TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT WIEN

Operations Research and Control Systems

SWM ORCOS

On the strong subregularity of the optimality mapping in an optimal control problem with pointwise inequality control constraints

N.P. Osmolovskii, V.M. Veliov

Research Report 2022-03

June 2022

ISSN 2521-313X

Operations Research and Control Systems
Institute of Statistics and Mathematical Methods in Economics
Vienna University of Technology

Research Unit ORCOS
Wiedner Hauptstraße 8 / E105-04
1040 Vienna, Austria
E-mail: orcos@tuwien.ac.at

On the strong subregularity of the optimality mapping in an optimal control problem with pointwise inequality control constraints *

N.P. Osmolovskii† V.M. Veliov‡

Abstract

This paper presents sufficient conditions for strong metric subregularity (SMsR) of the optimality mapping associated with the local Pontryagin maximum principle for Mayer-type optimal control problems with pointwise control constraints given by a finite number of inequalities $G_j(u) \le 0$. It is assumed that all data are twice smooth, and that at each feasible point the gradients $G'_j(u)$ of the active constraints are linearly independent. The main result is that the second-order sufficient optimality condition for a weak local minimum is also sufficient for a version of the SMSR property, which involves two norms in the control space in order to deal with the so-called two-norm-discrepancy. A detailed direct proof is given, which does not rely on abstract results.

Keywords: optimization, optimal control, Mayer's problem, control constraint, metric subregularity

AMS Classification: 49K40, 90C31

1 Introduction

This paper contributes to the analysis of Lipschitz stability with respect to perturbations of the following Mayer type optimal control problem:

$$\text{minimize} \quad J(x,u) := F(x(0), x(1)), \tag{1}$$

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(x(t), u(t)) \quad \text{a.e. in} \quad [0,1], \tag{2}$$

$$G(u(t)) \le 0 \quad \text{a.e. in} \quad [0,1], \tag{3}$$

where $F : \mathbb{R}^{2n} \to \mathbb{R}$, $f : \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \to \mathbb{R}^n$, and $G : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^k$ are of class C^2, $u \in L^\infty$, $x \in W^{1,1}$. More precisely, we investigate the property of *Strong Metric subRegularity* (SMsR) of the so-called *optimality mapping*, associated with the system of first order necessary optimality conditions (Pontryagin's conditions in local form) for problem (1)–(3). These optimality conditions may have various forms. In this paper we deal with the representation using the augmented Hamiltonian,

*This research is supported by the Austrian Science Foundation (FWF) under grant P 31400-N32.

†Systems Research Institute, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland osmolov@ibspan.waw.pl

‡Institute of Statistics and Mathematical Methods in Economics, TU Wien, Austria, vladimir.veliov@tuwien.ac.at

where the control constraints are included with corresponding Lagrange multipliers (see next section for a detailed formulation).

In general, the local Potryagin principle can be written in the form of a generalized equation (also called *optimality system*)

$$0 \in \Phi(y),$$

where y incorporates the state, control, adjoint variables, and possibly the Lagrange multipliers associated with the control constraints. In this general setting, y belongs to a metric space (Y, d_Y) and the image of Φ is contained in another metric space (Z, d_Z). Each of these spaces is endowed with an additional metric: d_{Y° in Y, and d_{Z° in Z.

The definition of strong metric subregularity of the mapping Φ that we use is a slight (however substantial) extension of the standard one, introduced under this name in [8], also see [9, Chapter 3.9] and the recent paper [6]. The difference is, that the definition below involves the four metrics, d_Y, d_{Y° in Y, and d_Z, d_{Z° in Z, instead of a single metric in each of the two spaces.

