

Polynomial stability of nonlinear Timoshenko beam with distributed delay

LAMINE BOUZETTOUTA^{*1}, HOUSSEM EDDINE KHOCHEMANE² AND FAHIMA HEBHOUB³

¹ *Laboratory of Applied Mathematics and History and Didactics of Mathematics (LAMAHS) University of 20 August 1955, Skikda, Algeria.*

² *Ecole Normale Supérieure d'Enseignement Technologique de Skikda.*

³ *University of 20 August 1955, Skikda.*

Received 26 April 2023; Accepted 31 January 2024

Abstract. In this work, we consider a Nonlinear Timoshenko system with distributed delay-time. We prove the polynomial stability of the system for the case of nonequal speeds of wave propagation. This is after verifying the exponential stability in the opposite one.

AMS Subject Classifications: 35B40, 35L70, 93D15, 93D20, 74F05.

Keywords: Porous system, distributed delay, polynomial stability, Lyapunov functional.

Contents

1	Introduction	193
2	Preliminaries	194
3	Decay result	196
4	Acknowledgement	203

1. Introduction

In this work, we consider a nonlinear Timoshenko system with distributed delay term,

$$\begin{cases} \rho_1 \phi_{tt} - k(\phi_{\mathcal{X}} + \psi)_{\mathcal{X}} = 0, \\ \rho_2 \psi_{tt} - b\psi_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{X}} + k(\phi_{\mathcal{X}} + \psi) + \mu_1 \psi_t + \int_{\iota_1}^{\iota_2} \eta_2(\tau) \psi_t(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{t} - \tau) d\tau + f(\psi) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{t}) \in (0, 1) \times \mathbb{R}^+$. The system (1.1) with $\mu_1 = \eta_2 = f = 0$, was first proposed by Timoshenko [24] as a model that describes the impact of vibrations on a thin elastic beam of length. The functions $\phi = \phi(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{t})$ and $\psi = \psi(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{t})$ describe the small transverse displacement of the beam and the rotation angle of the beam's filament. The parameters ρ_1, ρ_2, k and b are positive constants. The function $f(\psi)$ is a forcing term and $\mu_1 \psi_t$ designate a frictional damping. The distributed delay is given by $\int_{\iota_1}^{\iota_2} \eta_2(\tau) \psi_t(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{t} - \tau) d\tau$, where, $\iota_1, \iota_2 > 0$. We provide the system (1.1) with the initial data

$$\begin{cases} \phi(\mathcal{X}, 0) = \phi_0, \phi_t(\mathcal{X}, 0) = \phi_1, \psi(\mathcal{X}, 0) = \psi_0, \psi_t(\mathcal{X}, 0) = \psi_1 \\ \psi_t(\mathcal{X}, -\mathbf{t}) = f_0(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{t}), \mathcal{X} \in (0, 1), \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

^{*} **Corresponding author.** Email address: lami.750000@yahoo.fr (Lamine Bouzettouta)

and the boundary conditions

$$\phi(0, \mathbf{t}) = \phi(1, \mathbf{t}) = \psi(0, \mathbf{t}) = \psi(1, \mathbf{t}) = 0. \quad (1.3)$$

We remember that Timoshenko system without delay has been considered by many authors. Their goal was to achieve the asymptotic behaviour of the solutions of these systems by introducing different types of damping. See for instance [1–3, 9, 11, 12, 15, 19] and references therein.

In recent years, including the delay term makes the problems of EDPs more interesting. In fact, delays can cause destabilization of a system which is stable without the delays. Datko et al. [7] studied the the destabilizing effect of arbitrarily small delays in the boundary control of a wave equation. In [17], the authors proved an exponential decay result of the solution under suitable assumptions of the delayed wave equation where the delay is considered both in the boundary condition and in the internal feedback. Later [18] the same authors introduced a distributed delay on a part of the boundary, and they proved an exponential stability under some assumptions, they also studied the following problem with internal feedback

$$\begin{cases} u_{\mathbf{t}\mathbf{t}} - \Delta u + \mu_0 u_{\mathbf{t}} + \int_{\iota_1}^{\iota_2} a(\mathcal{X})\mu(\tau)u_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathbf{t} - \tau)d\tau \\ u = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_0(0, \alpha) \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_1(0, \alpha) \\ u(\mathcal{X}, 0) = u_0(\mathcal{X}) \text{ and } u_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathcal{X}, 0) = u_1(\mathcal{X}) \quad \text{in } \Omega \\ u_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathcal{X}, -\mathbf{t}) = f_0(\mathcal{X}, -\mathbf{t}) \quad \text{in } \Omega(0, \iota_2) \end{cases} \quad (1.4)$$

where $a \in L^2(\Omega)$ is a function satisfies

$$\mu_0 > \|a\|_{\alpha} \int_{\iota_1}^{\iota_2} \mu(\tau)d\tau.$$

They obtained an exponential decay result for the energy.

In [22], the authors discussed the stability of a linear Timoshenko system with a constant delay

$$\begin{cases} \rho_1 \phi_{\mathbf{t}\mathbf{t}} - k(\phi_{\mathcal{X}} + \psi)_{\mathcal{X}} = 0, \\ \rho_2 \psi_{\mathbf{t}\mathbf{t}} - b\psi_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{X}} + k(\phi_{\mathcal{X}} + \psi) + \mu_1 \psi_{\mathbf{t}} + \eta_2 \psi_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{t} - \tau) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

a necessary condition which made the solutions of (1.5) exponentially stable is

$$\frac{k}{\rho_1} = \frac{b}{\rho_2}. \quad (1.6)$$

It is most important to report that most of results on Timoshenko types systems is based on the above condition, otherwise, only a polynomial stability was proved for the case of nonequal speeds (see [2, 9, 11, 12, 15]).

For a non linear Timoshenko system , Feng and Pelicer [8] added to (1.5) a forcing term $f(\psi)$ in the second equation and proved an exponential decay under an appropriate condition between the weights of the the delay term and frictional damping, their result was extended by Hao and Wei [12] to nonlinear heatTimoshenko system of based on the energy method. In the case where the speeds are nonequal, they established a polynomial decay estimate.

System (1.1) was recently investigated by Bouzettouta et al. [4] and they proved an exponential decay result of the energy when (1.6) holds, in this paper our goal is to complete their study for the case of non equal wave speeds.

