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$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
A y+b(x) \cdot \nabla y+f(x, y)=u \text { in } \Omega \\
y=0 \text { on } \Gamma
\end{array}\right.
$$
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## Assumptions on the Linear Operator

- $\Omega$ is an open domain in $\mathbb{R}^{n}, n=2$ or 3 , with Lipschitz boundary $\Gamma$
- $A y=-\sum_{i, j=1}^{n} \partial_{x_{j}}\left(a_{i j}(x) \partial_{x_{i}} y\right)$ with $a_{i j} \in L^{\infty}(\Omega)$,
- $\exists \Lambda>0$ such that $\sum_{i, j=1}^{n} a_{i j}(x) \xi_{i} \xi_{j} \geq \Lambda|\xi|^{2} \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ and for a.a. $x \in \Omega$
- $b \in L^{p}(\Omega)$ for some $p$ to be fixed later
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Theorem. Let $b \in L^{p}(\Omega)^{n}$ with $p>n, a_{0} \in L^{q}(\Omega)$ with $q>1$ if $n=2$ and $q \geq \frac{3}{2}$ if $n=3$. Then, $\mathcal{A}: H_{0}^{1}(\Omega) \longrightarrow H^{-1}(\Omega)$ is an isomorphism.
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- Step 3: The general case.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f_{k}(x, y)=f\left(x, \operatorname{proj}_{[-k,+k]}(y)\right) \\
& A y_{k}+b(x) \cdot \nabla y_{k}+f_{k}\left(x, y_{k}\right)=u
\end{aligned}
$$
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& A y_{k}+b(x) \cdot \nabla y_{k}+f_{k}\left(x, y_{k}\right)=u \\
& A z_{1}+b(x) \cdot \nabla z_{1}+f\left(x, z_{1}^{+}\right)=u
\end{aligned}
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\begin{aligned}
& f_{k}(x, y)=f\left(x, \operatorname{proj}_{[-k,+k]}(y)\right) \\
& A y_{k}+b(x) \cdot \nabla y_{k}+f_{k}\left(x, y_{k}\right)=u \\
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& \Rightarrow z_{1} \leq y_{k} \quad \forall k \geq 1
\end{aligned}
$$
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& \Rightarrow z_{1} \leq y_{k} \quad \forall k \geq 1 \\
& A z_{2}+b(x) \cdot \nabla z_{2}=u-f\left(x,-\left\|z_{1}\right\|_{C(\bar{\Omega})}\right)
\end{aligned}
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- Step 3: The general case.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f_{k}(x, y)=f\left(x, \operatorname{proj}_{[-k,+k]}(y)\right) \\
& A y_{k}+b(x) \cdot \nabla y_{k}+f_{k}\left(x, y_{k}\right)=u \\
& A z_{1}+b(x) \cdot \nabla z_{1}+f\left(x, z_{1}^{+}\right)=u \\
& A z_{1}+b(x) \cdot \nabla z_{1}+f_{k}\left(x, z_{1}\right)=u+f_{k}\left(x, z_{1}\right)-f\left(x, z_{1}^{+}\right) \leq u \\
& \Rightarrow z_{1} \leq y_{k} \quad \forall k \geq 1 \\
& A z_{2}+b(x) \cdot \nabla z_{2}=u-f\left(x,-\left\|z_{1}\right\|_{C(\bar{\Omega})}\right) \\
& A\left(z_{2}-y_{k}\right)+b(x) \cdot \nabla\left(z_{2}-y_{k}\right)=f_{k}\left(x, y_{k}\right)-f\left(x,-\left\|z_{1}\right\|_{C(\bar{\Omega})}\right) \geq 0 \\
& \Rightarrow y_{k} \leq z_{2} \Rightarrow\left\|y_{k}\right\|_{C(\bar{\Omega})} \leq \max \left\{\left\|z_{1}\right\|_{C(\bar{\Omega})},\left\|z_{2}\right\|_{C(\bar{\Omega})}\right\} \\
& f_{k}\left(x, y_{k}\right)=f\left(x, y_{k}\right) \quad \forall k \geq \max \left\{\left\|z_{1}\right\|_{C(\bar{\Omega})},\left\|z_{2}\right\|_{C(\bar{\Omega})}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$
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## Continuity of $u \rightarrow y$ and regularity of $y$

