| > 0$  on  $\overline{\Omega}$  and  $\partial_\nu d \leq 0$  on  $\partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma$ . For the proof of such  $d$ , see e.g., Imanuvilov [10].

We set

$$\beta(x, t) = \frac{e^{\lambda d(x)}}{(t - T_1)(T_2 - t)}, \quad \alpha(x, t) = \frac{e^{\lambda d(x)} - e^{2\lambda \|d\|_{C(\overline{\Omega})}}}{(t - T_1)(T_2 - t)}, \quad x \in \Omega, T_1 < t < T_2,$$

where we choose  $\lambda > 0$  sufficiently large. Then

### Lemma 6 (Carleman estimate).

There exist constants  $C > 0$  and  $s_0 > 0$  such that

$$\int_{\Omega \times (T_1, T_2)} \left( \frac{1}{s\beta} |\partial_t u|^2 + s^3 \lambda^4 \beta^3 |u|^2 \right) e^{2s\alpha} dx dt \leq C \int_{\gamma \times (T_1, T_2)} |\partial_\nu u|^2 dS dt$$

for all  $s > s_0$  and all  $u$  satisfying (5.1) and  $\partial_t u, \Delta u \in L^2(\Omega \times (T_1, T_2))$ .

For the proof, we refer to Imanuvilov [10], and also Imanuvilov and Yamamoto [11], where the parabolic equation is considered in the time interval  $(0, T)$ , and we can translate by change  $t \mapsto \frac{T}{T_2 - T_1}(t - T_1)$ .

We choose and fix  $t_1, t_2$  such that  $T_1 < t_1 < \frac{T_1 + T_2}{2} < t_2 < T_2$ . Since  $\alpha(x, t) < 0$  for  $x \in \Omega$  and  $T_1 < t < T_2$ , there exist constants  $C_1, C_2, C_3 > 0$  such that

$$\alpha(x, t) \geq -C_1, \quad C_2 \leq \beta(x, t) < C_3, \quad (x, t) \in \overline{\Omega} \times [t_1, t_2].$$

Therefore, for all large  $s > 0$ , we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega \times (t_1, t_2)} (|\partial_t u|^2 + |u|^2) dx dt \leq C \int_{\gamma \times (T_1, T_2)} |\partial_\nu u|^2 dS dt.$$



Here the constant  $C > 0$  depends on  $t_1, t_2$  and fixed large constants  $s > 0$ . Applying the Sobolev embedding  $H^1(t_1, t_2; L^2(\Omega)) \subset C([t_1, t_2]; L^2(\Omega))$ , we obtain

$$\sup_{t_1 \leq t \leq t_2} \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq C \|\partial_\nu u\|_{L^2(\gamma \times (t_1, t_2))}^2.$$

Since  $t_1, t_2$  are arbitrarily provided that  $T_1 < t_1 < t_2 < T_2$ , the proof of (5.2) is complete.

Henceforth we renumber the set  $\{\lambda_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  of all the eigenvalues of  $-\Delta$  with the zero Dirichlet boundary condition, according to the multiplicities:  $0 < \sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2 \leq \sigma_3 \leq \dots$ . We can choose an eigenfunction  $\varphi_k$  corresponding to  $\sigma_k$  such that  $\{\varphi_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  forms an orthonormal basis in  $L^2(\Omega)$ .

By the eigenfunction expansion, we can represent the solution  $u$  to (1.1) for  $0 \leq t \leq T$  as

$$u(x, t) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} e^{-\sigma_j t} \left( \int_0^t e^{\sigma_j s} \mu(s) ds \right) (f, \varphi_j) \varphi_j(x), \quad x \in \Omega, 0 \leq t \leq T. \quad (5.3)$$

Since  $\mu(s) = 0$  for  $s \geq T$ , we obtain

$$u(x, t) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} e^{-\sigma_j t} \left( \int_0^T e^{\sigma_j s} \mu(s) ds \right) (f, \varphi_j) \varphi_j(x), \quad x \in \Omega, T < t \leq T_2. \quad (5.4)$$

### Second Step: Proof of Theorem 4 (i).

By (5.2) and  $\partial_\nu u = 0$  on  $\gamma \times (T_1, T_2)$ , we have  $u(x, t) = 0$  for  $x \in \Omega$  and  $T_1 < t < T_2$ . Therefore, (5.4) yields

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} e^{-\sigma_j \tilde{t}} \left( \int_0^T e^{\sigma_j s} \mu(s) ds \right) (f, \varphi_j) \varphi_j(x) = 0, \quad x \in \Omega, T_1 \leq \tilde{t} \leq T_2,$$

which implies

$$\left( \int_0^T e^{\sigma_j s} \mu(s) ds \right) (f, \varphi_j) = 0 \quad \text{for all } j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

By the assumption (1.29), we reach  $(f, \varphi_j) = 0$  for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Thus  $f = 0$  in  $\Omega$ .

