



**HAL**  
open science

# Joint Coefficient and Solution Estimation for the 1D Wave Equation: An Observer-Based Solution to Inverse Problems

Constantinos Kitsos, Mathieu Bajodek, Lucie Baudouin

► **To cite this version:**

Constantinos Kitsos, Mathieu Bajodek, Lucie Baudouin. Joint Coefficient and Solution Estimation for the 1D Wave Equation: An Observer-Based Solution to Inverse Problems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2023, 68 (8), pp.4827 - 4840. 10.1109/TAC.2022.3213625 . hal-03447113v3

**HAL Id: hal-03447113**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03447113v3>**

Submitted on 22 Oct 2022

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Joint Coefficient and Solution Estimation for the 1D Wave Equation: An Observer-Based Solution to Inverse Problems

Constantinos Kitsos, Mathieu Bajodek, and Lucie Baudouin

**Abstract**—The estimation of an unknown source coefficient and of the solution to a 1-dimensional (1D) wave equation via exponentially convergent state observers is the problem under consideration in this work. The coefficient is assumed to depend on the space variable only and to be polynomial. The main observation information for this inverse problem is the value of the solution to the wave equation in a subinterval of the domain, including also some of its higher-order spatial derivatives. In order to estimate the source coefficient, we turn it into a new state as in finite-dimensional parameter identification approaches. However in this infinite-dimensional setting, this requires the introduction of a novel indirect approach involving an infinite-dimensional state transformation. Sufficient conditions allow the design of a composite observer consisting of an internal observer, which estimates in higher regularity spatial norms both the source term and the solution on a subinterval, and a boundary observer, in order to eventually provide the estimation of the solution everywhere. The observer convergence is proven by means of Lyapunov analysis. An extension of this approach to the case of the identification of a potential in the wave equation is finally considered, which is a nonlinear inverse problem since here, in the equation, the unknown coefficient multiplies the solution.

**Index Terms**—coefficient identification/estimation in the wave equation, inverse problems, observers for PDEs

## I. INTRODUCTION

The *inverse problem* of determining unknown coefficients in partial differential equations (PDEs) has been extensively studied during the last decades, see [21]. A lot of the recent results rely on the use of Carleman estimates for the PDE operator under consideration, dating back to the seminal work of [11]. In our work, we are interested in the study of inverse problems for the wave equation, for which Carleman estimates approaches have already given a lot of answers, from uniqueness and stability in the determination of source or potential term (see [35] or [22]) to reconstruction algorithms (e.g. [5]). Other techniques also exist for the same kind of problem, see e.g. [9] for a spectral estimation of eigenvalues approach. For this equation, applications may concern the recovery of properties of the medium when dealing with acoustic waves, ocean and seismic prospection, medical imaging, or geophysics, see [15], [32], see also [2] for the 1D wave equation (inverse problems for bridges, antennas, space-structures, steel-grid reinforcements etc).

This article has the ambition to propose a different kind of answer to the inverse problem of the determination of a time independent source term in the wave equation. The main

goal here will be to design an online estimation of the source coefficient by means of an appropriate observer.

Observation and observer design results for the wave equation have already been given for instance in [27], [31]. Estimating the initial state of infinite-dimensional systems from measurements on a finite interval is solved by use of a sequence of forward and backward observers in [30], see also [17]. One can also mention [13] or [10] for the so-called back-and-forth algorithms. In [18] and references therein, the problem of reconstruction of initial data using observers is considered. In all these works, the reconstruction algorithms are either performed offline or lead to asymptotic, but not exponential, estimation.

The present paper deals with the estimation through time of a source coefficient of the 1D wave equation via Luenberger observers. A novel approach for this rather classical question is proposed here, method that is initially based on a standard trick for constant parameter estimation in finite dimensions: the state of the system is extended with the unknown parameter, in order to get a system in a *canonical* form, for which an observer can be easily designed, see for instance [8, Chaps. 1,3]. In the present case, where the role of the parameter is played by a space-varying source coefficient, a similar approach turns out not to be so direct due to the properties of the differential operator of the extended coupled system. An indirect approach is thus proposed, that eventually leads to the exponential estimation in time of the coefficient. In [20], an in-domain constant parameter is estimated for a hyperbolic system via adaptive observer, however, similarly as in finite dimension (see [34]), the estimation is not necessarily exponential. Contrary to that approach, in the present work, the estimation of the potential is exponentially convergent, while the solution to the wave equation is simultaneously estimated.

The so-called indirect approach we will describe in this paper includes the introduction of an infinite-dimensional transformation that maps the wave equation into a system of three coupled PDEs, whose differential operator is decomposed into a part with the same elements on the diagonal and a part acting on the observation of the solution (considered as measurement). Aiming at the final observer design, we assume that the coefficient we seek is a polynomial of the space variable and that observations include the solution and its higher order spatial derivatives in a subinterval of the domain coming from appropriately strong regularity assumptions. An exponentially convergent composite observer is then designed. It consists of two components: an “internal observer” (or alternatively called “distributed observer”) on the observed subinterval, providing the estimation of the potential arbitrarily fast, and of the solution in this subinterval, and a “boundary observer” for the rest of the domain, bringing the estimation of

Corresponding author is Constantinos Kitsos

Submitted in November 22 2021. This research was funded by the French Grant ANR ODISSE (ANR-19-CE48-004-01).

All authors are with LAAS-CNRS, Université de Toulouse, Toulouse, France (emails: {ckitsos, mbajodek, baudouin}@laas.fr).

the rest of the solution. The stability proof in higher regularity spatial norms is based on the introduction of appropriate Lyapunov functionals. The current approach is inspired by a recently introduced methodology in [25] to deal with the observer design of under-observed systems of coupled PDEs.

In summary, this work introduces a first extension of the classical parameter identification/estimation methodology from finite dimensions to infinite dimensions, more precisely to the problem of coefficient estimation for the wave equation.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section II, we introduce the estimation problem and we present our approach that leads to solvability of the main observer problem. In Section III, we present the joint estimation of a source term and the solution to the wave equation via the proposed observer, which is stated in Theorem 1. We extend this approach to a related nonlinear inverse problem in Section IV, concerning the recovery of a potential in a wave equation under comparable technical assumptions as stated in Theorem 2. Section V includes an illustrative simulation, and we provide some conclusions and perspectives in Section VI.

*Notation:* For a given  $w$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $|w|$  denotes its usual Euclidean norm. For a matrix  $A$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ ,  $A^\top$  denotes its transpose,  $|A| := \sup\{|Aw|, |w| = 1\}$  is its induced norm and  $\text{Sym}(A) = \frac{A+A^\top}{2}$  stands for its symmetric part. If  $A$  is symmetric,  $\text{eig}(A)$  is its minimum eigenvalue.  $I_n$  and  $0_n$  are the identity and zero matrix of dimension  $n$ , respectively, and  $\text{anti}diag_k(A_i)_{i=1,\dots,k}$  denotes the block matrix consisting of  $k$  matrices  $A_i$  placed on antidiagonal block-row  $i$ . By  $\{j, \dots, k\}$  we denote the set of  $k - j + 1$  consecutive integers from  $j$  to  $k$ . For given  $u : [0, +\infty) \times [l, L] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  and time  $t \geq 0$  we use the notation  $u(t)(x) := u(t, x)$ , for all  $x$  in  $[l, L]$  to refer to the profile at certain time and  $\partial_x^i u$  (resp.  $\partial_x^i u$ ) is its partial derivative with respect to  $t$  (resp.  $x$ ) of order  $i$ . For a  $q$ -times continuously differentiable mapping  $u$  we denote  $\|u\|_{C^q[l, L]} := \sum_{i=0}^q \max\{|\partial_x^i u(x)|, x \in [l, L]\}$  for the  $q$ -norm. Any element  $u : [l, L] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  of the Hilbert space  $L^2(l, L; \mathbb{R}^n)$  satisfies  $\|u\|_{L^2(l, L)}^2 := \int_l^L |u(x)|^2 dx < +\infty$ . From there, the Sobolev space  $H^q(l, L; \mathbb{R}^n)$  gathers functions  $u$  such that all their weak derivatives up to order  $q$  are also in  $L^2(l, L; \mathbb{R}^n)$ , and is equipped with the norm  $\|u\|_{H^q(l, L; \mathbb{R}^n)} := \sum_{i=0}^q \left( \int_l^L |\partial_x^i u(x)|^2 dx \right)^{1/2}$ . Finally,  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X})$  denotes the space of bounded linear operators from  $\mathcal{X}$  to  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathbb{R}^N[x]$  denotes the vector space of polynomials over  $\mathbb{R}$  in the variable  $x$  and of degree less than or equal to  $N$ .

## II. PROBLEM STATEMENT AND ASSUMPTIONS

Let us consider the following wave equation:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t^2 z(t, x) = \partial_x^2 z(t, x) + F(t, x), & t \in \mathbb{R}_+, x \in (0, L) \\ z(t, 0) = h_1(t), z(t, L) = h_2(t), & t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \\ z(0, x) = z^0(x), \partial_t z(0, x) = z^1(x), & x \in (0, L), \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where  $F(t, x)$  is a source term that takes the shape

$$F(t, x) = f(x)R(t, x), \quad (2)$$

where  $f$  is an unknown coefficient and  $R$  is known. The boundary data  $h_1$  and  $h_2$  are also given, but  $(z^0, z^1)$  are

unknown initial data (contrary to several other approaches of inverse problems where they are usually known). The problem we wish to solve here is summarized as follows.

**Problem 1:** Determine sufficient conditions and define appropriate observations on the solution of the wave equation that will allow the design of an observer system leading to estimation of the unknown coefficient  $f(x)$  and the solution  $z(t, x)$  of the wave equation simultaneously, converging exponentially in time.

To the best of our knowledge, this problem has not been given solutions yet. The problem of finding a source coefficient is a *linear inverse problem* as the operator mapping the solution to the unknown coefficient is linear (see [35]). Previous approaches to solve initial state or source reconstruction have led to offline estimation (back-and-forth observers), in contrast with the aim of this work. In [20], an in-domain constant uncertainty is estimated for a class of hyperbolic systems via an adaptive observer with a measurement of the state in the entire domain based on a standard approach for parameter identification in finite-dimensional systems (see also [36]), that we avoid in the present work. Such approaches or observer-based approaches as in [13] might lead to asymptotic convergence of the observer scheme to the unknown parameters, but not necessarily exponentially, as we plan here. Additionally, the problem of estimation of a spatially varying parameter, as the source term  $f(x)$  here, is even more complicated.

**Remark 1:** Note that the first part of Problem 1 on the coefficient estimation has been given a solution in our introductory work [23]. However, here we provide a solution to the complete problem of joint estimation of the solution and coefficient, which is more complex. At the same time, we have some weaker conditions and we present the results in a more concrete manner compared to this preliminary work, in order for the reader to obtain a complete framework on the solvability of this problem.

The answer we will be able to give to Problem 1 will require strong assumptions such as the polynomial nature of  $f$  and some high regularity of the solution. Dropping these assumptions is still an open problem.

