

CONTROL RESULTS FOR A MODEL OF RESONANT INTERACTION BETWEEN SHORT AND LONG CAPILLARY-GRAVITY WAVES

ROBERTO DE A. CAPISTRANO-FILHO* AND ADEMIR B. PAMPU

ABSTRACT. The purpose of this article is the investigation of the global control properties of a coupled nonlinear dispersive system posed in the periodic domain \mathbb{T} , a system with structure of a nonlinear Schrödinger equation and a nonlinear Korteweg-de Vries equation. Combining estimates derived from Bourgain spaces and using microlocal analysis we show that this system has global control properties. The main novelty of this work is in twofold. One is that the global results for the nonlinear system are presented for the first time thanks to the propagation of singularities. The second one is that these propagation results are shown to a coupled dispersive system with two equations defined by differential operators with principal symbols of different orders.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Setting of the problem. Our work is related with global control properties of a system composed by a nonlinear Schrödinger equation and a nonlinear Korteweg-de Vries equation

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \partial_x^2 u = i\partial_x v + \beta|u|^2 u, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\ \partial_t v + \partial_x^3 v + \frac{1}{2}\partial_x(v^2) + \mu\partial_x v = \operatorname{Re}(\partial_x u), & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), \quad v(x, 0) = v_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{T}, \end{cases}$$

where $u = u(x, t)$ is a complex valued function and $v = v(x, t)$ is a real valued function. The nonlinear Schrödinger–Korteweg-de Vries system (NLS–KdV) that appears in the study of resonant interaction between short and long capillary-gravity waves on water of uniform finite depth, in plasma physics and in a diatomic lattice system. Here, u represents the short wave, while v stands for the long wave, see e.g. [1, 2, 4, 14] and the references therein for more details about the physical motivation for this system.

The first goal of the manuscript is to establish well-posedness results for the system (1.1). To do so the main ingredient is a fixed point argument in the Bourgain spaces associated with the linear Schrödinger and linear Korteweg-de Vries equations. Once we have the global well-posedness of the NLS–KdV system, we can consider the system (1.1) from a control point of view with two forcing terms f and g added in each equation

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \partial_x^2 u = i\partial_x v + \beta|u|^2 u + f, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ \partial_t v + \partial_x^3 v + \frac{1}{2}\partial_x(v^2) + \mu\partial_x v = \operatorname{Re}(\partial_x u) + g, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), \quad v(x, 0) = v_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{T}, \end{cases}$$

where f and g are assumed to be supported in a non-empty subset $\omega \subset \mathbb{T}$. Here, the main point is to use microlocal analysis to prove results of propagation of singularities, which is the key point to prove global control results. The main difficulty to prove these propagation is related to the fact that we have a coupled system defined by two differential operators with principal symbols of different orders.

It is not of our acknowledgement any global control results for the nonlinear NLS–KdV system (1.2). However, for the linear system control problems are considered in [3]. Precisely, the authors

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35Q55, 35Q53, 93B05, 93D15, 35A21.

Key words and phrases. Bourgain spaces · Global control results · Propagation of compactness · Propagation of regularity · Unique continuation property · Schrödinger–KdV system.

*Corresponding author: roberto.capistranofilho@ufpe.br.

treated a linear Schrödinger–Korteweg-de Vries system

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t w + \partial_x^2 w = a_1 w + a_2 y + h \mathbf{1}_\omega & \text{in } Q \\ \partial_t y + \partial_x^3 y + \partial_x(My) = \operatorname{Re}(a_3 w) + a_4 y + l \mathbf{1}_\omega & \text{in } Q \\ w(0, t) = w(1, t) = 0 & \text{in } (0, T), \\ y(0, t) = y(1, t) = \partial_x y(1, t) = 0 & \text{in } (0, T), \\ w(x, 0) = w_0(x), \quad y(x, 0) = y_0(x) & \text{in } (0, 1) \end{cases}$$

in a bounded domain $Q := (0, 1) \times (0, T)$ with a purely real or a purely imaginary control h acting in the Schrödinger equation and a control l acting in the KdV equation. Thanks to the Carleman estimates they proved an observability inequality that helps them achieve the result. However, the following questions naturally arise:

Control problems: *What can be said about the global controllability for system (1.2)? Would it be possible to find appropriate damping mechanisms to stabilize this system?*

In this way, our work will provide answers to these questions for the nonlinear NLS–KdV system (1.2). Although these issues are typical in control theory and have been the subject of the study in several single equations over the past 30 years, the controllability problems involving nonlinear coupled dispersive systems still are not well understood.

1.2. Known results for single equations. Let us present a review of the control and stabilization results for the KdV and NLS equations. We caution that this is only a small sample of the extant works on these equations.

1.2.1. KdV equation. Russell and Zhang are the pioneers in the study of control problems to the KdV equation [26, 27]. They treated the following KdV system

$$(1.3) \quad u_t + uu_x + u_{xxx} = f,$$

with periodic boundary conditions and an internal control f . Since then, both controllability and stabilization problems have been intensively studied. We can cite, for instance, the exact boundary controllability of KdV on a bounded domain [12, 13, 16, 24, 28] and the internal control problem [11], among others.

It is well known that the KdV system (1.3) has at least the following conserved integral quantities

$$I_1(t) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} u(x, t) dx, \quad I_2(t) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} u^2(x, t) dx \quad \text{and} \quad I_3(t) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left(u_x^2(x, t) - \frac{1}{3} u^3(x, t) \right) dx.$$

From the historical origins of the KdV equation involving the behavior of water waves in a shallow channel, it is natural to think that I_1 and I_2 express conservation of *volume (or mass)* and *energy*, respectively.

The first work of Russel and Zhang [26] is purely linear. In fact, they had to wait for several years to extend their results to the nonlinear system [27] until Bourgain [7] discovered a subtle smoothing property of solutions of the KdV equation posed on a periodic domain, thanks to which Bourgain was able to show that the Cauchy problem (1.3) is well-posed in the space $H^s(\mathbb{T})$, for any $s \geq 0$.

In [27] the authors studied the equation (1.3) assuming f supported in a given open set $\omega \subset \mathbb{T}$. To keep the mass $I_1(t)$ conserved, the control input $f(x, t)$ is necessary to be chosen of the form

$$(1.4) \quad f(x, t) = [Gh](x, t) := g(x) \left(h(x, t) - \int_{\mathbb{T}} g(y) h(y, t) dy \right).$$

Here h is considered as a new control input, and $g(x)$ is a given non-negative smooth function such that $\{g > 0\} = \omega$ and

$$2\pi [g] = \int_{\mathbb{T}} g(x) dx = 1.$$

For the chosen g , it is easy to see that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{T}} u(x, t) dx = \int_{\mathbb{T}} f(x, t) dx = 0,$$

for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and for any solution $u = u(x, t)$ of the system

$$(1.5) \quad u_t + uu_x + u_{xxx} = Gh.$$

Thus, the mass of the system is indeed conserved. With this in hand Russell and Zhang were able to show the local exact controllability and local exponential stabilizability for the system (1.5). Indeed, the results presented in [27] are essentially linear; they are more or less small perturbation of the linear results. However, Laurent *et al.* in [17] showed global results for the system (1.5). In fact, the global control results are established with the aid of certain properties of propagation of compactness and regularity in Bourgain spaces.

1.2.2. *NLS equation.* Consider the following equation

$$(1.6) \quad i\partial_t u + \Delta u = \lambda|u|^2 u, \quad (x, t) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathbb{R}.$$

The first results to the system (1.6), when \mathcal{M} a compact Riemannian manifold of dimension 2 without boundary, is due to Dehman *et al.* in [15]. The authors considered the stabilization and exact controllability problem for NLS. Precisely, to prove the control properties, the authors were able to prove the propagation results in \mathcal{M} . However, these properties are shown considering ω be an open subset of \mathcal{M} and the following two assumptions:

- (A) ω geometrically controls \mathcal{M} ; i.e. there exists $T_0 > 0$, such that every geodesic of \mathcal{M} traveling with speed 1 and issued at $t = 0$, enters the set ω in a time $t < T_0$.
- (B) For every $T > 0$, the only solution lying in the space $C[0, T], H^1(\mathcal{M})$ of the system

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \Delta u + b_1(x, t)u + b_2(x, t)\bar{u}, & (x, t) \in \mathcal{M} \times (0, T), \\ u = 0, & (x, t) \in \omega \times (0, T), \end{cases}$$

where $b_1(t, x)$ and $b_2(t, x) \in L^\infty(0, T, L^p(\mathcal{M}))$ for some $p > 0$ large enough, is the trivial one $u \equiv 0$.

Considering the NLS on a periodic domain \mathbb{T} with Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions, Laurent [19] applied the method introduced by Dehman *et al.* to prove that this system is globally internally controllable.

When a compact Riemannian manifold of dimension $d \geq 3$ is considered, Strichartz estimates does not yield uniform well posedness results at the energy level for the NLS equation, property which seems to be very important to prove controllability results. In this way, Burq *et al.* in two works [8, 9] managed to introduce the Bourgain spaces $X^{s,b}$ on certain manifolds without boundary where the bilinear Strichartz estimates can be showed and, consequently, they get the uniform well-posedness for the NLS equation. Taking advantage of these results, Laurent [18] proved that the geometric control condition (\mathcal{A}) is sufficient to prove the exact controllability for the NLS in $X^{s,b}$ spaces on some three-dimensional Riemannian compact manifolds. Similarly of this work, we mention [25] and [19] where controllability results were studied for the NLS in euclidean and periodic domains, respectively, relying on the properties of the Bourgain spaces.

1.3. **Main results.** Note that to deal with the nonlinearity associated with the KdV part in (1.2), we must use appropriated estimates which requires that the mean value of v satisfying

$$[v] = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{T}} v(x, t) dx = 0, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

If we set $\mu := [v_0]$, we get from the second equation in (1.2) that

$$\tilde{\mu} := [v_0] = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{T}} v(x, 0) dx = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{T}} v(x, t) dx, \quad \forall t > 0.$$

Thus it is convenient to set $\tilde{v} = v - \tilde{\mu}$ and to study the following equivalent system

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \partial_x^2 u = i\partial_x \tilde{v} + \beta|u|^2 u + f, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ \partial_t \tilde{v} + \partial_x^3 \tilde{v} + \frac{1}{2}\partial_x(\tilde{v}^2) + (\mu + \tilde{\mu})\partial_x \tilde{v} = \operatorname{Re}(\partial_x u) + g, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), \quad v(x, 0) = \tilde{v}_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{T}, \end{cases}$$

where $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ is a constant.

Now consider $a \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ a real valued function such that

$$(1.7) \quad a(x)^2 > \eta > 0,$$

in some non-empty open set $\omega \subset \mathbb{T}$ and the operator G defined, for some $g \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ real valued function such that $g > 0$ in $\omega \subset \mathbb{T}$, as

$$(1.8) \quad Gh(x, t) := g(x) \left(h(x, t) - \int_{\mathbb{T}} g(y)h(y, t)dy \right),$$

where h is any function considered as a control input. Choosing $f := -ia(x)^2 u$ and $g := Gh$, with $h = -G^* \tilde{v}$, we have that the solution of

$$(1.9) \quad \begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \partial_x^2 u = i\partial_x v + \beta|u|^2 u + f, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\ \partial_t \tilde{v} + \partial_x^3 \tilde{v} + \frac{1}{2}\partial_x(\tilde{v}^2) + (\mu + \tilde{\mu})\partial_x \tilde{v} = \operatorname{Re}(\partial_x u) + Gh, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), \quad \tilde{v}(x, 0) = \tilde{v}_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{T}, \end{cases}$$

satisfies

$$\frac{d}{dt}E(t) = - \int_{\mathbb{T}} \|a(\cdot)u(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 dx - \int_{\mathbb{T}} \|G\tilde{v}(t)\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 dx \leq 0.$$

Here

$$E(t) := \|u(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 + \|\tilde{v}(t)\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}^2,$$

is the total energy associated to (1.9) and $L_0^2(\mathbb{T}) = \{w \in L^2(\mathbb{T}); [w] = 0\}$. This indicates that the controls play the role of two damping mechanisms. So, our result establishes that the system (1.9) is asymptotically exponential stable. Precisely, we provides a positive answer for the global stabilization question already mentioned at the beginning of the introduction.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that $a \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ satisfy the conditions (1.7) and Gh given by (1.8). Then, for every $R_0 > 0$, there exist $C := C(R_0) > 0$ and $\gamma > 0$ such that the following inequality holds*

$$(1.10) \quad \|(u, \tilde{v})(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} \leq Ce^{-\gamma t} \|(u_0, \tilde{v}_0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}, \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

for every solution (u, \tilde{v}) of the system (1.9) with initial data $(u_0, \tilde{v}_0) \in L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})$ satisfying $\|(u_0, \tilde{v}_0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} \leq R_0$.

Once we have established the global stabilization result, the answer for the global exact controllability problem will be a consequence of the following local exact controllability theorem.

Theorem 1.2. *Let ω be any nonempty set of \mathbb{T} . Then there exist $\delta > 0$ and $T > 0$ such that for every $(u_0, \tilde{v}_0) \in L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})$ with $\|(u_0, \tilde{v}_0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} < \delta$, we can find $f \in C([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{T}))$ and $h \in C([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{T}))$, f and h compactly supported in $]0, T[\times \omega$, such that, the unique solution $(u, \tilde{v}) \in C([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L^2(\mathbb{T}))$ of the system (1.9) satisfies $(u, \tilde{v})(x, T) = (0, 0)$.*

Finally with the previous local exact controllability result in hand, combining it with the global stabilization result we get the global controllability result, that can be read as follows.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $\omega \subset \mathbb{T}$ be a nonempty open set and $R_0 > 0$. Then, there exist $T := T(R_0) > 0$ such that, for every $(u_0, v_0), (u_1, v_1) \in L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L^2(\mathbb{T})$ with*

$$\|(u_0, v_0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L^2(\mathbb{T})} \leq R_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \|(u_1, v_1)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L^2(\mathbb{T})} \leq R_0,$$

and $[v_0] = [v_1]$ one can find control inputs $f \in C([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{T}))$ and $h \in C([0, T]; L_0^2(\mathbb{T}))$, with f and h supported in $\omega \times (0, T)$, such that the unique solution $(u, v) \in C([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L^2(\mathbb{T}))$ of the system (1.2) satisfies $(u, v)(x, T) = (u_1(x), v_1(x))$.