### Third Step: Proof of Theorem 4 (ii).

We fix  $\tilde{t} \in (T_1, T_2)$  arbitrarily. Combining (5.2) with (5.4) with  $t = \tilde{t}$ , we obtain

$$\|u(\cdot, \tilde{t})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 = \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} p_j (f, \varphi_j) \varphi_j \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq C \|\partial_\nu u\|_{L^2(T_1, T_2; L^2(\gamma))}^2. \quad (5.5)$$

Here we set

$$p_j = e^{-\sigma_j \tilde{t}} \left( \int_0^T e^{\sigma_j s} \mu(s) ds \right), \quad j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since  $f \in \mathcal{D}(A^\ell)$  with given  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$|(f, \varphi_j)| = |(A^\ell f, A^{-\ell} \varphi_j)| = \left| \frac{1}{\sigma_j^\ell} (A^\ell f, \varphi_j) \right|. \quad (5.6)$$

Therefore, for each  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |(f, \varphi_j)|^2 &= \left( \sum_{j=1}^N + \sum_{j=N+1}^{\infty} \right) |(f, \varphi_j)|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^N |(f, \varphi_j)|^2 + \sum_{j=N+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sigma_j^{2\ell}} |(A^\ell f, \varphi_j)|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^N |(f, \varphi_j)|^2 + \frac{1}{\sigma_N^{2\ell}} \sum_{j=N+1}^{\infty} |(A^\ell f, \varphi_j)|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^N |(f, \varphi_j)|^2 + \frac{1}{\sigma_N^{2\ell}} \|A^\ell f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

Next we estimate  $p_j$ . By (1.30), we arbitrarily fix constants  $0 < t_1 < t_2 < T$  and  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\mu(s) \geq \delta$  for  $t_1 \leq s \leq t_2$ . Therefore,

$$\int_0^T e^{\sigma_j s} \mu(s) ds \geq \delta \int_{t_1}^{t_2} e^{\sigma_j s} ds = \frac{e^{\sigma_j t_2} - e^{\sigma_j t_1}}{\sigma_j} \delta,$$

so that

$$\frac{1}{|p_j|} = \frac{e^{\sigma_j \tilde{t}} \sigma_j}{\delta} \frac{1}{e^{\sigma_j t_2} (1 - e^{-\sigma_j (t_2 - t_1)})} = \frac{e^{\sigma_j (\tilde{t} - t_2)} \sigma_j}{\delta} \frac{1}{1 - e^{-\sigma_j (t_2 - t_1)}} \leq C_1 \sigma_j e^{C_2 \sigma_j} \quad (5.8)$$

for  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . By  $e^{-\sigma_j (t_2 - t_1)} \leq e^{-\sigma_1 (t_2 - t_1)} < 1$  for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , the constants  $C_1 > 0$  and  $C_2 > 0$  are independent of  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . On the other hand, substituting  $t = \tilde{t}$  in (5.4), we take the scalar product of (5.4) with  $\varphi_j$ , and we obtain  $(u(\cdot, \tilde{t}), \varphi_j) = p_j (f, \varphi_j)$ . Hence, (5.8) implies

$$|(f, \varphi_j)| = \frac{1}{|p_j|} |(u(\cdot, \tilde{t}), \varphi_j)| \leq C_1 \sigma_j e^{C_2 \sigma_j} |(u(\cdot, \tilde{t}), \varphi_j)|, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Substituting this into (5.7), we see

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 &\leq C_1^2 \sum_{j=1}^N \sigma_j^2 e^{2C_2 \sigma_j} |(u(\cdot, \tilde{t}), \varphi_j)|^2 + \frac{1}{\sigma_N^{2\ell}} \|A^\ell f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ &\leq C_1^2 \sigma_N^2 e^{2C_2 \sigma_N} \|(u(\cdot, \tilde{t}))\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{\sigma_N^{2\ell}} \|A^\ell f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \end{aligned}$$

with arbitrary  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ .

In terms of (5.2), since we are considering the case of  $\|\partial_\nu u\|_{L^2(\gamma \times (T_1, T_2))} \rightarrow 0$ , we can assume that  $\|u(\cdot, \tilde{t})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} < 1$ . Since  $\sigma_N \sim \rho_0 N^{\frac{2}{d}}$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  (e.g., [1], [8]) and  $N^{\frac{2}{d}} \leq \exp(N^{\frac{2}{d}})$  for sufficiently large  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , we obtain

$$\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C_1 \exp\left(C_3 N^{\frac{2}{d}}\right) \eta + \frac{C_1}{N^{\theta_0}} M \quad \text{for all } N \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (5.9)$$

where we choose a small constant  $\eta_0 \in (0, 1)$  and set

$$\eta := \|u(\cdot, \tilde{t})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq 1 - \eta_0, \quad M := \|A^\ell f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad \theta_0 := \frac{2\ell}{d}.$$

Now, for given  $\eta > 0$ , we make the right-hand side of (5.9) smaller by choosing  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ . By  $\eta < 1$ , we see  $\log \frac{1}{\eta} > 1$ . Let  $\theta \in (0, \ell)$  be arbitrarily given. We can choose  $N = N(\eta) \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\left(\log \frac{1}{\eta}\right)^{\frac{\theta}{\theta_0}} \leq N < \left(\log \frac{1}{\eta}\right)^{\frac{\theta}{\theta_0}} + 1.$$

Then

$$\left(\log \frac{1}{\eta}\right)^\theta \leq N^{\theta_0},$$

that is,

$$\frac{C_1}{N^{\theta_0}} \leq \frac{C_1}{\left(\log \frac{1}{\eta}\right)^\theta}. \quad (5.10)$$