We first assume that the unknown coefficient  $f$  belongs to  $\mathbb{R}^N[x]$ , with  $N \in \{0, 2, 4, \dots\}$ , meaning:

$$f(x) = \sum_{i=0}^N f_i x^i, \quad \forall x \in [0, L], \quad (3)$$

with degree less than or equal to  $N$  and completely unknown coefficients  $f_i \in \mathbb{R}$ . This assumption on restriction of the space of admissible coefficients  $f$  to the finite-dimensional space  $\mathbb{R}^N[x]$  is a sufficient condition for the design of an infinite-dimensional observer in the subsequent section. Note also that the assumption  $f \in \mathbb{R}^N[x]$  with  $N$  even does not require a priori knowledge of the exact degree or of the parity of the degree of the unknown polynomial but only of an even upper bound of its degree, equal to  $N$ . Choosing this maximal degree to be even leads to Lyapunov stabilization of the observer error equations as it is fully revealed in the next section.

Consider now a given  $\delta \in (0, L]$  that determines the observation interval  $[0, \delta]$  in which we assume availability

of the observations. This constant  $\delta$  can be chosen close to zero. We will also make the hypothesis that the initial data and the boundary conditions of the system have some additional regularity than the usual one assumed for the wave equation. This will induce existence of solutions of sufficiently strong regularity. Prior to the main assumptions, let us define compatibility conditions of higher order for initial conditions of the wave equation, that will be invoked later.

**Definition 1:** Assume that  $\bar{N} \geq 3$  is odd. We say that initial conditions  $(z^0, z^1)$  of wave equation (1) satisfy compatibility conditions of order  $\bar{N}$  if the following conditions are satisfied:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{d^i h_1(t)}{dt^i} \Big|_{t=0} = \frac{d^i z^0(x)}{dx^i} \Big|_{x=0} \\ \quad + \sum_{j=1}^{i/2} \partial_t^{i-2j} \partial_x^{2j-2} F(t, x) \Big|_{t=0, x=0}, \\ \frac{d^i h_2(t)}{dt^i} \Big|_{t=0} = \frac{d^i z^0(x)}{dx^i} \Big|_{x=L} \\ \quad + \sum_{j=1}^{i/2} \partial_t^{i-2j} \partial_x^{2j-2} F(t, x) \Big|_{t=0, x=L}, \\ \text{for all } i \in \{0, 2, 4, \dots, \bar{N} - 1\}, \end{array} \right. \quad (4a)$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{d^i h_1(t)}{dt^i} \Big|_{t=0} = \frac{d^{i-1} z^1(x)}{dx^{i-1}} \Big|_{x=0} \\ \quad + \sum_{j=1}^{(i-1)/2} \partial_t^{i-2j} \partial_x^{2j-2} F(t, x) \Big|_{t=0, x=0}, \\ \frac{d^i h_2(t)}{dt^i} \Big|_{t=0} = \frac{d^{i-1} z^1(x)}{dx^{i-1}} \Big|_{x=L} \\ \quad + \sum_{j=1}^{(i-1)/2} \partial_t^{i-2j} \partial_x^{2j-2} F(t, x) \Big|_{t=0, x=L}, \\ \text{for all } i \in \{3, 5, 7, \dots, \bar{N}\}. \end{array} \right. \quad (4b)$$

To see how the above relations are deduced, we need to differentiate  $i$ -times with respect to time the wave equation (1) and then substitute successively expressions for  $\partial_t^{i-2} \partial_x^2 z, \dots, \partial_t^{i-2} \partial_x^{2 \lceil \frac{i-1}{2} \rceil + 1} \partial_x^{2 \lceil \frac{i-1}{2} \rceil - 1} z$  by using again the dynamics of the wave equation, in order to retain  $\partial_t^{i-2 \lceil \frac{i-1}{2} \rceil} \partial_x^{2 \lceil \frac{i-1}{2} \rceil} z$  as a principal term in the right-hand side. Then, in the corresponding equations, we set  $t = 0$  and  $x = 0, x = L$  and we readily obtain (4). In the following,  $\bar{N}$  appearing in Definition 1 is taking the value  $3N + 3$ , which is odd thanks to the assumption in (3) that  $N$  is even.

We now make two crucial assumptions.

**Assumption 1 (Regularity):** The function  $R$ , part of the source term in (2), satisfies

$$R \in C^{3N+3}(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{3N+3}(0, L)) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{3N+3}(0, L)).$$

Moreover, a bound  $c > 0$  is a priori known for which

$$\|R\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{N+1}(0, \delta))} \leq c. \quad (5)$$

Simultaneously,  $R$  satisfies

$$\inf_{(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times [0, \delta]} |R(t, x)| > 0. \quad (6)$$

In the sequel, a positive lower bound of  $|R|$  coming from (6) is considered a priori known.

We furthermore assume that

$$z^0 \in H^{3N+3}(0, L), \quad z^1 \in H^{3N+2}(0, L).$$

We also suppose that  $h_1$  and  $h_2$  are of class  $H^{3N+3}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ . Finally, we assume that initial conditions  $(z^0, z^1)$  satisfy compatibility conditions of order  $3N + 3$  (see Definition 1).

Assumptions on  $R$  given by (5)-(6) are stronger versions of classical assumptions in the solvability of linear inverse

problems (see e.g. [18]). From Assumption 1, we may invoke well-known existence/uniqueness arguments (see for instance [28], following also a transposition method, since we have inhomogeneous boundary conditions), along with the extra regularity and, thus, we can easily deduce the existence of a unique solution

$$\begin{aligned} z \in & C^{3N+1}(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{3N+3}(0, L)) \\ & \cap C^{3N+2}(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{3N+2}(0, L)) \\ & \cap C^{3N+3}(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{3N+1}(0, L)). \end{aligned}$$

Actually, one can see in the sequel that strong regularity of the solution is only needed on  $(0, \delta)$  and not on the whole domain  $(0, L)$ . However, to ensure that singularities do not propagate over  $(0, L)$ , we demanded strong regularity of initial and boundary conditions everywhere. The following assumption concerns the main observations that we consider to be available in the output of the system.

**Assumption 2 (Observations):** As output observations, we consider several measurements of the solution to the wave equation. To start with, the solution on  $[0, \delta]$ :

$$z(t, \cdot) \Big|_{[0, \delta]}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+. \quad (7a)$$

Given the extra regularity of the system, we also consider as output the spatial derivatives of the state (in the weak sense) of higher order on  $\{x = 0\}$  and  $\{x = \delta\}$ :

$$\partial_x^i \partial_t z(t, l), \quad i \in \{0, \dots, 2N + 1\}, \quad l = 0, \delta. \quad (7b)$$

We further use the internal spatial derivatives (in the weak sense) of order up to  $3N + 3$  of the solution localized in  $[0, \delta]$ :

$$\partial_x^i z(t, \cdot) \Big|_{[0, \delta]}, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, 3N + 3\}. \quad (7c)$$

Finally, we assume observation of the following state components on the right boundary  $x = L$ :

$$z(t, L), \quad \partial_t z(t, L), \quad \partial_x z(t, L), \quad (7d)$$

which are common in observation problems for the wave equation.

Notice that the appearing observations  $z(t, 0)$  and  $z(t, L)$  in Assumption 2 correspond to  $h_1(t)$  and  $h_2(t)$ , respectively. Note also that we avoid observations of noncausal nature, namely, time derivatives of the solution, except for the first time derivative (7b) on the boundaries, which is of course natural as it is a part of the state  $(z, \partial_t z)$  of the wave. Time derivatives are not in general available as measurements in observer designs. However, the spatial derivatives of the solution in a part of the domain, which are assumed to be known, can be measured causally and one can consider them as observations in conjunction with the extra regularity of the system. Note also that to solve the inverse problems for the potential of the wave equation as in [6], we need the first spatial derivative of the solution on the boundaries as observation. However, this online estimation problem via observers appears to be more demanding, requiring stronger assumptions. Finally, notice that the observations on the right boundary  $x = L$ , given by (7d), are only essential for the estimation of the solution to the wave equation and not for the estimation of the source term.

A convenient and standard approach in the parameter identification to design an observer is to write (1) as a system of coupled PDEs, as we are trying to recover the trick followed in finite dimension, where the system's equations are extended by  $\partial_t f = 0$ , see [8, Chap. 3]. In a first step, let us rewrite (1) as a first-order hyperbolic system as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u_1(t, x) = -\partial_x u_1(t, x) + u_2(t, x), \\ \partial_t u_2(t, x) = \partial_x u_2(t, x) + |R(t, x)|u_3(t, x), \\ \partial_t u_3(x) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

where

$$u_1 = z, \quad u_2 = \partial_t z + \partial_x z, \quad u_3 = f \operatorname{sgn}(R(0, 0)). \quad (9)$$

Remark that  $\operatorname{sgn}(R(0, 0)) = \operatorname{sgn}(R(t, x))$ , for all  $(t, x)$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+ \times [0, \delta]$  as a result of (6) in Assumption 1. It is worth noting at this step that (8) satisfies a cascade form similarly as in the finite dimensions but up to the differential operator. For finite dimensions, such a cascade form (*observability canonical form*) allows Luenberger observer design, which is not yet the case here. Considering an abstract realization of (8), the diagonal part of system's operator is written as follows:

$$\begin{pmatrix} -\partial_x & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \partial_x & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\partial_x^{N+1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Its third element  $-\partial_x^{N+1}$  is placed there instead of zero, contrary to what seen in (8), however in accordance with the fact that  $-\partial_x^{N+1}u_3 = -\operatorname{sgn}(R(0, 0))\partial_x^{N+1}f = 0$ , due to the polynomial nature of  $f$  (see (3)). This placement of the differential operator  $-\partial_x^{N+1}$  is made in order to obtain later a differential operator for the observer error equation of the shape  $-I_3\partial_x^{N+1}$  in contrast with the three distinct elements appearing above. In fact, the differential operator  $-\partial_x^{N+1}$  in the third equation, which should be nonzero, is achieved to appear in the remaining two equations via an appropriate infinite-dimensional transformation. This is explicitly given in a second step as it is explained below.

Internal observability of under-observed linear systems in cascade has been studied for instance in [3] or [29]. In these works, it is shown that the presence of distinct elements on the diagonal of the main differential operator creates technical obstructions coming from a problem of algebraic solvability. This observability problem reveals the difficulty that will subsequently appear in observer designs for such systems. Besides this, particular solutions to the problem of observer design of under-observed nonlinear infinite-dimensional systems have been given in [24]. Here, inspired by this work, we employ an analogous strategy noting that (8) is under-observed, since we only measure the first state instead of all its three components. The goal is to write system (8) in a form where its differential operator is decomposed into a part with the same elements on its diagonal, namely  $-\partial_x^{N+1}$ , plus an operator acting on the first state only, which is actually the observation  $z$ . Following this change of dynamics, the problem of observer design can be solved in the spirit of the techniques introduced in [24] for several coupled systems of PDEs.

As a result of the previous reasoning, in order to write the system in an appropriate form for observer design, let us apply

an infinite-dimensional state transformation of triangular shape  $\mathcal{T} : u|_{[0, \delta]} \mapsto \mathcal{T}u$  satisfying

$$\mathcal{T}u = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -\partial_x - \partial_x^{N+1} & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \\ u_3 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (10)$$

We can see that  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X})$ , where  $\mathcal{X} = H^{3N+3}(0, \delta) \times H^{2N+2}(0, \delta) \times H^{3N+3}(0, \delta)$  with norm  $\|u\|_{\mathcal{X}} := \|u_1\|_{H^{3N+3}(0, \delta)} + \|u_2\|_{H^{2N+2}(0, \delta)} + \|u_3\|_{H^{3N+3}(0, \delta)}$ , since  $\|\mathcal{T}u\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq C\|u\|_{\mathcal{X}}$  for some  $C > 0$ . Then,  $\mathcal{T} : (\mathcal{X}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{X}}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{X}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{X}})$  is invertible and its inverse has the same triangular shape, namely,

$$\mathcal{T}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \partial_x + \partial_x^{N+1} & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

satisfying  $\mathcal{T}^{-1} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X})$ .