2. Preliminaries

The necessary assumptions and transformations needed to obtain the desired results were presented in this section. As in [17], we use the following notation

$$\chi(\mathcal{X}, \rho, \tau, \mathbf{t}) = \psi_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{t} - \rho\tau), \quad \mathcal{X} \in (0, L), \quad \rho \in (0, L), \quad \mathbf{t}, \tau \in (\iota_1, \iota_2).$$

Nonlinear Timoshenko system with distributed delay-time

The new variable χ satisfies the following differential equation

$$\tau \chi_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathcal{X}, \rho, \tau, \mathbf{t}) + \chi_{\rho}(\mathcal{X}, \rho, \tau, \mathbf{t}) = 0, \quad (\mathcal{X}, \rho, \tau, \mathbf{t}) \in (0, L) \times (0, L) \times (\iota_1, \iota_2) \times (0, +\infty).$$

Therefore, the problem (1.1) becomes

$$\begin{cases} \rho_1 \phi_{\mathbf{t}\mathbf{t}} - k(\phi_{\mathcal{X}} + \psi)_{\mathcal{X}} = 0, \quad \mathcal{X} \in (0, L), \mathbf{t} > 0, \\ \rho_2 \psi_{\mathbf{t}\mathbf{t}} - b\psi_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{X}} + k(\phi_{\mathcal{X}} + \psi) + \mu_1 \psi_{\mathbf{t}} \\ + \int_{\iota_1}^{\iota_2} \eta_2(\tau) \chi(\mathcal{X}, \rho, \tau, \mathbf{t}) d\tau + f(\psi) = 0, \quad \mathcal{X} \in (0, L), \mathbf{t} > 0, \\ \tau \chi_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathcal{X}, \rho, \tau, \mathbf{t}) + \chi_{\rho}(\mathcal{X}, \rho, \tau, \mathbf{t}) = 0, \quad \rho \in (0, L), \tau \in (\iota_1, \iota_2), \mathbf{t} > 0, \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

with the initial data and boundary conditions

$$\begin{cases} \phi(\mathcal{X}, 0) = \phi_0, \quad \phi_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathcal{X}, 0) = \phi_1, \quad \mathcal{X} \in (0, L), \\ \psi(\mathcal{X}, 0) = \psi_0, \quad \psi_{\mathbf{t}}(\mathcal{X}, 0) = \psi_1, \quad \mathcal{X} \in (0, L), \\ \chi(\mathcal{X}, \rho, \tau, 0) = f_0(\mathcal{X}, \rho\tau), \quad \mathcal{X} \in (0, 1), \rho \in (0, L), \tau \in (0, \iota_2), \\ \phi(0, \mathbf{t}) = \phi(1, \mathbf{t}) = \psi(0, \mathbf{t}) = \psi(1, \mathbf{t}) = 0, \quad \mathbf{t} > 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

In what follows, we assume that

$$\int_{\iota_1}^{\iota_2} |\eta_2(\tau)| d\tau < \mu_1. \quad (2.3)$$

We assume that $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies

$$|f(\psi^1) - f(\psi^2)| \leq k_0 \left(|\psi^1|^{\theta} - |\psi^2|^{\theta} \right) |\psi^1 - \psi^2| \quad (2.4)$$

for all $\psi^1, \psi^2 \in \mathbb{R}$, where $k_0 > 0, \theta > 0$. Also

$$0 \leq \tilde{f}(\psi) \leq f(\psi)\psi, \quad \text{for all } \psi \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (2.5)$$

with

$$\tilde{f}(y) = \int_0^y f(\tau) d\tau.$$

Let \mathbf{H} the Hilbert space,

$$\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{H}_0^1(0, L) \times L^2(0, L) \times \mathbf{H}_0^1(0, L) \times L^2(0, L) \times L^2((0, L) \times (0, L) \times (\iota_1, \iota_2)),$$

and for any $U = (\phi, u, \psi, v, \chi)^{\mathbf{t}} \in \mathbf{H}, \tilde{U} = (\tilde{\phi}, \tilde{u}, \tilde{\psi}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{\chi})^{\mathbf{t}} \in \mathbf{H}$, we equip the space \mathbf{H} with the inner product

$$\begin{aligned} \langle U, \tilde{U} \rangle_{\mathbf{H}} &= \int_0^L \left[\rho_1 u \tilde{u} + \rho_2 v \tilde{v} + k(\phi_{\mathcal{X}} + \psi) (\tilde{\phi}_{\mathcal{X}} + \tilde{\psi}) + b\psi_{\mathcal{X}} \tilde{\psi}_{\mathcal{X}} \right] d\mathcal{X} \\ &+ \int_0^L \int_{\iota_1}^{\iota_2} \tau |\eta_2(\tau)| \int_0^L \chi(\mathcal{X}, \rho, \tau, \mathbf{t}) \tilde{\chi}(\mathcal{X}, \rho, \tau, \mathbf{t}) d\rho d\tau d\mathcal{X}. \end{aligned}$$

By introducing the variables $\phi_{\mathbf{t}} = u$ and $\psi_{\mathbf{t}} = v$, then the system (2.1)-(2.2) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} U_{\mathbf{t}} = AU + F, \quad \mathbf{t} > 0 \\ U(\mathcal{X}, 0) = U^0(\mathcal{X}) = (\phi^0, \phi^1, \psi^0, \psi^1, f_0)^{\mathbf{t}}, \end{cases} \quad (2.6)$$

and

$$AU = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ \frac{k}{\rho_1} (\phi_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{X}} + \psi_{\mathcal{X}}) \\ v \\ \frac{b}{\rho_2} \psi_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{X}} - \frac{k}{\rho_2} (\phi_{\mathcal{X}} + \psi) - \frac{\mu_1}{\rho_2} v - \frac{\mu_1}{\rho_2} \int_{\iota_1}^{\iota_2} \eta_2(\tau) \chi(\mathcal{X}, \rho, \tau, \mathbf{t}) d\tau \\ -\frac{1}{\tau} \chi_{\rho}(\mathcal{X}, \rho, \tau, \mathbf{t}) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.7)$$

$$F = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \frac{-1}{\rho^2} f(\psi) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

with the domain

$$D(A) = \left\{ (\phi, u, \psi, v, \chi)^t \in \mathbf{H}_1 \right\},$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}_1 = & (\mathbf{H}^2(0, L) \cap \mathbf{H}_0^1(0, L)) \times \mathbf{H}_0^1(0, L) \times (\mathbf{H}^2(0, L) \cap \mathbf{H}_0^1(0, L)) \\ & \times \mathbf{H}_0^1(0, L) \times L^2((0, L) \times (0, L) \times (\iota_1, \iota_2)). \end{aligned}$$

We state the following well-posedness result (see [8]).