Moreover, we know

$$N^{\frac{2}{d}} \leq \left(\left(\log \frac{1}{\eta}\right)^{\frac{\theta}{\theta_0}} + 1\right)^{\frac{2}{d}} \leq C_4 \left(\left(\log \frac{1}{\eta}\right)^{\frac{\theta}{\theta_0} \frac{2}{d}} + 1\right),$$

that is,

$$e^{C_3 N^{\frac{2}{d}}} \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left(C_3 C_4 \left(\left(\log \frac{1}{\eta}\right)^{\frac{\theta}{\ell}} + 1\right)\right) \leq C_5 \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left(C_5 \left(\log \frac{1}{\eta}\right)^{\frac{\theta}{\ell}}\right)$$

for  $\eta \leq 1 - \eta_0$ . Setting  $t = \log \frac{1}{\eta} > 0$ , we can see

$$\eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left(C_5 \left(\log \frac{1}{\eta}\right)^{\frac{\theta}{\ell}}\right) = e^{-\frac{1}{2}t} \exp(C_5 t^{\frac{\theta}{\ell}}),$$

and so  $\frac{\theta}{\ell} < 1$  yields

$$\sup_{\eta < 1} \left| \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left(C_5 \left(\log \frac{1}{\eta}\right)^{\frac{\theta}{\ell}}\right) \right| < \infty.$$

Hence,

$$\exp(C_3 N^{\frac{2}{d}}) \eta \leq C_5 \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \sup_{\eta < 1} \left| \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp \left( C_5 \left( \log \frac{1}{\eta} \right)^{\frac{\theta}{2}} \right) \right| \leq C_6 \eta^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and (5.9) with this choice of  $N$  and (5.10) yield

$$\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C_7 \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{C_1}{\left( \log \frac{1}{\eta} \right)^{\theta}} M.$$

Since we can find a constant  $C_8 > 0$  such that  $\eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{C_8}{\left( \log \frac{1}{\eta} \right)^{\theta}}$  for  $\eta < 1$ , we obtain

$$\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \frac{C_9}{\left( \log \frac{1}{\eta} \right)^{\theta}} M.$$

By using (5.5), we complete the proof of Theorem 4 (ii).

## 6 Proof of Theorem 5

Since  $\mu(t) = 0$  for  $t > T$ , we have

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^2 u(x, t) = \Delta u(x, t), & x \in \Omega, t > T, \\ u(x, t) = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, t > T. \end{cases} \quad (6.1)$$

Setting  $v = \partial_t u$  and

$$\tilde{\mu}(t) = \begin{cases} \mu'(t), & 0 < t \leq T, \\ 0, & t > T, \end{cases}$$

we have

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^2 v(x, t) = \Delta v(x, t) + \tilde{\mu}(t) f(x), & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ v(x, t) = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, t > 0, \\ v(x, 0) = \partial_t v(x, 0) = 0, & x \in \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (6.2)$$

By Theorem 8.2 (p.275) in [17], we note that  $v \in C([0, \infty); H_0^1(\Omega))$  and  $\partial_t v \in C([0, \infty); L^2(\Omega))$ .

In particular,

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^2 v(x, t) = \Delta v(x, t), & x \in \Omega, t > T, \\ v(x, t) = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, t > 0, \\ v(x, T) = \partial_t u(x, T), & \partial_t v(x, 0) = \Delta u(x, T), \quad x \in \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (6.3)$$

In view of (1.24), we can apply the observability inequality (e.g., Komornik [16]) to (6.3), so that we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\partial_t u(\cdot, T)\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\Delta u(\cdot, T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = \|v(\cdot, T)\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\partial_t v(\cdot, T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ & \leq C \|\partial_\nu u\|_{H^1(T_1, T_2; L^2(\Gamma))}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $u(\cdot, T) = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$ , the elliptic regularity implies  $\|u(\cdot, T)\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \leq C \|\Delta u(\cdot, T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ , we have

$$\|u(\cdot, T)\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \|\partial_t u(\cdot, T)\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} \leq C \|\partial_\nu u\|_{H^1(T_1, T_2; L^2(\Gamma))}. \quad (6.4)$$

Similarly to (4.1), we can obtain

$$u(x, t) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \int_0^t \frac{\sin \sqrt{\lambda_n}(t-s)}{\sqrt{\lambda_n}} \mu(s) ds \right) P_n f(x)$$

in  $H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$  for  $0 < t < T$ . Therefore,

$$\partial_t u(x, t) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \int_0^t \cos \sqrt{\lambda_n}(t-s) \mu(s) ds \right) P_n f(x)$$

in  $H_0^1(\Omega)$  for  $0 < t < T$ . Hence,

$$\begin{cases} u(x, T) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \int_0^T \frac{\sin \sqrt{\lambda_n}(T-s)}{\sqrt{\lambda_n}} \mu(s) ds \right) P_n f(x), \\ \partial_t u(x, T) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \int_0^T \cos \sqrt{\lambda_n}(T-s) \mu(s) ds \right) P_n f(x) \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega). \end{cases} \quad (6.5)$$

On the other hand, by  $\mu(T) = 0$ , the integration by parts yields

$$\int_0^T \mu(s) \sin \sqrt{\lambda_n}(T-s) ds = -\frac{\mu(0) \cos T \sqrt{\lambda_n}}{\sqrt{\lambda_n}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_n}} \int_0^T \mu'(s) \cos \sqrt{\lambda_n}(T-s) ds.$$

