

# Some controllability results for the Navier-Stokes equation with a reduced number of scalar controls

Universidad Técnica Federico Santa María  
Seminario de Estudiantes del Departamento de Matemática

**Nicolás Carreño**

Ph.D. student at Laboratoire Jacques-Louis Lions  
Université Pierre et Marie Curie  
Paris, France  
(Thesis advisor: Sergio Guerrero)

January 9, 2014

# Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Result for the Navier-Stokes system
- 3 Extension: Boussinesq system
- 4 Insensitizing controls for the Navier-Stokes system
- 5 Perspectives

# Navier-Stokes in a bounded domain

- $\Omega$  bounded connected regular open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^N$  ( $N = 2$  or  $3$ )
- $T > 0$
- $\omega \subset \Omega$  (control set),  $Q := \Omega \times (0, T)$ ,  $\Sigma := \partial\Omega \times (0, T)$

$$\begin{cases} y_t - \Delta y + (y \cdot \nabla)y + \nabla p = \mathbf{v} \mathbf{1}_\omega, & \nabla \cdot y = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ y = 0 & & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ y(0) = y^0 & & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

where  $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2, v_3)$  stands for the control which acts over the set  $\omega$ .

**Controllability problem:** Can we drive the solution of the NS system to a given state at time  $T$  by means of a control  $\mathbf{v} \in L^2(\omega \times (0, T))^N$ ?

Because of regularization, we cannot expect exact controllability.

# Exact controllability to trajectories

Consider the uncontrolled solution to the same equation:

$$\begin{cases} \bar{y}_t - \Delta \bar{y} + (\bar{y} \cdot \nabla) \bar{y} + \nabla \bar{p} = 0, & \nabla \cdot \bar{y} = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ \bar{y} = 0 & & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ \bar{y}(0) = \bar{y}^0 & & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

**Exact controllability to trajectories:** Given an initial condition  $y^0$ , can we find  $v$  such that

$$\boxed{y(T) = \bar{y}(T)} ?$$

**Local exact controllability to trajectories:** If  $\|y^0 - \bar{y}^0\|$  is small enough, can we find  $v$  such that

$$\boxed{y(T) = \bar{y}(T)} ?$$

**Remark:** After time  $T$ , we can “turn off” the control and follow the ideal trajectory.

# Some results

Under regularity assumptions on  $\bar{y}$

- [Imanuvilov 2001]

Improvements in:

- [Fernández-Cara, Guerrero, Imanuvilov, Puel, 2004]
- [Imanuvilov, Puel, Yamamoto, 2012]:  $\bar{y} \in L^\infty(Q)$

## Method of proof

- Linearization around  $\bar{y}$ .
- Null controllability of the linearized problem.
- Fixed point or inverse mapping theorem for the nonlinear problem.

# Reduced number of controls

Now we consider:

$$y_t - \Delta y + (y \cdot \nabla)y + \nabla p = (v_1, v_2, 0)\mathbb{1}_\omega, \quad \nabla \cdot y = 0, \quad y|_\Sigma = 0$$

## Some results:

- First results by Fernández-Cara, Guerrero, Imanuvilov, Puel (2006):  
Local exact controllability to the trajectories when  $\bar{\omega} \cap \partial\Omega \neq \emptyset$ .
  - Null component depends on this geometric assumption.
  - We are interested in removing this geometric property.
- Coron, Guerrero (2009): Null controllability of the Stokes system for a general  $\omega \subset \Omega$

$$y_t - \Delta y + \nabla p = (v_1, v_2, 0)\mathbb{1}_\omega, \quad \nabla \cdot y = 0, \quad y|_\Sigma = 0$$

# Controllability, observability and Carleman estimates

We consider the adjoint system

$$-\varphi_t - \Delta \varphi + \nabla \pi = 0, \quad \nabla \cdot \varphi = 0, \quad \varphi|_{\Sigma} = 0$$

Null controllability is equivalent to the Observability inequality

$$\int_{\Omega} |\varphi(0)|^2 dx \leq C \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} (|\varphi_1|^2 + |\varphi_2|^2) dx dt, \quad \varphi = (\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3).$$

Important tool: Carleman estimates

$$\iint_Q \rho_1(x, t) |\varphi|^2 dx dt \leq C \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} \rho_2(x, t) (|\varphi_1|^2 + |\varphi_2|^2) dx dt$$

$\rho_1, \rho_2$  some positive weight functions,  $C$  independent of  $\varphi$ .

## How to prove this type of Carleman estimate?

If  $\bar{\omega} \cap \partial\Omega \neq \emptyset$ :

- From an estimate of the type

$$\iint_Q \rho_1(x, t) |\varphi|^2 dx dt \leq C \iint_{\omega \times (0, T)} \rho_2(x, t) (|\varphi_1|^2 + |\varphi_2|^2 + |\varphi_3|^2) dx dt$$

we can use  $\varphi|_{\Sigma} = 0$  and  $\nabla \cdot \varphi = 0$  to estimate  $\varphi_3$  by  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$ .