This type of transformation is inspired by the previous works [24], [25], where such transformations were subject to generalized Sylvester operator equations. Thanks to transformation (10), which is a lower triangular matrix operator involving higher order differentiations in its domain, we obtain a desired form for target system (see below), that allows us later to prove Lyapunov stabilization of the observer error equations.

Now, system (8) writes in the new state variable

$$v = \mathcal{T}u|_{[0, \delta]} \quad (11)$$

as a system of PDEs of order  $2N + 2$  as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v_1(t, x) = +\partial_x^{N+1}v_1(t, x) + v_2(t, x), \\ \partial_t v_2(t, x) = -\partial_x^{N+1}v_2(t, x) + |R(t, x)|v_3(t, x) \\ \quad + \partial_x^2 v_1(t, x) + \partial_x^{2N+2}v_1(t, x), \\ \partial_t v_3(t, x) = -\partial_x^{N+1}v_3(t, x), \quad \text{in } (0, +\infty) \times (0, \delta), \end{cases}$$

which amounts to

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t v(t, x) = & -\partial_x^{N+1}v(t, x) \\ & + A[R(t)](x)v(t, x) + \mathcal{K}Cv(t)(x), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A[R] &:= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & |R| \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{K} := \begin{pmatrix} 2\partial_x^{N+1} \\ \partial_x^2 + \partial_x^{2N+2} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ C &:= (1 \ 0 \ 0). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

System (12) is written as a system of three coupled PDEs. As we noted earlier, we managed to decompose our differential operator associated to this system in a part of the form  $-I_3\partial_x^{N+1}$  (same differential operators on the diagonal), which is desired for the the Lyapunov stabilization of the observer error, plus an undesired operator  $\mathcal{K}$  acting on the first state  $v_1 = z$  only. To get rid of it in the observer error dynamics, this second part will be copied in the observer dynamics assumed to be acting on the measurement  $z|_{[0, \delta]}$ . Up to the perturbation term  $\mathcal{K}Cv$ , system satisfies a cascade form with zero-order coupling coefficient  $A[R]$ , whose stabilization will lead to exponential stability of the observer error later.

The decomposition of the differential operator into these two parts and the subsequent elimination of  $\mathcal{K}Cv$  reveals why we demanded knowledge of  $z$  and of its spatial derivatives in  $[0, \delta]$  from Assumption 2. In fact, even higher-order derivatives than the ones contained in the domain of  $\mathcal{K}$  are considered as observations, as the estimation needs to be proven in higher regularity norms. It is worth also noting that the coefficients  $f_i$  of the polynomial  $f$  are written as follows:

$$f_i = \frac{1}{i! \operatorname{sgn}(R(0,0))} \partial_x^i v_3(t, 0),$$

which are our target in the estimation problem.

To complete the initial value-boundary conditions problem, we associate to system (12) the following boundary conditions, which stem from boundary conditions of (1) in conjunction with transformations (9)-(10):

$$\forall j \in \{0, \dots, N\},$$

$$\partial_x^j v_1(t, 0) = \partial_x^j z(t, 0), \quad (14a)$$

$$\partial_x^j v_2(t, 0) = \partial_t \partial_x^j z(t, 0) - \partial_x^{N+1+j} z(t, 0), \quad (14b)$$

$$\partial_x^j v_3(0) = \sum_{k=j}^N \sigma_{jk} \partial_x^k v_3(\delta), \quad (14c)$$

where

$$\sigma_{jk} := \frac{(-\delta)^{k-j}}{(k-j)!}, \quad \forall j \leq k \leq N, \quad (15)$$

while (14c) is in view of the polynomial properties of  $v_3 = f$  coming from its Taylor representation. Notice also that boundary conditions (14a)-(14b) are induced naturally from transformation (10). These boundary conditions involve mappings that have been already considered as measurements by Assumption 2.

### III. OBSERVER AND MAIN RESULT

In this section, we present our observer of composite form consisting of an internal observer on the subinterval  $[0, \delta]$  and a boundary one for its complement  $[\delta, L]$ . This observer provides a solution to Problem 1 of Section II.

#### A. Observer design

We first present the internal observer corresponding to the observed subinterval  $[0, \delta]$ , see Assumption 2. For system (12), written in such an appropriate form as explained previously, we are in a position to propose the following Luenberger internal observer localized in  $[0, \delta]$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \hat{v}(t, x) &= -\partial_x^{N+1} \hat{v}(t, x) + A[R(t)](x) \hat{v}(t, x) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{K}z(t)(x) + \Theta P^{-1} C^\top (z(t, x) - C \hat{v}(t, x)), \\ &\quad \forall (t, x) \in (0, +\infty) \times (0, \delta). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Taking into account the stronger regularity from Assumption 1, we additionally associate to observer state  $\hat{v}$  its spatial derivatives  $\partial_x^i \hat{v}$  up to order  $i = N + 1$ . Overall, the observer state  $\hat{v}^{[N+1]} := \operatorname{col}\{\hat{v}, \partial_x \hat{v}, \dots, \partial_x^{N+1} \hat{v}\}$  satisfies the following  $(N + 2)$  systems resulting from  $(N + 1)$  differentiations

of (16) (incorporating also the case  $i = 0$ , which corresponds to (16)):

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \partial_x^i \hat{v} &= -\partial_x^{N+1+i} \hat{v} + \sum_{k=0}^i \binom{i}{k} A [\partial_x^{i-k} R] \partial_x^k \hat{v} + \mathcal{K} \partial_x^i z \\ &\quad + \Theta P^{-1} C^\top (\partial_x^i z - C \partial_x^i \hat{v}), \quad i \in \{0, \dots, N + 1\}. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Boundary conditions for each of the states  $\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2, \hat{v}_3$  of (17) are assumed to be of the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_x^j \hat{v}_1(t, 0) &= \partial_x^j z(t, 0) + \sum_{k=j}^N \sigma_{jk} \partial_x^k (\hat{v}_1(t, \delta) - z(t, \delta)), \\ &\quad \forall j \in \{i, \dots, N\}, \\ \partial_x^j \hat{v}_1(t, \delta) &= \partial_x^j z(t, \delta), \quad \forall j \in \{N + 1, \dots, N + i\}; \\ \partial_x^j \hat{v}_2(t, 0) &= \partial_t \partial_x^j z(t, 0) - \partial_x^{N+1+j} z(t, 0) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=j}^N \sigma_{jk} \partial_x^k [\hat{v}_2(t, \delta) - (\partial_t - \partial_x^{N+1}) z(t, \delta)], \\ &\quad \forall j \in \{i, \dots, N\}, \\ \partial_x^j \hat{v}_2(t, \delta) &= \partial_t \partial_x^j z(t, \delta) - \partial_x^{N+1+j} z(t, \delta), \\ &\quad \forall j \in \{N + 1, \dots, N + i\}; \\ \partial_x^j \hat{v}_3(t, 0) &= \sum_{k=j}^N \sigma_{jk} \partial_x^k \hat{v}_3(t, \delta), \quad \forall j \in \{i, \dots, N\}, \\ \partial_x^j \hat{v}_3(t, \delta) &= 0, \quad \forall j \in \{N + 1, \dots, N + i\}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

We can interpret observer equations (17)-(18) as a family of observers parametrized by  $i$  and corresponding to each spatial derivative  $\partial_x^i \hat{v}$ . Notice that in both (17) and (18), we injected output correction terms. The ones injected in boundary conditions (18) are needed for the elimination of the boundary terms in the Lyapunov analysis, while the one in the internal dynamics, (16) multiplied by a suitable gain, is used in the observer convergence. This gain consists of matrix  $\Theta$  given by

$$\Theta := \operatorname{diag} \{\theta, \theta^2, \theta^3\} \quad (19)$$

with  $\theta > 0$  a tuning parameter and  $P$  a positive definite symmetric matrix satisfying for all  $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times [0, \delta]$  a Lyapunov matrix inequality of the following form:

$$\operatorname{Sym}(PA[R(t)](x)) - C^\top C \leq -\eta I_3, \quad (20)$$

for some constant  $\eta > 0$ . Such an inequality is always feasible for  $A$  and  $C$  given by (13) (structured as an observability canonical form of a finite-dimensional system) and under conditions (5)-(6) in Assumption 1 for function  $R$ . The reader can refer to [19] for the feasibility of inequalities of such a type in finite-dimensional observer design and the extension to the present formulation is direct. Matrix  $P$  chosen as a solution of (20) will serve as a Lyapunov matrix in the sequel. Note here the necessity of Assumption 2 on the observations as the assumed measurements (7a)-(7c) intervene in the dynamics of observer equation (17), particularly in mapping  $\mathcal{K}$  and in the output correction term, while the boundary measurements (7b) intervene in observer boundary conditions (18).

**Remark 2:** *The determination of matrix  $P$  solving (20) depends only on the knowledge of the bounds of  $A[R]$  coming from (5)-(6) in Assumption 1 without this requiring a priori knowledge of  $R(t, x)$  however. In order to weaken this assumption even more and avoid a priori knowledge of these bounds, we might alternatively follow a different approach as in [7]*

concerning finite dimensions, where a time-varying Lyapunov matrix  $P(t)$  is considered instead.

**Remark 3:** In this work, an elevated regularity is required in order to solve the observer problem, in contrast to the classical solvability requirements of the wave equation (see Assumption 1). Strong regularity is still required even for the case of constant unknown coefficient, namely, when  $N = 0$ . This assumption is required to perform transformations (9)-(10) in order to achieve an appropriate form for observer design and it is needed in order to inject spatial derivatives of higher order of the solution in the observer dynamics. To the best of our knowledge, there exists no previous work in the literature aiming at exponential in time estimation of a coefficient in the wave equation and it does not seem straightforward how to weaken such regularity assumptions.

We now note that the observer system (17)-(18) is localized in the space subinterval  $[0, \delta]$  and not in the whole space  $[0, L]$ . This observer provides an estimate of the source coefficient  $f$  and the solution  $z$  to the wave equation in the part  $[0, \delta]$  only, as it is proven in the sequel. However, since  $f$  is polynomial, it is written as

$$f(x) = \sum_{i=0}^N \frac{\partial_x^i v_3(0)}{i! \operatorname{sgn}(R(0,0))} x^i, \quad x \in [0, L]. \quad (21)$$

Additionally, its estimation in  $[0, \delta]$  is extended everywhere in  $[0, L]$  by analytic continuation and it is given by

$$\hat{f}(t, x) = \sum_{i=0}^N \frac{\partial_x^i \hat{v}_3(t, 0)}{i! \operatorname{sgn}(R(0,0))} x^i, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}_+ \times [0, L]. \quad (22)$$

In this way, we get the estimation of the source term  $f$  on the whole spatial domain.