Theorem 2.1. *Let $U_0 \in \mathbf{H}$ and suppose that (2.3)-(2.5) hold. Then, the problem (2.1)-(2.2) has a unique weak solution $U \in C(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbf{H})$. If $U_0 \in D(A)$, then*

$$U \in C(\mathbb{R}^+, D(A)) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbf{H}).$$

3. Decay result

We exploit the multipliers technique, we show that the solution of (2.1)–(2.2) decays exponentially. First, we present the following lemmas.

Lemma 3.1. *The energy \mathbf{E} of (2.1)–(2.2), defined by*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{t}) = & \frac{1}{2} \int_0^L (\rho_1 \phi_{\mathbf{t}}^2 + \rho_2 \psi_{\mathbf{t}}^2) d\mathcal{X} + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^L \left\{ K (\phi_{\mathcal{X}} + \psi)^2 + b \psi_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \right\} d\mathcal{X} \\ & + \int_0^L \int_0^L \int_{\iota_1}^{\iota_2} \tau |\eta_2(\tau)| \chi(\mathcal{X}, \rho, \tau, \mathbf{t}) d\tau d\rho d\mathcal{X} + \int_0^L \tilde{f}(\psi) d\mathcal{X} \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

satisfies

$$\frac{d\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{t})}{d\mathbf{t}} \leq -m_1 \int_0^L \psi_{\mathbf{t}}^2 d\mathcal{X} \leq 0, \quad (3.2)$$

where $m_1 = \mu_1 - \int_{\iota_1}^{\iota_2} |\eta_2(\tau)| d\tau$.

Proof. Multiplying (2.1)₁ by $\phi_{\mathbf{t}}$, (2.1)₂ by $\psi_{\mathbf{t}}$, integrating and combining the results, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{d\mathbf{t}} \int_0^L (\rho_1 \phi_{\mathbf{t}}^2 + \rho_2 \psi_{\mathbf{t}}^2) d\mathcal{X} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{d\mathbf{t}} \int_0^L \left\{ K (\phi_{\mathcal{X}} + \psi)^2 + b \psi_{\mathcal{X}}^2 \right\} d\mathcal{X} \\ & = -\mu_1 \int_0^L \psi_{\mathbf{t}}^2 d\mathcal{X} - \mu_1 \int_0^L f(\psi) \psi_{\mathbf{t}} d\mathcal{X} - \int_0^L \int_{\iota_1}^{\iota_2} \psi_{\mathbf{t}} \eta_2(\tau) \chi(\mathcal{X}, 1, \tau, \mathbf{t}) d\tau d\mathcal{X}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Multiplying (2.1)₃ by $|\eta_2(\tau)| \chi(\mathcal{X}, \rho, \tau, \mathbf{t})$, integrating over $(0, L) \times (0, L) \times (\iota_1, \iota_2)$, summing the result with (3.3) and applying Young's inequality, we have (3.1) and (3.2). ■

Lemma 3.2. *The functional*

$$I_1(\mathbf{t}) := - \int_0^L (\rho_1 \phi_{\mathbf{t}} + \rho_2 \psi_{\mathbf{t}}) d\mathcal{X} - \frac{\mu_1}{2} \int_0^L \psi^2 d\mathcal{X}. \quad (3.4)$$

satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dI_1(\mathbf{t})}{d\mathbf{t}} &\leq - \int_0^L (\rho_1 \phi_{\mathbf{t}}^2 + \rho_2 \psi_{\mathbf{t}}^2) d\mathcal{X} + c_0 \int_0^L \psi_{\mathcal{X}}^2 d\mathcal{X} + k \int_0^L (\phi_{\mathcal{X}} + \psi)^2 d\mathcal{X} \\ &\quad + \frac{\mu_1}{4} \int_0^L \int_{\iota_1}^{\iota_2} |\eta_2(\tau)| \chi^2(\mathcal{X}, 1, \tau, \mathbf{t}) d\tau d\mathcal{X}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

Proof. Differentiating $I_1(\mathbf{t})$ with (2.1)₁, (2.1)₂ and Young's and Poincaré inequalities, we obtain (3.5). ■

Now, we introduce the following problem

$$-w_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{X}} = \psi_{\mathcal{X}}, \quad w(0) = w(1) = 0, \quad (3.6)$$

where w the solution of the above problem is given by

$$w(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{t}) = - \int_0^{\mathcal{X}} \psi(z, \mathbf{t}) dz + \mathcal{X} \left(\int_0^L \psi(z, \mathbf{t}) dz \right).$$

Lemma 3.3. *The solution of (3.6) satisfies*

$$\int_0^L w_{\mathcal{X}}^2 d\mathcal{X} \leq \int_0^L \psi^2 d\mathcal{X} \text{ and } \int_0^L w_{\mathbf{t}}^2 d\mathcal{X} \leq \int_0^L \psi_{\mathbf{t}}^2 d\mathcal{X}.$$

Proof. Multiplying (3.6) by w , integrating and introduce the Hölder inequality, we arrive at

$$\int_0^L w_{\mathcal{X}}^2 d\mathcal{X} \leq \int_0^L \psi^2 d\mathcal{X}$$

Next, we differentiate (3.6) and using the same above technique, we get

$$\int_0^L w_{\mathbf{t}}^2 d\mathcal{X} \leq \int_0^L \psi_{\mathbf{t}}^2 d\mathcal{X}. \quad (3.7)$$

■

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\Phi = (\phi, \psi, \chi)$ be the solution of the system (2.1)–(2.2). Then, for any $\varepsilon_2 > 0$, the functional*

$$I_2(\mathbf{t}) := \int_0^L \left(\rho_2 \psi_{\mathbf{t}} \psi + \rho_1 \phi_{\mathbf{t}} w + \frac{\mu_1}{2} \psi^2 \right) d\mathcal{X}, \quad (3.8)$$

satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dI_2(\mathbf{t})}{d\mathbf{t}} &\leq -\frac{b}{2} \int_0^L \psi_{\mathcal{X}}^2 d\mathcal{X} + \left(\frac{\rho_1}{4\varepsilon_2} + \rho_2 \right) \int_0^L \psi_{\mathbf{t}}^2 d\mathcal{X} + \rho_1 \varepsilon_2 \int_0^L \phi_{\mathbf{t}}^2 d\mathcal{X} \\ &\quad + \frac{\mu_1}{4\varepsilon_2} \int_0^L \left(\int_{\iota_1}^{\iota_2} |\eta_2(\tau)| \chi^2(\mathcal{X}, 1, \tau, \mathbf{t}) d\tau \right) d\mathcal{X} - \int_0^L \tilde{f}(\psi) d\mathcal{X}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