- This estimate was proved in [Imanuvilov, 2001], [Fernández-Cara, Guerrero, Imanuvilov, Puel, 2004] for a general  $\omega \subset \Omega$ .
- The main difficulty is estimating de pressure.



General case  $\omega \subset \Omega$  : Method introduced in [Coron, Guerrero, 2009]:

- $\nabla \cdot \varphi = 0 \Rightarrow \Delta \pi = 0$ ,
- Look at the (heat) equations satisfied by  $\nabla \Delta \varphi_1$  and  $\nabla \Delta \varphi_2$  and apply suitable Carleman estimates (doing this eliminates the pressure),
- Use  $\varphi|_{\Sigma} = 0$  and  $\nabla \cdot \varphi = 0$  to recover  $\varphi_3$  in the LHS,
- Regularity estimates for the Stokes system to estimate the boundary terms.

Two key points:

- Avoid estimating the pressure,
- Not make appear local terms of  $\varphi_3$ .

# Navier-Stokes system

We deal with the **local null controllability** of

$$\begin{cases} y_t - \Delta y + (y \cdot \nabla)y + \nabla p = (v_1, v_2, 0)\mathbb{1}_\omega, & \nabla \cdot y = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ y = 0 & & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ y(0) = y^0 & & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

with **no assumption** on the control domain  $\emptyset \neq \omega \subset \Omega$ .

**Theorem (Guerrero, C., 2013, JMFM)**

For every  $T > 0$  and  $\omega \subset \Omega$ , the NS system is **locally null controllable** by controls  $v_1, v_2 \in L^2(\omega \times (0, T))$ .

- We can also choose  $v = (v_1, 0, v_3)$  or  $v = (0, v_2, v_3)$ .

# Method of proof

- Linearization around zero

$$y_t - \Delta y + \nabla p = f + (v_1, v_2, 0)\mathbb{1}_\omega, \quad \nabla \cdot y = 0, \quad y|_\Sigma = 0$$

- Null controllability of the linearized system (Main part of the proof).  
**Main tool:** Carleman estimate for the adjoint system

$$-\varphi_t - \Delta \varphi + \nabla \pi = g, \quad \nabla \cdot \varphi = 0, \quad \varphi|_\Sigma = 0$$

There exists a constant  $C > 0$  (depending on  $\Omega, \omega, T$ )

$$\int_Q \rho_1(t) |\varphi|^2 \leq C \left( \int_Q \rho_2(t) |g|^2 + \int_{\omega \times (0, T)} \rho_3(t) (|\varphi_1|^2 + |\varphi_2|^2) \right)$$

- Inverse mapping theorem for the nonlinear system

$$\mathcal{A} = \left( y_t - \Delta y + (y \cdot \nabla) y + \nabla p - (v_1, v_2, 0)\mathbb{1}_\omega, \quad y(0) \right)$$

# What is different with the Stokes case?

- $g \neq 0$ .
- $\Delta\pi \neq 0$ .
- Applying  $\nabla\Delta\cdot$  is more difficult now, since  $g$  is not regular.
- We overcome this by separating  $\varphi$  in  $\varphi^g + \varphi^i$ , with  $\varphi^g$  not regular and  $\varphi^i$  very regular.

Once the Carleman estimate is proved, we can construct a solution  $(y, v_1, v_2)$  of

$$\begin{cases} y_t - \Delta y + \nabla p = f + (v_1, v_2, 0)\mathbb{1}_\omega, & \nabla \cdot y = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ y = 0 & & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ y(0) = y^0 & & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

such that

$$\left[ \iint_Q \rho_2^{-1} |y|^2 + \iint_Q \rho_3^{-1} (|v_1|^2 + |v_2|^2) \mathbb{1}_\omega < +\infty, \right]$$

which gives that  $y$  goes to zero at  $T$  exponentially (so do the controls), provided that

$$\iint_Q \rho_1^{-1} |f|^2 < +\infty.$$

# Extension: Boussinesq system

Now we consider the Boussinesq system:

$$\begin{cases} y_t - \Delta y + (y \cdot \nabla)y + \nabla p = (\mathbf{v}_1, 0, 0) \mathbb{1}_\omega + (0, 0, \theta), & \nabla \cdot y = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ \theta_t - \Delta \theta + y \cdot \nabla \theta = \mathbf{v}_0 \mathbb{1}_\omega & & \text{in } Q, \\ y = 0, \quad \theta = 0 & & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ y(0) = y^0, \quad \theta(0) = \theta^0 & & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