Definition 1.1 *The set-valued mapping $\Phi : Y \rightrightarrows Z$ is* strongly metrically subregular *(SMsR) at $(\hat{y}, \hat{z}) \in Y \times Z$ if $\hat{z} \in \Phi(\hat{y})$ and there exist number $\kappa \geq 0$ and neighborhoods B_Y of $\hat{y}$ in the metric d_{Y° and B_z of $\hat{z}$ in the metric d_{Z°, such that for any $z \in B_Z$ and any solution $y \in B_Y$ of the inclusion $z \in \Phi(y)$, it holds that $d_Y(y, \hat{y}) \leq \kappa\, d_Z(z, \hat{z})$.*

Versions of the SMsR property have also been introduced and utilized in [3, 5, 10]. Metric regularity properties with two norms in the space Z (a Banach space) are first introduced in [19], while utilization of two metrics in Y, in relation with the SMsR property, is important in [2]. It is well recognized that the SMsR of the optimality mapping in optimal control is a key property for ensuring convergence with error estimates of numerous methods for solving optimal control problems: discretization methods, gradient methods, Newton-type methods, etc. (see e.g. ([3, 18, 6], in addition to a large number of papers where the SMsR property is implicitly used).

The SMsR property of the optimality mapping associated with optimal control problems has been investigated and used in several papers, e.g. [1, 18, 17, 7]. However, the sufficient conditions obtained in these papers require various kinds of coercivity conditions for a quadratic form defined by the second derivatives of the (augmented) Hamiltonian. These conditions have to be satisfied for *all* (sufficiently small) admissible variations of the reference solution of the optimality system. In the present paper, we require coercivity of this quadratic form on an *extended critical cone* only, which is a subset of the set of all admissible variations. Namely, we establish that the known second-order sufficient optimality conditions for problem (1)–(3) (in terms of the extended critical cone) are also sufficient for SMsR. This makes the conditions for SMsR close to those in mathematical programming. A remarkable additional result is that in the second-order sufficient optimality conditions, the extended critical cone can be replaced with the usual critical cone, provided that a point-wise Legendre-type condition is satisfied. Moreover, we show that the converse is also true: the latter condition together with coercivity of the quadratic form on the critical cone implies coercivity on the extended critical cone.

Another feature of the present paper is that the proofs are direct and not based on abstract results.

In Section 2 we introduce some basic notations and assumptions. In Section 3 we define the extended critical cone and recall a second order sufficient optimality condition ensuring local quadratic growth of the objective function (1). This condition involves coercivity of the quadratic form associated with the Hamiltonian along the directions of the extended critical cone. In Section 4 we prove that for the local quadratic growth it suffices to require coercivity on the usual (not extended) critical cone, together with a Legendre-type condition. The main result—the sufficient conditions for SMsR—is formulated in Section 5, while the long Section 6 contains its proof.

2 Notations and assumptions

According to (3), the set of admissible control values is

$$U := \{v \in \mathbb{R}^m : \; G(v) \le 0\}.$$

Let G_i denote the ith component of the vector G. For any $v \in U$ define the set of active indices

$$I(v) = \{i \in \{1, \dots, k\} : \quad G_i(v) = 0\}.$$

Assumption 2.1 (regularity of the control constraints) *The set U is nonempty and at each point $v \in U$ the gradients $G_i'(v)$, $i \in I(v)$ are linearly independent.*

In the sequel we use the notation

$$q = (x(0), x(1)) = (x_0, x_1), \quad w = (x, u), \quad \mathcal{W} = W^{1,1} \times L^\infty.$$

Similarly, we denote $\hat{w} = (\hat{x}, \hat{u}) \in \mathcal{W}$, $\hat{q} = (\hat{x}(0), \hat{x}(1))$.

Assumption 2.2 *The triplet $(\hat{w}, \hat{p}, \hat{\lambda}) \in \mathcal{W} \times W^{1,1} \times L^\infty$ satisfies the following system of equations and inequalities:*

$$\hat{\lambda}(t) \ge 0, \quad \hat{\lambda}(t) G(\hat{u}(t)) = 0 \quad a.e. \;\; in \quad [0,1], \tag{4}$$

$$(-\hat{p}(0), \hat{p}(1)) = F'(\hat{q}), \tag{5}$$

$$\dot{\hat{p}}(t) + \hat{p}(t)\, f_x(\hat{w}(t)) = 0 \quad a.e. \;\; in \quad [0,1], \tag{6}$$