Proof. By differentiation $I_2(\mathbf{t})$ and using (2.1)₁, (2.1)₂, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dI_2(\mathbf{t})}{d\mathbf{t}} &= \rho_2 \int_0^L \psi_{\mathbf{t}}^2 d\mathcal{X} - b \int_0^L \psi_{\mathcal{X}}^2 d\mathcal{X} + \rho_1 \int_0^L \phi_{\mathbf{t}} w_{\mathbf{t}} d\mathcal{X} - k \int_0^L \psi^2 d\mathcal{X} + k \int_0^L w_{\mathcal{X}}^2 d\mathcal{X} \\ &\quad - \int_0^L f(\psi) \psi d\mathcal{X} - \int_0^L \psi \left(\int_{\iota_1}^{\iota_2} \eta_2(\tau) \chi(\mathcal{X}, 1, \tau, \mathbf{t}) d\tau \right) d\mathcal{X}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

Using (3.7), Young's, Cauchy-Schwarz, Poincaré inequalities, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1 \int_0^L \phi_{\mathbf{t}} w_{\mathbf{t}} d\mathcal{X} &\leq \rho_1 \varepsilon_2 \int_0^L \phi_{\mathbf{t}}^2 d\mathcal{X} + \frac{\rho_1}{4\varepsilon_2} \int_0^L w_{\mathbf{t}}^2 d\mathcal{X} \\ &\leq \rho_1 \varepsilon_2 \int_0^L \phi_{\mathbf{t}}^2 d\mathcal{X} + \frac{\rho_1}{4\varepsilon_2} \int_0^L \psi_{\mathbf{t}}^2 d\mathcal{X}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_0^L \psi \left(\int_{\iota_1}^{\iota_2} |\eta_2(\tau) \chi(\mathcal{X}, 1, \tau, \mathbf{t})| d\tau \right) d\mathcal{X} \\ & \leq \delta_1 \int_0^L \psi_{\mathcal{X}}^2 d\mathcal{X} + \frac{\mu_1}{4\delta_1} \int_0^L \left(\int_{\iota_1}^{\iota_2} |\eta_2(\tau) \chi^2(\mathcal{X}, 1, \tau, \mathbf{t})| d\tau \right) d\mathcal{X}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^L |f(\psi)\psi| d\mathcal{X} &\leq \int_0^L |\psi|^\theta |\psi| |\psi| d\mathcal{X} \\ &\leq \|\psi\|_{2(\theta+1)}^\theta \|\psi\|_{2(\theta+1)} \|\psi\| \\ &\leq c_1 \int_0^L \psi_{\mathcal{X}}^2 d\mathcal{X}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

By substituting (3.11), (3.12), (3.13) in (3.10), recalling (2.5) and letting $\delta_1 = \frac{b}{2}$, we obtain (3.9). ■

Lemma 3.5. *The functional*

$$I_3(\mathbf{t}) := \rho_2 \int_0^L \psi_{\mathbf{t}}(\phi_{\mathcal{X}} + \psi) + \rho_2 \int_0^L \psi_{\mathcal{X}} \phi_{\mathbf{t}} d\mathcal{X},$$

satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dI_3(\mathbf{t})}{d\mathbf{t}} &\leq b [\psi_{\mathcal{X}} \phi_{\mathcal{X}}]_0^1 d\mathcal{X} + \left(\rho_2 + \frac{\mu_1^2}{k} \right) \int_0^L \psi_{\mathbf{t}}^2 d\mathcal{X} - \frac{k}{4} \int_0^L (\phi_{\mathcal{X}} + \psi)^2 d\mathcal{X} \\ & + c_1 \int_0^L \psi_{\mathcal{X}}^2 d\mathcal{X} + \frac{\mu_1}{k} \int_0^L \int_{\iota_1}^{\iota_2} |\eta_2(\tau) \chi^2(\mathcal{X}, 1, \tau, \mathbf{t})| d\tau d\mathcal{X} - \int_0^L \tilde{f}(\psi) d\mathcal{X} \\ & + \left(\frac{\rho_2 k - \rho_1 b}{\rho_1} \right) \int_0^L \psi_{\mathcal{X}} (\phi_{\mathcal{X}} + \psi)_{\mathcal{X}} d\mathcal{X}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

where c_1 is a positive constant.

Proof. By differentiation $I_3(\mathbf{t})$ and exploiting (2.1)₁, (2.1)₂, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dI_3(\mathbf{t})}{d\mathbf{t}} &= \rho_2 \int_0^L \psi_{\mathbf{t}\mathbf{t}}(\phi_{\mathcal{X}} + \psi) d\mathcal{X} + \rho_2 \int_0^L \psi_{\mathbf{t}}(\phi_{\mathcal{X}} + \psi)_{\mathbf{t}} d\mathcal{X} + \rho_2 \int_0^L \psi_{\mathcal{X}\mathbf{t}} \phi_{\mathbf{t}} d\mathcal{X} \\ & + \rho_2 \int_0^L \psi_{\mathcal{X}} \phi_{\mathbf{t}\mathbf{t}} d\mathcal{X} \\ & = b [\psi_{\mathcal{X}} \phi_{\mathcal{X}}]_0^1 + \rho_2 \int_0^L \psi_{\mathbf{t}}^2 d\mathcal{X} - k \int_0^L (\phi_{\mathcal{X}} + \psi)^2 d\mathcal{X} - \mu_1 \int_0^L \psi_{\mathbf{t}}(\phi_{\mathcal{X}} + \psi) d\mathcal{X} \\ & - \int_0^L \int_{\iota_1}^{\iota_2} \eta_2(\tau) (\phi_{\mathcal{X}} + \psi) \chi(\mathcal{X}, 1, \tau, \mathbf{t}) d\tau d\mathcal{X} - \int_0^L f(\psi)(\phi_{\mathcal{X}} + \psi) d\mathcal{X}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