As a final step, we propose a boundary observer of system (8) on the partition  $[\delta, L]$ . This boundary observer is constructed by copying standard techniques from Lyapunov analysis for hyperbolic systems (e.g. [4]). In such a way, we obtain the estimation of the yet unknown solution  $z$  to the wave equation on the whole spatial domain. The proposed boundary observer with state  $\tilde{u} = (\tilde{u}_1 \ \tilde{u}_2)^\top$  satisfies the following equations in  $\mathbb{R}_+ \times (\delta, L)$ :

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \tilde{u}_1(t, x) = -\partial_x \tilde{u}_1(t, x) + \tilde{u}_2(t, x), \\ \partial_t \tilde{u}_2(t, x) = \partial_x \tilde{u}_2(t, x) + R(t, x) \hat{f}(t, x), \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

with the following boundary conditions:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{u}_1(t, \delta) \\ \tilde{u}_2(t, L) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{v}_1(t, \delta) \\ \partial_t z(t, L) + \partial_x z(t, L) \end{pmatrix} + k \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \tilde{u}_1(t, L) - z(t, L), \end{pmatrix} \quad (24)$$

where  $k \in \mathbb{R}$  is an appropriately chosen constant gain.

This second observer (23)-(24) of state  $\tilde{u} \in H^1(\delta, L) \times L^2(\delta, L)$  can be seen as a boundary observer of the wave equation. It exploits the estimates  $\hat{f}(t, x)$  and  $\hat{v}_1(t, \delta)$  coming from the internal observer equations (17)-(18) and also the observations  $z(t, L)$ ,  $\partial_t z(t, L)$ , and  $\partial_x z(t, L)$  coming from Assumption 2. In other words, state components of the internal observer are used as inputs for the boundary observer, while

system's output (boundary observations) are utilized in the output correction term inside boundary conditions (24). Gain  $k$  can be tuned to increase the exponential decay of the observer or even to draw near a finite time observer for the case  $k = 0$ .

This work elaborates the convergence of the composite observer, consisting of parts (17)-(18) and (23)-(24), which estimates the source component  $f$  and the solution  $z$  in the whole space domain. The overall observer state  $\xi$  is written as

$$\begin{aligned} \xi &:= (\hat{z}, \hat{f})^\top, \quad \text{with } \hat{z} := \begin{cases} \hat{v}_1, & x \in [0, \delta] \\ \tilde{u}_1, & x \in [\delta, L] \end{cases} \\ \text{and } \hat{f} &= \sum_{i=0}^N \frac{\partial_x^i \hat{v}_3(0)}{i! \operatorname{sgn}(R(0,0))} x^i, \quad x \in [0, L], \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where  $\hat{v}$  satisfies (17)-(18), and  $\tilde{u}$  satisfies (23)-(24). Note that

Note that by virtue of the first boundary condition in (24) (on  $x = \delta$ ) and of internal observer boundary conditions (18), observer state  $\hat{z}$  is continuous with respect to the space variable. This was a result of the appropriate choice of transformation  $\mathcal{T}$  in order to get  $-I_3 \partial_x^{N+1}$  as principal differential operator of (12) (and consequently of internal observer (16)) instead of  $+I_3 \partial_x^{N+1}$  in our preliminary work [23] concerning just the estimation of the coefficient. As a consequence, boundary conditions (14) of system and, thus, the ones of internal observer (see (18)) were formed in such a way that continuity of observer state  $\hat{z}$  with respect to the state variable is guaranteed, i.e.,  $\hat{v}_1(t, \delta) = \tilde{u}_1(t, \delta), \forall t \geq 0$ .

We are now in a position to state our main result, which gives a solution to Problem 1 in Section II.

**Theorem 1:** Consider wave equation (1) with unknown source term  $F$  given by (2) consisting of a known function  $R$  and an unknown polynomial  $f \in \mathbb{R}^N[x]$  written as  $f(x) = \sum_{i=0}^N f_i x^i$  of degree less than or equal to  $N$ , where  $N$  is even. Suppose that Assumption 1 holds and that observations in Assumption 2 are available at system's output. Let  $P \succ 0$  satisfying (20) for some  $\eta > 0$ . Denote also  $v^0 = (z^0, z^1 - \partial_x^{N+1} z^0, f)^\top$  with  $(z^0, z^1)$  the unknown initial conditions of the wave equation. Then, the following results (i) and (ii) hold about the unique solutions  $\xi$  to composite observer (25) assuming also that initial condition  $\hat{v}^0(\cdot) := \hat{v}(0, \cdot)$  of internal observer (17)-(18) belongs to  $H^{2N+2}(0, \delta; \mathbb{R}^3)$  and satisfies compatibility conditions of order  $2N+2$  and also that initial condition  $(\tilde{u}_1(0, \cdot), \tilde{u}_2(0, \cdot))$  of boundary observer (23)-(24) belongs to  $H^1(\delta, L) \times L^2(\delta, L)$ .

(i) For gain  $\theta \geq 1$ , internal observer (17)-(18) provides an estimate for the source component via  $\hat{v}_3$ , in the sense that there exist  $\kappa, \ell > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| f_i - \frac{1}{i! \operatorname{sgn}(R(0,0))} \partial_x^i \hat{v}_3(t, 0) \right| \\ & \leq \ell \theta^2 e^{-\theta \kappa t} \|v^0 - \hat{v}^0\|_{H^{N+1}(0, \delta; \mathbb{R}^3)}, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

for  $i = 0, \dots, N$ .

(ii) For appropriate choice of boundary observer gain  $k$  small enough and choice of internal observer gain  $\theta$  large enough, composite observer (25) provides an exponential

estimation of the solution  $z$ , namely, there exist  $\alpha, \beta > 0$  such that

$$\|z(t, \cdot) - \hat{z}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(0, L)} \leq \alpha e^{-\beta t} \left( \theta^2 \|v^0 - \hat{v}^0\|_{H^{N+1}(0, \delta; \mathbb{R}^3)} + \|u(0, \cdot) - \hat{u}(0, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\delta, L; \mathbb{R}^2)} \right). \quad (27)$$

Prior to presenting the proof of Theorem 1, note that compatibility conditions of order  $2N + 2$  for initial condition  $\hat{v}^0$  of the observer system (17) are explicitly written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \begin{array}{c} \frac{d^j}{dx^j} z^1(x)|_{x=0} + \sum_{k=j}^N \sigma_{jk} \left( \eta_{1,k} - \frac{d^k}{dx^k} z^1(x)|_{x=0} \right) \\ \frac{d^{j+2}}{dx^{j+2}} z^0(x)|_{x=0} + \partial_x^j F(t, x)|_{t=0, x=0} \\ \quad - \frac{d^{N+1+j}}{dx^{N+1+j}} z^1(x)|_{x=0} \\ + \sum_{k=j}^N \sigma_{jk} \left[ \eta_{2,k} - \frac{d^{k+2}}{dx^{k+2}} z^0(x)|_{x=\delta} \right] \\ \left[ -\partial_x^k F(t, x)|_{t=0, x=0} - \frac{d^{k+N+1}}{dx^{k+N+1}} z^1(x)|_{x=\delta} \right] \\ \quad \sum_{k=j}^N \sigma_{jk} \eta_{3,k} \end{array} \right) \\ &= -\frac{d^{N+1+j}}{dx^{N+1+j}} \hat{v}^0(x)|_{x=0} + \sum_{k=0}^j \binom{j}{k} A [\partial_x^{j-k} R] |_{t=0, x=0} \\ & \times \frac{d^k}{dx^k} \hat{v}^0(x)|_{x=0} + \mathcal{K} \partial_x^j z^0(x)|_{x=0} \\ & + \Theta P^{-1} C^\top \left( \frac{d^j}{dx^j} z^0(x)|_{x=0} - C \frac{d^j}{dx^j} \hat{v}^0(x)|_{x=0} \right), \\ & \forall j \in \{0, \dots, N\}, \end{aligned} \quad (28a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d^j}{dx^j} \hat{v}^0(x)|_{x=\delta} = \left( \frac{d^j}{dx^j} z^1(x)|_{x=\delta} - \frac{d^{N+1+j}}{dx^{N+1+j}} z^0(x)|_{x=\delta} \right), \\ & \forall j \in \{N+1, \dots, 2N+1\}, \end{aligned} \quad (28b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{where } \begin{pmatrix} \eta_{1,i} \\ \eta_{2,i} \\ \eta_{3,i} \end{pmatrix} := -\frac{d^{N+1+i}}{dx^{N+1+i}} \hat{v}^0(x)|_{x=\delta} \\ & + \sum_{k=0}^i \binom{i}{k} A [\partial_x^{i-k} R] |_{t=0, x=\delta} \frac{d^k}{dx^k} \hat{v}^0(x)|_{x=\delta} \\ & + \mathcal{K} \partial_x^i z^0(x)|_{x=\delta} + \Theta P^{-1} C^\top \left( \frac{d^i}{dx^i} z^0(x)|_{x=\delta} \right. \\ & \left. - C \frac{d^i}{dx^i} \hat{v}^0(x)|_{x=\delta} \right), \quad i = 0, \dots, N. \end{aligned}$$

## B. Proof of the Observer Convergence

We prove here both parts (i) and (ii) of Theorem 1.

(i) Let us prove the convergence of the internal observer (17)-(18). First, we easily deduce global existence and uniqueness of solutions to (17)-(18) under Assumption 1 by invoking classical arguments from the theory of PDEs (Lumers-Philippis theorem for instance). More particularly, for initial condition  $\hat{v}^0 \in H^{2N+2}(0, \delta; \mathbb{R}^3)$  satisfying compatibility conditions of order  $2N + 2$ , there exist unique classical solutions  $\hat{v}$  to (17)-(18) belonging to  $C^0(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{2N+2}(0, \delta; \mathbb{R}^3)) \cap$

$C^1(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{N+1}(0, \delta; \mathbb{R}^3))$ . Next, let us define the scaled observer error by

$$\varepsilon := \Theta^{-1}(\hat{v} - v)$$

recalling  $\Theta$  given by (19) and also define

$$E^{[N+1]} := \text{col}\{\varepsilon, \partial_x \varepsilon, \dots, \partial_x^{N+1} \varepsilon\}.$$

We can easily see that  $E^{[N+1]}$  satisfies the following equations in  $\mathbb{R}_+ \times (0, \delta)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_x^i \partial_t \varepsilon &= -\partial_x^{N+1+i} \varepsilon + \theta \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} \binom{i}{k} A [\partial_x^{i-k} R] \partial_x^k \varepsilon \\ & \quad + \theta (A[R] - P^{-1} C^\top C) \partial_x^i \varepsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (29a)$$

and for all  $i \in \{0, \dots, N+1\}$  and boundary conditions

$$\partial_x^j \varepsilon(t, 0) = \sum_{k=j}^N \sigma_{jk} \partial_x^k \varepsilon(t, \delta), \quad \forall j \in \{i, \dots, N\}, \quad (29b)$$

$$\partial_x^j \varepsilon(t, \delta) = 0, \quad \forall j \in \{N+1, \dots, N+i\},$$

which by virtue of the dynamics (29a), lead additionally to the following implicit boundary conditions:

$$\partial_x^j \varepsilon(t, 0) = 0, \quad \forall j \in \{N+1, \dots, N+i\}. \quad (30)$$

To see how we obtained the above implicit boundary conditions, we first differentiate with respect to  $t$  the first equation in (29b) and we obtain

$$\partial_x^j \partial_t \varepsilon(t, 0) = \sum_{k=j}^N \sigma_{jk} \partial_x^k \partial_t \varepsilon(t, \delta), \quad \forall j \in \{i, \dots, N\}.$$