$$\hat{p}(t)\, f_u(\hat{w}(t)) + \hat{\lambda}(t) G'(\hat{u}(t)) = 0 \quad a.e. \;\; in \quad [0,1], \tag{7}$$

$$-\dot{\hat{x}}(t) + f(\hat{w}(t)) = 0 \quad a.e. \;\; in \quad [0,1], \tag{8}$$

$$G(\hat{u}(t)) \le 0 \quad a.e. \;\; in \quad [0,1]. \tag{9}$$

Observe that this system represents the first order necessary optimality condition for a weak local minimum[1] of the pair $\hat{w} = (\hat{x}, \hat{u})$ (see e.g. [12, part 1, section 18]); later on we refer to it as to *optimality system*. Namely, if $\hat{w}$ is a point of weak local minimum in problem (1)–(3), then there exist $\hat{p} \in W^{1,1}$ and $\hat{\lambda} \in L^\infty$ such that the optimality system if fulfilled. Note that for a given $\hat{w}$ the pair $(\hat{p}, \hat{\lambda})$ is uniquely determined by these conditions. Indeed, the adjoint variable p is uniquely determined by adjoint equation (6) and transversality conditions (5), and

[1]This means that $J(\hat{x}, \hat{u}) \le J(x, u)$ for every admissible pair (x, u) which is close enough to $(\hat{x}, \hat{u})$ in the space $\mathcal{W}$.

then $\hat{\lambda}$ is uniquely determined by equation (7) and complementary slackness condition in (4) due to Assumption 2.1.

Introduce the *Hamiltonian* and the *augmented Hamiltonian*

$$H(w,p) = p\,f(w), \quad \bar{H}(w,p,\lambda) = p\,f(w) + \lambda\,G(u).$$

Then equations (6) and (7) take the form

$$-\dot{\hat{p}}(t) = H_x(\hat{w}(t),\hat{p}(t)), \quad \bar{H}_u(\hat{w}(t),\hat{p}(t),\hat{\lambda}(t)) = 0 \quad \text{a.e. in} \quad [0,1].$$

Notice that here and below, the dual variables p and λ are treated as row vectors, while x, u, w, f, and G are treated as column vectors.

3 Second-order Sufficient Conditions for a Weak Local Minimum.

Now we discuss the second-order sufficient conditions for a weak local minimum (references will be given at the end of Section 4). Set

$$M_j = \{t \in [0,1] : \; G_j(\hat{u}(t)) = 0\}, \quad j = 1,\dots,k.$$

Define the *critical cone*

$$\begin{aligned} K := \Big\{ w \in \mathcal{W} \;\; : \;\; & \dot{x}(t) = f'(\hat{w}(t))w(t), \quad H_u(\hat{w}(t),\hat{p}(t))u(t) = 0 \quad \text{a.e. in} \quad [0,1], \\ & G_j'(\hat{u}(t))u(t) \le 0 \;\text{ a.e. on } M_j, \quad j = 1,\dots,k \Big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

It can be easily verified that $F'(\hat{q})q = 0$ for any element w of the critical cone.

Indeed, let $w \in K$. Then $\dot{x}(t) = f'(\hat{w}(t))w(t)$ a.e. in $[0,1]$. Multiplying this equation by $\hat{p}(t)$ we get that $\hat{p}(t)\dot{x}(t) = \hat{p}(t)f_x(\hat{w}(t))x(t) + \hat{p}(t)f_u(\hat{w}(t))u(t)$ a.e. in $[0,1]$. The equalities $\hat{p}(t)f_x(\hat{w}(t)) = -\dot{\hat{p}}(t)$ and $\hat{p}(t)f_u(\hat{w}(t))u(t) = 0$ a.e. in $[0,1]$, give $\hat{p}(t)\dot{x}(t) + \dot{\hat{p}}(t)x(t) = 0$ a.e. in $[0,1]$. Integrating this equation on $[0,1]$, we obtain that $\hat{p}(1)x(1) - \hat{p}(0)x(0) = 0$. Using the transversality conditions (5), we get $F_{x_0}(\hat{q})x(0) + F_{x_1}(\hat{q})x(1) = 0$ q.e.d.