By functional inequalities, we arrive at

$$\mu_1 \int_0^L |\psi_{\mathbf{t}}(\phi_{\varkappa} + \psi)| d\varkappa \leq \frac{k}{4} \int_0^L (\phi_{\varkappa} + \psi)^2 d\varkappa + \frac{\mu_1^2}{k} \int_0^L \psi_{\mathbf{t}}^2 d\varkappa, \quad (3.16)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^L (\phi_{\varkappa} + \psi) \int_{\iota_1}^{\iota_2} |\eta_2(\tau) \chi(\varkappa, 1, \tau, \mathbf{t})| d\tau d\varkappa \\ & \leq \frac{k}{4} \int_0^L (\phi_{\varkappa} + \psi)^2 d\varkappa + \frac{\mu_1^2}{k} \int_0^L \int_{\iota_1}^{\iota_2} |\eta_2(\tau)| \chi^2(\varkappa, 1, \tau, \mathbf{t}) d\tau d\varkappa, \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^L f(\psi)\phi_{\varkappa} d\varkappa & \leq \frac{\rho_0}{2b^2} \int_0^L \phi_{\varkappa}^2 d\varkappa + \frac{b^2}{2\rho_0\lambda_1} \int_0^L \psi_{\varkappa}^2 d\varkappa \\ & \leq \frac{\rho_0}{2b^2} \int_0^L (\phi_{\varkappa} + \psi)^2 d\varkappa + \frac{\rho_0}{2b^2} \int_0^L \psi^2 d\varkappa + \frac{b^2}{2\rho_0\lambda_1} \int_0^L \psi_{\varkappa}^2 d\varkappa \\ & \leq \frac{\rho_0}{2b^2} \int_0^L (\phi_{\varkappa} + \psi)^2 d\varkappa + \left(\frac{\rho_0}{2\lambda_1 b^2} + \frac{b^2}{2\rho_0\lambda_1} \right) \int_0^L \psi_{\varkappa}^2 d\varkappa. \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

Inserting (3.16)-(3.18) in (3.15) and letting $\rho_0 = \frac{1}{2}kb^2$, we obtain (3.14). ■

To manipulate the boundary terms appeared in (3.14), we introduce the function

$$q(\varkappa) = -4\varkappa + 2, \quad \varkappa \in (0, 1).$$

So, we were able to find the following result.

Lemma 3.6. *For any $\varepsilon_1 > 0$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} b[\psi_{\varkappa}\phi_{\varkappa}]_0^1 & \leq -\frac{b\rho_2}{4\varepsilon_1} \frac{d}{d\mathbf{t}} \int_0^L q\psi_{\mathbf{t}}\psi_{\varkappa} d\varkappa - \frac{\rho_1\varepsilon_1}{k} \frac{d}{d\mathbf{t}} \int_0^L q\phi_{\mathbf{t}}\phi_{\varkappa} d\varkappa + 3\varepsilon_1 \int_0^L \phi_{\varkappa}^2 d\varkappa \\ & + \left(\frac{2\rho_1\varepsilon_1}{k} + \frac{b\rho_2}{2\varepsilon_1} \right) \int_0^L \psi_{\mathbf{t}}^2 d\varkappa + \left(\frac{k^2\varepsilon_1^2}{4} + \frac{\varepsilon_1}{4b^2} \right) \int_0^L (\phi_{\varkappa} + \psi)^2 d\varkappa \\ & + \frac{b}{4\varepsilon_1} \int_0^L \int_{\iota_1}^{\iota_2} |\eta_2(\tau)| \chi^2(\varkappa, 1, \tau, \mathbf{t}) d\varkappa \\ & + \left(\frac{b^2}{2\varepsilon_1^2} + \frac{1}{4\lambda_1 b^2} + \frac{b^2}{8\varepsilon_1^2\lambda_1} + \frac{\mu_1 b}{4\varepsilon_1} + \frac{b^2}{4\varepsilon_1^3} + \varepsilon_1 \right) \int_0^L \psi_{\varkappa}^2 d\varkappa \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

Proof. Young's inequality gives easily for $\varepsilon_1 > 0$,

$$b[\psi_{\varkappa}\phi_{\varkappa}]_0^1 \leq \varepsilon_1 [\phi_{\varkappa}^2(1) + \phi_{\varkappa}^2(0)] + \frac{b^2}{4\varepsilon_1} [\psi_{\varkappa}^2(1) + \psi_{\varkappa}^2(0)], \quad (3.20)$$

we need the following fact

$$\frac{d}{d\mathbf{t}} \int_0^L b\rho_2 q\psi_{\mathbf{t}}\psi_{\varkappa} d\varkappa = b\rho_2 \int_0^L q\psi_{\mathbf{t}\mathbf{t}}\psi_{\varkappa} d\varkappa + b\rho_2 \int_0^L q\psi_{\mathbf{t}}\psi_{\varkappa\mathbf{t}} d\varkappa.$$

On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned}
 b\rho_2 \int_0^L q\psi_{\mathbf{t}\mathbf{t}}\psi_{\mathbf{x}}d\mathbf{x} &= b^2 \int_0^L q\psi_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}}\psi_{\mathbf{x}}d\mathbf{x} - kb \int_0^L q(\phi_{\mathbf{t}} + \psi)\psi_{\mathbf{x}}d\mathbf{x} \\
 &\quad - b \int_0^L \int_{\iota_1}^{\iota_2} q\psi_{\mathbf{x}}\eta_2(\tau)\chi(\mathbf{x}, 1, \tau, \mathbf{t})d\tau d\mathbf{x} - b \int_0^L qf(\psi)\phi_{\mathbf{x}}d\mathbf{x} \\
 &\leq -b^2 [\psi_{\mathbf{x}}^2(1) + \psi_{\mathbf{x}}^2(0)] + 2b^2 \int_0^L \psi_{\mathbf{x}}^2d\mathbf{x} \\
 &\quad + (k^2\varepsilon_1^2 + \frac{\varepsilon_1}{b^2}) \int_0^L (\phi_{\mathbf{x}} + \psi)^2d\mathbf{x} \\
 &\quad + (\frac{b^2}{\varepsilon_1^2} + \frac{\varepsilon_1}{2\lambda_1 b^2} + \frac{b^2}{2\varepsilon_1\lambda_1} + \mu_1 b) \int_0^L \psi_{\mathbf{x}}^2d\mathbf{x} \\
 &\quad + b \int_0^L \int_{\iota_1}^{\iota_2} |\eta_2(\tau)|\chi^2(\mathbf{x}, 1, \tau, \mathbf{t})d\tau d\mathbf{x}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

Therefore

$$b\rho_2 \int_0^L q\psi_{\mathbf{t}}\psi_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{t}}d\mathbf{x} = 2\rho_2 b \int_0^L \psi_{\mathbf{t}}^2d\mathbf{x}$$