After substituting (29a) in the above equation, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & -\partial_x^{N+1+j} \varepsilon(t, 0) + \theta \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} \binom{j}{k} A [\partial_x^{j-k} R(t)] (0) \partial_x^k \varepsilon(t, 0) \\ & + \theta (A[R(t)](0) - P^{-1} C^\top C) \partial_x^j \varepsilon(t, 0) \\ & = \sum_{k=j}^N \sigma_{jk} \left( -\partial_x^{N+1+k} \varepsilon(t, \delta) \right. \\ & \left. + \theta \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \binom{k}{i} A [\partial_x^{k-i} R(t)] (\delta) \partial_x^i \varepsilon(t, \delta) \right. \\ & \left. + \theta (A[R(t)](\delta) - P^{-1} C^\top C) \partial_x^k \varepsilon(t, \delta) \right), \end{aligned}$$

which corresponds to a system of three equations. Now, by virtue of the second equation in (29b), the first term  $\sum_{k=j}^N \sigma_{kj} \partial_x^{N+1+k} \varepsilon(t, \delta)$  of the right-hand side of the above equation is equal to zero. Starting from the third equation of the above system, we readily obtain  $\partial_x^{N+1+j} \varepsilon_3(t, 0) = 0$ , for all  $j = 0, \dots, N$ . Also, by virtue of the first equation in (29b), the second and third term of the left-hand side of the first equation of the above system is cancelled out with the second and third term of its right-hand side, respectively, implying  $\partial_x^{N+1+j} \varepsilon_1(t, 0) = 0$ , for all  $j = 0, \dots, N$ . In a similar fashion,  $\partial_x^{N+1+j} \varepsilon_3(t, 0) = 0$ , for all  $j = 0, \dots, N$ . As a consequence of the previous steps, we get  $\partial_x^{N+1+j} \varepsilon(t, 0) = 0$ , for all  $j = 0, \dots, N$ , which in turn leads to implicit boundary conditions (30).

It is clear now that we achieved the main goal described already in the reasoning for the choice of transformation (10), since in the observer error dynamics (29) (for  $i = 0$ ), differential operator associated to the system consists only of  $-I_3 \partial_x^{N+1}$  (same differential operators on the diagonal), while the undesired perturbation term  $\mathcal{K}C$  in (12) has completely disappeared. This leads to Lyapunov stabilization of the error system, as it is seen below. The latter is a result (i) of the presence of the same differential operators on the diagonal, which allows to perform integration by parts when taking the Lyapunov derivative and simultaneously, (ii) of the stabilization of zero-order coupling coefficient  $A[R]$ .

Let us now introduce a Lyapunov functional  $\mathcal{V}_1 : H^{N+1}(0, \delta) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  by

$$\mathcal{V}_1[\varepsilon] = \sum_{i=0}^{N+1} \rho_i \int_0^\delta \partial_x^i \varepsilon^\top(x) P \partial_x^i \varepsilon(x) dx, \quad (31)$$

with  $\rho_0 = 1$ ,  $\rho_i > 0$ , for all  $i$  in  $\{1, \dots, N+1\}$  to be chosen appropriately, and matrix  $P \succ 0$  satisfying (20). Taking the time derivative of  $V_1(t) := \mathcal{V}_1[\varepsilon(t)]$ ,  $t \geq 0$  along the solutions of (29) and substituting the corresponding dynamics, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mathcal{V}}_1 = & - \sum_{i=0}^{N+1} \rho_i \int_0^\delta (\partial_x^{N+1+i} \varepsilon^\top(x) P \partial_x^i \varepsilon(x) \\ & + \partial_x^i \varepsilon^\top(x) P \partial_x^{N+1+i} \varepsilon(x)) dx \\ & - \theta \int_0^\delta \left( E^{[N+1]}(x) \right)^\top \mathcal{M}[R](x) E^{[N+1]}(x) dx, \quad (32) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{M}[R] = (\mathcal{M}_{ij})_{(N+2) \times (N+2)}[R]$  with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{ii}[R] &= -2\rho_{i-1} (\text{Sym}(PA[R]) - C^\top C), \\ & \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, N+2\}, \\ \mathcal{M}_{ij}[R] &= \mathcal{M}_{ji}^\top[R] = -\rho_{i-1} \binom{i-1}{j-1} PA[\partial_x^{i-j} R], \\ & \quad \forall i \in \{j+1, \dots, N+2\}, \quad j \in \{1, \dots, N+2\}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that by using the Schur complement, Lyapunov inequality (20), and the uniform boundedness of  $R$  in  $H^{N+1}(0, \delta)$ , we can always choose  $\rho_i \in (0, 1]$ , for  $i$  in  $\{1, \dots, N+1\}$  such that  $\mathcal{M}$  becomes positive for all  $R$  satisfying (5)-(6) in Assumption 1. More precisely, we choose constants  $\rho_i \in (0, 1]$  such that

$$\gamma := \inf_{R \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{N+1}(0, \delta))} \frac{w^\top \mathcal{M}[R] w}{|w|^2} > 0, \quad \forall w \in \mathbb{R}^{3N+6} \setminus \mathbf{0}.$$

Therefore, applying repeated integration by parts in (32) and by the fact that  $N$  is even, we obtain

$$\dot{\mathcal{V}}_1 \leq \sum_{i=0}^{N+1} \rho_i [\Pi_i(x)]_0^\delta - \theta \frac{\gamma}{|P|} V_1, \quad (33)$$

where

$$\Pi_i(x) := \left( \partial_x^i E^{[N]}(x) \right)^\top \mathcal{P} \partial_x^i E^{[N]}(x),$$

with  $\mathcal{P} := \text{antidiag}_{N+1}((-1)^j P)_{j=1, \dots, N+1}$ . Next, substituting boundary conditions of  $\varepsilon$  given by (29b) and by use of (30), we obtain the following for  $\Pi_i$ ,  $i \in \{0, \dots, N+1\}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} [\Pi_i(x)]_0^\delta &= \left( \partial_x^i E^{[N]}(\delta) \right)^\top \Omega_i \partial_x^i E^{[N]}(\delta); \\ \Omega_i &:= \text{antidiag}_{N+1}(\Xi_{ij})_{j=1, \dots, N+1} \\ & \quad - \Sigma_i^\top \text{antidiag}_{N+1}(\Xi_{ij})_{j=1, \dots, N+1} \Sigma_i, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Xi_{ij} := \begin{cases} \mathbf{0}_3, & j = 1, \dots, i \text{ and } j = N+2-i, \dots, N+1 \\ (-1)^j P, & j = i+1, \dots, N+1-i \end{cases},$$

$\Sigma_i$  is a block matrix given by

$$\Sigma_i := (\sigma_{jk} I_3)_{j,k=i, \dots, N+i},$$

while  $\sigma_{jk}$  are given by (15) for  $j \leq k \leq N$  and  $\sigma_{jk} \equiv 0$  for  $k \leq j-1 \leq N$  and for  $k = j \in \{N+1, \dots, 2N+1\}$ . After appropriate calculations, it turns out that

$$\Omega_i = 0, \quad \forall i = 0, \dots, N+1, \quad (34)$$

leading eventually to

$$\dot{\mathcal{V}}_1 \leq -2\theta\kappa V_1; \quad \kappa := \frac{\gamma}{2|P|}. \quad (35)$$

**Remark 4:** In this work, we chose  $N$  even ( $f \in \mathbb{R}^N[x]$  with  $N$  even, see below (3)). Obviously, if our polynomial has degree less than or equal to an odd number  $\tilde{N}$ , we may choose  $N = \tilde{N} + 1$ . The reason why we need  $N$  even is revealed in (32), where we performed repeated integration by parts. After this, we obtained (33) consisting of boundary terms  $\Pi_i$  that are eventually annihilated, see (34). Thanks to the latter, we obtained (35), which is essential to deduce stabilization of the error equation. In fact, the previously described requirements are fulfilled if implication (32)  $\Rightarrow$  (33) holds true. This implication holds only if  $N$  is even and to see this, recall the following general formula on repeated integration by parts holding for sufficiently smooth scalar functions  $g, h$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \int h^{(N+1)} g dx &= \sum_{k=0}^N (-1)^k g^{(k)} h^{(N-k)} \\ & \quad + (-1)^{N+1} \int g^{(N+1)} h dx. \quad (36) \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, adapting the above general formula to our expression  $\int_0^\delta (\partial_x^{N+1+i} \varepsilon^\top P \partial_x^i \varepsilon + \partial_x^i \varepsilon^\top P \partial_x^{N+1+i} \varepsilon) dx$  in (32) and choosing  $N$  even, we can verify the virtue of (32)  $\Rightarrow$  (33).

Next, by use of the Grönwall Lemma and also (35), (9), (11), and (35), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \theta^{-1} \| (z(t, \cdot) - \hat{v}_1(t, \cdot)) \|_{H^{N+1}(0, \delta)} \\ & \quad + \theta^{-2} \| \partial_t z(t, \cdot) - \partial_x^{N+1} z(t, \cdot) - \hat{v}_2(t, \cdot) \|_{H^{N+1}(0, \delta)} \\ & \quad + \theta^{-3} \| f(\cdot) \text{sgn}(R(0, 0)) - \hat{v}_3(t, \cdot) \|_{H^{N+1}(0, \delta)} \\ & \leq \gamma_1 \theta^{-1} e^{-\theta\kappa t} \| v^0 - \hat{v}^0 \|_{H^{N+1}(0, \delta; \mathbb{R}^3)}, \quad (37) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\gamma_1 := \frac{1}{\min\{\rho_i, i=0, \dots, N+1\}} \sqrt{3 \frac{|P|}{\text{eig}(P)}}$ .

Stability inequality (37) indicates that  $\hat{v}_1$  and  $\hat{v}_3$  provide an estimate of  $z|_{[0, \delta]}$  and of the unknown  $f$ , respectively, in

the  $H^{N+1}$  spatial norm. We also observe that (37) has led to a phenomenon of *loss of derivatives*. Indeed, in order to estimate the solution of the wave equation, we demand higher order of regularity ( $3N + 3$ ) of the solution than the order of the convergent derivatives of the observer error ( $N + 1$ ). Such phenomena appear when studying the controllability of underactuated coupled systems (see [3]).

Finally, by invoking the continuous embedding  $H^{N+1}(0, \delta) \hookrightarrow C^N([0, \delta])$  (see [1] on Sobolev embeddings and Morrey's inequality), we get by (37)

$$\begin{aligned} & \|z(t, \cdot) - \hat{v}_1(t, \cdot)\|_{C^N([0, \delta])} \\ & \leq c_0 \gamma_1 e^{-\theta \kappa t} \|v^0 - \hat{v}^0\|_{H^{N+1}(0, \delta; \mathbb{R}^3)}, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \|f(\cdot) \operatorname{sgn}(R(0, 0)) - \hat{v}_3(t, \cdot)\|_{C^N([0, \delta])} \\ & \leq c_0 \gamma_1 \theta^2 e^{-\theta \kappa t} \|v^0 - \hat{v}^0\|_{H^{N+1}(0, \delta; \mathbb{R}^3)}, \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

with  $c_0 > 0$  an embedding constant.

The latter shows that the coefficients of polynomial  $f(\cdot)$ , given by  $f_i = \frac{f^{(i)}(0)}{i!}$ , are approximated by  $\frac{1}{i! \operatorname{sgn}(R(0, 0))} \partial_x^i \hat{v}_3(t, 0)$  for all  $i$  in  $\{0, \dots, N\}$  in an exponentially fast manner. Then, by use of (9)-(10), we deduce (26) with  $\ell = c_0 \gamma_1$ .