1.4. Heuristic and outline of the manuscript. Our global control results are proved combining estimates derived from Bourgain spaces and using microlocal analysis. To our knowledge this is the first time that this method is used in a coupled dispersive system with two equations defined by differential operators with principal symbols of different orders and more importantly, a key feature in this contribution is that we are able to prove global control results for the nonlinear system in a bounded domain. This represents an improvement with respect to the previous paper [3] where the control problem, for the linear system, is considered. The key ingredients of this work are:

- *Strichartz, bilinear and multilinear estimates* associated to the solution of the problem under consideration;
- *Microlocal analysis* to prove *propagation of the regularity and compactness* for two equations defined by differential operators with principal symbols of different orders;
- *Unique continuation property* which is a consequence of the Carleman estimates for each equation, KdV and Schrödinger equations.

The proof of the Theorem 1.1 is equivalent to prove an *observability inequality*, which one, by using *contradiction arguments*, relies to prove a *unique continuation property* for the system (1.9). This property is achieved thanks to the *propagation results* using the smooth properties of the Bourgain spaces. The main difficulties to prove the propagation results arises from the fact that the system (1.9) is defined by two differential operators with principal symbols of different orders. To overcome this difficulty we employ the estimates, proved in Section 2, for the solution of our problem in Bourgain Spaces.

The strategy to prove Theorem 1.2 is to consider the control operator for the nonlinear problem as a perturbation of the control operator for the linear system associated to (1.9), the perturbation argument is due to Zuazua [29]. Additionally, the control result for large data (Theorem 1.3) will be a combination of a global stabilization result (Theorem 1.1) and the local control result (Theorem 1.2), as it is usual in control theory.

Lastly, it is important to point out that the dissipation laws in (1.9) are intrinsically linked with the physical problems modeled by the Schrödinger and the KdV equations. In the case when is considered only one equation, this same dissipation laws were already considered in [18, 25], for the NLS equation, and in [17, 27], for the KdV equation.

Our manuscript is outlined as follows. Section 2 is to establish estimates needed in our analysis, *Strichartz, bilinear and multilinear estimates*. With these estimates we are able to prove the existence of solutions for the nonlinear NLS-KdV system with source and damping terms in Section 3. Next, Sections 4 and 5, are aimed to present the proof of the stabilization and controllability theorems, respectively. We also present in Section 6 concluding remarks and open problems. Finally, Appendixes A and B are devoted to prove the *propagation results* and the *unique continuation property*, respectively.

2. FOURIER TRANSFORM RESTRICTION

In this section we present definitions, some properties of the Bourgain spaces associated with the system (1.1) and estimates which will be essential to prove our main results. It is well known that J. Bourgain [6] discovered a subtle smoothing property of solutions of the Schrödinger and KdV equations in \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{T} .

2.1. Definitions and notations. Let us now define the Bourgain spaces $X^{k,b}$ and $Y^{s,b}$ associated to the linear operators of the Schrödinger and KdV equations, respectively. For given $k, b, s \in \mathbb{R}$, functions $u : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ and $v : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, in $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R})$, and $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ define the quantities

$$\|u\|_{X^{k,b}} = \left(\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \langle n \rangle^{2k} \langle \tau + n^2 \rangle^{2b} |\hat{f}(n, \tau)|^2 d\tau \right)^{1/2}$$

and

$$\|v\|_{Y^{s,b}} = \left(\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \langle n \rangle^{2s} \langle \tau - n^3 + \mu n \rangle^{2b} |\hat{g}(n, \tau)|^2 d\tau \right)^{1/2},$$

where \hat{f} is the Fourier transform of f with respect to the variables x and t , with $\langle \cdot \rangle = \sqrt{1 + |\cdot|^2}$. The Bourgain spaces $X^{k,b}$ and $Y^{s,b}$ associated to Schrödinger and KdV operators are the completion of the Schwartz space $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R})$ under the norm $\|u\|_{X^{k,b}}$ and $\|v\|_{Y^{s,b}}$, respectively.

Considering the time interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, we define $X^{k,b}(I)$ and $Y^{s,b}(I)$ as the restriction spaces of $X^{k,b}$ and $Y^{s,b}$, respectively, to the interval I with the norm

$$(2.1) \quad \|f\|_{X^{k,b}(I)} = \inf_{\tilde{f}|_I = f} \|\tilde{f}\|_{X^{k,b}} \quad \text{and} \quad \|g\|_{Y^{s,b}(I)} = \inf_{\tilde{g}|_I = g} \|\tilde{g}\|_{Y^{s,b}}.$$

We shall also consider the smaller spaces \tilde{X}^k and \tilde{Y}^k defined by the norms

$$(2.2) \quad \|u\|_{\tilde{X}^k} := \|u\|_{X^{k,1/2}} + \left\| \langle n \rangle^k \hat{u}(n, \tau) \right\|_{l_n^2 L_\tau^1} \quad \text{and} \quad \|v\|_{\tilde{Y}^s} := \|v\|_{Y^{s,1/2}} + \left\| \langle n \rangle^s \hat{v}(n, \tau) \right\|_{l_n^2 L_\tau^1}$$

and the restriction spaces $\tilde{X}^k(I)$ and $\tilde{Y}^k(I)$ as in (2.1). The companion spaces will be defined as Z^k and W^s via the norms

$$\|u\|_{Z^k} = \|u\|_{X^{k,-1/2}} + \left\| \frac{\langle n \rangle^k \hat{u}(n, \tau)}{\langle \tau + n^2 \rangle} \right\|_{L_\tau^1 l_n^2}$$

and

$$\|v\|_{W^s} = \|v\|_{Y^{s,-1/2}} + \left\| \frac{\langle n \rangle^s \hat{v}(n, \tau)}{\langle \tau - n^3 + \mu n \rangle} \right\|_{L_\tau^1 l_n^2},$$

respectively.

2.1.1. Notations. If $I = (0, T)$, we denote $X^{k,b}(I)$ (resp. $Y^{s,b}(I)$, $\tilde{X}^{k,b}(I)$ and $\tilde{Y}^{s,b}(I)$) by $X_T^{k,b}$ (resp. $Y_T^{s,b}$, $\tilde{X}_T^{k,b}$ and $\tilde{Y}_T^{s,b}$). Denote from now on $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ a non-negative function supported in $[-2, 2]$ with $\psi \equiv 1$ on $[-1, 1]$ and $\psi_\delta(t) := \psi(t/\delta)$, for any $\delta > 0$. We also denote

$$H_0^s(\mathbb{T}) = \{u \in H^s(\mathbb{T}); [u] = 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad L_0^2(\mathbb{T}) = \{u \in L^2(\mathbb{T}); [u] = 0\}.$$

Finally, for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $a+$ (resp. $a-$) is a number slightly larger (resp. smaller) than a , more precisely, $a+ = a + \epsilon$, for some $\epsilon > 0$ as small as we want. We shall also denote by D^r the operator defined on $\mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{T})$ by

$$(2.3) \quad \widehat{D^r u}(k) = \begin{cases} |k|^r \hat{u}(k) & \text{if } k \neq 0, \\ \hat{u}(0) & \text{if } k = 0. \end{cases}$$

The following properties of $X_T^{k,b}$ and $Y_T^{s,b}$, $k, s, b \in \mathbb{R}$, can be verified.

- (i) $X_T^{k,b}$ and $Y_T^{s,b}$ are Hilbert spaces.
- (ii) Let $\delta, \delta_1 \geq 0$, then $X_T^{k+\delta, b+\delta_1}$ is continuously embedded in $X_T^{k,b}$ and if $\delta > 0$ and $\delta_1 > 0$ we have a compact embedding. Similar result holds for $Y_T^{s,b}$ spaces.
- (iii) The spaces \tilde{X}_T^k and \tilde{Y}_T^s are continuously embedded in $C([0, T]; H^k(\mathbb{T}))$ and $C([0, T]; H^s(\mathbb{T}))$, respectively.

2.2. Overview of the estimates. This part of the work is dedicated to present estimates for the linear group associated to Schrödinger and KdV equations. Additionally, we will present the trilinear and bilinear estimates associated with the nonlinearities involved in our problem, which are the key to prove the global control results in this manuscript. These results will be borrowed from [2, 17, 19].

Let $U(t) = e^{it\partial_x^2}$ and $V(t) = e^{-t(\partial_x^3 + \mu\partial_x)}$ be the unitary groups associated to the linear Schrödinger and the Airy equations, respectively. So, the following linear estimates is verified

and the proofs were made in [2, Lemma 4.1.], [17, Lemma 3.4.] and [19, Lemma 1.2.], respectively, so we will omit them.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $u_0 \in H^k(\mathbb{T})$ and $v_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{T})$, then*

$$(i) \quad \|\psi_1(t)e^{it\partial_x^2}u_0\|_{X^{k,b}} \leq C\|u_0\|_{H^k} \quad \text{and}$$

$$\left\| \psi_T(t) \int_0^t e^{i(t-t')\partial_x^2} F(t') dt' \right\|_{X^{k,\frac{1}{2}}} \leq C\|F\|_{Z^k}.$$

$$(ii) \quad \|\psi_1(t)e^{-t(\partial_x^3+\mu\partial_x)}v_0\|_{Y^{s,b}} \leq C\|v_0\|_{H^s} \quad \text{and}$$

$$\left\| \psi_T(t) \int_0^t e^{(t-t')(\partial_x^3+\mu\partial_x)} G(t') dt' \right\|_{Y^{s,\frac{1}{2}}} \leq C\|G\|_{W^s}.$$

- (iii) *Let $-1 \leq b \leq 1$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T})$. Then, for every $u \in Y^{s,b}$, $\varphi(x)u \in Y^{s-|b|,b}$. Similarly, the multiplication φ maps $Y_T^{s,b}$ into $Y_T^{s-|b|,b}$.*
- (iv) *Let $-1 \leq b \leq 1$, $k \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T})$. Then, for every $u \in X^{k,b}$, $\varphi(x)u \in X^{k-|b|,b}$. Similarly, the multiplication φ maps $X_T^{k,b}$ into $X_T^{k-|b|,b}$.*

The next proposition, showed in [2, Lemma 4.2.] and [17, Lemma 3.3.], concerns to the trilinear estimates for the term $|u|^2u$ and bilinear estimates for the term $\partial_x v^2$, respectively.

Proposition 2.2. *The following estimates hold true.*

$$(i) \quad \text{For any } k \geq 0,$$

$$(2.4) \quad \|\psi(t)uv\bar{w}\|_{Z^k} \lesssim \|u\|_{X^{k,3/8}} \|v\|_{X^{k,3/8}} \|w\|_{X^{k,3/8}}.$$

- (ii) *For any $s \geq 0$, $T \in (0, 1)$ and $v_1, v_2 \in Y^{s,\frac{1}{2}}$ x -periodic functions having zero x -mean for all t , that is $[v_1] = [v_2] = 0$, there exist some constants $\theta > 0$, $C > 0$ independent of T , v_1 and v_2 such that*

$$(2.5) \quad \|\psi_T(t)\partial_x(v_1v_2)\|_{W^s} \leq CT^\theta \|v_1\|_{Y^{s,1/2}} \|v_2\|_{Y^{s,1/2}}.$$

At this point we present an elementary lemma concerning the stability of Bourgain's spaces with respect to time localization which one was proved in [2, Lemma 4.4.].

Proposition 2.3. *Let $X_{\tau=h(\xi)}^{s,b} := \left\{ f : \langle \tau - h(\xi) \rangle^b \langle \xi \rangle^s |\hat{f}(\tau, \xi)| \in L^2 \right\}$. Then,*

$$\|\psi(t)f\|_{X_{\tau=h(\xi)}^{s,b}} \lesssim_{\psi,b} \|f\|_{X_{\tau=h(\xi)}^{s,b}}$$

for any $x, b \in \mathbb{R}$. Furthermore, if $-\frac{1}{2} < b' \leq b < \frac{1}{2}$, then for any $0 < T < 1$ we have

$$\|\psi_T(t)f\|_{X_{\tau=h(\xi)}^{s,b'}} \lesssim_{\psi,b',b} T^{b-b'} \|f\|_{X_{\tau=h(\xi)}^{s,-b}}$$

Finally, to end this subsection, we invoke the following result related to the linear system associated with the KdV equation. Precisely, we present below the following Strichartz estimate for the KdV equation showed in [17, Lemma 3.2.].

Proposition 2.4. *Let $T > 0$. The following estimate is verified*

$$\|v\|_{L^4(0,T;L^4(\mathbb{T}))} \leq C\|v\|_{Y_T^{0,\frac{1}{3}}}.$$

In other words, $Y_T^{0,\frac{1}{3}}$ is continuously embedded in $L^4(0,T;L^4(\mathbb{T}))$.

2.3. Auxiliary estimates. The next auxiliary lemma help us to prove the necessary estimates for the following derivative terms $\partial_x u$ and $\partial_x v$ in W_T^k and Z_T^s , $k, s \in \mathbb{R}$, respectively.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $H : \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$H(n, \tau) = \frac{|n|}{\langle \tau - n^3 + \mu n \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon} \langle \tau + n^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}}, \quad (n, \tau) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R},$$

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

$$H(n, \tau) \leq C, \quad \forall (n, \tau) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}.$$

Proof. It is enough to prove that, for every $(n, \tau) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}$, with $|n|$ large enough, there exist $\alpha > 0$ and $C_0 > 0$ such that

$$(2.6) \quad \langle \tau - n^3 + \mu n \rangle \langle \tau + n^2 \rangle \geq C_0 |n|^\alpha,$$

with $(\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon) \alpha > 1$.