Theorem. Let $\left\{u_{k}\right\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \subset L^{\bar{p}}(\Omega)$ with $\bar{p}>\frac{n}{2}$ be a sequence weakly converging to $u$ in $L^{\bar{p}}(\Omega)$. Then, $y_{u_{k}} \rightarrow y_{u}$ strongly in $H_{0}^{1}(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$, where $y_{u_{k}}$ is the solution of the semilinear equation associated to $u_{k}$.
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## Continuity of $u \rightarrow y$ and regularity of $y$

Theorem. Let $\left\{u_{k}\right\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \subset L^{\bar{p}}(\Omega)$ with $\bar{p}>\frac{n}{2}$ be a sequence weakly converging to $u$ in $L^{\bar{p}}(\Omega)$. Then, $y_{u_{k}} \rightarrow y_{u}$ strongly in $H_{0}^{1}(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$, where $y_{u_{k}}$ is the solution of the semilinear equation associated to $u_{k}$.

Theorem. Suppose that assumption on $f$ holds with $\bar{p}=2, a_{i j} \in$ $C^{0,1}(\bar{\Omega})$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, and $b \in L^{p}(\Omega)^{n}$ with $p>2$ if $n=2$ and $p>6$ if $n=3$. We also suppose that $\Gamma$ is of class $C^{1,1}$ or $\Omega$ is convex. Then, for every $u \in L^{2}(\Omega)$ the state equation has a unique solution $y_{u} \in H^{2}(\Omega) \cap H_{0}^{1}(\Omega)$.

## New Trends in PDE Constrained Optimization

## Existence of solution of (P)

- We recall that
(P) $\min _{u \in \mathcal{Y}_{a d}} J(u):=\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega}\left(y_{u}(x)-y_{d}(x)\right)^{2} d x+\frac{\nu}{2} \int_{\Omega} u^{2}(x) d x \quad(\nu>0)$


## New Trends in PDE Constrained Optimization

## Existence of solution of (P)

- We recall that
(P) $\min _{u \in \mathcal{U}_{a d}} J(u):=\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega}\left(y_{u}(x)-y_{d}(x)\right)^{2} d x+\frac{\nu}{2} \int_{\Omega} u^{2}(x) d x \quad(\nu>0)$

Theorem. The control problem (P) has at least one solution $\bar{u}$.
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Differentiability Assumptions on $f$
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## Differentiability Assumptions on $f$

- $f: \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is of class $C^{2}$ w.r.t. the second variable
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- $f: \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is of class $C^{2}$ w.r.t. the second variable
- $f(\cdot, 0) \in L^{\bar{p}}(\Omega)$ with $\bar{p}>\frac{n}{2}$ and $\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x, y) \geq 0$ a.e. in $\Omega$ and $\forall y \in \mathbb{R}$
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## Differentiability Assumptions on $f$

- $f: \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is of class $C^{2}$ w.r.t. the second variable
- $f(\cdot, 0) \in L^{\bar{p}}(\Omega)$ with $\bar{p}>\frac{n}{2}$ and $\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x, y) \geq 0$ a.e. in $\Omega$ and $\forall y \in \mathbb{R}$
- $\forall M>0 \exists C_{f, M}:\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x, y)\right|+\left|\frac{\partial^{2} f}{\partial y^{2}}(x, y)\right| \leq C_{f, M} \forall|y| \leq M$
- $\left\{\begin{array}{l}\forall M>0 \text { and } \forall \varepsilon>0 \exists \delta>0 \text { such that } \\ \left|\frac{\partial^{2} f}{\partial y^{2}}\left(x, y_{2}\right)-\frac{\partial^{2} f}{\partial y^{2}}\left(x, y_{1}\right)\right|<\varepsilon \text { if }\left|y_{1}\right|,\left|y_{2}\right| \leq M,\left|y_{2}-y_{1}\right| \leq \delta\end{array}\right.$
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## New Trends in PDE Constrained Optimization