(ii) Focusing next on the spatial subdomain  $[\delta, L]$ , we define observer error by

$$\tilde{u} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{u}_1 - u_1 \\ \tilde{u}_2 - u_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad x \in [\delta, L].$$

For systems of conservation laws, an observer-based method for estimation has been developed in [12] and we are inspired by this work. The error  $\tilde{u}$  satisfies the following equations in  $\mathbb{R}_+ \times (\delta, L)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \tilde{u}(t, x) &= \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \partial_x \tilde{u}(t, x) + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tilde{u}(t, x) \\ &+ R(t, x) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} (\hat{f}(t, x) - f(x)), \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

with boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}_1(t, \delta) &= \theta \varepsilon_1(t, \delta), \\ \tilde{u}_2(t, L) &= k \tilde{u}_1(t, L). \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Introduce a Lyapunov functional  $\mathcal{V}_2 : H^1(\delta, L) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  as

$$\mathcal{V}_2[\tilde{u}] = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\delta}^L \tilde{u}^\top(x) \operatorname{diag}\{e^{-\mu x}, e^{\mu x}\} \tilde{u}(x) dx, \quad (42)$$

with  $\mu > 0$  to be chosen appropriately. Taking the time derivative of  $V_2(t) := \mathcal{V}_2[\tilde{u}(t)]$ , along the dynamics (40) for  $t \geq 0$ , one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_2 &= \int_{\delta}^L \tilde{u}^\top(x) \operatorname{diag}\{-e^{-\mu x}, e^{\mu x}\} \partial_x \tilde{u}(x) dx \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \int_{\delta}^L e^{-\mu x} \tilde{u}^\top(x) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tilde{u}(x) dx \\ &+ \int_{\delta}^L e^{\mu x} R(t, x) \tilde{f}(x) \tilde{u}_2(x) dx, \\ &= I_1 + I_2 + I_3, \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

where  $\tilde{f} := \hat{f} - f$  and each of  $I_1, I_2$ , and  $I_3$  corresponds to each of the three integral terms in (43) consecutively. The

first integral term can be rewritten after applying integration by parts as

$$I_1 = [G(x)]_{\delta}^L - \frac{\mu}{2} \int_{\delta}^L \tilde{u}^\top(x) \operatorname{diag}\{e^{-\mu x}, e^{\mu x}\} \tilde{u}(x) dx, \quad (44)$$

where  $G(x) := \frac{1}{2} \tilde{u}^\top(x) \operatorname{diag}\{-e^{-\mu x}, e^{\mu x}\} \tilde{u}(x)$ .

The boundary term  $[G(x)]_{\delta}^L$  is written after using boundary conditions (41) as follows:

$$[G(x)]_{\delta}^L = \tilde{u}_1^2(L) (k^2 e^{\mu L} - e^{-\mu L}) + \theta^2 e^{-\mu \delta} \varepsilon_1^2(\delta) - \tilde{u}_2^2(\delta) e^{\mu \delta}.$$

Then, for choice of gain parameter  $k$  small enough, namely, for

$$|k| \leq e^{-\mu L},$$

we obtain

$$[G(x)]_{\delta}^L \leq \theta^2 e^{-\mu \delta} \varepsilon_1^2(\delta). \quad (45)$$

Considering the second integral term, it is easy to see that it can be bounded as follows:

$$I_2 \leq \frac{e^{-\mu \delta}}{2} \int_{\delta}^L \tilde{u}^\top(x) \operatorname{diag}\{e^{-\mu x}, e^{\mu x}\} \tilde{u}(x) dx = e^{-\mu \delta} V_2. \quad (46)$$

Moreover, the third term of the time derivative (43) can be bounded as a result of Assumption 1 on function  $R$ , the Cauchy-Schwartz and Young's inequalities, and (42) in the following manner:

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &= \int_{\delta}^L e^{\mu x} R(t, x) \tilde{f}(x) \tilde{u}_2(x) dx \\ &\leq \bar{c} e^{\frac{\mu}{2} L} \|\tilde{f}\|_{L^2(\delta, L)} \left( \int_{\delta}^L e^{\mu x} \tilde{u}_2^2(x) dx \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\epsilon_0} \bar{c} e^{\mu L} \|\tilde{f}\|_{L^2(\delta, L)}^2 + \frac{\epsilon_0}{2} \int_{\delta}^L e^{\mu x} \tilde{u}_2^2(x) dx \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\epsilon_0} \bar{c} e^{\mu L} \|\tilde{f}\|_{L^2(\delta, L)}^2 + \epsilon_0 V_2, \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

for some  $\epsilon_0$  chosen in  $(0, 1)$  and

$$\bar{c} := \sup_{(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times [\delta, L]} |R(t, x)|,$$

which makes sense from Assumption 1.

Overall,  $\dot{V}_2$  is bounded by use of (43)-(47) as follows:

$$\dot{V}_2 \leq -(\mu - e^{-\mu \delta} - \epsilon_0) V_2 + \Omega(t),$$

with

$$\Omega(t) := \frac{1}{2\epsilon_0} \bar{c} e^{\mu L} \|\tilde{f}\|_{L^2(\delta, L)}^2 + \theta^2 e^{-\mu \delta} \varepsilon_1^2(t, \delta).$$

By choosing parameter  $\mu$  large enough such that

$$\mu - e^{-\mu \delta} > \epsilon_0,$$

we obtain after applying the Grönwall Lemma

$$V_2(t) \leq e^{-\mu_0 t} V_2(0) + \int_0^t e^{-\mu_0(t-s)} \Omega(s) ds, \quad (48)$$

for some  $0 < \mu_0 < \mu - e^{-\mu \delta} - \epsilon_0$ . We now notice that the difference  $\|\tilde{f}\|_{L^2(\delta, L)}$  is bounded by use of (37), in conjunction

with (21)-(22), whereas the trace of the error of the internal observer  $\varepsilon_1(t, \delta)$  is bounded, according to (38), as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |\varepsilon_1(t, \delta)| &\leq \|\varepsilon_1(t, \cdot)\|_{C^0[0, \delta]} \\ &\leq c_0 \gamma_1 \theta^{-1} e^{-\theta \kappa t} \|v^0 - \hat{v}^0\|_{H^{N+1}(0, \delta; \mathbb{R}^3)}. \end{aligned}$$

By virtue of these bounds, we can bound  $\Omega(s)$  for all  $s \geq 0$  as follows:

$$\Omega(s) \leq \left( \frac{1}{2\epsilon_0} \bar{c} e^{\mu L} \theta^4 + c_0^2 \right) \gamma_1^2 e^{-2\theta \kappa s} \|v^0 - \hat{v}^0\|_{H^{N+1}(0, \delta; \mathbb{R}^3)}^2. \quad (49)$$

From there, and choosing the gain  $\theta$  large enough, namely,

$$\theta > \frac{\mu_0}{2\kappa},$$

(48) brings

$$\begin{aligned} V_2(t) &\leq e^{-\mu_0 t} V_2(0) + \left( \frac{1}{2\epsilon_0} \bar{c} e^{\mu L} \theta^4 + c_0^2 \right) \gamma_1^2 \\ &\quad \times \frac{e^{-2\theta \kappa t} - e^{-\mu_0 t}}{\mu_0 - 2\theta \kappa} \|v^0 - \hat{v}^0\|_{H^{N+1}(0, \delta; \mathbb{R}^3)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by use of (42) and also trivial inequalities we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{u}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\delta, L; \mathbb{R}^2)} &\leq e^{\mu L} e^{-\frac{\mu_0}{2} t} \|u(0, \cdot) - \tilde{u}(0, \cdot)\|_{L^2(\delta, L; \mathbb{R}^2)} \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2\epsilon_0} \bar{c} e^{\mu L} \theta^4 + c_0^2} \gamma_1 e^{\frac{\mu}{2} L} e^{-\frac{\mu_0}{2} t} \|v^0 - \hat{v}^0\|_{H^{N+1}(0, \delta; \mathbb{R}^3)}. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

The above corresponds to the exponential estimation of the solution  $u_1 = z$  on the subinterval  $[\delta, L]$ . The latter concludes part (ii) of Theorem 1.

Overall, combining (50) (for the part of the solution on  $[\delta, L]$ , proven above) with (37) (for the part  $[0, \delta]$  proven in the part (i)), we deduce (27).

The proof is complete.  $\square$

**Remark 5:** Composite observer (25) provides an exponentially fast estimation of the source coefficient  $f$  and the solution  $z$ . For the coefficient  $f$ , the estimation can be arbitrarily fast by appropriately tuning parameter  $\theta$  in the dynamics of the internal observer (17)-(24) (see (26)). However, for the solution  $z$  to the wave equation, whose estimation relies on boundary observer (23)-(24) in  $(\delta, L)$ , its estimation on the whole domain cannot become arbitrarily fast and it is limited by the wave propagation. In (50), we see that the maximal convergence rate (finite-time convergence achieved for observer gain  $k = 0$ ) is independent of the choice of observer gain  $\theta$  and, thus, cannot be tuned. Finally, note that the choice of the right endpoint  $\delta$  of the observation interval  $[0, \delta]$  plays a role in the estimation of the coefficient, as seen by (35), where convergence rate coefficient  $\kappa$  depends on  $\gamma$ , which in turn depends on  $\delta$ , noting that the further  $R(t, x)$  is away from zero on  $[0, \delta]$ , the larger  $\kappa$  is. This means that the value of  $\delta$  has an effect on the convergence rate coefficient  $\kappa$  and therefore on the choice of observer gain  $\theta$ , which might be needed to be large enough when  $\kappa$  is small in order to obtain a desired convergence rate  $\theta \kappa$ .

**Remark 6:** We designed the first internal observer with a structure resembling to high-gain observers for finite dimensions (see (17)-(18) and the form of observer gain matrix  $\Theta$

(19)). High-gain observer designs have been extended to infinite dimensions (see for instance [24], [25]) aiming at tackling the presence of nonlinearities and unknown perturbations in system dynamics. In Section III, this design could be seemingly replaced by a standard Luenberger observer design. However, we use this high-gain design that would be indispensable to deal with possible perturbations appearing in the error dynamics if we intended to prove an Input-to-State (ISS) estimate with respect to a generic (not essentially polynomial) source coefficient. Additionally, the high-gain observer structure that we introduced in this work could be used to deal with an alternative setting where the wave equation was semilinear with Lipschitz nonlinear perturbations of the form  $h(z, \partial_t z)$ . The stabilization of the coupling coefficient  $A[R]$  along with the cascade structure of the observer error and the use of the high-gain technique permits the consideration of such more general cases. These topics are left for future works.

**Remark 7:** We notice that by (37), additionally to the solution  $z$ , its time derivative  $\partial_t z$  is also estimated in  $[0, \delta]$ , hence the full state of the wave  $(z, \partial_t z)$  is estimated, whereas in the subinterval  $[\delta, L]$  such an estimation is not obtained, since we used a weighted  $L^2$  spatial norm (instead of an  $H^1$  one) as a Lyapunov functional (42) leading exclusively to an estimation of  $z$ .

#### IV. EXTENSION TO A NONLINEAR INVERSE PROBLEM

In this section, we discuss the solvability of a closely related inverse problem for the wave equation via exponential observers for the case of an unknown parameter multiplying the state. Solutions to such a nonlinear inverse problem [26] involve the recovery of the potential of the wave equation (see e.g. [35], [5]).