Indeed, let us assume that (2.6) is verified. We then split the analysis into two cases, $|n| \leq C$, for some $C > 0$ large enough, and $|n| > C$. For the first case, note that considering a fixed $n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$, we get

$$(2.7) \quad H(n_0, \tau) = \frac{|n_0|}{\langle \tau - n_0^3 + \mu n_0 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon} \langle \tau + n_0^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}} \leq |n_0|,$$

for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$. On the other hand, (2.6) asserts that there exist $C_0 > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$H(n, \tau) \leq \frac{|n|}{C_0 |n|^{(\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon)\alpha}} \leq \frac{1}{C_0},$$

for every $(n, \tau) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}$, with $|n| > C$. So, by (2.6) and (2.7),

$$H(n, \tau) \leq \max \left\{ \frac{1}{C_0}, C \right\}, \quad \forall (n, \tau) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R},$$

and the lemma is proved.

Now, to prove (2.6) we start by observing that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tau - n^3 + \mu n \rangle \langle \tau + n^2 \rangle &= (1 + |\tau - n^3 + \mu n|)(1 + |\tau + n^2|) \\ &\geq |\tau - n^3 + \mu n| + |\tau + n^2| \\ &\geq |n^3 - n^2 - \mu n| \\ &\geq |n|^3 - |n^2 + \mu n| \\ &= \frac{1}{2}|n|^3 + \frac{1}{2}|n|^3 - |n^2 + \mu n| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}|n|^3 + \frac{1}{2}|n|^3 - |n|^2 - |\mu||n|. \end{aligned}$$

Since we have that $\lim_{|n| \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{1}{2}|n|^3 - |n|^2 - |\mu||n| \right) = \infty$, (2.6) is verified. \square

We are in position to prove the last two linear estimates.

Proposition 2.6. *Let $T > 0$. If $u \in X_T^{k, \frac{1}{2}}$ and $v \in Y_T^{s, \frac{1}{2}}$, for $k, s \in \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$(2.8) \quad \|\partial_x u\|_{W_T^k} \lesssim \|u\|_{X_T^{k, \frac{1}{2}-}}$$

and

$$(2.9) \quad \|\partial_x v\|_{Z_T^s} \lesssim \|v\|_{Y_T^{s, \frac{1}{2}-}}.$$

Proof. We start observing that

$$\|\partial_x u\|_{W^k} = \left\| \langle \tau - n^3 + \mu n \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}} \langle n \rangle^k \widehat{\partial_x u} \right\|_{L_\tau^2 l_n^2} + \left\| \frac{\langle n \rangle^k \widehat{\partial_x u}(n, \tau)}{\langle \tau - n^3 + \mu n \rangle} \right\|_{L_\tau^1 l_n^2}.$$

Since $\widehat{\partial_x u}(n, \tau) = in \widehat{u}(n, \tau)$ and

$$\frac{1}{\langle \tau - n^3 + \mu n \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq \frac{1}{\langle \tau - n^3 + \mu n \rangle^{\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon}},$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$, we have that

$$\left\| \langle \tau - n^3 + \mu n \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}} \langle n \rangle^k \widehat{\partial_x u} \right\|_{L_\tau^2 l_n^2} \leq \left\| \frac{n}{\langle \tau - n^3 + \mu n \rangle^{\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon}} \langle n \rangle^k \widehat{u} \right\|_{L^2 l^2}.$$

Thanks to the Lemma 2.5 and using duality argument, follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{n}{\langle \tau - n^3 + \mu n \rangle^{\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon}} \langle n \rangle^k \widehat{u} \right\|_{L^2 l^2} &= \sup_{\|\varphi\|_{L^2 l^2} \leq 1} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{|n|}{\langle \tau - n^3 + \mu n \rangle^{\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon}} \langle n \rangle^k \widehat{u}(n, \tau) \overline{\widehat{\varphi}(n, \tau)} d\tau \\ &= \sup_{\|\varphi\|_{L^2 l^2} \leq 1} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} H(n, \tau) \langle \tau + n^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon} \langle n \rangle^k \widehat{u}(n, \tau) \overline{\widehat{\varphi}(n, \tau)} d\tau \\ (2.10) \quad &\leq C \sup_{\|\varphi\|_{L^2 l^2} \leq 1} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \langle \tau + n^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon} \langle n \rangle^k \widehat{u}(n, \tau) \overline{\widehat{\varphi}(n, \tau)} d\tau \\ &\leq C \sup_{\|\varphi\|_{L^2 l^2} \leq 1} \left\| \langle \tau + n^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon} \langle n \rangle^k \widehat{u} \right\|_{L_\tau^2 l_n^2} \|\varphi\|_{L_\tau^2 l_n^2} \\ &\leq C \|u\|_{X^{k, \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon}}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\langle n \rangle^k \widehat{\partial_x u}(n, \tau)}{\langle \tau - n^3 + \mu n \rangle} \right\|_{L_\tau^1 l_n^2} &\leq \left\| \frac{1}{\langle \tau - n^3 + \mu n \rangle^{\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon} \langle \tau - n^3 + \mu n \rangle^{\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon}} \langle n \rangle^k \widehat{\partial_x u}(n, \tau) \right\|_{L_\tau^1 l_n^2} \\ &\leq \left\| \frac{1}{\langle \tau - n^3 + \mu n \rangle^{\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon}} \langle n \rangle^k \widehat{\partial_x u}(n, \tau) \right\|_{L_\tau^2 l_n^2} \\ &\leq \|u\|_{X^{k, \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds using (2.10). So, (2.8) is verified.

Analogously, we can prove (2.9). In fact, observing that

$$\|\partial_x v\|_{Z^s} = \|\partial_x v\|_{X^{s, -\frac{1}{2}}} + \left\| \frac{\langle n \rangle^s \widehat{\partial_x v}(n, \tau)}{\langle \tau + n^2 \rangle} \right\|_{L_\tau^1 l_n^2}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\langle n \rangle^s \widehat{\partial_x v}(n, \tau)}{\langle \tau + n^2 \rangle} \right\|_{L_\tau^1 l_n^2} &= \left\| \frac{|n|}{\langle \tau + n^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon} \langle \tau + n^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon}} \langle n \rangle^s \widehat{v}(n, \tau) \right\|_{L_\tau^1 l_n^2} \\ &\leq \left\| \frac{|n|}{\langle \tau + n^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon}} \langle n \rangle^s \widehat{v}(n, \tau) \right\|_{L_\tau^2 l_n^2} \\ &= \left\| \frac{|n|}{\langle \tau + n^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon} \langle \tau - n^3 + \mu n \rangle^{\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon}} \langle \tau - n^3 + \mu n \rangle^{\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon} \langle n \rangle^s \widehat{v}(n, \tau) \right\|_{L_\tau^2 l_n^2}, \end{aligned}$$

we conclude the proof of (2.9) arguing by duality as in (2.10) and so the lemma is proved. \square

3. EXISTENCE OF SOLUTIONS FOR THE NLS–KdV SYSTEM

In this section we are able to prove that the following system

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \partial_x^2 u + i\varphi(t)^2 a(x)^2 u = i\partial_x v + \beta|u|^2 u, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\ \partial_t v + \partial_x^3 v + \frac{1}{2}\partial_x(v^2) + \mu\partial_x v = Re(\partial_x u) - GG^*v, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), \quad v(x, 0) = v_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{T}, \end{cases}$$

where $a(x)$ satisfies (1.7) and Gv is defined in (1.8), is well-posed in H^s , for $s \geq 0$. Precisely, we prove the result for \tilde{X}_T^s and \tilde{Y}_T^s , defined by (2.2). So, the result of well-posedness can be read as follows.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $T > 0$, $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\beta, \mu \in \mathbb{R}$, $a \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ and $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ taking real values. For a given $(u_0, v_0) \in H^s(\mathbb{T}) \times H_0^s(\mathbb{T})$ there exists a unique solution $(u, v) \in \tilde{X}_T^s \times (\tilde{Y}_T^s \cap L^2(0, T; L_0^2(\mathbb{T})))$ of (3.1) and the same result is valid for $s = 0$ if $a \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T})$. Additionally, the flow map*

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} F : L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T}) &\rightarrow \tilde{X}_T^0 \times \tilde{Y}_T^0 \\ (u_0, v_0) &\mapsto F(u_0, v_0) = (u, v) \end{aligned}$$

is Lipschitz on every bounded set.

Proof. We split the proof in three parts. Precisely, first we prove the existence and uniqueness of a local solution. After that, we prove that the solution of (3.1) is globally defined. Finally, we are able to derive that the flow map (3.2) is Lipschitz.

(a) **Existence and uniqueness of local solution.**

Let $T > 0$ to be determined later and $t \in [0, T]$, system (3.1) is equivalent to the following Duhamel integral equations

$$u(t) = e^{it\partial_x^2} u_0 - i \int_0^t e^{i(t-t')\partial_x^2} \{i\partial_t v(t') + \beta|u|^2 u(t') - i\varphi(t')^2 a(x)^2 u(t')\} dt'$$

and

$$v(t) = e^{-t(\partial_x^3 + \mu\partial_x)} v_0 + \int_0^t e^{-(t-t')(\partial_x^3 + \mu\partial_x)} \left\{ Re(\partial_x u)(t') - GG^*v(t') - \frac{1}{2}\partial_x(v^2)(t') \right\} dt'.$$

Therefore, to find a solution to the system (3.1) in the class $\tilde{X}_T^s \times (\tilde{Y}_T^s \cap L^2(0, T; L_0^2(\mathbb{T})))$ is equivalent to prove the existence of a fixed point to the map

$$\Phi := (\Phi_1, \Phi_2) : \tilde{X}_T^s \times (\tilde{Y}_T^s \cap L^2(0, T; L_0^2(\mathbb{T}))) \rightarrow \tilde{X}_T^s \times (\tilde{Y}_T^s \cap L^2(0, T; L_0^2(\mathbb{T})))$$

where

$$\Phi_1(u, v) = e^{it\partial_x^2} u_0 - i \int_0^t e^{i(t-t')\partial_x^2} \{i\partial_x v(t') + \beta|u|^2 u(t') - i\varphi(t')^2 a(x)^2 u(t')\} dt'$$

and

$$\Phi_2(u, v) = e^{-t(\partial_x^3 + \mu\partial_x)} v_0 + \int_0^t e^{-(t-t')(\partial_x^3 + \mu\partial_x)} \left\{ Re(\partial_x u)(t') - \frac{1}{2}\partial_x(v^2)(t') - GG^*v(t') \right\} dt'.$$

Our aim is to prove that Φ is a contraction in some ball of $\tilde{X}_T^s \times (\tilde{Y}_T^s \cap L^2(0, T; L_0^2(\mathbb{T})))$. To do so, observe that the item (i) of Proposition 2.1, inequalities (2.4) and (2.5), Proposition 2.3 and estimate (2.8) give us

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\Phi_1(u, v)\|_{\tilde{X}_T^s} &\lesssim \|u_0\|_{H^s} + \|\partial_x v\|_{Z_T^s} + \| |u|^2 u \|_{Z_T^s} + \|i\varphi(t')^2 a(x)^2 u\|_{Z_T^s} \\ &\lesssim \|u_0\|_{H^s} + \|\partial_x v\|_{Y_T^{s, \frac{1}{2}-}} + \|u\|_{X_T^{s, \frac{3}{8}}}^3 + \|i\varphi(t')^2 a(x)^2 u\|_{X_T^{s, \frac{1}{2}}} \\ &\lesssim \|u_0\|_{H^s} + T^{0+} \left(\|v\|_{Y_T^{s, \frac{1}{2}}} + \|u\|_{X_T^{s, \frac{1}{2}}}^3 + \|u\|_{X_T^{s, \frac{1}{2}}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

and, similarly,

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\Phi_1(u, v) - \Phi_1(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})\|_{\tilde{X}_T^s} &\lesssim T^{0+} \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{\tilde{X}_T^{s, \frac{1}{2}}} \left(1 + \|u\|_{X_T^{s, \frac{1}{2}}}^2 + \|\tilde{u}\|_{X_T^{s, \frac{1}{2}}}^2\right) \\ &\quad + T^{0+} \|v - \tilde{v}\|_{\tilde{Y}_T^s}, \end{aligned}$$

for every $(u, v), (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) \in \tilde{X}_T^s \times (\tilde{Y}_T^s \cap L^2(0, T; L_0^2(\mathbb{T})))$. On the other hand, observe that

$$\|Re(\partial_x u)\|_{\tilde{Y}_T^s} = \left\| \frac{\partial_x u + \overline{\partial_x u}}{2} \right\|_{\tilde{Y}_T^s} \lesssim \|\partial_x u\|_{\tilde{Y}_T^s},$$

then using items (ii) and (iv) of Proposition 2.1, estimates (2.5) and (2.9), we have the following

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\Phi_2(u, v)\|_{\tilde{Y}_T^s} &\lesssim \|v_0\|_{H^s} + \|\partial_x u\|_{W_T^s} + \|\partial_x(v^2)\|_{W_T^s} + \|GG^*v\|_{W_T^s} \\ &\lesssim \|v_0\|_{H^s} + T^{0+} \left(\|u\|_{X_T^{s, \frac{1}{2}}} + \|v\|_{Y_T^{s, \frac{1}{2}}}^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

and similarly we get that,

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\Phi_2(u, v) - \Phi_2(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})\|_{\tilde{Y}_T^s} &\lesssim T^{0+} \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{\tilde{X}_T^s} \\ &\quad + T^{0+} \left(\|v\|_{Y_T^{s, \frac{1}{2}}} + \|\tilde{v}\|_{Y_T^{s, \frac{1}{2}}} \right) \|v - \tilde{v}\|_{\tilde{Y}_T^s}, \end{aligned}$$

for every $(u, v), (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) \in \tilde{X}_T^s \times (\tilde{Y}_T^s \cap L^2(0, T; L_0^2(\mathbb{T})))$. We conclude from these estimates that if we take $T > 0$ small enough, the map Φ is a contraction in some suitable ball of $\tilde{X}_T^s \times (\tilde{Y}_T^s \cap L^2(0, T; L_0^2(\mathbb{T})))$, then it has a fixed point.