Similarly

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^L \rho_1 q\phi_{\mathbf{t}}\phi_{\mathbf{x}}d\mathbf{x} &= \int_0^L q(\phi_{\mathbf{t}} + \psi)\phi_{\mathbf{x}}d\mathbf{x} + \int_0^L \rho_1 q\phi_{\mathbf{t}}\phi_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{t}}d\mathbf{x} \\
 &\leq -k [\phi_{\mathbf{x}}^2(1) + \phi_{\mathbf{x}}^2(0)] + 3k \int_0^L \phi_{\mathbf{x}}^2d\mathbf{x} \\
 &\quad + k \int_0^L \psi_{\mathbf{x}}^2d\mathbf{x} + 2\rho_1 \int_0^L \psi_{\mathbf{t}}^2d\mathbf{x}
 \end{aligned}$$

which gives us (3.19) by exploiting (3.20)-(3.21). ■

Lemma 3.7. ([13]) For $\eta_1 > 0$, the functional

$$I_4(\mathbf{t}) = \int_0^L \int_0^L \int_{\iota_1}^{\iota_2} \tau e^{-\tau\rho} |\eta_2(\tau)|\chi^2(\mathbf{x}, \rho, \tau, \mathbf{t})d\tau d\rho d\mathbf{x}, \tag{3.22}$$

satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{dI_4(\mathbf{t})}{dt} &\leq -\eta_1 \int_0^L \int_0^L \int_{\iota_1}^{\iota_2} \tau |\eta_2(\tau)|\chi^2(\mathbf{x}, \rho, \tau, \mathbf{t})d\tau d\rho d\mathbf{x} \\
 &\quad - \eta_1 \int_0^L \int_{\iota_1}^{\iota_2} |\eta_2(\tau)|\chi^2(\mathbf{x}, 1, \tau, \mathbf{t})d\tau d\mathbf{x} + \beta \int_0^L \phi_{\mathbf{t}}^2d\mathbf{x}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

where β is a positive constant.

Let $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{t})$ the Lyapunov functional given by

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{t}) = N\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{t}) + \frac{1}{8}I_1(\mathbf{t}) + N_1I_2(\mathbf{t}) + I_3(\mathbf{t}) + N_2I_4(\mathbf{t}), \tag{3.24}$$

where $N_1, N_2, N > 0$.

Lemma 3.8. *There exist $\beta_1, \beta_2 > 0$, such that $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{t})$ verifies*

$$\beta_1 \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{t}) \leq \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{t}) \leq \beta_2 \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{t}), \quad \forall \mathbf{t} \geq 0, \quad (3.25)$$

and

$$\mathcal{L}'(\mathbf{t}) \leq -\lambda_1 \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{t}) + \left(\frac{\rho_2 k - \rho_1 b}{\rho_1} \right) \int_0^L \psi_{\mathcal{X}}(\phi_{\mathcal{X}} + \psi)_{\mathcal{X}} d\mathcal{X}. \quad (3.26)$$

Proof. Let

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{t}) := N\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{t}) + \frac{1}{8}I_1(\mathbf{t}) + N_1 I_2(\mathbf{t}) + I_3(\mathbf{t}) + N_2 I_4(\mathbf{t}),$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{t}) - N\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{t})| &\leq \frac{\rho_1}{8} \int_0^L |\phi \phi_{\mathbf{t}}| d\mathcal{X} + \frac{\rho_2}{8} \int_0^L |\psi \psi_{\mathbf{t}}| d\mathcal{X} + \frac{\mu_1}{16} \int_0^L \psi^2 d\mathcal{X} \\ &\quad + N_1 \rho_2 \int_0^L |\psi_{\mathbf{t}} \psi| d\mathcal{X} + N_1 \rho_1 \int_0^L |\phi_{\mathbf{t}} w| d\mathcal{X} + N_1 \frac{\mu_1}{2} \int_0^L \psi^2 d\mathcal{X} \\ &\quad + \rho_2 \int_0^L |\psi_{\mathbf{t}}(\phi_{\mathcal{X}} + \psi)| d\mathcal{X} + \rho_2 \int_0^L |\psi_{\mathcal{X}} \phi_{\mathbf{t}}| d\mathcal{X} \\ &\quad + N_2 \int_0^L \int_0^L \int_{\iota_1}^{\iota_2} \tau e^{-\tau \rho} |\eta_2(\tau)| \chi^2(\mathcal{X}, \rho, \tau, \mathbf{t}) d\tau d\rho d\mathcal{X}. \end{aligned}$$

Exploiting some functional inequalities, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{t}) - N\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{t})| &\leq C \int_0^L \left(\psi_{\mathcal{X}}^2 + \psi_{\mathbf{t}}^2 + \phi_{\mathbf{t}}^2 + (\phi_{\mathcal{X}} + \psi)^2 \right) d\mathcal{X} \\ &\quad + \int_0^L \int_{\iota_1}^{\iota_2} \tau |\eta_2(\tau)| \chi^2(\mathcal{X}, 1, \tau, \mathbf{t}) d\tau d\mathcal{X} + \int_0^L \tilde{f}(\psi) d\mathcal{X} \\ &\leq C\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{t}), \end{aligned}$$

By (3.2), (3.5), (3.9), (3.14), (3.23) and (3.19), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{t})}{d\mathbf{t}} &= - \left(Nm_1 - N_1 \left(\frac{\rho_1}{4\varepsilon_2} + \rho_2 \right) - N_2 \mu_1 - \left(\rho_2 + \frac{\mu_1^2}{k} \right) - \left(\frac{2\rho_1 \varepsilon_1}{k} + \frac{b\rho_2}{2\varepsilon_1} \right) + \rho_2 \right) \int_0^L \psi_{\mathbf{t}}^2 d\mathcal{X} \\ &\quad - \left(\frac{b}{2} N_1 - \frac{c_0}{8} - \left(\frac{b^2}{2\varepsilon_1^2} + \frac{1}{4b^2} + \frac{b^2}{8\varepsilon_1^2} + \frac{\mu_1 b}{4\varepsilon_1} + \frac{b^2}{4\varepsilon_1^3} + \varepsilon_1 \right) \right) \int_0^L \psi_{\mathcal{X}}^2 d\mathcal{X} \\ &\quad - \left(\frac{k}{8} - \varepsilon_1 \left(k^2 \varepsilon_1 + \frac{1}{b^2} \right) \right) \int_0^L (\phi_{\mathcal{X}} + \psi)^2 d\mathcal{X} \\ &\quad - N_2 \beta \int_0^L \int_0^L \int_{\iota_1}^{\iota_2} \tau |\eta_2(\tau)| \chi^2(\mathcal{X}, \rho, \tau, \mathbf{t}) d\tau d\rho d\mathcal{X} \\ &\quad - \left(N_2 \beta - N_1 \frac{\mu_1}{4\varepsilon_2} - \frac{\mu_1}{32} - \frac{\mu_1}{k} - \frac{b}{4\varepsilon_1} \right) \int_0^L \int_{\iota_1}^{\iota_2} |\eta_2(\tau)| \chi^2(\mathcal{X}, 1, \tau, \mathbf{t}) d\tau d\mathcal{X} \\ &\quad - \left(\frac{\rho_1}{8} - \rho_1 \varepsilon_2 N_1 \right) \int_0^L \phi_{\mathbf{t}}^2 d\mathcal{X} \\ &\quad - (N_1 + 1) \int_0^L \tilde{f}(\psi) d\mathcal{X}, \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{\rho_2 k - \rho_1 b}{\rho_1} \right) \int_0^L \psi_{\mathcal{X}}(\phi_{\mathcal{X}} + \psi)_{\mathcal{X}} d\mathcal{X}. \end{aligned}$$