## Differentiability of the Mapping $u \rightarrow y_{u}$

Given $\hat{p}>\frac{n}{2}$, let us denote $G: L^{\hat{p}}(\Omega) \longrightarrow Y=H_{0}^{1}(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ the mapping associating with each control the state $G(u)=y_{u}$.
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Theorem. The control-to-state mapping $G$ is of class $C^{2}$
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## Differentiability of the Mapping $u \rightarrow y_{u}$

Given $\hat{p}>\frac{n}{2}$, let us denote $G: L^{\hat{p}}(\Omega) \longrightarrow Y=H_{0}^{1}(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ the mapping associating with each control the state $G(u)=y_{u}$.

Theorem. The control-to-state mapping $G$ is of class $C^{2}$ and for every $u, v \in L^{\hat{p}}(\Omega)$, we have that $z_{v}=G^{\prime}(u) v$ is the solution of

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
A z+b(x) \cdot \nabla z+\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}\left(x, y_{u}\right) z=v \text { in } \Omega \\
z=0 \text { on } \Gamma
\end{array}\right.
$$
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## Differentiability of the Mapping $u \rightarrow y_{u}$

Given $\hat{p}>\frac{n}{2}$, let us denote $G: L^{\hat{p}}(\Omega) \longrightarrow Y=H_{0}^{1}(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ the mapping associating with each control the state $G(u)=y_{u}$.

Theorem. The control-to-state mapping $G$ is of class $C^{2}$ and for every $u, v \in L^{\hat{p}}(\Omega)$, we have that $z_{v}=G^{\prime}(u) v$ is the solution of

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
A z+b(x) \cdot \nabla z+\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}\left(x, y_{u}\right) z=v \text { in } \Omega \\
z=0 \text { on } \Gamma
\end{array}\right.
$$

and for $v, w \in L^{\hat{p}}(\Omega), z_{v, w}=G^{\prime \prime}(u)(v, w)$ solves the equation

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
A z+b(x) \cdot \nabla z+\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}\left(x, y_{u}\right) z+\frac{\partial^{2} f}{\partial y^{2}}\left(x, y_{u}\right) z_{v} z_{w}=0 \text { in } \Omega \\
z=0 \text { on } \Gamma
\end{array}\right.
$$
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## New Trends in PDE Constrained Optimization

## Analysis of the Cost Functional

Theorem. The functional $J: L^{2}(\Omega) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is of class $C^{2}$.
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## New Trends in PDE Constrained Optimization

## Analysis of the Cost Functional

Theorem. The functional $J: L^{2}(\Omega) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is of class $C^{2}$. Moreover, given $u, v, v_{1}, v_{2} \in L^{2}(\Omega)$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& J^{\prime}(u) v=\int_{\Omega}\left(\varphi_{u}+\nu u\right) v d x \\
& J^{\prime \prime}(u)\left(v_{1}, v_{2}\right)=\int_{\Omega}\left[1-\varphi_{u} \frac{\partial^{2} f}{\partial y^{2}}\left(x, y_{u}\right)\right] z_{v_{1}} z_{v_{2}} d x+\nu \int_{\Omega} v_{1} v_{2} d x
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\varphi_{u} \in H_{0}^{1}(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ is the unique solution of the adjoint equation

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
A^{*} \varphi-\operatorname{div}[b(x) \varphi]+\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}\left(x, y_{u}\right) \varphi=y_{u}-y_{d} \text { in } \Omega \\
\varphi=0 \text { on } \Gamma
\end{array}\right.
$$
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## Local Solutions
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## Local Solutions

Definition. We say that $\bar{u} \in \mathcal{U}_{a d}$ is an $L^{r}(\Omega)$-weak local minimum of (P), with $r \in[1,+\infty]$, if there exists some $\varepsilon>0$ such that

$$
J(\bar{u}) \leq J(u) \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{U}_{a d} \text { with }\|\bar{u}-u\|_{L^{r}(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon .
$$
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J(\bar{u}) \leq J(u) \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{U}_{a d} \text { with }\|\bar{u}-u\|_{L^{r}(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon .
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An element $\bar{u} \in \mathcal{U}_{a d}$ is said a strong local minimum of $(\mathrm{P})$ if there exists some $\varepsilon>0$ such that

$$
J(\bar{u}) \leq J(u) \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{U}_{a d} \text { with }\left\|y_{\bar{u}}-y_{u}\right\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon
$$
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## Local Solutions