The Riemann-Lebesgue theorem implies

$$\int_0^T \mu(s) \sin \sqrt{\lambda_n}(T-s) ds = -\frac{\mu(0) \cos T \sqrt{\lambda_n}}{\sqrt{\lambda_n}} + o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_n}}\right) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (6.6)$$

Similarly we can verify

$$\int_0^T \mu(s) \cos \sqrt{\lambda_n}(T-s) ds = \frac{\mu(0) \sin T \sqrt{\lambda_n}}{\sqrt{\lambda_n}} + o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_n}}\right) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (6.7)$$

Moreover, by (6.5), we have

$$\|u(\cdot, T)\|_{H^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\partial_t u(\cdot, T)\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)}^2$$

$$= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_n \left( \left| \int_0^T \mu(s) \sin \sqrt{\lambda_n}(T-s) ds \right|^2 + \left| \int_0^T \mu(s) \cos \sqrt{\lambda_n}(T-s) ds \right|^2 \right) \|P_n f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$

By (6.6) and (6.7), we see

$$\begin{aligned} J_n &:= \lambda_n \left( \left| \int_0^T \mu(s) \sin \sqrt{\lambda_n}(T-s) ds \right|^2 + \left| \int_0^T \mu(s) \cos \sqrt{\lambda_n}(T-s) ds \right|^2 \right) \\ &= \mu(0)^2 (\cos^2 T \sqrt{\lambda_n} + \sin^2 T \sqrt{\lambda_n}) + o(1) \geq \mu(0)^2 - o(1) \end{aligned}$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . We choose large  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $J_n \geq \frac{\mu(0)^2}{2}$  for  $n \geq N$ . By (1.31) we obtain

$$\mu_0 := \min \left\{ \min_{1 \leq n \leq N} J_n, \frac{\mu(0)^2}{2} \right\} > 0,$$

and so

$$\lambda_n \left( \left| \int_0^T \mu(s) \sin \sqrt{\lambda_n}(T-s) ds \right|^2 + \left| \int_0^T \mu(s) \cos \sqrt{\lambda_n}(T-s) ds \right|^2 \right) \geq \mu_0, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

which yields

$$\|u(\cdot, T)\|_{H^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\partial_t u(\cdot, T)\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)}^2 \geq \mu_0 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{d_n} |(f, \varphi_{nk})|^2 = \mu_0 \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$

The combination with (6.4) completes the proof of the second inequality in (1.32).

Finally we prove the first inequality in (1.32). Applying the direct inequality (e.g., Komornik [16]) to (6.1), for any  $T_0 > T$ , we have

$$\|\partial_\nu u\|_{H^1(T, T_0; L^2(\partial\Omega))} \leq \|\partial_\nu v\|_{L^2(T, T_0; L^2(\partial\Omega))} \leq C(T_0) (\|v(\cdot, T)\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\partial_t v(\cdot, T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}).$$

Here  $C(T_0) > 0$  depends on  $T_0 > T$ . Hence,

$$\|\partial_\nu u\|_{H^1(T_1, T_2; L^2(\partial\Omega))} \leq C (\|v(\cdot, T)\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\partial_t v(\cdot, T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}). \quad (6.8)$$

By  $\mu' \in L^2(0, T)$ , we apply the usual energy estimate (or Theorem 8.2 (p.275) in [17] for example) to (6.2) for  $0 < t < T$ , we have

$$\|v(\cdot, T)\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\partial_t v(\cdot, T)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C \|\mu' f\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega))},$$

with which (6.8) completes the proof of the first inequality in (1.32). Thus the proof of Theorem 5 is complete.

## 7 Proofs of Propositions 2 and 3

### 7.1 Proof of Proposition 2

We set  $u := u_{\mu_1} - u_{\mu_2}$  and  $\mu := \mu_1 - \mu_2$ . Then we have (5.1) for  $t > T$ . Therefore, in view of (5.2), we obtain  $u(\cdot, \frac{T_1+T_2}{2}) = 0$  in  $\Omega$ . The uniqueness for a heat equation (5.1) backward in time (e.g., Imanuvilov and Yamamoto [12], Isakov [13]) yields  $u(\cdot, T) = 0$  in  $\Omega$ . Here, by  $u \in C([0, T_2]; L^2(\Omega))$ , we see that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0, \varepsilon > 0} u(\cdot, T + \varepsilon) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0, \varepsilon > 0} u(\cdot, T - \varepsilon),$$

and (3.1) yields

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda_n T} \left( \int_0^T e^{\lambda_n s} \mu(s) ds \right) (P_n f)(x) = 0, \quad x \in \Omega.$$

Therefore, by definition (1.21) of  $\tilde{\Lambda}$ , we obtain

$$\int_0^T e^{\lambda_n s} \mu(s) ds = 0, \quad n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \tilde{\Lambda}.$$

Similarly to the argument after (3.3), we apply the Müntz theorem ([3]) to obtain  $\mu(t) = 0$  for  $0 < t < T$  if and only if (1.22) holds. Thus the proof of Proposition 2 is complete.