Now, we prove the uniqueness in the class $\tilde{X}_T^s \times \tilde{Y}_T^s$ for the integral equation Φ_1 and Φ_2 . Set

$$w(t) = e^{it\partial_x^2} u_0 - i \int_0^t e^{i(t-t')\partial_x^2} \left\{ i\partial_t v(t') + \beta|u|^2 u(t') - i\varphi(t')^2 a(x)^2 u(t') \right\} dt'$$

and

$$z(t) = e^{-t(\partial_x^3 + \mu\partial_x)} v_0 + \int_0^t e^{-(t-t')(\partial_x^3 + \mu\partial_x)} \left\{ \text{Re}(\partial_x u)(t') - GG^*v(t') - \frac{1}{2}\partial_x(v^2)(t') \right\} dt'.$$

Observe that, $\beta|u|^2 u, \partial_x v \in X_T^{s, -\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\frac{1}{2}\partial_x(v^2), \partial_x u \in Y_T^{s, -\frac{1}{2}}$, hence we infer that,

$$\partial_t \left(\int_0^t e^{-it'\partial_x^2} \left\{ i\partial_x v + \beta|u|^2 u - i\varphi^2 a(x)^2 u \right\} (t') dt' \right) = e^{-it\partial_x^2} (i\partial_x v + \beta|u|^2 u - i\varphi^2 a^2 u)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \left(\int_0^t e^{-t'(\partial_x^3 + \mu\partial_x)} \left\{ \text{Re}(\partial_x u) - GG^*v - \frac{1}{2}\partial_x(v^2) \right\} (t') dt' \right) \\ = e^{-t(\partial_x^3 + \mu\partial_x)} \left(\text{Re}(\partial_x u) - GG^*v - \frac{1}{2}\partial_x(v^2) \right), \end{aligned}$$

in the distributional sense. This implies that (w, z) is a solution of

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t w + \partial_x^2 w = i\partial_x v + \beta|u|^2 u - i\varphi^2 a(\cdot)^2 u, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\ \partial_t z + \partial_x^3 z + \mu\partial_x z = \text{Re}(\partial_x u) - GG^*v - \frac{1}{2}\partial_x(v^2), & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}_+. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, it follows that, $r_1(t) = e^{-it\partial_x^2}(u - w)$ and $r_2(t) = e^{-t(\partial_x^3 + \mu\partial_x)}(v - z)$ is a solution of $\partial_t r_1 = \partial_t r_2 = 0$ and $r_1(t) = r_2(t) = 0$. Thus $r_1 = r_2 = 0$ and (u, v) is the unique solution of the integral equations.

(b) **The solution is globally defined.**

In order to prove that our solutions are global, we observe that,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\|u(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 + \|v(t)\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 \right) \leq 0.$$

Then, integrating over t and using the Gronwall Inequality we get that, the $L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})$ norm of (u, v) remains bounded by every $t \in [0, T]$, hence the local solution of (3.1) can be extended to a global one.

Now we prove that, if $(u_0, v_0) \in H^2(\mathbb{T}) \times H_0^3(\mathbb{T})$ then the solution $(u, v) \in C([0, T]; H^2(\mathbb{T}) \times H_0^2(\mathbb{T}))$ of (3.1) can be extended for any $T > 0$ and then, by nonlinear interpolation (see, e.g., [5] and [23]), we can get the global well-posedness for the solution $(u, v) \in C([0, T]; H^s(\mathbb{T}) \times H_0^s(\mathbb{T}))$ of (3.1) with $(u_0, v_0) \in H^s(\mathbb{T}) \times H_0^s(\mathbb{T})$ with $0 \leq s \leq 2$.

Indeed, we start by considering a smooth solution (u, v) of (3.1). Let $(z, w) = (u_t, v_t)$ so,

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{cases} i\partial_t z + \partial_x^2 z + ia(x)^2 z = i\partial_x w + 2\beta|u|^2 z + \beta u^2 z, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\ \partial_t w + \partial_x^3 w + \frac{1}{2}\partial_x(vw) + \mu\partial_x w = \text{Re}(\partial_x z) - GG^*w, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\ z(x, 0) = z_0(x), \quad w(x, 0) = w_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{T}, \end{cases}$$

where

$$z_0 = iu_{0xx} + v_{0x} - i\beta|u_0|^2 u_0 - a^2 u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{T}) \in L^2(\mathbb{T})$$

and

$$w_0 = -v_{0xxx} - \mu v_0 - v_0 v_{0x} + \text{Re}(u_{0x}) - GG^* v_0 \in L_0^2(\mathbb{T}).$$

If we consider $T > 0$ such that Φ is a contraction in some suitable ball of $\tilde{X}_T^0 \times \tilde{Y}_T^0$ as in (3.4) and (3.6), we have that

$$\|(u, v)\|_{\tilde{X}_T^0 \times \tilde{Y}_T^0} \leq C_1,$$

with $C_1 = C_1(\|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}, \|v_0\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}) > 0$. The same computation as in (3.3) and (3.4) leads us to

$$\|z\|_{\tilde{X}_T^0} \lesssim \|z_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})} + T^{0+} \left(\|w\|_{\tilde{Y}_T^0} + \|z\|_{\tilde{X}_T^0} + 2C_1^2 \|z\|_{\tilde{X}_T^0} \right)$$

and

$$\|w\|_{\tilde{Y}_T^0} \lesssim \|w_0\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} + T^{0+} \left(\|z\|_{\tilde{X}_T^0} + C_1 \|w\|_{\tilde{Y}_T^0} \right),$$

or equivalently,

$$\|(z, w)\|_{\tilde{X}_T^0 \times \tilde{Y}_T^0} \leq C \|(z_0, w_0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}.$$

Therefore, using the previous inequalities, we have

$$\|(z, w)\|_{L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T}))} \leq \|(z, w)\|_{\tilde{X}_T^0 \times \tilde{Y}_T^0} \leq C \|(z_0, w_0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}.$$

Thanks to the system (3.1), we get that

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\partial_x^3 v\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} &\leq \|w\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} + \|\text{Re}(\partial_x u)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})} + \frac{1}{2} \|v\partial_x v\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} + |\mu| \|\partial_x v\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} + \|GG^* v\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} \\ &\leq \|w\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} + C \|\partial_x u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})} + \|v\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} \|\partial_x v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})} + \|v\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} + |\mu| \|\partial_x v\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} \\ &\leq \|w\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} + C \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_x^2 u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}^{\frac{1}{2}} + C(1 + \|v\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}) \|v\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_x^3 v\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}^{\frac{1}{2}} + |\mu| \|\partial_x v\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \|(\partial_x^2 u, \partial_x^3 v)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} + \|w\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} + C(\|v\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} + \|v\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}^3 + \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the Young inequality in this last inequality and

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\partial_x^2 u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})} &\leq \|z\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})} + \|\partial_x v\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} + |\beta| \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})} \|u\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|a\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \|(\partial_x^2 u, \partial_x^3 v)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} + \|z\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})} + C|\beta| \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 + \|a\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})} \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}, \end{aligned}$$

where, for this last inequality, we have used that $H^2(\mathbb{T})$ is embedded in $L^\infty(\mathbb{T})$, the interpolation between $H^2(\mathbb{T})$ and $L^2(\mathbb{T})$ and Young inequality. So adding up the estimates (3.8) and (3.9) we can conclude that

$$\|(\partial_x^2 u, \partial_x^3 v)(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} \leq C(\|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}, \|v_0\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})})\|(u_0, v_0)\|_{H^2(\mathbb{T}) \times H_0^3(\mathbb{T})},$$

from which follows that $(u, v) \in C(\mathbb{R}_+; H^2(\mathbb{T}) \times H_0^2(\mathbb{T}))$. A similar argumentation can be done for $(u_0, v_0) \in H^{2k}(\mathbb{T}) \times H_0^{3k}(\mathbb{T})$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and for other values of $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$ using again nonlinear interpolation.

(c) **The flow map is Lipschitz.**

Finally we prove that the map (3.2) is Lipschitz on bounded sets. To do so, consider (u, v) and (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) solutions of (3.1) with initial data $(u_0, v_0), (\tilde{u}_0, \tilde{v}_0)$, respectively. Arguing as in (3.4) and (3.6) we have that,

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{\tilde{X}_T^0} + \|v - \tilde{v}\|_{\tilde{Y}_T^0} &\leq C\|u_0 - \tilde{u}_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})} + C\|v_0 - \tilde{v}_0\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} \\ &\quad + T^{0+} \left(1 + \|u\|_{\tilde{X}_T^0} + \|\tilde{u}\|_{\tilde{X}_T^0}\right) \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{\tilde{X}_T^0} \\ &\quad + CT^{0+} \left(1 + \|v\|_{\tilde{Y}_T^0} + \|\tilde{v}\|_{\tilde{Y}_T^0}\right) \|v - \tilde{v}\|_{\tilde{Y}_T^0}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for $T > 0$ small enough, depending of the size of $(u_0, v_0), (\tilde{u}_0, \tilde{v}_0)$, it follows that

$$(3.10) \quad \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{\tilde{X}_T^0} + \|v - \tilde{v}\|_{\tilde{Y}_T^0} \leq C\|u_0 - \tilde{u}_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})} + C\|v_0 - \tilde{v}_0\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}.$$

By iterating process we get that (3.10) is valid for every T , concluding the proof of Theorem 3.1. \square

4. STABILIZATION RESULT

In this section we are able to prove one of the main results of the article, precisely, we prove that the following system

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \partial_x^2 u + ia(x)^2 u = i\partial_x v + \beta|u|^2 u, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\ \partial_t v + \partial_x^3 v + \frac{1}{2}\partial_x(v^2) + \mu\partial_x v = \text{Re}(\partial_x u) - GG^*v, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), \quad v(x, 0) = v_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{T}, \end{cases}$$

where $\beta, \mu \in \mathbb{R}$, is asymptotically stable for $(u_0, v_0) \in L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})$, when two control inputs are acting in both equation in $\omega \subset \mathbb{T}$.

4.1. Proof of Theorem 1.1. Under the hypothesis of the Theorem 1.1, the global stabilization property is equivalent to show the following observability inequality:

For any $T > 0$ there exists $C = C(T) > 0$ such that

$$(4.2) \quad \|(u_0, v_0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 \leq C \left(\int_0^T \|au(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 dt + \int_0^T \|Gv(t)\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 dt \right),$$

for any solution (u, v) of the system (4.1) with initial data $(u_0, v_0) \in L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})$ such that $\|(u_0, v_0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} \leq R_0$.

Indeed, it follows from the energy estimate that

$$\|(u, v)(T)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 = \|(u_0, v_0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 - \int_0^T \|au(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 dt - \int_0^T \|Gv(t)\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 dt.$$

Thus, from (4.2), we get that

$$\|(u, v)(T)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 \leq (1 - C^{-1})\|(u_0, v_0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}^2,$$

and since the solution (u, v) of the system (4.1) satisfies the semigroup property we have, for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, that

$$\|(u, v)(mT)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 \leq (1 - C^{-1})^m \|(u_0, v_0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}^2,$$

which yields the desired result. \square

4.2. Proof of the observability inequality. We argue by contradiction. If (4.2) does not occur, there exist $T > 0$ and a sequence $\{(u_{0n}, v_{0n})\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$(4.3) \quad \|(u_{0n}, v_{0n})\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} \leq R_0$$

and

$$(4.4) \quad \int_0^T \|au_n(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 dt + \int_0^T \|Gv_n(t)\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 dt \leq \frac{1}{n} \|(u_{0n}, v_{0n})\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}^2.$$

Hence if we define $\alpha_n := \|(u_{0n}, v_{0n})\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}^2$ we get

$$\alpha_n \leq R_0^2,$$

so we can extract a subsequence, still denoted by the same index, such that

$$\alpha_n \rightarrow \alpha,$$

with $\alpha \geq 0$. We split the analysis into two cases:

$$(i) \alpha > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (ii) \alpha = 0.$$

(i) $\alpha > 0$.

It follows from Theorem 3.1 that the corresponding sequence of solutions $\{(u_n, v_n)\}$ associated with the initial data $\{(u_{0n}, v_{0n})\}$ is bounded in both spaces $L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T}))$ and $X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}} \times Y_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}$ then as $X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}} \times Y_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}$ is a separable Hilbert space compactly embedded in $X_T^{-k, \frac{1}{2}-\delta} \times Y_T^{-s, \frac{1}{2}-\delta_1}$, for every $k, s > 0$ and $\delta, \delta_1 > 0$, we can get a subsequence, which will be denoted with the same index, such that

$$(u_n, v_n) \rightarrow (u, v) \text{ weakly in } X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}} \times Y_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}$$

and

$$(u_n, v_n) \rightarrow (u, v) \text{ strongly in } X_T^{-k, \frac{1}{2}-\delta} \times Y_T^{-s, \frac{1}{2}-\delta_1}.$$

Moreover, by (4.4) we deduce that

$$au_n \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{T}))$$

and

$$Gv_n \rightarrow 0 = Gv \quad \text{in } L^2(0, T; L_0^2(\mathbb{T})),$$

from which follows that $u \equiv 0$ in ω and $v = c(t)$ in ω .