By setting $\varepsilon_2 = \frac{\rho_1}{16N_1}$, we get First, we choose ε_1 small to hold

$$\frac{k}{8} - \varepsilon_1 \left(k^2 \varepsilon_1 + \frac{1}{b^2} \right) > 0.$$

Choosing N_1 large to verify

$$\frac{b}{2} N_1 - \frac{c_0}{8} - \left(\frac{b^2}{2\varepsilon_1^2} + \frac{1}{4b^2} + \frac{b^2}{8\varepsilon_1^2} + \frac{\mu_1 b}{4\varepsilon_1} + \frac{b^2}{4\varepsilon_1^3} + \varepsilon_1 \right) > 0.$$

Then, we select N_2 large to satisfies

$$N_2 \beta - N_1 \frac{\mu_1}{4\varepsilon_2} - \frac{\mu_1}{32} - \frac{\mu_1}{k} - \frac{b}{4\varepsilon_1} > 0.$$

Choosing N large such that

$$Nm_1 - N_1 \left(\frac{\rho_1}{4\varepsilon_2} + \rho_2 \right) - N_2 \mu_1 - \left(\rho_2 + \frac{\mu_1^2}{k} \right) - \left(\frac{2\rho_1 \varepsilon_1}{k} + \frac{b\rho_2}{2\varepsilon_1} \right) + \rho_2 > 0,$$

and so that (3.25) remains valid. We obtain (3.26). ■

Here is the following polynomial stability result.

Lemma 3.9. *Let $\Phi = (\phi, \psi, \chi)$ be the solution of the system (2.1)–(2.2) and suppose that $\frac{k}{\rho_1} \neq \frac{b}{\rho_2}$ holds. Therefore, the solution (ϕ, ψ, χ) decays in polynomial manner, i.e. there exists $a > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbf{E}(t) \leq \frac{a}{t}, \quad t > 0.$$

Proof. Using (3.26) and (1)₁, we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}'(t) \leq -\lambda_1 \mathbf{E}(t) + \varsigma \int_0^L \psi_{\mathcal{X}} \phi_{tt} d\mathcal{X}, \quad (3.27)$$

where $\varsigma = \frac{k}{\rho_1} \left(\frac{\rho_2 k - \rho_1 b}{\rho_1} \right)$, and by applying Young's inequality, we get

$$\varsigma \int_0^L \psi_{\mathcal{X}} \phi_{tt} d\mathcal{X} \leq -\varsigma \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^L (\phi_{\mathcal{X}t} \psi - \phi_{\mathcal{X}} \psi_t) d\mathcal{X} + |\varsigma| \rho \int_0^L \phi_{\mathcal{X}}^2 d\mathcal{X} + \frac{|\varsigma|}{4\rho} \int_0^L \psi_{tt}^2 d\mathcal{X}, \quad \rho > 0. \quad (3.28)$$

Because

$$\int_0^L \phi_{\mathcal{X}}^2 d\mathcal{X} \leq 2 \int_0^L (\phi_{\mathcal{X}} + \psi)^2 d\mathcal{X} + 2 \int_0^L \psi^2 d\mathcal{X}, \quad (3.29)$$

we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma \int_0^L \psi_{\mathcal{X}} \phi_{tt} d\mathcal{X} &\leq -\varsigma \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^L (\phi_{\mathcal{X}t} \psi - \phi_{\mathcal{X}} \psi_t) d\mathcal{X} + C_0 |\varsigma| \rho \mathbf{E}(t) \\ &\quad + \frac{|\varsigma|}{4\rho} \int_0^L \psi_{tt}^2 d\mathcal{X}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.30)$$

By substituting (3.30) in (3.27) and letting $\rho = \frac{\lambda_1}{2C_0 |\varsigma|}$, the inequality becomes as

$$\mathcal{L}'(t) + \varsigma \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^L (\phi_{\mathcal{X}t} \psi - \phi_{\mathcal{X}} \psi_t) d\mathcal{X} \leq -\iota_1 \mathbf{E}(t) + \iota_2 \int_0^L \psi_{tt}^2 d\mathcal{X}, \quad \iota_1, \iota_2 > 0. \quad (3.31)$$

Now, let the functional

$$\mathcal{L}_1(\mathbf{t}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{t}) + \varsigma \int_0^L (\phi_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{t}}\psi - \phi_{\mathbf{x}}\psi_{\mathbf{t}}) d\mathbf{x} + N_3 (\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{t}) + \mathbf{E}_2(\mathbf{t})),$$

where $\mathbf{E}_2(\mathbf{t})$ is the second order energy of the problem (2.1)–(2.2) and we choice

$$N_3 > \max \left\{ \frac{2|\varsigma|}{K}, \frac{|\varsigma|}{\rho_2}, \frac{3|\varsigma|}{b}, \frac{\iota_2}{m_1} \right\}, \quad (3.32)$$

for that $\mathcal{L}_1(\mathbf{t})$ be equivalent to $\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{t}) + \mathbf{E}_2(\mathbf{t})$. Indeed,

$$|\mathcal{L}_1(\mathbf{t}) - N_3 (\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{t}) + \mathbf{E}_2(\mathbf{t}))| \leq \beta_2 \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{t}) + |\varsigma| \int_0^L |\phi_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{t}}\psi| d\mathbf{x} + |\varsigma| \int_0^L |\phi_{\mathbf{x}}\psi_{\mathbf{t}}| d\mathbf{x},$$

and by using some functional inequalities, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{L}_1(\mathbf{t}) - N_3 (\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{t}) + \mathbf{E}_2(\mathbf{t}))| &\leq \beta_2 \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{t}) + \frac{|\varsigma|}{2} \int_0^L \phi_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{t}}^2 d\mathbf{x} + \frac{|\varsigma|}{2} \int_0^L \psi^2 d\mathbf{x} \\ &\quad + \frac{|\varsigma|}{2} \int_0^L \phi_{\mathbf{x}}^2 d\mathbf{x} + \frac{|\varsigma|}{2} \int_0^L \psi_{\mathbf{t}}^2 d\mathbf{x}. \end{aligned}$$