Definition. We say that $\bar{u} \in \mathcal{U}_{a d}$ is an $L^{r}(\Omega)$-weak local minimum of (P), with $r \in[1,+\infty]$, if there exists some $\varepsilon>0$ such that

$$
J(\bar{u}) \leq J(u) \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{U}_{a d} \text { with }\|\bar{u}-u\|_{L^{r}(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon
$$

An element $\bar{u} \in \mathcal{U}_{a d}$ is said a strong local minimum of $(\mathrm{P})$ if there exists some $\varepsilon>0$ such that

$$
J(\bar{u}) \leq J(u) \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{U}_{a d} \text { with }\left\|y_{\bar{u}}-y_{u}\right\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon .
$$

We say that $\bar{u} \in \mathcal{U}_{a d}$ is a strict (weak or strong) local minimum if the above inequalities are strict for $u \neq \bar{u}$.
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## New Trends in PDE Constrained Optimization

## I - Relationships among these Notions

- If $\mathcal{U}_{a d}$ is bounded in $L^{2}(\Omega)$, then

1. $\bar{u}$ is an $L^{1}(\Omega)$-weak local minimum of $(\mathrm{P})$ if and only if it is an $L^{r}(\Omega)$-weak local minimum of $(\mathrm{P})$ for every $r \in(1,+\infty)$.
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- If $\mathcal{U}_{a d}$ is bounded in $L^{2}(\Omega)$, then

1. $\bar{u}$ is an $L^{1}(\Omega)$-weak local minimum of $(\mathrm{P})$ if and only if it is an $L^{r}(\Omega)$-weak local minimum of (P) for every $r \in(1,+\infty)$.
2. If $\bar{u}$ is an $L^{r}(\Omega)$-weak local minimum of ( P$)$ for some $r<+\infty$, then it is an $L^{\infty}(\Omega)$-weak local minimum of $(\mathrm{P})$.
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- If $\mathcal{U}_{a d}$ is bounded in $L^{2}(\Omega)$, then

1. $\bar{u}$ is an $L^{1}(\Omega)$-weak local minimum of $(\mathrm{P})$ if and only if it is an $L^{r}(\Omega)$-weak local minimum of $(\mathrm{P})$ for every $r \in(1,+\infty)$.
2. If $\bar{u}$ is an $L^{r}(\Omega)$-weak local minimum of ( P$)$ for some $r<+\infty$, then it is an $L^{\infty}(\Omega)$-weak local minimum of $(\mathrm{P})$.
3. $\bar{u}$ is a strong local minimum of $(\mathrm{P})$ if and only if it is an $L^{r}(\Omega)$-weak local minimum of $(\mathrm{P})$ for all $r \in[1, \infty)$.
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## New Trends in PDE Constrained Optimization

## II - Relationships among these Notions

- If $\mathcal{U}_{a d}$ is not bounded in $L^{2}(\Omega)$, then

1. If $\bar{u}$ is an $L^{2}(\Omega)$-weak local solution, then $\bar{u}$ is an $L^{1}(\Omega)$-weak local solution.


## New Trends in PDE Constrained Optimization

## II - Relationships among these Notions

- If $\mathcal{U}_{a d}$ is not bounded in $L^{2}(\Omega)$, then

1. If $\bar{u}$ is an $L^{2}(\Omega)$-weak local solution, then $\bar{u}$ is an $L^{1}(\Omega)$-weak local solution.
2. If $\bar{u}$ is an $L^{p}(\Omega)$-weak local solution, then $\bar{u}$ is an $L^{q}(\Omega)$-weak local solution for every $p<q \leq \infty$.
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## II - Relationships among these Notions

- If $\mathcal{U}_{a d}$ is not bounded in $L^{2}(\Omega)$, then

1. If $\bar{u}$ is an $L^{2}(\Omega)$-weak local solution, then $\bar{u}$ is an $L^{1}(\Omega)$-weak local solution.
2. If $\bar{u}$ is an $L^{p}(\Omega)$-weak local solution, then $\bar{u}$ is an $L^{q}(\Omega)$-weak local solution for every $p<q \leq \infty$.
3. $\bar{u}$ is an $L^{2}(\Omega)$-weak local solution if and only if it is a strong local solution.