On the other hand, by Proposition 2.2, we infer that $\beta|u_n|^2 u_n$ is bounded in $X_T^{0, -\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\frac{1}{2}\partial_x(v_n^2)$ is bounded in $Y_T^{0, -\frac{1}{2}}$. Moreover, note that, $(\beta|u_n|^2 u_n)$ is bounded in $X_T^{0, -b'}$ for $\frac{3}{8} < b' < \frac{1}{2}$, which is compactly embedded in $X_T^{-1, -\frac{1}{2}}$, then we can extract a subsequence, still denoted by the same index, such that, for some $f \in X_T^{-1, -\frac{1}{2}}$,

$$\beta|u_n|^2 u_n \rightarrow f \quad \text{strongly in } X_T^{-1, -\frac{1}{2}}.$$

As $Y_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}$ is continuously embedded in $L^4(\mathbb{T} \times (0, T))$, thanks to the Proposition 2.4, $(\partial_x(v_n^2))$ is bounded in $L^2(0, T; H^{-1}(\mathbb{T})) = Y_T^{-1, 0}$, so, by interpolation between those spaces, we get that $(\partial_x(v_n^2))$ is bounded in $Y_T^{-\theta, -\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\theta}{2}}$, $\theta \in (0, 1)$, which is compactly embedded in $Y_T^{-1, -\frac{1}{2}}$. Therefore, we can extract a subsequence of $(\frac{1}{2}\partial_x(v_n^2))$ in $Y_T^{-1, -\frac{1}{2}}$, which will be denoted by the same index, such that

$$\frac{1}{2}\partial_x(v_n^2) \rightarrow \tilde{g} \quad \text{strongly in } Y_T^{-1, -\frac{1}{2}}.$$

With these convergences in hand we can pass to the limit in n , to obtain that (u, v) satisfies

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \partial_x^2 u = i\partial_x v + f, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ \partial_t v + \partial_x^3 v + \mu\partial_x v = Re(\partial_x u) + \tilde{g}, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T). \end{cases}$$

Now, consider $w_n = u_n - u$, $z_n = v_n - v$,

$$f_n = -ia^2 u_n + \beta |u_n|^2 u_n - f$$

and

$$g_n = -GG^* v_n - \frac{1}{2} \partial_x (v_n^2) - \tilde{g}.$$

Observe that

$$\int_0^T \|Gz_n\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 dt = \int_0^T \|Gv_n\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 dt + \int_0^T \|Gv\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 dt - 2 \int_0^T (Gv_n, Gv)_0 dt \rightarrow 0.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$Gz_n(x, t) = g(x)z_n(x, t) + \int_{\mathbb{T}} g(y)z_n(y, t) dy.$$

Since $z_n \rightarrow 0$ weakly in $Y_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}$, using Rellich theorem we get that $\int_{\mathbb{T}} g(y)z_n(y, \cdot) dy$ strongly converges to 0 in $L^2(0, T)$, from which follows that

$$\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}} g^2(x)z_n(x, t)^2 dx dt \rightarrow 0.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t w_n + \partial_x^2 w_n = i\partial_x z_n + f_n, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ \partial_t z_n + \partial_x^3 z_n + \mu \partial_x z_n = Re(\partial_x w_n) + g_n, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T) \end{cases}$$

with

$$(w_n, z_n) \rightarrow (0, 0) \quad \text{in } L^2(0, T; L^2(\tilde{\omega}) \times L_0^2(\tilde{\omega}))$$

and

$$(f_n, g_n) \rightarrow (0, 0) \quad \text{strongly in } X_T^{-1, -\frac{1}{2}} \times Y_T^{-1, -\frac{1}{2}},$$

where $\tilde{\omega} = \text{supp}(g) \cap \text{supp}(a)$.

Now, we are in position to use the results of the Appendix A and B. First, using the propagation of compactness, given in Proposition A.1, we have

$$(z_n, w_n) \rightarrow (0, 0) \quad \text{in } L_{loc}^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})).$$

Then we can pick $t_0 \in [0, T]$ such that $(z_n(t_0), w_n(t_0)) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ strongly in $L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})$. Denote by (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) the solution of the problem

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t \tilde{u} + \partial_x^2 \tilde{u} = i\partial_x \tilde{v} + \beta |\tilde{u}|^2 \tilde{u}, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ \partial_t \tilde{v} + \partial_x^3 \tilde{v} + \mu \partial_x \tilde{v} + \partial_x (\tilde{v}^2) = Re(\partial_x \tilde{u}), & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ (\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})(t_0) = (u(t_0), v(t_0)), & t_0 \in (0, T). \end{cases}$$

Theorem 3.1 gives us that the flow map is Lipschitz on bounded sets, hence as

$$(u_n(t_0), v_n(t_0)) \rightarrow (u(t_0), v(t_0)) \quad \text{in } L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T}),$$

$$ia^2 u_n \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{T}))$$

and

$$Gv_n \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } L^2(0, T; L_0^2(\mathbb{T})),$$

follows that

$$(u_n, v_n) \rightarrow (u, v) \quad \text{in } X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}} \times Y_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}.$$

Therefore, putting together all these convergences and passing to the limit, we can conclude that (u, v) solves

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \partial_x^2 u = i\partial_x v + \beta |u|^2 u, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ \partial_t v + \partial_x^3 v + \frac{1}{2} \partial_x (v^2) + \mu \partial_x v = Re(\partial_x u), & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ u(x, t) = 0 \quad v(x, t) = c, & (x, t) \in \omega \times (0, T), \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), \quad v(x, 0) = v_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{T}. \end{cases}$$

By the unique continuation property, given by Corollary B.4, we ensure that $(u, v) = (0, 0)$. From this, we conclude that

$$\|(u_n(0), v_n(0))\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} \rightarrow 0,$$

which is a contradiction with our hypothesis $\alpha > 0$.

(ii) $\alpha = 0$.

Observe that we can assume $\alpha_n > 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Pick the function as follows $w_n = \frac{u_n}{\alpha_n}$ and $z_n = \frac{v_n}{\alpha_n}$, for all $n \geq 1$. Thus,

$$\|(w_{0n}, z_{0n})\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 = 1$$

and (w_n, z_n) satisfies the system

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t w_n + \partial_x^2 w_n = i\partial_x z_n + \alpha_n^2 \beta |v_n|^2 v_n - ia(x)^2 w_n, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ \partial_t z_n + \partial_x^3 z_n + \frac{\alpha_n^2}{2} \partial_x (v_n^2) = \operatorname{Re}(\partial_x w_n) - GG^* z_n, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T) \end{cases}$$

with

$$\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}} (a(x)|w_n|^2 + Gz_n) dx d\tau \leq \frac{1}{n}, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

By a boot-strap argument we conclude that (w_n, z_n) is bounded in $X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}} \times Y_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}$. Hence we can extract a subsequence of $\{(w_n, z_n)\}$, still denoted by the same index, such that

$$(w_n, z_n) \rightarrow (w, z) \quad \text{weakly in} \quad X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}} \times Y_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}$$

and

$$(w_n, z_n) \rightarrow (w, z) \quad \text{strongly in} \quad X_T^{0, -\frac{1}{2}} \times Y_T^{0, -\frac{1}{2}}.$$

By Proposition 2.2 we have that $\beta|w_n|^2 w_n$ is bounded in $X_T^{0, -\frac{1}{2}}$ then

$$\alpha_n^2 \beta |w_n|^2 w_n \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{strongly in} \quad X_T^{0, -\frac{1}{2}},$$

as $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$. Similarly, due to the fact that $\{\partial_x(v_n^2)\}$ is bounded in $Y_T^{0, -\frac{1}{2}}$ we have that

$$\alpha_n \partial_x(v_n^2) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{strongly in} \quad Y_T^{0, -\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Hence, (w, z) solves the following system

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t w + \partial_x^2 w = i\partial_x z, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ \partial_t z + \partial_x^3 z + \mu \partial_x z = \operatorname{Re}(\partial_x w), & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ w(x, t) = 0, \quad z(x, t) = c, & (x, t) \in \omega \times (0, T). \end{cases}$$

Again using Corollary B.4 we have that $w = z = 0$ in $(0, T) \times \mathbb{T}$. Then, by an application of Proposition A.1,

$$(w_n, z_n) \rightarrow (0, 0) \quad \text{in} \quad L_{loc}^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})).$$

So we can conclude the proof as in the first case, showing the observability inequality (4.2). \square

5. CONTROLLABILITY RESULTS

In this section we are interested to prove the exact controllability for the following nonlinear system

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \partial_x^2 u = i\partial_x v + \beta|u|^2 u + f, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ \partial_t v + \partial_x^3 v + \frac{1}{2} \partial_x (v^2) + \mu \partial_x v = \operatorname{Re}(\partial_x u) + Gh, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), \quad v(x, 0) = v_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{T}, \end{cases}$$

where f and h are control functions. Before to present the result for this system, we first need to prove the result for the linear system associated to (5.1),

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \partial_x^2 u = f, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ \partial_t v + \partial_x^3 v + \mu \partial_x v = Gh, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ u(x, T) = 0, \quad v(x, T) = 0, & x \in \mathbb{T}. \end{cases}$$

In both cases we take f and h with a special form, that is,

$$(5.3) \quad f := a^2 \varphi^2 h_1 \quad \text{and} \quad h := G^* h_2,$$

with a and G satisfying (1.7) and (1.8), respectively, and h_1, h_2 in some appropriated space.

It is classical in the literature that the observability inequality for the NLS equation holds true, precisely, the following proposition related with the observability inequality for the adjoint system associated to Schrödinger equation is verified and for details see, e.g. [20] and [22].

Proposition 5.1. *Let $\omega \subset \mathbb{T}$. For any $a = a(x) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ and $\varphi = \varphi(t) \in C^\infty([0, T])$ real valued such that $a \equiv 1$ on $\omega \times]0, T[$ and $\varphi \equiv 1$ on $[\frac{T}{3}, \frac{2T}{3}]$ there exists $C := C(T) > 0$ such that*

$$(5.4) \quad \|\phi_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 \leq C \int_0^T \|a(x)\varphi(t)e^{it\partial_x^2}\phi_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 dt.$$

Additionally, an observability inequality for the single KdV equation can be verified and we cite [26] for more details.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $T > 0$ be given. There exists $C = C(T) > 0$ such that,*

$$(5.5) \quad C\|\psi_0\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 \leq C \int_0^T \|Ge^{-t(\partial_x^3 + \mu\partial_x)}\psi_0\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 dt.$$

As a consequence of the previous observability inequality, using the HUM method introduced by Lions [21], the exact controllability in $L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})$ for the linear system (5.2) holds. Indeed, just observe that combining both observability estimates (5.4) and (5.5), we get

$$C\|(\phi_0, \psi_0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 \leq \int_0^T \|a(\cdot)\varphi(t)u(t)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 dt + \int_0^T \|Ge^{-t(\partial_x^3 + \mu\partial_x)}\psi(t)\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 dt,$$

which means that, the linear system (5.2) is null controllable, that is, the map

$$\begin{aligned} S : L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T}) &\rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T}) \\ S(\varphi_0, \psi_0) &= (u(0), v(0)), \end{aligned}$$

where $(u(0), v(0))$ is the initial data associated to (5.2) with $f(x, t)$ and $h(x, t)$ defined by (5.3), is an isomorphism and the following linear result is verified.

Theorem 5.3. *Let $\omega \subset \mathbb{T}$ be a nonempty open set and $T > 0$. Then for every $(u_0, v_0), (u_1, v_1) \in L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})$ one can find two control inputs $f \in C([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{T}))$ and $h \in C([0, T]; L_0^2(\mathbb{T}))$, such that, the unique solution $(u, v) \in C([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T}))$ of (5.2) satisfies $(u, v)(x, T) = (u_1(x), v_1(x))$.*

Now, we are in position to prove the Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. For $T > 0$ to be determined, we consider the systems

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t \phi + \partial_x^2 \phi = 0, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ \partial_t \psi + \partial_x^3 \psi + \mu \partial_x \psi = 0, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ \phi(x, 0) = \phi_0(x), \quad \psi(x, 0) = \psi_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{T} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \partial_x^2 u = i\partial_x v + \beta|u|^2 u + f, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ \partial_t v + \partial_x^3 v + \mu \partial_x v + \frac{1}{2} \partial_x (v^2) = \text{Re}(\partial_x u) + Gh, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ (u(\cdot, T), v(\cdot, T)) = (0, 0), & x \in \mathbb{T}, \end{cases}$$

with $f := a^2 \varphi^2 \phi$ and $h := G^* \psi$. Let us define the operator

$$\begin{aligned} L : L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T}) &\rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T}) \\ (\phi_0, \psi_0) &\mapsto L(\phi_0, \psi_0) = (u|_{t=0}, v|_{t=0}) = (u_0, v_0) \end{aligned}$$

We split (u, v) into

$$(u, v) = (u_L, v_L) + (u_{NL}, v_{NL})$$

where (u_L, v_L) is solution of

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t u_L + \partial_x^2 u_L = a^2 \varphi^2 \phi, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ \partial_t v_L + \partial_x^3 v_L + \mu \partial_x v_L = GG^* \psi, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ (u_L, v_L)(\cdot, T) = (0, 0), & x \in \mathbb{T}. \end{cases}$$

and (u_{NL}, v_{NL}) is solution of

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t u_{NL} + \partial_x^2 u_{NL} = i\partial_x v + \beta |u|^2 u, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ \partial_t v_{NL} + \partial_x^3 v_{NL} + \mu \partial_x v_{NL} = \operatorname{Re}(\partial_x u) - \frac{1}{2} \partial_x (v^2), & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ (u_{NL}, v_{NL})(\cdot, T) = (0, 0), & x \in \mathbb{T}. \end{cases}$$

Observe that we can follow [15] to construct an isomorphism

$$S : L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T}) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})$$

such that $(u_L(0), v_L(0)) = S_L(\phi_0, \psi_0)$. Additionally, we can also construct another application (see e.g. [17, Lemma 2.4])

$$K : L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T}) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})$$

which satisfies $K(\phi_0, \psi_0) = (u_{NL}(0), v_{NL}(0))$. With these information in hand, we have that if $(u, v), (u_L, v_L), (u_{NL}, v_{NL}) \in \tilde{X}_T^0 \times \tilde{Y}_T^0$ and

$$(u, v)(0) = (u_L, v_L)(0) + (u_{NL}, v_{NL})(0),$$

then we can rewrite the previous equality as follows

$$L(\phi_0, \psi_0) = S_L(\phi_0, \psi_0) + K(\phi_0, \psi_0),$$

where $K(\phi_0, \psi_0) = (u_{NL}(0), v_{NL}(0))$. So, we have that $L(\phi_0, \psi_0) = (u_0, v_0)$ is equivalent to

$$(\phi_0, \psi_0) = S_L^{-1}(u_0, v_0) - S_L^{-1}K(\phi_0, \psi_0).$$

Thus, let us define the following map

$$B : L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T}) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})$$

by

$$B(\phi_0, \psi_0) = S_L^{-1}(u_0, v_0) - S_L^{-1}K(\phi_0, \psi_0).$$

Therefore, our null controllability problem is reduced to prove that B has a fixed point, so let us prove it now.