## Theorem (C., 2013, MCRF)

For every  $T > 0$  and  $\omega \subset \Omega$ , the Boussinesq system is **locally controllable to the trajectory**  $(0, \bar{p}, \bar{\theta})$  by controls  $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1 \in L^2(\omega \times (0, T))$ , where

$$\begin{cases} \nabla \bar{p} = \bar{\theta} \mathbf{e}_3 & \text{in } Q, \\ \bar{\theta}_t - \Delta \bar{\theta} = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ \bar{\theta} = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma, \bar{\theta}(0) = \bar{\theta}^0 & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

- We can also choose  $\mathbf{v} = (0, \mathbf{v}_2, 0)$ .
- For  $N = 2$ ,  $\mathbf{v} \equiv 0$ : No control is needed in the fluid equation.

# Insensitizing controls for Navier-Stokes system

We consider the problem of **insensitizing controls** for the NS system:

$$\begin{cases} y_t - \Delta y + (y \cdot \nabla)y + \nabla p = f + \mathbf{v} \mathbf{1}_\omega, & \nabla \cdot y = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ y = 0 & & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ y(0) = y^0 + \tau \hat{y}^0 & & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

where  $\tau$  is a small constant and  $\|\hat{y}^0\|_{L^2(\Omega)^3} = 1$ . Both are **unknown**.

**Insensitizing control problem:** To find a control  $\mathbf{v} \in L^2(\omega \times (0, T))^3$  such that the functional (**Sentinel**)

$$J(y) = \iint_{\mathcal{O} \times (0, T)} |y|^2 dx dt, \quad \mathcal{O} \subset \Omega \quad (\text{Observation set})$$

is not affected by the **uncertainty of the initial data**, that is,

$$\left. \frac{\partial J(y)}{\partial \tau} \right|_{\tau=0} = 0, \quad \forall \hat{y}^0 \in L^2(\Omega)^3 \text{ s.t. } \|\hat{y}^0\|_{L^2(\Omega)^3} = 1.$$

# Some previous works

- Heat equation: [Bodart, Fabre, 1995], [de Teresa, 2000], [Bodart, González-Burgos, Pérez-García, 2002]
- Quasi-Geostrophic ocean model: [Fernández-Cara, García, Osses, 2005]
- Stokes: [Guerrero, 2007]
- Navier-Stokes: [Gueye, 2013]

We are interested in controls with **one vanishing component**.



# A cascade Navier-Stokes system

The previous condition is equivalent to the following **null controllability problem**: To find a control  $v = (v_1, v_2, 0)$  such that  $z(0) = 0$ , where

$$\begin{cases} w_t - \Delta w + (w \cdot \nabla)w + \nabla p^0 = f + (v_1, v_2, 0)\mathbb{1}_\omega, & \nabla \cdot w = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ -z_t - \Delta z + (z \cdot \nabla^t w) - (w \cdot \nabla)z + \nabla q = w\mathbb{1}_\mathcal{O}, & \nabla \cdot z = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ w = z = 0 & & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ w(0) = y^0, \quad z(T) = 0 & & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

## Theorem (Gueye, C., 2014, JMPA)

Assume  $y^0 = 0$  and  $\mathcal{O} \cap \omega \neq \emptyset$ . There exists  $\delta > 0$  such that if  $\|e^{K/t^{10}} f\|_{L^2(Q)^3} < \delta$ , there exist a controls  $v_1, v_2 \in L^2(\omega \times (0, T))$  such that  $z(0) = 0$ .

- We can also choose:  $v = (v_1, 0, v_3)$  or  $v = (0, v_2, v_3)$ .

# Same strategy as before

Null controllability of the linearized system around 0:

$$\begin{cases} w_t - \Delta w + \nabla p^0 = f^0 + (v_1, v_2, 0)\mathbb{1}_\omega, & \nabla \cdot w = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ -z_t - \Delta z + \nabla q = f^1 + w\mathbb{1}_\mathcal{O}, & \nabla \cdot z = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ w = z = 0 & & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ w(0) = 0, \quad z(T) = 0 & & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

where  $f^0$  and  $f^1$  decrease exponentially to zero at  $t = 0$ .

- The control acts on  $z$  through  $w$ .

As before, we need a Carleman estimate for the solutions  $(\varphi, \psi) = (\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3, \psi_1, \psi_2, \psi_3)$  of the adjoint system

$$\begin{cases} -\varphi_t - \Delta \varphi + \nabla \pi = g^0 + \psi \mathbb{1}_O, & \nabla \cdot \varphi = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ \psi_t - \Delta \psi + \nabla \kappa = g^1, & \nabla \cdot \psi = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ \varphi = \psi = 0 & & \text{on } \Sigma \\ \varphi(T) = 0, \quad \psi(0) = \psi^0 & & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

with **only local terms** of  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$ .