### 7.2 Proof of Proposition 3

We set  $u := u_{\mu_1} - u_{\mu_2}$  and  $\mu := \mu_1 - \mu_2$ . Then we have (6.1). First, since  $\partial_\nu u = 0$  on  $\Gamma \times (T_1, T_2)$ , by (1.24) the observability inequality (e.g., [16]) to (6.1) yields  $u(\cdot, T_1) = \partial_t u(\cdot, T_1) = 0$  in  $\Omega$ . Therefore, in (6.1) we see that  $u(\cdot, T) = \partial_t u(\cdot, T) = 0$  in  $\Omega$ . Here we note that  $u \in C^1([0, T_2]; L^2(\Omega))$ . Hence, (6.4) implies

$$\int_0^T \mu(s) \sin \sqrt{\lambda_n} (T - s) ds = 0, \quad \int_0^T \mu(s) \cos \sqrt{\lambda_n} (T - s) ds = 0, \quad n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \tilde{\Lambda},$$

that is,

$$\begin{cases} \sin T \sqrt{\lambda_n} \int_0^T \mu(s) \cos \sqrt{\lambda_n} s ds - \cos T \sqrt{\lambda_n} \int_0^T \mu(s) \sin \sqrt{\lambda_n} s ds = 0, \\ \cos T \sqrt{\lambda_n} \int_0^T \mu(s) \cos \sqrt{\lambda_n} s ds + \sin T \sqrt{\lambda_n} \int_0^T \mu(s) \sin \sqrt{\lambda_n} s ds = 0, \end{cases} \quad n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \tilde{\Lambda}.$$

Considering the system as linear equations in  $\int_0^T \mu(s) \cos \sqrt{\lambda_n} s ds$  and  $\int_0^T \mu(s) \sin \sqrt{\lambda_n} s ds$ , since the determinant of the coefficient matrix is non-zero:  $\sin^2 T \sqrt{\lambda_n} + \cos^2 T \sqrt{\lambda_n} = 1 \neq 0$ , we see

$$\int_0^T \mu(s) \cos \sqrt{\lambda_n} s ds = \int_0^T \mu(s) \sin \sqrt{\lambda_n} s ds = 0, \quad n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \tilde{\Lambda}. \quad (7.1)$$

In view of (1.23) and (1.25), we can argue similarly to the proof of Proposition 1, and by Lemma 5, we can reach  $\mu(s) = 0$ ,  $0 < s < T$ . Thus the proof of Proposition 3 is complete.

## 8 Appendix I. Uniqueness in determining $\mu(t)$ by data over time interval $(0, T)$

Our main interest is the inverse source problems by data over the time interval  $(T_1, T_2)$  where  $T < T_1 < T_2$ , because the inverse problems with data over  $(0, T)$  have been well studied. However, uniqueness results by data over  $(0, T)$  seem a kind of folklore, and it is not easy to find relevant articles. Thus for completeness, we here show the uniqueness limited to the case of the determination of  $\mu(t)$ .

Our argument can work for the case where  $\Delta$  is replaced by a general uniformly elliptic operator with some regularity condition on the coefficients, but we are restricted to (1.1) and (1.2) with the zero Dirichlet boundary condition. For simplicity we assume that  $f \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ .

**Case 1: one-dimensional case and pointwise data  $u(x_0, t)$ ,  $0 < t < T$  with  $x_0 \in \Omega := (0, \ell)$ .**

We recall

$$\lambda_n = \frac{n^2 \pi^2}{\ell^2}, \quad \varphi_n(x) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{\ell}} \sin \frac{n\pi}{\ell} x, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

and  $(f, g) := \int_0^\ell f(x)g(x)dx$  for  $f, g \in L^2(0, \ell)$ . By  $u_k$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ , we denote the solution to (1.1) and (1.2) respectively. that is,  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  are the solutions for the diffusion and the wave equations respectively.

### Proposition A.

*We assume*

$$\text{there exists } n_1 \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } (f, \varphi_{n_1})\varphi_{n_1}(x_0) \neq 0. \quad (8.1)$$



**(i): Case of diffusion equation.** If  $u_1(x_0, t) = 0$  for  $0 < t < T$ , then  $\mu(t) = 0$  for  $0 < t < T$ .

**(ii): Case of wave equation.** If  $u_2(x_0, t) = 0$  for  $0 < t < T$ , then  $\mu(t) = 0$  for  $0 < t < T - \ell$ .

We can compare Proposition A (i) and (ii) with Theorems 2 and 3 respectively, which naturally require more conditions. In (ii), if  $T \leq \ell$ , then we can not conclude the uniqueness for any time interval  $(0, \varepsilon)$  with arbitrary  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and in view of the propagation speed 1, it is natural that  $T > \ell$  is needed for the meaningful uniqueness.

**Remark.**

If either

$$f(x_0) \neq 0,$$

or

$$\frac{x_0}{\ell} \notin \mathbb{Q}, \quad f \not\equiv 0 \quad \text{in } (0, \ell),$$

then (8.1) holds. Indeed if (8.1) does not hold, then  $(f, \varphi_n)\varphi_n(x_0) = 0$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , which implies  $f(x_0) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (f, \varphi_n)\varphi_n(x_0) = 0$ . Hence, in the first case, (8.1) holds. Furthermore, in the second case we note that  $\frac{x_0}{\ell} \notin \mathbb{Q}$  implies that  $\varphi_n(x_0) \neq 0$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Case 2: general dimensional case and data  $\partial_\nu u$  on lateral subboundary of  $\partial\Omega \times (0, T)$ .**

For arbitrarily chosen  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we recall that  $\nu = \nu(x)$  denotes the unit outward normal vector to  $\partial\Omega$  at  $x$ , and

$$\Gamma(x_0) := \{x \in \partial\Omega; (x - x_0) \cdot \nu(x) \geq 0\}, \quad R(x_0) := \max_{x \in \Omega} |x - x_0|.$$

**Proposition B.**

We assume that  $f \not\equiv 0$  in  $\Omega$ .