From now on we may fix $T < 1$. Since S_L is an isomorphism of $L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})$, we have,

$$\|B(\phi_0, \psi_0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} \leq C \left(\|K(\phi_0, \psi_0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} + \|(u_0, v_0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} \right).$$

We are interested to estimate $\|K(\phi_0, \psi_0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} = \|(u_{NL}(0), v_{NL}(0))\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}$. To make it we use the Duhamel formula and the $X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}} \times Y_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}$ -estimates, to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(u_{NL}(0), v_{NL}(0))\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} &\leq \|(u_{NL}, v_{NL})\|_{\tilde{X}_T^0 \times \tilde{Y}_T^0} \\ &\leq C \| |u|^2 u \|_{X_T^{0, -\frac{1}{2}}} + C \|\partial_x v\|_{X_T^{0, -\frac{1}{2}}} \\ &\quad + C \|\operatorname{Re}(\partial_x u)\|_{Y_T^{0, -\frac{1}{2}}} + C \|\partial_x (v^2)\|_{Y_T^{0, -\frac{1}{2}}} \\ &\leq CT^{0+} \|u\|_{X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}}^3 + CT^{0+} \|u\|_{X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}} + CT^{0+} \|v\|_{Y_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}} + CT^{0+} \|v\|_{Y_T^{0+}}^2, \end{aligned}$$

thanks to the estimates of the Section 2. Now, we notice that,

$$\|(u, v)\|_{X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}} \leq C \|(\varphi^2 a^2 \phi, GG^* \psi)\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T}))} \leq C \|(\phi_0, \psi_0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} < C\eta$$

and then,

$$\|B(\phi_0, \psi_0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} \leq C \left(T^{0+} \eta + T^{0+} \eta^2 + \|(u_0, v_0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} \right).$$

Therefore, taking $\|(u_0, v_0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}$ small enough, we can conclude that B maps the closed ball B_η of $L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L^2(\mathbb{T})$ into itself.

It remains to prove that B is a contraction. We start by considering the following two systems

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t(u - \tilde{u}) + \partial_x^2(u - \tilde{u}) = i\partial_x(v - \tilde{v}) + \beta(|u|^2u - |\tilde{u}|^2\tilde{u}) + a^2\varphi^2(\phi - \tilde{\phi}) \\ \partial_t(v - \tilde{v}) + \partial_x^3(v - \tilde{v}) + \mu\partial_x(v - \tilde{v}) + \frac{1}{2}\partial_x(v^2 - \tilde{v}^2) = \operatorname{Re}(\partial_x u - \partial_x \tilde{u}) + GG^*(\psi - \tilde{\psi}) \\ (u - \tilde{u})(\cdot, T) = 0, \quad (v - \tilde{v})(\cdot, T) = 0. \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t(u_{NL} - \tilde{u}_{NL}) + \partial_x^2(u_{NL} - \tilde{u}_{NL}) = \beta(|u|^2u - |\tilde{u}|^2\tilde{u}) + i\partial_x(v - \tilde{v}) \\ \partial_t(v_{NL} - \tilde{v}_{NL}) + \partial_x^3(v_{NL} - \tilde{v}_{NL}) + \mu\partial_x(v_{NL} - \tilde{v}_{NL}) = \operatorname{Re}(\partial_x u - \partial_x \tilde{u}) + \frac{1}{2}(\partial_x(\tilde{v}^2 - v^2)) \\ (u_{NL} - \tilde{u}_{NL})(\cdot, T) = 0, \quad (v_{NL} - \tilde{v}_{NL})(\cdot, T) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Again, due to the estimates provided in the Section 2, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|B(\phi_0, \psi_0) - B(\tilde{\phi}_0, \tilde{\psi}_0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} &\leq \|((u_{NL} - \tilde{u}_{NL})(0), (v_{NL} - \tilde{v}_{NL})(0))\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} \\ &\leq C\| |u|^2u - |\tilde{u}|^2\tilde{u} \|_{X_T^{0, -\frac{1}{2}}} + C\|\partial_x v - \partial_x \tilde{v}\|_{X_T^{0, -\frac{1}{2}}} \\ &\quad + C\|\partial_x(v^2) - \partial_x(\tilde{v}^2)\|_{Y_T^{0, -\frac{1}{2}}} + C\|\operatorname{Re}(\partial_x u - \partial_x \tilde{u})\|_{Y_T^{0, -\frac{1}{2}}} \\ &\leq CT^{0+} \left(1 + \|u\|_{X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}}^2 + \|\tilde{u}\|_{X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}}^2\right) \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}} \\ &\quad + CT^{0+} \left(1 + \|v\|_{Y_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}} + \|\tilde{v}\|_{Y_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}}\right) \|v - \tilde{v}\|_{Y_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}} \\ &\leq C(T^{0+}\eta^2 + T^{0+}) \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}} \\ &\quad + (T^{0+} + T^{0+}\eta) \|v - \tilde{v}\|_{Y_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Considering the system (5.1), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}} + \|v - \tilde{v}\|_{Y_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}} &\leq C\| |u|^2u - |\tilde{u}|^2\tilde{u} \|_{X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}} + C\|\partial_x v - \partial_x \tilde{v}\|_{X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}} \\ &\quad + C\|\partial_x(v^2) - \partial_x(\tilde{v}^2)\|_{Y_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}} + \|\operatorname{Re}(\partial_x u) - \operatorname{Re}(\partial_x \tilde{u})\|_{Y_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}} \\ (5.6) \quad &\quad + C\|\varphi^2 a^2(\phi - \tilde{\phi})\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})} + \|GG^*(\psi - \tilde{\psi})\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} \\ &\leq C(T^{0+}\eta^2 + T^{0+})\|u - \tilde{u}\|_{X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}} + (T^{0+} + T^{0+}\eta^2)\|v - \tilde{v}\|_{Y_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}} \\ &\quad + C\|\phi_0 - \tilde{\phi}_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})} + C\|\psi_0 - \tilde{\psi}_0\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for $\eta < 1$ fixed, we can get a small $T > 0$ such that,

$$(5.7) \quad \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}} + \|v - \tilde{v}\|_{Y_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}} \leq C\|\phi_0 - \tilde{\phi}_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})} + C\|\psi_0 - \tilde{\psi}_0\|_{L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}.$$

Thanks to the inequalities (5.6) and (5.7), we get that

$$\|B(\phi_0, \psi_0) - B(\tilde{\phi}_0, \tilde{\psi}_0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})} \leq C(T^{0+} + \eta T^{0+}) \|(\phi_0, \psi_0) - (\tilde{\phi}_0, \tilde{\psi}_0)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})}.$$

To finish, just choosing

$$T^{0+} + \eta T^{0+} < \frac{1}{2C},$$

we conclude that B is a contraction in the closed ball of $L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})$ and the local controllability result is verified and Theorem 1.2 is achieved. \square

6. FURTHER COMMENTS AND OPEN ISSUES

In this work we are able to prove the stabilization and control issues for the system

$$(6.1) \quad \begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \partial_x^2 u = i\partial_x v + \beta|u|^2 u + f, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ \partial_t v + \partial_x^3 v + \frac{1}{2}\partial_x(v^2) + \mu\partial_x v = \operatorname{Re}(\partial_x u) + g, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), \quad v(x, 0) = v_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{T}. \end{cases}$$

When we introduce two damping mechanisms $f := -ia^2(x)u$ and $g := -GG^*h$, where a satisfies (1.7) and G is defined by (1.8), we are able to prove that the solutions associated to (6.1) decays exponentially for t large enough. Moreover, together with a local exact controllability, we are also able to prove a global exact controllability property, that means, for any initial and final data, without restrictions on its norms, we can find two control inputs f and g such that we can drive the initial data to the final data by using these controls.

The strategy employed in the proof of the main results in this manuscript uses the contradiction argument, which aims to prove an observability inequality. Observability inequality follows by a combination of propagation of compactness and regularity, together with a unique continuation property for the operator associated to the NLS–KdV system, which are proved using the defect measure.

6.1. Only one control acting. Control problems of coupled dispersive systems are still not well understood and most of the results consider single equations. In our case, we are able to combine two dispersive equations with nonlinearities and principal symbols of different order. One of the main difficulties in our case arises in the proof of the propagation results, and was overcome using the smoothing properties of the solutions in Bourgain space.

This method presented here seems to work well however it has a drawback. When we decided to study the nonlinear problem directly, instead of first the linear problem, we were unable to remove controls, that is, with this method, the best possible result is to show the control results with a control in each equation.

Recently, in [3]. There, the authors are able to prove that the following linear Schrödinger–KdV system

$$(6.2) \quad \begin{cases} i\partial_t w + \partial_x^2 w = a_1 w + a_2 y + h\mathbf{1}_\omega & \text{in } Q \\ \partial_t y + \partial_x^3 y + \partial_x(My) = \operatorname{Re}(a_3 w) + a_4 y + l\mathbf{1}_\omega & \text{in } Q \\ w(0, t) = w(1, t) = 0 & \text{in } (0, T), \\ y(0, t) = y(1, t) = \partial_x y(1, t) = 0 & \text{in } (0, T), \\ w(x, 0) = w_0(x), \quad y(x, 0) = y_0(x) & \text{in } (0, 1), \end{cases}$$

in a bounded domain $Q := (0, 1) \times (0, T)$, is controllable. However, they are not able to produce any nonlinear results. In this way, our work extends for the nonlinear system in a bounded domain the control result present only for linear system in [3]. The main point to deal with nonlinear structure in this manuscript is to work in the Bourgain spaces, which helps us to treat the nonlinearities appropriately.

Working on the linear case helps to deal with the system (6.2) with only a control $h\mathbf{1}_\omega$. In [3], the authors are able to treat the system (6.2) without the control $l\mathbf{1}_\omega$. This was possible by using a Carleman estimate which involves both operator, Schrödinger and KdV operators. However it is important to mention that in our case we can not use this inequality to remove a control, since the regularity used in [3, Theorem 1.3.] is not enough to deal with the nonlinearities involved in the system (6.1). In this way, our plan is to address of this issue in a forthcoming paper.

6.2. Others nonlinearities. Another interesting problem is to consider the full physical model of the NLS–KdV system that appears in [2],

$$(6.3) \quad \begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \partial_x^2 u = \alpha uv + \beta|u|^2 u + f, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ \partial_t v + \partial_x^3 v + \frac{1}{2}\partial_x(v^2) = \gamma\partial_x(|u|^2) + g, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x), \quad v(x, 0) = v_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{T}, \end{cases}$$

to prove controllability results. In this way, we propose the following natural issue.

Question A: Is it possible to prove control results for the system (6.3)?

Note that, in this case, to reach the result we need to study some conservation laws associated with the solution of the system. In [2, Lemma 5.1.] the authors proved that the evolution system (6.3) preserves the following quantities

$$M(t) := \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u(t)|^2 dx, \quad Q(t) := \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left\{ \alpha v(t)^2 + 2\gamma \Im \left(u(t) \overline{\partial_x u(t)} \right) \right\} dx$$

and

$$E(t) := \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left\{ \alpha \gamma v(t) |u(t)|^2 - \frac{\alpha}{6} v(t)^3 + \frac{\beta \gamma}{2} |u(t)|^4 + \frac{\alpha}{2} |\partial_x v(t)|^2 + \gamma |\partial_x u(t)|^2 \right\} dx.$$

These quantities give us only information of the “mass” $M(t)$ associated with the Schrödinger equation and there is no information about this conversation for the part of the KdV equation. So, it is necessary, before answering the Question A, to solve the following problem.

Question B: How to deal with the KdV part presented in (6.3) to present some information for the “mass”?

This problem is a open issue and it seems that our work opens, from now on, some possibilities to deal with these types of systems.

APPENDIX A. PROPAGATION RESULTS IN BOURGAIN SPACES

This appendix is dedicated to present properties of propagation in Bourgain spaces for the linear differential operator associated with the NLS-KdV system. These results of propagation are the key to prove the global control results. The main ingredient is basically pseudo-differential analysis. Let us begin with a result of propagation of compactness which will ensure strong convergence in appropriate spaces.

Proposition A.1 (*Propagation of compactness*). *Let $T > 0$, suppose that $(u_n, v_n) \in X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}} \times Y_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}$ and $(f_n, g_n) \in X_T^{-1, -\frac{1}{2}} \times Y_T^{-1, -\frac{1}{2}}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t u_n + \partial_x^2 u_n = i\partial_x v_n + f_n, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ \partial_t v_n + \partial_x^3 v_n + \mu \partial_x v_n = \operatorname{Re}(\partial_x u_n) + g_n, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T). \end{cases}$$

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

$$(A.1) \quad \|(u_n, v_n)\|_{X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}} \times Y_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}} \leq C, \quad \text{for } n \geq 1.$$

Additionally, suppose that

$$(u_n, v_n) \rightarrow (0, 0) \quad \text{weakly in } X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}} \times Y_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}},$$

$$(f_n, g_n) \rightarrow (0, 0) \quad \text{strongly in } X_T^{-1, -\frac{1}{2}} \times Y_T^{-1, -\frac{1}{2}}.$$

and that for some nonempty set $\omega \subset \mathbb{T}$ we have

$$(u_n, v_n) \rightarrow (0, 0) \quad \text{in } L^2(0, T; L^2(\omega) \times L_0^2(\omega)).$$

Then,

$$(A.2) \quad (u_n, v_n) \rightarrow (0, 0) \quad \text{strongly in } L_{loc}^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T})).$$

Proof. We shall start proving the following convergence

$$(A.3) \quad u_n \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{strongly in } L_{loc}^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{T})).$$

Denote $L_1 := i\partial_t + \partial_x^2$ the linear Schrödinger operator and consider $\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ and $\psi \in C_0^\infty([0, T])$ taking real values to be determined. Define $Bu := \varphi(x)D^{-1}$ and $A = \psi(t)B$ and for $\epsilon > 0$, $A_\epsilon = Ae^{\epsilon \partial_x^2} = \psi(t)B_\epsilon$, with D^{-1} defined by (2.3). We consider,

$$\alpha_{n, \epsilon} := ([A_\epsilon, L_1]u_n, u_n)_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{T}))} = ([A_\epsilon, \partial_x^2]u_n, u_n) - i(\psi'(t)Bu_n, u_n).$$