# Idea of proof

- Carleman for  $\psi_1$  and  $\psi_2$ .
- Carleman for  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$ .
- Estimate local terms on  $\psi_1$  and  $\psi_2$  using

$$\Delta \psi_i = -\Delta \varphi_{i,t} - \Delta^2 \varphi_i + \partial_i \nabla \cdot g^0 - \Delta g_i^0 \quad \text{in } \omega \cap \mathcal{O}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

# Insensitizing controls for the Boussinesq system

(Joint work with M. Gueye and S. Guerrero)

$$\begin{cases} y_t - \Delta y + (y \cdot \nabla)y + \nabla p = f + (\mathbf{v}_1, 0, 0) \mathbf{1}_\omega + (0, 0, \theta), & \nabla \cdot y = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ \theta_t - \Delta \theta + y \cdot \nabla \theta = f_0 + \mathbf{v}_0 \mathbf{1}_\omega & & \text{in } Q, \\ y = 0, \quad \theta = 0 & & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ y(0) = y^0 + \tau \hat{y}_0, \quad \theta(0) = \theta^0 + \tau \hat{\theta}_0 & & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

We look to insensitize the functional

$$J_\tau(y, \theta) := \frac{1}{2} \iint_{\mathcal{O} \times (0, T)} (|y|^2 + |\theta|^2) \, dx \, dt,$$

$$\left. \frac{\partial J_\tau(y, \theta)}{\partial \tau} \right|_{\tau=0} = 0 \quad \forall (\hat{y}_0, \hat{\theta}_0) \in L^2(\Omega)^4 \text{ s.t. } \|\hat{y}_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)^3} = \|\hat{\theta}_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = 1.$$

The associated linear system:

$$\begin{cases} w_t - \Delta w + \nabla p_0 = f^w + (\mathbf{v}_1, 0, 0) \mathbb{1}_\omega + (0, 0, r), & \nabla \cdot w = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ -z_t - \Delta z + \nabla p_1 = f^z + w \mathbb{1}_\mathcal{O}, & \nabla \cdot z = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ r_t - \Delta r = f^r + \mathbf{v}_0 \mathbb{1}_\omega & & \text{in } Q, \\ -q_t - \Delta q = f^q + z_3 + r \mathbb{1}_\mathcal{O} & & \text{in } Q, \end{cases}$$

where we want to prove  $\mathbf{z}(0) = 0$  and  $q(0) = 0$ . We need a Carleman estimate for

$$\begin{cases} -\varphi_t - \Delta \varphi + \nabla \pi_\varphi = \mathbf{g}^\varphi + \psi \mathbb{1}_\mathcal{O}, & \nabla \cdot \varphi = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ \psi_t - \Delta \psi + \nabla \pi_\psi = \mathbf{g}^\psi + (0, 0, \sigma), & \nabla \cdot \psi = 0 & \text{in } Q, \\ -\phi_t - \Delta \phi = \mathbf{g}^\phi + \varphi_3 + \sigma \mathbb{1}_\mathcal{O} & & \text{in } Q, \\ \sigma_t - \Delta \sigma = \mathbf{g}^\sigma & & \text{in } Q, \end{cases}$$

with **only local terms** of  $\varphi_1$  and  $\phi$ .

# Perspectives, open problems

- What about controllability to trajectories for Navier-Stokes?  
Adjoint equation:

$$-\varphi_t - \Delta\varphi + \bar{y} \cdot D\varphi + \nabla\pi = g.$$

Problem: The components of  $\varphi$  are mixed.

- What about **two vanishing components**, e.g.,  $v = (v_1, 0, 0)$ ?  
[Coron, Lissy, 2013]: [Return method](#).
- Boundary controllability with one vanishing component (taking the trace of an extended controlled solution does not work).
- Boussinesq system: No control on the heat equation.

# Some references



N. C. and S. Guerrero, Local null controllability of the  $N$ -dimensional Navier-Stokes system with  $N - 1$  scalar controls in an arbitrary control domain, *J. Math. Fluid Mech.*, **15** (2013), no. 1, 139–153.



N. C., Local controllability of the  $N$ -dimensional Boussinesq system with  $N - 1$  scalar controls in an arbitrary control domain, *Math. Control Relat. Fields*, **2** (2012), no. 4, 361–382.



N. C. and M. Gueye, Insensitizing controls with one vanishing component for the Navier-Stokes system, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **101** (2014), no. 1, 27–53.



N. C., S. Guerrero and M. Gueye, Insensitizing controls with two vanishing components for the three-dimensional Boussinesq system, to appear in *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*

Available on: <https://www.ljll.math.upmc.fr/~ncarreno>