**(i): Case of diffusion equation.** Let  $\gamma \subset \partial\Omega$  be an arbitrarily fixed subboundary. If  $\partial_\nu u_1|_{\gamma \times (0, T)} = 0$ , then  $\mu(t) = 0$  for  $0 < t < T$ .

**(ii): Case of wave equation.** If  $\partial_\nu u_2|_{\Gamma(x_0) \times (0, T)} = 0$ , then  $\mu(t) = 0$  for  $0 < t < T - R(x_0)$ .

Similarly to Proposition A, in the case of the wave equation, owing to the finite propagation speed 1, the time interval for the uniqueness of  $\mu(t)$  is reduced by  $R(x_0)$  from the observation time length  $T$ . The conclusion of (ii) makes sense only if  $T > R(x_0)$ .

Proposition B (i) and (ii) should be compared with Propositions 2 and 3 respectively where data are taken over  $(T_1, T_2)$  with  $T_1 > 0$ . Also in (ii), for the uniqueness we can take arbitrary subboundary with relevantly long time interval as long as the wave equation has analytic coefficients. For the uniqueness we can apply Fritz John's global Holmgren theorem (e.g., John [15]), but we omit the details.

For the proofs of the propositions, we reduce the problems to initial boundary value problems for equations with the zero right-hand sides. More precisely, for  $k = 1, 2$ , let  $v_k = v_k(x, t)$  satisfy

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^k v_k(x, t) = \Delta v_k(x, t), & x \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ v_k(x, t) = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, t > 0, \\ \begin{cases} v_k(x, 0) = f(x), & x \in \Omega, \text{ if } k = 1, \\ v_k(x, 0) = 0, \quad \partial_t v_k(x, 0) = f(x), & x \in \Omega, \text{ if } k = 2. \end{cases} \end{cases} \quad (8.2)$$

Then, as is easily verified, we see

$$u_k(x, t) = \int_0^t \mu(t-s)v_k(x, s)ds, \quad x \in \Omega, t > 0 \quad (8.3)$$

for  $k = 1, 2$ .

**Proof of Proposition A.**

For  $k = 1, 2$ , let  $u_k(x_0, t) = 0$  for  $0 < t < T$ . Then (8.3) yields

$$\int_0^t \mu(t-s)v_k(x_0, s)ds = 0, \quad 0 < t < T.$$

The Titchmarsh theorem on the convolution (Titchmarsh [20]) yields that there exists  $t_* \in (0, T)$  such that

$$\begin{cases} \mu(s) = 0, & 0 < s < t_*, \\ v_k(x_0, s) = 0, & 0 < s < T - t_*. \end{cases} \quad (8.4)$$

We assume that  $t_* < T$ . Otherwise  $\mu(s) = 0$  for  $0 < s < T$  have been already proved.

**Proof of (i).**

We know

$$v_1(x_0, t) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda_n t} (f, \varphi_n) \varphi_n(x_0), \quad t > 0.$$

Then

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda_n t} (f, \varphi_n) \varphi_n(x_0) = 0, \quad 0 < t < T - t_*. \quad (8.5)$$

We can apply Lemma 3 in Section 3 to obtain  $(f, \varphi_n)\varphi_n(x_0) = 0$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . This contradicts assumption (8.1). Hence  $t_* < T$  is impossible and so  $t_* = T$ , that is,  $\mu(t) = 0$  for  $0 < t < T$ . Thus the proof of Proposition A (i) is complete.

**Proof of (ii).**

In the case of the wave equation, we have

$$v_2(x, t) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\sin \sqrt{\lambda_n} t}{\sqrt{\lambda_n}} (f, \varphi_n)\varphi_n(x_0) = 0 \quad (8.6)$$

for  $0 < t < T - t_*$  (e.g., Komornik [16]). If  $T - t_* \geq \ell$ , then (8.6) holds for  $0 < t < \ell$ . Recalling that  $\varphi_n(x) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{\ell}} \sin \frac{n\pi}{\ell} t$  with  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we can obtain

$$(f, \varphi_n)\varphi_n(x_0) = 0 \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N},$$

which contradicts assumption (8.1). Hence,  $T - t_* < \ell$ , that is,  $t_* > T - \ell$ . Thus (8.4) yields  $\mu(t) = 0$  for  $0 < t < T - \ell$ , and the proof of Proposition A (ii) is complete.