On the other hand, we also have

$$(A.4) \quad \alpha_{n,\epsilon} = (i\partial_x v_n, A_\epsilon^* u_n) - (A_\epsilon u_n, i\partial_x v_n) + (f_n, A_\epsilon^* u_n) - (A_\epsilon u_n, f_n).$$

Now, observe that using Lemma 2.5 we have

(A.5)

$$\begin{aligned} |(i\partial_x v_n, A_\epsilon^* u_n)_{L_{t,x}^2}| &\leq \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left| \widehat{\partial_x v_n}(m, \tau) \right| \left| \widehat{A_\epsilon^* u_n}(n, \tau) \right| d\tau \\ &\leq \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} H(\tau, n) \langle \tau - n^3 + \mu n \rangle^{b'} \langle n \rangle^{-1} |\widehat{v_n}(n, \tau)| \langle \tau + n^2 \rangle^{b'} \langle n \rangle^1 |\widehat{A_\epsilon^* u_n}(n, \tau)| d\tau \\ &\leq C \left(\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \langle \tau - n^3 + \mu n \rangle^{2b'} \langle n \rangle^{-2} |\widehat{v_n}(m, \tau)|^2 d\tau \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \times \\ &\quad \left(\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \langle \tau + n^2 \rangle^{2b'} \langle n \rangle^2 |\widehat{A_\epsilon^* u_n}(n, \tau)|^2 d\tau \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C \|v_n\|_{Y_T^{-1,b'}} \|A_\epsilon^* u_n\|_{X_T^{1,b'}} \\ &\leq C \|v_n\|_{Y_T^{-1,b'}} \|u_n\|_{X_T^{0,b'}}. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that, for $b' = \frac{1}{2}-$, we have

$$v_n \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{strongly in } Y_T^{-1,b'}$$

and thanks to (A.1) we get that $\|u_n\|_{X_T^{0,b'}}$ is bounded. Since

$$v_n \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } Y_T^{-1,b'},$$

yields that

$$\sup_{0 < \epsilon \leq 1} |(i\partial_x v_n, A_\epsilon^* u_n)_{L_{t,x}^2}| \rightarrow 0,$$

due to (A.5). Additionally, holds that

$$|(f_n, A_\epsilon^* u_n)| \leq \|f_n\|_{X_T^{-1, -\frac{1}{2}}} \|u_n\|_{X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}},$$

which yields that

$$\sup_{1 < \epsilon \leq 0} |(f_n, A_\epsilon^* u_n)| \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

The same kind of estimates for the other terms in (A.4) give us the following limit

$$\sup_{1 < \epsilon \leq 0} |\alpha_{n,\epsilon}| \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{when } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Noting that

$$[A, \partial_x^2] = -2\psi(t)(\partial_x \varphi) \partial_x D^{-1} - \psi(t)(\partial_x^2) D^{-1},$$

since D^{-1} commutes with ∂_x , and taking the supremum on ϵ tending to 0, we conclude that

$$([A, \partial_x^2] u_n, u_n) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Putting together these convergences, above mentioned, we may have that

$$(\psi(t)(\partial_x^2 \varphi) D^{-1} u_n, u_n) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Note that, $-i\partial_x D^{-1}$ is the orthogonal projection on the subspace of functions with $\widehat{u}(0) = 0$, and $\widehat{u}_n(0)(t)$ tends to 0 in $L^2([0, T])$ we have

$$(\psi(t)(\partial_x \varphi) \widehat{u}_n(0)(t), u_n) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Thus we have proved that for any $\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ and $\psi \in C_0^\infty([0, T])$,

$$(\psi(t)(\partial_x \varphi) u_n, u_n) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

We conclude the first part of this proof by observing that a function $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ can be written as $\partial_x \varphi$ for some $\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ if and only if $\int_{\mathbb{T}} \varphi dx = 0$. Thus for any $\chi \in C_0^\infty(\omega)$ and any $x_0 \in \mathbb{T}$, $\phi(x) = \chi(x) - \chi(\cdot - x_0)$ can be written as $\phi = \partial_x \varphi$ for some $\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T})$.

Now we use the hypothesis that $u_n \rightarrow 0$ strongly in $L^2(0, T; L^2(\omega))$ to conclude that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\psi(t) \chi u_n, u_n) = 0.$$

Therefore, for any $x_0 \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\psi(t) \chi(\cdot - x_0) u_n, u_n) = 0$$

and yields that $u_n \rightarrow 0$ in $L_{loc}^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{T}))$ by constructing a partition of the unity of \mathbb{T} involving functions of the form $\chi_i(\cdot - x_0^i)$ with $\chi_i \in C^\infty(\omega)$ and $x_0^i \in \mathbb{T}$.

To prove that $v_n \rightarrow 0$ strongly in $L_{loc}^2(0, T; L_0^2(\mathbb{T}))$ we argue analogously, but in this case considering $L_2 = \partial_t + \partial_x^3 + \mu \partial_x$, $B_1 = \varphi(x) D^{-2}$ and $A_2 = \psi(t) B_2$ and for $\epsilon > 0$, $A_{2\epsilon} = A_2 e^{\epsilon \partial_x^2}$. In this situation, we deal with

$$\widetilde{\alpha_{n,\epsilon}} = ([A_{2\epsilon}, L_2] v_n, v_n)_{L_{t,x}^2}$$

the novelty in this case is that

$$\widetilde{\alpha_{n,\epsilon}} = (g_n, A_{2\epsilon}^* v_n) + (A_{2\epsilon} v_n, g_n) + (Re(\partial_x u_n), v_n) + (v_n, Re(\partial_x u_n))$$

and the terms $(Re(\partial_x u_n), v_n) + (v_n, Re(\partial_x u_n))$ can be dealt as in (A.5). The rest of the proof is then completed following the same steps of the first case and the proof is complete. \square

We prove now the propagation of regularity for the linear operator associated to the NLS-KdV system.

Proposition A.2 (*Propagation of regularity*). *Let $T > 0$, $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $(u, v) \in X_T^{r, \frac{1}{2}} \times Y_T^{r, \frac{1}{2}}$ solution of*

$$\begin{cases} i \partial_t u + \partial_x^2 u = i \partial_x v + f, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ \partial_t v + \partial_x^3 v + \mu \partial_x v = Re(\partial_x u) + g, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \end{cases}$$

with $(f, g) \in X_T^{r, -\frac{1}{2}} \times Y_T^{r, -\frac{1}{2}}$. Assume that there exists a non-empty open set $\omega \subset \mathbb{T}$ such that

$$(u, v) \in L_{loc}^2([0, T[; H^{r+\rho}(\omega) \times H_0^{r+\rho}(\omega)),$$

for some $0 < \rho < \frac{1}{4}$. Then

$$(u, v) \in L_{loc}^2([0, T[; H^{r+\rho}(\mathbb{T}) \times H_0^{r+\rho}(\mathbb{T})).$$

Proof. We first regularize (u, v) by introducing, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$u_n := e^{\frac{1}{n} \partial_x^2} u, \quad v_n := e^{\frac{1}{n} \partial_x^2} v,$$

and

$$f_n := e^{\frac{1}{n} \partial_x^2} f, \quad g_n := e^{\frac{1}{n} \partial_x^2} g.$$

In this case, by hypothesis over u and v , we have

$$\|(u_n, v_n)\|_{X_T^{r, \frac{1}{2}} \times Y_T^{r, \frac{1}{2}}} \leq C \quad \text{and} \quad \|(f_n, g_n)\|_{X_T^{r, -\frac{1}{2}} \times Y_T^{r, -\frac{1}{2}}} \leq C,$$

for some constant $C > 0$.

Pick $s = r + \rho$, $\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ and $\psi \in C^\infty([0, T[)$ taking real values. As in the proof of Proposition A.1 we define $B = D^{2s-1} \varphi(x)$ and $A = \psi(t) B$, with D defined in (2.3). Set $L_1 = i \partial_t + \partial_x^2$ the Schrödinger operator and

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_n &:= (L_1 u_n, A^* u_n)_{L_{t,x}^2} - (A u_n, L_1 u_n)_{L_{t,x}^2} \\ &= ([A, \partial_x^2] u_n, u_n)_{L_{t,x}^2} - i(\psi'(t) B u_n, u_n)_{L_{t,x}^2} \\ &= i(\partial_x v_n, A^* u_n)_{L_{t,x}^2} + (f_n, A^* u_n)_{L_{t,x}^2} - (A u_n, i \partial_x v_n)_{L_{t,x}^2} - (A u_n, f_n)_{L_{t,x}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that, as we choose $\rho > 0$ small enough, we have $r + 2\rho - \frac{1}{2} \leq r$. Hence, we obtain

$$\left| (Au_n, f_n)_{L^2_{t,x}} \right| \leq \|Au_n\|_{X_T^{-r, \frac{1}{2}}} \|f_n\|_{X_T^{r, -\frac{1}{2}}} \leq C, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Arguing as in (A.4) we can similarly get that

$$\left| (\partial_x v_n, Au_n)_{L^2_{t,x}} \right| \leq C, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$$

and also estimate all the other terms in order to get that $([A, \partial_x^2]u_n, u_n)$ is uniformly bounded in $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

On the other hand, notice that

$$[A, \partial_x^2] = -2\Psi(t)D^{2s-1}(\partial_x \varphi)\partial_x - \Psi(t)D^{2s-1}(\partial_x^2 \varphi)$$

and

$$|(\psi(t)D^{2s-1}(\partial_x \varphi)u_n, u_n, u_n)| \leq C\|u_n\|_{X_T^{r, \frac{1}{2}}} \|v_n\|_{X_T^{r, -\frac{1}{2}}} \leq C.$$

Analogously,

$$|(\psi(t)D^{2s-1}(\partial_x \varphi)\partial_x u_n, u_n)| \leq C.$$

Since, $fu \in L^2_{loc}(0, T; H^s(\mathbb{T}))$ and $f\partial_x u \in L^2_{loc}(0, T; H^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}))$ we can conclude that

$$fu_n = e^{\frac{1}{n}\partial_x^2} fu + \left[f, e^{\frac{1}{n}\partial_x^2} \right]$$

is uniformly bounded in $L^2_{loc}(0, T; H^s(\mathbb{T}))$, since $s \leq r + 1$. The same reasoning we get that $f\partial_x u$ is uniformly bounded in $L^2_{loc}(0, T; H^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}))$ thus,

$$|(\psi(t)D^{2s-1}f\partial_x u, D^s fu_n)| \leq C.$$

Due to the fact that $[D^s, f]$ is a pseudo-differential operator of order $s - 1$ and $u \in L^2(0, T; H^r(\mathbb{T}))$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |(\psi(t)D^{s-1}f\partial_x u_n, [D^s, f]u_n)| &\leq \|D^{s-1}fu_n\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{T}))} \|D^\rho[D^\rho, f]u_n\|_{L^2(0, T; L^2(\mathbb{T}))} \\ &\leq \|u_n\|_{L^2 H^r} \|u_n\|_{L^2 H^{s-1+\rho}} \leq C \end{aligned}$$

and finally,

$$|(\psi(t)D^{2s-1}(\partial_x \varphi)\partial_x u_n, u_n)| \leq C.$$

As in proposition A.1, we finish this proof by writing $\partial \varphi = f_2(\cdot) - f_2(\cdot - x_0)$, with $x_0 \in \mathbb{T}$, thus

$$|(\psi(t)D^{2s-1}f_2(\cdot - x_0)\partial_x u_n, u_n)| \leq C.$$

From this calculation we conclude that $u \in L^2_{loc}(0, T; H^{r+\rho}(\mathbb{T}))$.

To conclude the proof, we argue analogously for the KdV operator $L_2 = \partial_t + \partial_x^3 + \mu\partial_x$, and then we consider

$$\tilde{\alpha}_n = ([A, L_2]v_n, v_n)_{L^2(0, T; L^2_0(\mathbb{T}))} = (Lv_n, A^*v_n)_{L^2_{t,x}} + (Av_n, L_2v_n)_{L^2_{t,x}}$$

and we also have,

$$\tilde{\alpha}_n = (\text{Re}(\partial_x u_n), A^*v_n)_{L^2_{t,x}} + (Av_n, g_n)_{L^2_{t,x}} + (g_n, A^*v_n)_{L^2_{t,x}} + (Av_n, \text{Re}(\partial_x u_n))_{L^2_{t,x}}$$

and the main difference from the first equation is the estimate of

$$(\text{Re}(\partial_x u_n), A^*v_n)_{L^2_{t,x}} \quad \text{and} \quad (Av_n, \text{Re}(\partial_x u_n))_{L^2_{t,x}},$$

which can be dealt as in (A.5), and so the propagation of regularity is proved. \square

Next result is a consequence of Proposition A.2.

Corollary A.3. *Let $(u, v) \in X_T^{r, \frac{1}{2}} \times Y_T^{r, \frac{1}{2}}$ be a solution of*

$$(A.6) \quad \begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \partial_x^2 u = i\partial_x v + \beta|u|^2 u, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ \partial_t v + \partial_x^3 v + \mu\partial_x v + \frac{1}{2}\partial_x(v^2) + \mu\partial_x v = \operatorname{Re}(\partial_x u), & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T). \end{cases}$$

Assume that, for some nonempty open set $\omega \subset \mathbb{T}$, $(u, v) \in [C^\infty(\omega \times (0, T))]^2$. So $(u, v) \in [C^\infty(\mathbb{T} \times (0, T))]^2$.

Proof. Note that, we may assume that $[v] = 0$, thus we can apply the estimate (2.5) to conclude that $\partial_x(v^2) \in Y_T^{r, -\frac{1}{2}}$ and we have that $\beta|u|^2 u \in X_T^{r, -\frac{1}{2}}$ by estimate (2.4). Then we can apply the Proposition A.2 to conclude that $(u, v) \in L_{loc}^2(0, T; H^{r+\rho}(\mathbb{T}) \times H^{r+\rho}(\mathbb{T}))$. Hence we can get $t_0 \in (0, T)$ such that $(u(t_0), v(t_0)) \in H^{r+\rho}(\mathbb{T}) \times H^{r+\rho}(\mathbb{T})$, then solving the equation with $(u(t_0), v(t_0))$ as initial data, it follows that $(u, v) \in L^2(0, T; H^{r+\rho}(\mathbb{T}) \times H^{r+\rho}(\mathbb{T}))$ and iterating this process we get that if $(u, v) \in [C^\infty(\mathbb{T} \times (0, T))]^2$, showing the result. \square

APPENDIX B. UNIQUE CONTINUATION FOR THE NLS-KdV SYSTEM

We present the unique continuation property for the NLS-KdV system. This will be proved taking advantage of Carleman estimates already proved for the Korteweg-de Vries and Schrödinger operators in [3, 10]. For completeness, we will present below the estimates necessary to demonstrate the result.