## New Trends in PDE Constrained Optimization

## First Order Optimality Conditions
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## New Trends in PDE Constrained Optimization

## First Order Optimality Conditions

Theorem. Let $\bar{u}$ be a local solution of $(\mathrm{P})$ in any of the previous senses, then there exist two unique elements $\bar{y}, \bar{\varphi} \in H_{0}^{1}(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\{\begin{array}{l}
A \bar{y}+b(x) \cdot \nabla \bar{y}+f(x, \bar{y})=\bar{u} \text { in } \Omega, \\
\bar{y}=0 \text { on } \Gamma,
\end{array}\right. \\
& \left\{\begin{array}{l}
A^{*} \bar{\varphi}-\operatorname{div}[b(x) \bar{\varphi}]+\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x, \bar{y}) \bar{\varphi}=\bar{y}-y_{d} \text { in } \Omega, \\
\bar{\varphi}=0 \text { on } \Gamma,
\end{array}\right. \\
& \int_{\Omega}(\bar{\varphi}+\nu \bar{u})(u-\bar{u}) d x \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{U}_{a d}
\end{aligned}
$$
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A^{*} \bar{\varphi}-\operatorname{div}[b(x) \bar{\varphi}]+\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x, \bar{y}) \bar{\varphi}=\bar{y}-y_{d} \text { in } \Omega, \\
\bar{\varphi}=0 \text { on } \Gamma,
\end{array}\right. \\
& \int_{\Omega}(\bar{\varphi}+\nu \bar{u})(u-\bar{u}) d x \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{U}_{a d}
\end{aligned}
$$

Moreover, $\bar{u} \in H^{1}(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ holds.
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-Cone of critical directions:
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C_{\bar{u}}=\left\{v \in L^{2}(\Omega): J^{\prime}(\bar{u}) v=0 \text { and } v(x)\left\{\begin{array}{l}
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$$
J(\bar{u})+\frac{\kappa}{2}\|u-\bar{u}\|_{2}^{2} \leq J(u) \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{U}_{a d}:\left\|y_{u}-\bar{y}\right\|_{L^{\infty}(Q)} \leq \varepsilon
$$

Theorem Let $\bar{u} \in \mathcal{U}_{a d}$. Then $J^{\prime \prime}(\bar{u}) v^{2}>0 \forall v \in C_{\bar{u}} \backslash\{0\}$ if and only if there exists $\delta>0$ such that $J^{\prime \prime}(\bar{u}) v^{2} \geq \delta\|v\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} \forall v \in C_{\bar{u}}$.
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- Let $\left\{\mathcal{T}_{h}\right\}_{h>0}$ be a quasi-uniform family of triangulations of $\bar{\Omega}$.
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- Let $\left\{\mathcal{T}_{h}\right\}_{h>0}$ be a quasi-uniform family of triangulations of $\bar{\Omega}$.
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\begin{aligned}
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& a\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)=\left\langle\mathcal{A} y_{1}, y_{2}\right\rangle_{H^{-1}(\Omega), H_{0}^{1}(\Omega)} \\
& =\int_{\Omega}\left(\sum_{i, j=1}^{n} a_{i j}(x) \partial_{x_{i}} y_{1} \partial_{x_{j}} y_{2}+\left[b(x) \cdot \nabla y_{1}\right] y_{2}\right) d x .
\end{aligned}
$$

$\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text { Find } y_{h} \in Y_{h} \text { such that } \\ a\left(y_{h}, z_{h}\right)+\int_{\Omega} f\left(x, y_{h}(x)\right) z_{h}(x) d x=\int_{\Omega} u(x) z_{h}(x) d x \quad \forall z_{h} \in Y_{h} .\end{array}\right.$
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## New Trends in PDE Constrained Optimization