Consider again wave equation (1). In the present formulation, term  $F$  is no longer considered a source term but it is assumed to be state-dependent and be written as follows:

$$F(t, x) = -q(x)z(t, x), \quad (51)$$

where  $q$  represents the unknown parameter, called potential, to be estimated.

We wish here to solve the first part of Problem 1 with unknown source  $f$  substituted by potential  $q$ . We provide a solution to this problem concerning the exponential estimation of the potential, but not yet the simultaneous estimation of the solution to the wave equation. Intuition coming from the solvability of inverse problems (see [26]) suggests that this nonlinear inverse problem would require stronger assumptions on the solution to the wave equation than the ones in Section II. Indeed, to deal with this problem, we replace the conditions on  $R(t, x)$  in Section II with similar conditions on  $z(t, x)$ . The result of this section is a consequence of the analysis presented in our preliminary work [23] concerning the recovery of the potential. Compared to [23], the conditions here are slightly weaker. The proof is not given in full details as it is a direct adaptation of the proof of Theorem 1. We keep here the same assumptions on the polynomial nature of the unknown parameter  $q$  as in Section II, namely,  $q \in \mathbb{R}^N[x]$  with  $N$  even and the same observation of the solution on a part of the

domain  $[0, \delta]$  (avoiding nevertheless the observations on  $x = L$  given in (7d), which are only needed for the estimation of the solution). Note that the case of polynomial-type potential is not uncommon in physical realizations, especially in quantum mechanics, see for instance [16], where a use of a polynomial as a potential is justified in the Schrödinger equation.

Let us now state the main hypothesis of this section.

**Assumption 3:** We assume that

$$z^0 \in H^{3N+3}(0, L), \quad z^1 \in H^{3N+2}(0, L).$$

We also suppose that  $h_1, h_2 \in H^{3N+3}(\mathbb{R}_+)$  and that initial conditions  $(z^0, z^1)$  satisfy compatibility conditions of order  $3N + 3$ .

Furthermore, we suppose that the solution to the wave equation is uniformly bounded on  $[0, \delta]$  as follows:

$$z \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{N+1}(0, \delta)) \quad (52)$$

and that it also holds

$$\inf_{(t,x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times [0, \delta]} |z(t, x)| > 0 \quad (53)$$

implying simultaneously the compatibility with  $z^0$ .

Some positive upper and lower bounds of  $|z|$  coming from (52)-(53) are considered a priori known.

The nature of assumptions in (52)-(53) are revealed in classical works on the solvability of inverse problems for the potential of the wave equation, where some slightly weaker conditions are assumed (see [5], [6]), i.e. that only the infimum of a norm of the initial condition is strictly positive. Notice also that if one assumes a priori that  $z^0(x) \neq 0, \forall x \in [0, \delta]$  and  $\inf_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} |h_1(t)| > 0$ , by continuity arguments, there always exists a  $\delta > 0$  near zero such that (53) is satisfied.

Next, consider  $P \succ 0$  satisfying for all  $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times [0, \delta]$

$$\text{Sym}(PA[z(t)](x)) - C^\top C \leq -\eta I_3 \quad (54)$$

for some  $\eta > 0$ , with  $A[z]$  given by (13). Similarly, as in the reasoning of Section III, the above inequality is feasible for  $z$  satisfying (52)-(53).

Now, we propose an internal observer to estimate the unknown potential  $q$  satisfying the following equation in  $\mathbb{R}_+ \times (0, \delta)$ , for all  $i \in \{0, \dots, N+1\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \partial_x^i \hat{v} = & -\partial_x^{N+1+i} \hat{v} + \sum_{k=0}^i \binom{i}{k} A[\partial_x^{i-k} z] \partial_x^k \hat{v} + \mathcal{K} \partial_x^i z \\ & + \Theta P^{-1} C^\top (\partial_x^i z - C \partial_x^i \hat{v}) \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

with  $\Theta$  given by (19),  $C$  and  $\mathcal{K}$  as in (13). We also associate to this observer the same boundary conditions as in (18).

The result of this section is stated as follows.

**Theorem 2:** Consider wave equation (1) where  $F$  is given by (51) with potential  $q \in \mathbb{R}^N[x]$ , namely,  $q(x) = \sum_{i=0}^N q_i x^i$  an unknown polynomial of degree less than or equal to  $N$  with  $N$  even. Suppose that Assumption 3 holds and that observations in Assumption 2 of the previous section are available in system's output. Let  $P \succ 0$  satisfy (54) for some  $\eta > 0$ . Denote also  $v^0 = (z^0, z^1 - \partial_x^{N+1} z^0, q)^\top$ , where  $(z^0, z^1)$  is the unknown initial conditions of the wave equation. Then, the following result holds about the unique

solution  $\hat{v}$  to internal observer (55)-(18) with initial condition  $\hat{v}^0(\cdot) := \hat{v}(0, \cdot)$  belonging to  $H^{2N+2}(0, \delta; \mathbb{R}^3)$  and satisfying compatibility conditions of order  $2N + 2$ .

For gain  $\theta \geq 1$ ,  $\hat{v}$  provides an estimate for the potential via  $\hat{v}_3$ , in the sense that there exist  $\kappa, \ell > 0$  such that for  $i = 0, \dots, N$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| q_i - \frac{1}{i! \text{sgn}(z^0(0))} \partial_x^i \hat{v}_3(t, 0) \right| \\ \leq \ell \theta^2 e^{-\theta \kappa t} \|v^0 - \hat{v}^0\|_{H^{N+1}(0, \delta; \mathbb{R}^3)}. \end{aligned}$$

We present here a sketch of the proof of Theorem 2.

*Proof:* The proof follows the steps of the one given in [23]. The objective is to adopt the same methodology as in the part (i) of the proof in Section III-B, except for the fact that  $z$  substitutes  $R$  in the observer equations. First, notice that under Assumption 3, similarly as in the reasoning in the proof of Theorem 1 (see Section III-B), existence/uniqueness of solutions to the wave and to the observer equations are guaranteed for all times  $t \geq 0$ . These solutions are regular enough as in the proof of Theorem 1. Second, for the stability analysis, we need to transform the wave equation into a first-order hyperbolic system, similarly as in Section II by using the transformation

$$u_1 = z, \quad u_2 = \partial_t z + \partial_x z, \quad u_3 = -q \text{sgn}(z^0(0)),$$

noting that as a consequence of (53) in Assumption 3, we have  $\text{sgn}(z(t, x)) = \text{sgn}(z^0(0))$ , for all  $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times [0, \delta]$ . Then, system writes exactly as (8) and by applying the same transformation as in Section II given by (11), system amounts to

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t v(t, x) = & -\partial_x^{N+1} v(t, x) \\ & + A[v_1(t)](x)v(t, x) + \mathcal{K}Cv(t)(x), \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

with boundary conditions given again by (14). Notice that the above transformed cascade system of PDEs is semilinear in contrast to (12), which was linear. Then, the stability analysis is similar to the one in the proof of part (i) of Theorem 1 in Section III-B noting that we ought to substitute  $R(t, x)$  by  $z(t, x)$  taking also into account sufficient conditions in Assumption 3.  $\square$

**Remark 8:** In Theorem 2, we presented the estimation of the potential  $q$  of the wave equation via an internal observer, similarly as in the part (i) of Theorem 1 in Section III on the estimation of the source coefficient. However, we did not answer completely to Problem 1, since we did not provide a simultaneous estimation for the solution  $z$  to the wave equation as in the second part (ii) of Theorem 1. It seems that a similar global estimation result cannot hold for this case and only a local result might be proven, as this is limited by the nonlinear nature of the present problem.

**Remark 9:** In both Assumption 3 and Theorem 2, we utilised the term ‘‘compatibility conditions’’ for initial conditions of the wave equation and the internal observer. For the wave equation, these are in the spirit of Definition 1 of Section II but with some adaptation to the present case, since in this section, (51) holds. One can follow the algorithm

described below Definition 1 in order to precise these conditions. More details are left to the reader, since this point is out of the main scope of this work. Notice also that  $z^0, h_1$  should be chosen such that  $z^0(x) \neq 0, \forall x \in [0, \delta]$  and  $\inf_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} |h_1(t)| > 0$  (see (53)). In this work, we are mostly interested in compatibility conditions for the observer system as observer design is the main goal. These conditions of order  $2N + 2$ , that the initial condition of the observer system (55)-(18) should satisfy, are exactly as in relations (28) of Section III but with  $A[\partial_x^l R]$  therein substituted by  $A[\frac{d^l}{dx^l} z^0]$ .

## V. SIMULATION


In this section, the composite observer designed in this paper for the joint estimation of the source coefficient and the solution in Section III is set up numerically for an example of polynomial of order  $N = 2$ . To avoid numerical issues, consistent and unconditionally stable schemes are chosen. For the first observer, which is an Airy's type equation, the Crank Nicholson right-winded numerical schema  $\mathcal{D}^+ \mathcal{D}^+ \mathcal{D}^-$  is selected. For the second observer, which is constituted of two transport equations, states  $\hat{u}_1, \hat{u}_2$  are discretized with  $\mathcal{D}^-$  and  $\mathcal{D}^+$ , respectively. For more details in that direction, one can refer to [14] which deals with Courant-Friedrich-Lewy conditions for several "finite-difference  $\theta$ -schemes" dedicated to hyperbolic systems of type  $(\partial_t + \partial_x^{2p+1})u = 0$ , according to the parity of  $p$ .

Consider system (1) on the interval  $[0, 10]$  with source term  $F(t, x) = x(x - 10)$ , homogeneous boundary conditions  $h_1 = h_2 = 0$  and compatible initial conditions  $\begin{pmatrix} z^0(x) \\ z^1(x) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 100 \sin(\frac{\pi x}{10}) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$  (see Definition 1). On Fig. 1a, the corresponding solution is drawn. The main goal is to reconstruct the three polynomial coefficients  $\{1, -10, 0\}$  as well as the solution. For that, measurements as the ones in Assumption 2 are available only on  $[0, \delta = 1]$  and on the right boundary at  $L = 10$ . Thanks to the composite observer (25), the task can be realized and Fig. 1b represents the observer errors: both internal and boundary observers converge.

It is also worth noticing that the convergence is faster on  $[0, 1]$  than the one on  $[1, 10]$ . This is always possible since the decay rate of the internal observer, namely,  $\theta \kappa$  (see (26)) can be larger than the decay rate of the second observer  $\beta$  (see (27)).


Let us now present more details on the behavior of each observer separately. By selecting our simple example, the main idea is also to highlight the relevance of each gain parameter and to understand their influence on the reconstruction process.

For the internal observer on  $[0, 1]$ , observer error system (29) is considered for some compatible initial condition of the observer (see compatibility conditions (28)). Error components gather the estimate of the state of the wave equation  $\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{v}_1 \\ \tilde{v}_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_t \tilde{z} - \partial_x^2 \tilde{z} - \partial_t z + \partial_x^2 z \\ \tilde{z} - z \end{pmatrix} |_{[0, 1]}$  and the estimate of the source term  $\tilde{v}_3 = \hat{v}_3 - v_3$ . On Fig. 2a, the  $H^3$  norm of  $\tilde{v}$  with respect to the time is depicted and it converges exponentially to zero, as demonstrated in (37). An underlying result is the exponential convergence of each polynomial coefficient  $\frac{\hat{v}_3^{(i)}(0)}{i!}$  for  $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$  towards the expected ones.