B.1. Carleman estimates. Consider the KdV equation on 2π -periodic conditions

$$(B.1) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t q + \partial_x^3 q = f, & (x, t) \in (0, 2\pi) \times (0, T), \\ q(0, t) = q(2\pi, t) & t \in (0, T), \\ \partial_x q(0, t) = \partial_x q(2\pi, t) & t \in (0, T), \\ \partial_x^2 q(0, t) = \partial_x^2 q(2\pi, t) & t \in (0, T), \\ q(x, 0) = q_0(x), & x \in (0, 2\pi). \end{cases}$$

Then the following Carleman inequality is consequence of the result proved in [10, Proposition 3.1].

Proposition B.1. *Pick any $T > 0$. There exist two constants $C > 0$ and $s_0 > 0$ such that any $f \in L^2(0, T; L^2(0, 2\pi))$, any $q_0 \in L_0^2(0, 2\pi)$ and any $s \geq s_0$, the solution q of (B.1) fulfills*

$$(B.2) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \int_0^{2\pi} [s\varphi |q_{xx}|^2 + (s\varphi)^3 |q_x|^2 + (s\varphi)^5 |q|^2] e^{-2s\varphi} dx dt \leq C \int_0^T \int_0^{2\pi} |f|^2 e^{-2s\varphi} dx dt \\ & + C \left(\int_0^T \int_\omega [s\varphi |q_{xx}|^2 + (s\varphi)^3 |q_x|^2 + (s\varphi)^5 |q|^2] e^{-2s\varphi} dx dt \right). \end{aligned}$$

Let us now borrow the results obtained in [3, Theorem 3.2.]. Consider the Schrödinger equation on 2π -periodic conditions

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t p + \partial_x^2 p = g & (x, t) \in (0, 2\pi) \times (0, T), \\ p(0, t) = p(2\pi, t) = 0 & t \in (0, T), \\ \partial_x p(0, t) = \partial_x p(2\pi, t) = 0 & t \in (0, T), \\ p(x, 0) = p_0(x) & x \in (0, 2\pi). \end{cases}$$

Thus, the following estimate holds true.

Theorem B.2. *There exist constants $C > 0$ and $s_0 \geq 1$ such that*

$$(B.3) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \int_0^{2\pi} [s\varphi |p_x|^2 + (s\varphi)^3 |p|^2] e^{-2s\varphi} dx dt \leq \int_0^T \int_0^{2\pi} |g|^2 e^{-2s\varphi} dx dt \\ & + C \int_0^T \int_\omega [(s\varphi)^3 |p|^2 + (s\varphi) |\operatorname{Re}(p_x)|^2] e^{-2s\varphi} dx dt \end{aligned}$$

for all $s > s_0$ and $\omega \subset (0, 2\pi)$.

B.2. Unique continuation property. Carleman inequalities with an internal observation for the KdV and Schrödinger operators ensures us the the result of the unique continuation.

Theorem B.3. *Let $T > 0$ and $V_1, V_2, V_3 \in C^\infty((0, T) \times \mathbb{T})$, then the solution of*

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \partial_x^2 u = i\partial_x v + V_1(x, t)u + V_2(x, t)\bar{u}, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ \partial_t v + \partial_x^3 v + \mu\partial_x v = V_3(t, x)\partial_x u + \text{Re}(\partial_x u), & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ u(x, t) = v(x, t) = 0, & (x, t) \in \omega \times (0, T), \end{cases}$$

with $(u, v) \in C([0, T]; L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L_0^2(\mathbb{T}))$, is the trivial one $u \equiv v \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{T} \times (0, T)$.

Proof. Putting together (B.2) and (B.3), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \int_0^{2\pi} [s\tilde{\varphi}|u_x|^2 + (s\tilde{\varphi})^3|u|^2]e^{-2s\tilde{\varphi}} dx dt \\ & + \int_0^T \int_0^{2\pi} [s\tilde{\varphi}|v_{xx}|^2 + (s\tilde{\varphi})^3|v_x|^2 + (s\tilde{\varphi})^5|v|^2]e^{-2s\tilde{\varphi}} dx dt \\ (B.4) \quad & \leq \int_0^T \int_0^{2\pi} (|g|^2 + |f|^2)e^{-2s\tilde{\varphi}} dx dt + C \int_0^T \int_\omega [(s\varphi)^3|u|^2 + (s\varphi)|\text{Re}(u_x)|^2]e^{-2s\varphi} dx dt \\ & + C \left(\int_0^T \int_\omega [s\varphi|v_{xx}|^2 + (s\varphi)^3|v_x|^2 + (s\varphi)^5|v|^2]e^{-2s\varphi} dx dt \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\varphi} = \min \varphi$, $\hat{\varphi} = \max \varphi$, $g := i\partial_x v + V_1(x, t)u + V_2(x, t)\bar{u}$ and $f := V_3(t, x)\partial_x u + \text{Re}(\partial_x u)$. The properties of the $\tilde{\varphi}$ and $\hat{\varphi}$ can be seen in [3, 10].

Now, note that the zero and first order terms of right hand side of (B.4) can be absorbed by the left hand side. Moreover, the second order term v_{xx} of the right hand side (B.4) can be treat as in [10, Lemma 3.7], resulting in the following estimate

$$(B.5) \quad \int_0^T \int_0^{2\pi} [(s\tilde{\varphi})^3|u|^2 + (s\tilde{\varphi})^5|v|^2]e^{-2s\tilde{\varphi}} dx dt \leq C \int_0^T \int_\omega [(s\varphi)^3|u|^2 + (s\varphi)^5|v|^2]e^{-2s\varphi} dx dt.$$

Therefore, thanks to the hypothesis $u \equiv v \equiv 0$ in $\omega \times (0, T)$, the right hand side of (B.5) yields that $u \equiv v \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{T} \times (0, T)$, and so the result follows. \square

As a consequence of this unique continuation property, we have the following result.

Corollary B.4. *Let $(u, v) \in X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}} \times Y_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}}$ be a solution of*

$$(B.6) \quad \begin{cases} i\partial_t u + \partial_x^2 u = i\partial_x v + \beta|u|^2 u, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ \partial_t v + \partial_x^3 v + \frac{1}{2}\partial_x(v^2) + \mu\partial_x v = -\text{Re}(\partial_x u), & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ u(x, t) = 0, \quad v(x, t) = c, & (x, t) \in \omega \times (0, T), \end{cases}$$

where $\omega \subset \mathbb{T}$ is a nonempty open set and c is some real constant. Then, there exists a small $T > 0$, such that $u = 0$ on $\mathbb{T} \times (0, T)$ and $v = c$ on $\mathbb{T} \times (0, T)$.

Proof. First note that using Corollary A.3 we have that $u, v \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T} \times (0, T))$ then, considering $(w, z) = (\partial_t u, \partial_t v)$ we get

$$\begin{cases} i\partial_t w + \partial_x^2 w = i\partial_x z + V_1(t, x)w + V_2(t, x)\bar{w}, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ \partial_t z + \partial_x^3 z + \mu\partial_x z + V_3(t, x)z = \text{Re}(\partial_x w), & (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times (0, T), \\ z(x, t) = w(x, t) = 0, & (x, t) \in \omega \times (0, T). \end{cases}$$

Then the unique continuation property given by Theorem B.3 implies that $w = z = 0$. In analogous way, we can consider $(\tilde{w}, \tilde{z}) = (\partial_x u, \partial_x v)$ and then we get that $\partial_x u = \partial_x v = 0$ in $\mathbb{T} \times (0, T)$. Hence we can conclude that, both functions u, v are constant and the result follows. \square

Acknowledgments. R. de A. Capistrano-Filho was supported by CNPq 408181/2018-4, CAPES-PRINT 88881.311964/2018-01, CAPES-MATHAMSUD 88881.520205/2020-01, MATHAMSUD 21-MATH-03 and Propesqi (UFPE). A. Pampu was supported by PNPD-CAPES grant number 88887.351630/2019-00. This work was done during the postdoctoral visit of the second author at the Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, who thanks the host institution for the warm hospitality.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Albert and J. A. Pava, *Existence and stability of ground-state solutions of a Schrödinger-KdV system*. Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect., 133 no. 5 (2003) 987–1029.
- [2] A. Arbieto, A. J. Corcho, A. J. and C. Matheus, *Rough solutions for the periodic Schrödinger-Korteweg-de Vries system*. J. Differential Equations, 230 (2006) 295–336.
- [3] F. D. Arauna, E. Cerpa, A. Mercado, and M. C. Santos, *Internal null controllability of a linear Schrödinger-KdV system on a bounded interval*. J. Differential Equations, 260 (2016) 653–687.
- [4] D. J. Benney, *A general theory for interactions between short and long waves*. Stud. Appl. Math., 56 (1977) 81–94.
- [5] J.L. Bona, S.M. Sun, B.Y. Zhang. *The initial-boundary value problem for the Korteweg-de Vries equation in a quarter plane*. Trans. American Math. Soc., 354 (2001) 427–490.
- [6] J. Bourgain, *Fourier transform restriction phenomena for certain lattice subsets and applications to nonlinear evolution equations. Part I: The Schrödinger equations*. Geometric and Funct. Anal., 3 (1993) 107–156.
- [7] J. Bourgain, *Fourier transform restriction phenomena for certain lattice subsets and applications to nonlinear evolution equations. Part II: The KdV equation*. Geom. & Funct. Anal., 3 (1993) 209–262.
- [8] N. Burq, P. Gerard and N. Tzvetkov, *Bilinear eigenfunction estimates and the nonlinear Schrödinger equation on surfaces*. Invent. Math., 159 (2005) 187–223.
- [9] N. Burq, P. Gerard and N. Tzvetkov, *Multilinear eigenfunction estimates and global existence for the three-dimensional nonlinear Schrödinger equations*. Ann. Sci. Ecole Norm. Sup., 38 (2005) 255–301.
- [10] R. A. Capistrano-Filho, A. F. Pazoto and L. Rosier, *Control of a Boussinesq system of KdV-KdV type on a bounded interval*. ESAIM Control Optimization and Calculus Variations, 25 (2019) 1–55.
- [11] R. A. Capistrano-Filho, A. F. Pazoto and L. Rosier, *Internal controllability for the Korteweg-de Vries equation on a bounded domain*. ESAIM Control Optimization and Calculus Variations, 21 (2015) 1076–1107.
- [12] E. Cerpa, *Exact controllability of a nonlinear Korteweg-de Vries equation on a critical spatial domain*. SIAM J. Control Optim., 43 (2007) 877–899.
- [13] E. Cerpa and E. Crépeau, *Boundary controllability for the nonlinear Korteweg-de Vries equation on any critical domain*. Ann. I.H. Poincaré, 26 (2009) 457–475.
- [14] A. J. Corcho and F. Linares, *Well-posedness for the Schrödinger-Korteweg-de-Vries system*. Trans. of the American Mathematical Society, 359 (2007) 4089–4106.
- [15] B. Dehman, P. Gérard and G. Lebeau, *Stabilization and control for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation on a compact surface*. Mathematische Zeitschrift., 254 (2006) 729–749.
- [16] O. Glass and S. Guerrero, *Some exact controllability results for the linear KdV equation and uniform controllability in the zero-dispersion limit*. Asymptot. Anal., 60 (2008) 61–100.
- [17] C. Laurent, L. Rosier and B.-Y. Zhang, *Control and Stabilization of the Korteweg-de Vries Equation on a Periodic Domain*. Commun. in Partial Differential Equations, 35 (2010) 707–744.
- [18] C. Laurent, *Global controllability and stabilization for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation on some compact manifolds of dimension 3*. SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis, 42 (2010) 785–832.
- [19] C. Laurent, *Global controllability and stabilization for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation on an interval*. ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var., 16 (2010) 356–379.
- [20] G. Lebeau, *Contrôle de l'équation de Schrödinger*. J. Math. Pures Appl., 71 (1992) 267–291.
- [21] J.-L. Lions, *Exact controllability, stabilization and perturbations for distributed systems*. SIAM Rev., 30 (1988) 1–68.
- [22] E. Machtyngier, *Exact controllability for the Schrödinger equation*. SIAM J. Control Optim., 32 (1994) 24–34.
- [23] L. Tartar. *Interpolation non lineaire et regularite [Nonlinear interpolation and regularity]*. J. Funct. Anal., (1972) 9:469–489.
- [24] L. Rosier, *Exact boundary controllability for the Korteweg-de Vries equation on a bounded domain*. ESAIM Control Optim. Cal. Var., 2 (1997) 33–55.
- [25] L. Rosier and B.-Y. Zhang, *Local Exact Controllability and Stabilizability of the Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation on a Bounded Interval*. SIAM J. Control and Optimization, 48 (2009) 972–992.
- [26] D. L. Russell and B.-Y. Zhang, *Controllability and stabilizability of the third order linear dispersion equation on a periodic domain*. SIAM J. Cont. Optim., 31 (1993) 659–676.
- [27] D. L. Russell and B.-Y. Zhang, *Exact controllability and stabilizability of the Korteweg-de Vries equation*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 348 (1996) 3643–3672.
- [28] B.-Y. Zhang, *Exact boundary controllability of the Korteweg-de Vries equation*. SIAM J. Cont. Optim., 37 (1999) 543–565.
- [29] E. Zuazua, *Exact controllability for the semilinear wave equation*. J. Math. Pures Appl., 69 (1990) 33–55

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE PERNAMBUCO (UFPE), 50740-545, RECIFE (PE), BRAZIL.

Email address: roberto.capistranofilho@ufpe.br

Email address: ademir_bp@hotmail.com