## Numerical Analysis of the Linear Equa-

 tionTheorem [Schatz, 1974]. Let $a_{0} \in L^{2}(\Omega)$ be a nonnegative function. There exists $h_{\mathcal{A}}>0$ depending on $\mathcal{A}$ and $\left\|a_{0}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}$ such that the variational problem

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\text { Find } y_{h} \in Y_{h} \text { such that } \\
a\left(y_{h}, z_{h}\right)+\int_{\Omega} a_{0}(x) y_{h}(x) z_{h}(x) d x=\int_{\Omega} u(x) z_{h}(x) d x \forall z_{h} \in Y_{h}
\end{array}\right.
$$

has a unique solution for every $h \leq h_{\mathcal{A}}$ and for every $u \in L^{2}(\Omega)$. Moreover, there exists a constant $C_{\mathcal{A}, a_{0}}$ such that

$$
\left\|y_{h}\right\|_{H_{0}^{1}(\Omega)} \leq C_{\mathcal{A}, a_{0}}\left\|\mathcal{A}^{-1} u\right\|_{H_{0}^{1}(\Omega)} \quad \forall h \leq h_{\mathcal{A}} .
$$
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 tionTheorem. Let us assume that

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
f(\cdot, 0) \in L^{2}(\Omega) \text { and } \forall M>0 \exists L_{f, M} \text { such that } \\
\left|f\left(x, y_{2}\right)-f\left(x, y_{1}\right)\right| \leq L_{f, M}\left|y_{2}-y_{1}\right| \forall\left|y_{i}\right| \leq M, i=1,2 .
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$\forall M \geq 1+\|y\|_{C(\bar{\Omega})} \exists h_{M}>0$ such that for every $h<h_{M}$ the discrete equation has a unique solution $y_{h}$ satisfying $\left\|y_{h}\right\|_{C(\bar{\Omega})} \leq M$.

## New Trends in PDE Constrained Optimization

## Numerical Analysis of the Semilinear Equ

 tionTheorem. Let us assume that

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
f(\cdot, 0) \in L^{2}(\Omega) \text { and } \forall M>0 \exists L_{f, M} \text { such that } \\
\left|f\left(x, y_{2}\right)-f\left(x, y_{1}\right)\right| \leq L_{f, M}\left|y_{2}-y_{1}\right| \forall\left|y_{i}\right| \leq M, i=1,2 .
\end{array}\right.
$$
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\begin{aligned}
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Further, if there exist other solutions $\left\{\tilde{y}_{h}\right\}_{h<h_{M}}$ with $y_{h} \neq \tilde{y}_{h}$ for all $h$, then $\lim _{h \rightarrow 0}\left\|\tilde{y}_{h}\right\|_{C(\bar{\Omega})}=\infty$.
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## A Discrete Mapping $u_{h} \rightarrow y_{h}$

Theorem. Let $\bar{y} \in Y$ be the solution of state equation corresponding to the control $\bar{u} \in L^{2}(\Omega)$. Given $\rho>0$ arbitrary, there exist $\rho^{*}>0$ and $h_{0}>0$ such that the discrete equation has a unique solution $y_{h}(u) \in$ $\bar{B}_{\rho^{*}}^{Y}(\bar{y})$ for every $u \in \bar{B}_{\rho}(\bar{u}) \subset L^{2}(\Omega)$ and for all $h<h_{0}$, where

$$
B_{\rho^{*}}^{Y}(\bar{y})=\left\{y \in Y:\|y-\bar{y}\|_{Y} \leq \rho^{*}\right\} .
$$

Furthermore, there exist constants $K$ and $K_{\infty}$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\|y_{u}-y_{h}(u)\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}+h\left\|y_{u}-y_{h}(u)\right\|_{H_{0}^{1}(\Omega)} \leq K\left(\|\bar{u}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}+\rho+1\right) h^{2} \\
& \left\|y_{u}-y_{h}(u)\right\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \leq K_{\infty}\left(\|\bar{u}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}+\rho+1\right) h^{2-\frac{n}{2}} \forall u \in \bar{B} \rho(\bar{u})
\end{aligned}
$$
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## Numerical Approximation of (P)