**Proof of Proposition B.**

Similarly to the proof of Proposition A, we obtain

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mu(s) = 0, \quad 0 < s < t_*, \\ \partial_\nu v_k = 0 \quad \text{on } \gamma \times (0, T - t_*) \text{ if } k = 1, \\ \partial_\nu v_k = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma(x_0) \times (0, T - t_*) \text{ if } k = 2. \end{array} \right. \quad (8.7)$$

**Proof of (i).**

Assume that  $t_* < T$ . Then  $\partial_\nu v_1 = 0$  on  $\gamma \times (0, T - t_*)$ . With this, we apply the classical unique continuation for the heat equation (e.g., Isakov [13], Yamamoto [26]), and so  $v_1 = 0$  in  $\Omega \times (0, T)$ , which yields  $f = 0$  in  $\Omega$ . This contradicts the assumption  $f \not\equiv 0$  in  $\Omega$ . Therefore,  $t_* < T$  is impossible, and we reach  $t_* = T$ . The proof of (i) is complete.

**Proof of (ii).**

Assume that  $t_* < T$ . Then  $\partial_\nu v_2 = 0$  on  $\Gamma(x_0) \times (0, T - t_*)$ . If  $T - t_* > R(x_0)$ , then the observability inequality (e.g., [16]) or the unique continuation by Carleman estimate (e.g., [2]) yields  $v_2 = 0$  in  $\Omega \times (0, T)$ . That is,  $f = 0$  in  $\Omega$ . By the assumption  $f \not\equiv 0$  in  $\Omega$ , it turns out that  $T - t_* > R(x_0)$  is impossible. Hence,  $T - t_* \leq R(x_0)$ , that is,  $t_* \geq T - R(x_0)$ . Consequently (8.7) implies  $\mu(t) = 0$  for  $0 < t < T - R(x_0)$ . Thus the proof of Proposition B is complete.

## 9 Appendix II. Proofs of Lemmas 1 and 2

We number all the eigenvalues of  $A = -\Delta$  with  $\mathcal{D}(A) = H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$  with the multiplicities. Let  $\{\varphi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  be eigenfunctions forming an orthonormal basis in  $L^2(\Omega)$ :  $A\varphi_j = \sigma_j\varphi_j$ . Let  $T_0 > 0$  be arbitrary.

### Proof of Lemma 1.

(i) We refer to the example in Evans [9, Thm. 5 in Ch. 7] to know that there exists a unique solution  $u \in L^2(0, T_0; H^2(\Omega)) \cap H^1(0, T_0; L^2(\Omega))$  to (1.1). Moreover, similarly to (5.3), we have

$$u(x, t) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} e^{-\sigma_j t} \left( \int_0^t e^{\sigma_j s} \mu(s) ds \right) (f, \varphi_j) \varphi_j(x), \quad x \in \Omega, t > 0, \quad (9.1)$$

where the series is convergent in  $L^2(0, T_0; H^2(\Omega)) \cap H^1(0, T_0; L^2(\Omega))$ . Since  $f \in C_0^\infty(\Omega) \subset \mathcal{D}(A^\ell)$  with any  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\sigma_j \sim \rho_0 j^{\frac{2}{d}}$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$  (e.g., [1], [8]), we see (5.6) and

$$|(f, \varphi_j)| \leq \frac{C}{j^{\frac{2\ell}{d}}} \|A^\ell f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad \ell \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (9.2)$$

Moreover, with  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfying  $\ell_0 > \frac{d}{4}$ , the Sobolev embedding yields

$$\|\varphi_j\|_{C(\bar{\Omega})} \leq C \|\varphi_j\|_{H^{2\ell_0}(\Omega)} \leq C \|A^{\ell_0} \varphi_j\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = C \sigma_j^{\ell_0} \leq C j^{\frac{2\ell_0}{d}}.$$

Therefore, for sufficiently large  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , we see that the series in (9.1) is convergent in  $L^\infty(0, T_0; H^2(\Omega))$ , and so  $u \in C([0, T_0]; H^2(\Omega))$ . Thus (1.3) is verified.

Since  $\partial_t u = -Au + \mu(t)f$  in  $\Omega \times (0, T)$ , in terms of (9.2), we can similarly prove that  $\partial_t u \in C([0, T_0]; L^2(\Omega))$ . Thus the proof of Lemma 1 (i) is complete.

(ii) Setting  $v = \partial_t u$ , we have

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^2 v = \Delta v + \mu'(t)f(x), & x \in \Omega, 0 < t < T_0, \\ v(x, 0) = 0, \quad \partial_t v(x, 0) = \mu(0)f(x), & x \in \Omega, \\ v(x, t) = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, 0 < t < T_0. \end{cases}$$

Since  $\mu' \in L^2(0, T_0)$  and  $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ , we see that  $v \in C([0, T_0]; H_0^1(\Omega)) \cap C^1([0, T_0]; L^2(\Omega))$  (e.g., [17], Theorem 8.2 (p.275)). Therefore,

$$u \in C^1([0, T_0]; H_0^1(\Omega)) \cap C^2([0, T_0]; L^2(\Omega)).$$

Moreover,  $\Delta u(\cdot, t) = \partial_t^2 u(\cdot, t) - \mu(t)f$  in  $\Omega$  and  $u(\cdot, t) = 0$  on  $\partial\Omega$  for each  $t \in [0, T_0]$ , and the elliptic regularity yields  $u \in C([0, T_0]; H^2(\Omega))$ . Since

$$u(x, t) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left( \int_0^t \frac{\sin(t-s)\sqrt{\lambda_j}}{\sqrt{\lambda_j}} \mu(s) ds \right) (f, \varphi_j) \varphi_j(x), \quad x \in \Omega, t > 0$$

(e.g., [16]), in terms of (9.2) we can see that the series is convergent on  $\overline{\Omega} \times [0, T_0]$ , so that  $u \in C(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, T_0])$  follows.