It's easily to show that

$$|\mathcal{L}_1(\mathbf{t}) - N_3 (\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{t}) + \mathbf{E}_2(\mathbf{t}))| \leq \max \left\{ \frac{2|\varsigma|}{K}, \frac{|\varsigma|}{\rho_2}, \frac{3|\varsigma|}{b} \right\} (\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{t}) + \mathbf{E}_2(\mathbf{t})),$$

and by recalling (3.32), we deduce that

$$\mathcal{L}_1(\mathbf{t}) \sim \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{t}) + \mathbf{E}_2(\mathbf{t}).$$

By using (3.31) and because $\mathbf{E}'(\mathbf{t}) \leq 0$, we can conclude that

$$\mathcal{L}'_1(\mathbf{t}) \leq -\iota_1 \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{t}) - (N_3 m_1 - \iota_2) \int_0^L \psi_{\mathbf{t}\mathbf{t}}^2 d\mathbf{x},$$

the choice of N_3 given in (3.31) leads to

$$\mathcal{L}'_1(\mathbf{t}) \leq -\iota_1 \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{t}). \quad (3.33)$$

Integrating the inequation (3.33), we obtain

$$\iota_1 \int_0^{\mathbf{t}} \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t} \leq - \int_0^{\mathbf{t}} \mathcal{L}_1(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t},$$

and because $\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{t})$ is decreasing, we have

$$\iota_1 \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{t}) \mathbf{t} \leq \mathcal{L}_1(0),$$

which gives (3.33) by taking $a = \frac{\mathcal{L}_1(0)}{\iota_1}$. Which complete the proof. ■

4. Acknowledgement

The authors thank the referees for their good remarks to correct the paper.

Conflict of interest

There is no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] F. ALABAU-BOUSSOUIRA, Asymptotic behavior for Timoshenko beams subject to a single nonlinear feedback control, *NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.* **14** (2007), no. 5-6, 643–669.
- [2] D. S. ALMEIDA JÚNIOR, M L. SANTOS , J E.MUNOZ RIVERA, Stability to weakly dissipative Timoshenko systems.*Math Meth Appl Sci*, **36** (2013), (14): 1965–1976.
- [3] F. AMAR-KHODJA, A. BENABDALLAH, J. E. MUÑOZ RIVERA AND R. RACKE, Energy decay for Timoshenko systems of memory type, *J. Differential Equations* **194** (2003), no. 1, 82–115.
- [4] L. BOUZETTOUTA , F. HEBHOUB, K. GHENAM, S. BENFERDI, Exponential stability for a non linear Timoshenko system with distributed delay, *International Journal of Analysis and Applications*, **19**, (2021) (1), 77-90.
- [5] L. BOUZETTOUTA ET AL, Well-posedness and decay of solutions to Bresse system with internal distributed delay, *Int. J. Appl. Math. Stat.*, **56**(4)(2017): 1-12.
- [6] R. DATKO, Two questions concerning the boundary control of certain elastic systems, *J. Differential Equations*, **92** (1991), no. 1, 27–44.
- [7] R. DATKO, J. LAGNESE AND M. P. POLIS, An example on the effect of time delays in boundary feedback stabilization of wave equations, *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, **24** (1986), no. 1, 152–156.
- [8] B.W. FENG AND M. L. PELICER, Global existence and exponential stability for a nonlinear Timoshenko system with delay, *Bound. Value Probl.*, 2015 (2015), Article ID 206.
- [9] H. D. FERNÁNDEZ SARE AND R. RACKE, On the stability of damped Timoshenko systems: Cattaneo versus Fourier law, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **194** (2009), no. 1, 221–251.
- [10] A. GUESMIA AND S. A. MESSAOUDI, General energy decay estimates of Timoshenko systems with frictional versus viscoelastic damping, *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, **32** (2009), no. 16, 2102–2122.
- [11] A. GUESMIA AND S. A. MESSAOUDI, On the stabilization of Timoshenko systems with memory and different speeds of wave propagation, *Appl.Math.Comput.* **219** (2013), 9424–9437.
- [12] J. HAO, F. WANG, Energy decay in a Timoshenko-type system for thermoelasticity of type III with distributed delay and past history, *Electronic Journal of Differential Equations*, (2018) , no. 75, pp. 127.
- [13] H. E. KHOCHEMANE, L. BOUZETTOUTA, A. GUEROUAH, Exponential decay and well-posedness for a onedimensional porous-elastic system with distributed delay, *Appl. Anal.*, **100**, 2950–2964 (2021).
- [14] H. E. KHOCHEMANE, S. ZITOUNI AND L. BOUZETTOUTA, Stability result for a nonlinear damping porous-elastic system with delay term, *Nonlinear Studies*, **27**(2)(2020).
- [15] S.A. MESSAOUDI, A. FAREH, Energy decay in a Timoshenko-type system of thermoelasticity of type III with different wave-propagation speeds, *Arab. J. Math.* **2**. (2013) 199–207
- [16] S. A. MESSAOUDI, M. POKOJOVY AND B. SAID-HOUARI, Nonlinear damped Timoshenko systems with second sound – global existence and exponential stability, *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, **32** (2009), no. 5, 505–534.
- [17] S. NICAISE AND C. PIGNOTTI, Stability and instability results of the wave equation with a delay term in the boundary or internal feedbacks, *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **45** (2006), no. 5, 1561–1585.
- [18] S. NICAISE, C. PIGNOTTI, Stabilization of the wave equation with boundary or internal distributed delay. *Diff. Int. Eqns.*, **21**.(2008), 935–958.

- [19] J. E. MUÑOZ RIVERA AND R. RACKE, Timoshenko systems with indefinite damping, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **341** (2008), no. 2, 1068–1083.
- [20] J. E. MUÑOZ RIVERA AND H. D. FERNÁNDEZ SARE, Stability of Timoshenko systems with past history, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **339** (2008), no. 1, 482–502.
- [21] A. SOUFYANE AND A. WEHBE, Uniform stabilization for the Timoshenko beam by a locally distributed damping, *Electron. J. Differential Equations*, (2003), no. 29, 14 pp. 1–14.
- [22] B. SAID-HOUARI AND Y. LASKRI, A stability result of a Timoshenko system with a delay term in the internal feedback, *Appl. Math. Comput.*, **217** (2010), no. 6, 2857–2869.
- [23] M. L. SANTOS, D. S. ALMEIDA JÚNIOR AND J. E. MUÑOZ RIVERA, The stability number of the Timoshenko system with second sound, *J. Differential Equations*, **253** (2012), no. 9, 2715–2733.
- [24] S. TIMOSHENKO, On the correction for shear of the differential equation for transverse vibrations of prismatic-bars, *Philos. Mag.*, 41, 744–746 (1921).



This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.