| 44 |
| :---: |
| - |
| 4 |
| - |
| Back |
| Close |

## New Trends in PDE Constrained Optimization

## Numerical Approximation of (P)

- Let us define $\mathcal{J}: L^{2}(\Omega) \times L^{2}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$
\mathcal{J}(y, u)=\frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega}\left(y(x)-y_{d}(x)\right)^{2} d x+\frac{\nu}{2} \int_{\Omega} u^{2} d x
$$
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- We set $\mathcal{U}_{h, a d}=\mathcal{U}_{h} \cap \mathcal{U}_{a d}$.
- We approximate Problem (P) by the problem
$\left(\mathcal{P}_{h}\right) \min \left\{\mathcal{J}\left(y_{h}, u_{h}\right):\left(y_{h}, u_{h}\right) \in Y_{h} \times \mathcal{U}_{h, a d}\right.$ satisfies the discrete equation $\}$
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## New Trends in PDE Constrained Optimization

## Convergence of $\left(\mathcal{P}_{h}\right)$ to (P)

Theorem. There exists $h_{0}>0$ such that problem $\left(\mathcal{P}_{h}\right)$ has at least one solution $\left(\bar{y}_{h}, \bar{u}_{h}\right)$ for all $h<h_{0}$.
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Theorem. There exists $h_{0}>0$ such that problem $\left(\mathcal{P}_{h}\right)$ has at least one solution $\left(\bar{y}_{h}, \bar{u}_{h}\right)$ for all $h<h_{0}$. Moreover, if $\left\{\left(\bar{y}_{h}, \bar{u}_{h}\right)\right\}_{h<h_{0}}$ is a sequence of solutions of problems $\left(\mathcal{P}_{h}\right)$, then it is bounded in $H_{0}^{1}(\Omega) \times L^{2}(\Omega)$ and there exist subsequences converging weakly in $H_{0}^{1}(\Omega) \times L^{2}(\Omega)$. In addition, if a subsequence, denoted in the same way, satisfies that $\left(\bar{y}_{h}, \bar{u}_{h}\right) \rightharpoonup(\bar{y}, \bar{u})$ in $H_{0}^{1}(\Omega) \times L^{2}(\Omega)$ as $h \rightarrow 0$, then $(\bar{y}, \bar{u}) \in Y \times \mathcal{U}_{a d}, \bar{u}$ is a solution of $(\mathrm{P})$ with associated stated $\bar{y}$, and $\left(\bar{y}_{h}, \bar{u}_{h}\right) \rightarrow(\bar{y}, \bar{u})$ strongly in $H_{0}^{1}(\Omega) \times L^{2}(\Omega)$.
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## Error Estimates

Theorem. Let $\bar{u} \in L^{2}(\Omega)$ be a local minimizer of $(\mathrm{P})$ satisfying the sufficient second order optimality conditions and let $\left\{\bar{u}_{h}\right\}$ be the sequence of minimizers of the problems $\left(\mathcal{P}_{h}\right)$ described in the above theorem. Then, there exists $h_{0}>0$ such that

- If $\mathcal{U}_{a d} \subsetneq L^{2}(\Omega)$, then

$$
\left\|\bar{u}-\bar{u}_{h}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \leq C h . \quad \forall h<h_{0}
$$

## New Trends in PDE Constrained Optimization

## Error Estimates

Theorem. Let $\bar{u} \in L^{2}(\Omega)$ be a local minimizer of $(\mathrm{P})$ satisfying the sufficient second order optimality conditions and let $\left\{\bar{u}_{h}\right\}$ be the sequence of minimizers of the problems $\left(\mathcal{P}_{h}\right)$ described in the above theorem. Then, there exists $h_{0}>0$ such that

- If $\mathcal{U}_{a d} \subsetneq L^{2}(\Omega)$, then

$$
\left\|\bar{u}-\bar{u}_{h}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \leq C h . \quad \forall h<h_{0}
$$

- If $\mathcal{U}_{a d}=L^{2}(\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{U}_{h}=\mathcal{U}_{h}^{i}, i=0,1$, then

$$
\left\|\bar{u}-\bar{u}_{h}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \leq C h^{1+i} \quad \forall h<h_{0}
$$
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