Finally  $\partial_\nu v \in L^2(0, T_0; L^2(\partial\Omega))$  is seen by e.g., [16], and so  $\partial_\nu u \in H^1(0, T_0; L^2(\partial\Omega))$ . Thus the proof of Lemma 1 is complete. ■

### **Proof of Lemma 2.**

The proof is similarly done to Lemma 1 for example by means of Sections 7.1 and 7.2 of Chapter 7 in Evans [9], Theorem 8.2 (p.275) in Lions and Magenes [17], Komornik [16] and Pazy [18], and we do not repeat the details.

## **Acknowledgments**

The first author was supported by NSFC (no. 11971104, 11971121). The second author was supported by NSFC (no.11925104) and Program of Shanghai Academic/Technology Research Leader (19XD1420500). The third author was supported by Grant-in-Aid (A) 20H00117 of Japan Society for the Promotion of Science and by The National Natural Science Foundation of China (no. 11771270, 91730303). This paper has been supported by the RUDN University Strategic Academic Leadership Program.

## **References**

- [1] S. Agmon, *Lectures on Elliptic Boundary Value Problems*, D. Van Nostrand, Princeton, New Jersey, 1965.
- [2] M. Bellassoued and M. Masahiro, *Carleman Estimates and Applications to Inverse Problems for Hyperbolic Systems*, Springer-Japan, Tokyo, 2017.
- [3] P. Borwein and T. Erdélyi, *Polynomials and Polynomial Inequalities*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.
- [4] A. Böttcher and B. Silbermann, *Analysis of Toeplitz Operators*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006.
- [5] J.R. Cannon and S.P. Esteva, *An inverse problem for the heat equation*, Inverse Problems **2** (1986) 395-403.

- [6] J. Cheng and J.Liu, An inverse source problem for parabolic equations with local measurements, *Applied Mathematics Letters* **103** (2020) 106213
- [7] M. Choulli and M. Yamamoto, Uniqueness and stability in determining the heat radiative coefficient, the initial temperature and a boundary coefficient in a parabolic equation, *Nonlinear Anal.* **69** (2008) 3983-3998.
- [8] R. Courant and D. Hilbert, *Methods of Mathematical Physics*, Interscience, New York, 1953.
- [9] L.C. Evans, *Partial Differential Equations*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, Rhode Island, 1998.
- [10] O.Y. Imanuvilov, *Controllability of parabolic equations*, *Sbornik Math.* **186** (1995) 879-900.
- [11] O.Y. Imanuvilov and M. Yamamoto, *Lipschitz stability in inverse parabolic problems by the Carleman estimate*, *Inverse Problems* **14** (1998) 1229-1245.
- [12] O.Y. Imanuvilov and M. Yamamoto, *Conditional stability in a backward parabolic system*, *Appl. Anal.* **93** (2014) 2174-2198.
- [13] V. Isakov, *Inverse Problems for Partial Differential Equations*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006.
- [14] S. Itô, *Diffusion Equations*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, Rhode Island, 1992.
- [15] F. John, *Partial Differential Equations*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1971.
- [16] V. Komornik, *Exact Controllability and Stabilization The Multiplier Method*, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, 1994.
- [17] J.L. Lions and E. Magenes, *Non-homogeneous Boundary Value Problems and Applications*, vol.I, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1972.
- [18] A. Pazy, *Semigroups of Linear Operators and Applications to Partial Differential Equations*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1983.
- [19] S. Saitoh, V. K. Tuan and M. Yamamoto, *Reverse convolution inequalities and applications to inverse heat source problems*, *JIPAM. J. Inequal. Pure Appl. Math.* **3** (2002) no. 5, Article 80, 11 pp.

- [20] E.C. Titchmarsh, *The zeros of certain integral functions*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **25** (1926) 283-302.
- [21] D. Xu and M. Yamamoto, *Stability estimates in state-estimation for a heat process*, Proceedings of the Second ISAAC Congress, Vol. 1 (Fukuoka, 1999), 193-198, Int. Soc. Anal. Appl. Comput., 7, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 2000.
- [22] M. Yamamoto, *Conditional stability in determination of force terms of heat equations in a rectangle*, Math. Comput. Modelling **18** (1993) 79-88.
- [23] M. Yamamoto, *Well-posedness of an inverse hyperbolic problem by the Hilbert uniqueness method*, J. Inverse Ill-Posed Probl. **2** (1994) 349-368.
- [24] M. Yamamoto, *Stability, reconstruction formula and regularization for an inverse source hyperbolic problem by a control method*, Inverse Problems **11** (1995) 481-496.
- [25] M. Yamamoto, *Determination of forces in vibrations of beams and plates by point-wise and line observations*, J. Inverse Ill-Posed Probl. **4** (1996) 437-457.
- [26] M. Yamamoto, *Carleman estimates for parabolic equations and applications*, Inverse Problems **25** (2009) 123013.
- [27] R.M. Young, *An Introduction to Nonharmonic Fourier Series*, revised first edition, Academic Press, San Diego, 2001.