(a) Solution of system (1).

(b) Error on the solution.

Fig. 1: Simulations on the whole interval  $[0, L]$ .(a) State error for  $\theta = 5$ .

(b) Coefficient error.

Fig. 2: First observer on  $[0, \delta]$  (internal observer).(a)  $k = 0$ .(b)  $k = 0.1$ .Fig. 3: Second observer on  $[\delta, L]$  (boundary observer).

Then, on Fig. 2b the norm of  $\sum_{i=0}^2 \frac{\hat{v}_3^{(i)}(0)}{i!}$  is drawn in log scale and illustrates the statement (i) in Theorem 1. By increasing the control gain  $\theta$  (see dashed curve), one also confirms that the decay rate increases. Moreover, as an exponential observer, it converges with the same convergence rate independently of initial condition (see dotted curve). Thanks to these coefficient estimations and (21)-(22), the source term can finally be reconstructed on the whole domain.

For the boundary observer on  $[1, 10]$ , the solution  $\tilde{u}_1 - u_1 |_{[1, 10]}$  of the difference between (23) and (8) is represented on Fig. 1b with  $k = 0.1$ . Once again, the state converges exponentially to zero, as mentioned in Theorem 1 (ii). Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that the dynamics of the observer are enforced by the dynamics of the system itself, associated to a characteristic time  $\tau > 20$ , which leads to much slower convergence than the previous internal observer. Lastly, the role played by the observer gain can be interpreted. On Fig. 3, the estimation seems to be faster when control gain  $|k|$  of the boundary observer decreases, probably at the price of robustness with respect to parameter uncertainties.

Simulations have been also done for a nonlinear inverse problem on the estimation of the potential (see Section IV) and can be found in [23].

## VI. CONCLUSION

The problem of simultaneous estimation of an unknown polynomial coefficient and the solution of the 1D wave equation was solved via a composite exponential observer. The first internal observer is performed in an observed subinterval of the domain and provides an estimate of the source coefficient and of a localized part of the solution. At the same time, in combination with a boundary observer, an estimation of the wave solution is obtained on the rest of the spatial domain. For this purpose, after augmenting the state with the unknown coefficient, the wave equation was written as a system of coupled PDEs of higher order. The measurement included the solution of the wave equation and its spatial derivatives on a subinterval of the domain. Some extensions were finally given on the estimation of a potential (nonlinear inverse problem).

Since solutions for nonlinear inverse problems were only partially established here, in our future works we will examine an alternative strategy on observer design for such problems inspired by a finite-dimensional approach for nonlinear systems appearing in [33]. Future research might also include the extension of this approach to 2-dimensional domains, which is more appealing for applications (see elastography), and some links of such an observer design approach with the internal observability of systems of coupled PDEs.

## REFERENCES

- [1] R. Adams and J. Fournier, "Sobolev Spaces," *London: Academic Press*, 2003.
- [2] F. Al-Musallam, S. Avdonin, N. Avdonina, and J. Edward, "Control and inverse problems for networks of vibrating strings with attached masses," *Nanosystems: Physics, Chemistry, Mathematics*, vol. 7(5), pp. 835–841, 2016.
- [3] F. Alabau-Boussouira, J.-M. Coron, and G. Olive, "Internal controllability of first order quasilinear hyperbolic systems with a reduced number of controls," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 55(1), pp. 300–323, 2017.
- [4] G. Bastin and J.-M. Coron, "Stability and Boundary Stabilization of 1-d Hyperbolic Systems," *Basel: Birkhäuser*, 2016.
- [5] L. Baudouin, M. De Buhan, and S. Ervedoza, "Convergent algorithm based on Carleman estimates for the recovery of a potential in the wave equation," *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, vol. 55(4), pp. 1578–1613, 2017.
- [6] L. Baudouin, A. Mercado, and A. Osses, "A global Carleman estimate in a transmission wave equation and application to a one-measurement inverse problem," *Inverse Problems*, vol. 23(1), pp. 257–278, 2007.
- [7] G. Besançon, "Further results on high gain observers for nonlinear systems," *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, Phoenix, AZ, USA, vol. 3, pp. 2904–2909, 1999.
- [8] G. Besançon, "Nonlinear Observers and Applications," *Springer Verlag, New York*, 2007.
- [9] A. Boumenir and V. K. Tuan, "An inverse problem for the wave equation," *J. Inverse Ill-Posed Probl.*, vol. 19, pp. 573–592, 2011.
- [10] L. Brivadis, V. Andrieu, U. Serres, and J.-P. Gauthier, "Luenberger observers for infinite-dimensional systems, Back and Forth Nudging and application to a crystallization process," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 59(2), pp. 857–886, 2021.
- [11] A. L. Bukhgeim and M. V. Klibanov, "Uniqueness in the large of a class of multidimensional inverse problems," *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, vol. 260(2), pp. 269–272, 1981.
- [12] F. Castillo, E. Witrant, C. Prieur, and L. Dugard, "Boundary observers for linear and quasi-linear hyperbolic systems with application to flow control," *Automatica*, vol. 49(11), pp. 3180–3188, 2013.
- [13] M. Chapouly and M. Mirrahimi, "Distributed source identification for wave equations: an observer-based approach," *Proceedings of the 19th International Symposium on Mathematical Theory of Networks and Systems*, pp. 389–394, Budapest, Hungary, 2010.
- [14] C. Courtes, "Convergence for PDEs with an arbitrary odd order spatial derivative term," In: *Klingenberg, C., Westdickenberg, M. (eds) Theory, Numerics and Applications of Hyperbolic Problems I. HYP 2016. Springer Proceedings in Mathematics and Statistics, Springer, Cham*, vol. 236, pp. 413–425, 2018.
- [15] M. De Hoop, "Microlocal analysis of seismic in inverse scattering Inside Out," *Inverse Problems and Applications (Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.)*, *Cambridge: Cambridge University Press*, vol. 47, pp. 219–296, 2003.
- [16] G. P. Flessas, "Exact solutions for anharmonic oscillators," *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, vol. 14, pp. 209–211, 1981.
- [17] E. Fridman, "Observers and initial state recovering for a class of hyperbolic systems via Lyapunov method," *Automatica*, vol. 49, pp. 2250–2260, 2013.
- [18] G. Haine and K. Ramdani, "Reconstructing initial data using observers: error analysis of the semi-discrete and fully discrete approximations," *Numerische Mathematik*, vol. 120(2), pp. 307–343, 2012.
- [19] H. Hammouri, B. Targui, and F. Armanet, "High gain observer based on a triangular structure," *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, vol. 12(6), pp. 497–518, 2002.
- [20] H. Holta and O. M. Aamo, "Observer design for a class of semi-linear hyperbolic PDEs with distributed sensing and parametric uncertainties," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2021.
- [21] V. Isakov, "Inverse Problems for Partial Differential Equations," *Applied Mathematical Sciences 127, 2nd ed.*, *Springer, New York*, 2006.
- [22] V. Isakov and M. Yamamoto, "Carleman estimate with the Neumann boundary condition and its applications to the observability inequality and inverse hyperbolic problems," *Contemp. Math.* 268, pp. 191–225, 2000.
- [23] C. Kitsos, M. Bajodek, and L. Baudouin, "Estimation of the potential in a 1D wave equation via exponential observers," *60th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, Austin Texas, USA, pp. 4032–4037, 2021.
- [24] C. Kitsos, G. Besançon, and C. Prieur, "High-gain observer design for some semilinear reaction-diffusion systems: a transformation-based approach," *IEEE Control Systems Letters (L-CSS)*, vol. 5(2), pp. 629–634, 2021.
- [25] C. Kitsos, G. Besançon, and C. Prieur, "High-gain observer for  $3 \times 3$  linear heterodirectional hyperbolic systems," *Automatica*, vol. 129, 2021.
- [26] M. V. Klibanov, "Inverse problems and Carleman estimates," *Inverse Problems*, vol. 8(4), pp. 575–596, 1992.
- [27] M. Krstic, B.-Z. Guo, A. Balogh, and A. Smyshlyaev, "Output-feedback stabilization of an unstable wave equation," *Automatica*, vol. 44, pp. 63–74, 2008.
- [28] J.-L. Lions, "Contrôlabilité exacte, Stabilisation et perturbations de systèmes distribués. Tome 1. Contrôlabilité exacte" *volume RMA 8. Masson*, 1988.
- [29] P. Lissy and E. Zuazua, "Internal observability for coupled systems of linear partial differential equations," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 57(2), pp. 832–853, 2019.
- [30] K. Ramdani, M. Tucsnak, and G. Weiss, "Recovering the initial state of an infinite-dimensional system using observers," *Automatica*, vol. 46, pp. 1616–1625, 2010.
- [31] C. Roman, D. Bresch-Pietri, E. Cerpa, C. Prieur, and O. Sename, "Backstepping observer based-control for an anti-damped boundary wave PDE in presence of in-domain viscous damping," *55th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, Las Vegas, pp. 549–554, 2016.
- [32] S. Schlaeger, "A fast TDR-inversion technique for the reconstruction of spatial soil moisture content," *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.* 9, pp. 481–492, 2005.
- [33] J. Tsiniias and C. Kitsos, "Observability and state estimation for a class of nonlinear systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 64, no. 6, pp. 2621–2628, 2019.
- [34] I. Y. Tyukin, E. Steur, H. Nijmeijer, and C. van Leeuwen, "Adaptive observers and parameter estimation for a class of systems nonlinear in the parameters," *Automatica*, vol. 49(8), pp. 2409–2423, 2013.
- [35] M. Yamamoto, "Uniqueness and stability in multidimensional hyperbolic inverse problems," *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, vol. 78(1), pp. 65–98, 1999.
- [36] J. Yuan and W. Wonham, "Probing signals for model reference identification," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 22(4), pp. 530–538, 1977.



**Constantinos Kitsos** holds a Diploma (M.Eng.) in electrical and computer engineering and in 2016 he obtained an M.Sc. in applied mathematics, both from the National Technical University of Athens. In 2020 he received a Ph.D. degree in control theory from Université Grenoble Alpes, GIPSA-lab (Dept. of Automatic Control). Since then, he has been affiliated to CNRS, LAAS, Toulouse and to Tel Aviv University, dept. of Electrical Engineering as a Postdoctoral Researcher. His research interests include nonlinear observers and control of PDEs.



**Mathieu Bajodek** Mathieu Bajodek received a joint M.Sc. in teacher education in computer science, automation, and electronics from Ecole Normale Supérieure Paris-Saclay, Cachan, France and in automatic control, signal and image processing from Université Paris-Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France in 2019. In 2022, he received the Ph.D. degree in automatic control from Université Paul Sabatier Toulouse III, Toulouse, France. He is currently a Postdoctoral Researcher at CentraleSupélec on nonhomogeneous reaction-diffusion equations. His research interests

concern the stability analysis, control and observation of infinite-dimensional systems.



**Lucie Baudouin** received the Ph.D. degree in applied mathematics from the University of Versailles Saint-Quentin in 2004, and the ‘Habilitation Diriger des Recherches’ in applied mathematics from University of Toulouse, France, in 2014. From 2006, she was an Associate Researcher and since 2022, she is a Senior Researcher with CNRS, LAAS, Toulouse. Her current research interests include stability analysis, robust control, and inverse problems for partial differential equations.