In many cases (in "smooth problems" of mathematical programming and the calculus of variations) it is sufficient for local minimality that the critical cone consists only of the zero element. However, this is not the case for optimal control problems with a control constraint of the type $u(t) \in U$. Let us show this for the following problem (which is somewhat different from (1)–(3), since the dynamics is non-stationary).

Example 3.1 *Let $n = m = k = 1$. Consider the problem*

$$\begin{gathered} \min\{x(1) - x(0)\} \\ \dot{x}(t) = tu(t) - (u(t))^2, \quad u(t) \ge 0 \qquad \textit{a.e. in} \quad [0,1]. \end{gathered}$$

Set $\hat{u} = 0$, $\hat{x}(t) = \hat{x}(0)$. The optimality system is satisfied with $\hat{p}(t) = 1$, $\hat{\lambda}(t) = t$. Here $K = \{0\}$. However, $\hat{u}$ is not a weak local minimum, because for the sequence

$$u_s(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{s} & 0 \le t \le \frac{1}{s} \\ 0, & \frac{1}{s} < t \le 1, \end{cases}$$

we have $J(u_s) = -1/(2s^3) < 0$ for all $s = 1,2,\dots,$ and $\|u_s - \hat{u}\|_\infty \to 0$.

An equivalent definition of the critical cone is the following. Set

$$M^+(\hat{\lambda}_j) = \{t \in [0,1] : \hat{\lambda}_j(t) > 0\}, \quad j = 1, \dots, k,$$

Then, due to (7),

$$K = \Big\{ w \in \mathcal{W} \ : \ \dot{x}(t) = f'(\hat{w}(t))w(t) \quad \text{a.e. in} \quad [0,1], \quad G_j'(\hat{u}(t))u(t) \le 0 \ \text{ a.e. on } M_j; \\ G_j'(\hat{u}(t))u(t) = 0 \ \text{ a.e. on } M^+(\hat{\lambda}_j), \quad j = 1, \dots, k \Big\}. \tag{11}$$

We introduce an extension of the critical cone. For any $\Delta > 0$ and $j = 1, \dots, k$ we set

$$M_\Delta^+(\hat{\lambda}_j) = \{t \in [0,1] : \hat{\lambda}_j(t) > \Delta\}.$$

For any $\Delta > 0$ we set

$$K_\Delta = \Big\{ w \in \mathcal{W} \ : \ \dot{x}(t) = f'(\hat{w}(t))w(t) \quad \text{a.e. in} \quad [0,1], \quad G_j'(\hat{u}(t))u(t) \le 0 \ \text{ a.e. on } M_j, \\ G_j'(\hat{u}(t))u(t) = 0 \ \text{ a.e. on } M_\Delta^+(\hat{\lambda}_j), \ \ j = 1, \dots, k \Big\}. \tag{12}$$

Notice that the cones K_Δ form a non-increasing family as $\Delta \to 0+$. In particular, $K \subset K_\Delta$ for any $\Delta > 0$.

Define the *quadratic form*:

$$\Omega(w) := \langle F''(\hat{q})q, q\rangle + \int_0^1 \langle \bar{H}_{ww}(\hat{w}(t), \hat{p}(t), \hat{\lambda}(t))w(t), w(t)\rangle \, dt, \quad \text{where} \quad q = (x(0), x(1)). \tag{13}$$

Assumption 3.1 *There exist $\Delta > 0$ and $c_\Delta > 0$ such that*

$$\Omega(w) \ge c_\Delta\big(|x(0)|^2 + \|u\|_2^2\big) \quad \forall\, w \in K_\Delta. \tag{14}$$

Remark 3.1 *Assumption 3.1 is equivalent to the following: there exist $\Delta > 0$ and $c_\Delta > 0$ such that*

$$\Omega(w) \ge c_\Delta\big(\|x\|_\infty^2 + \|u\|_2^2\big) \quad \forall\, w \in K_\Delta. \tag{15}$$

Indeed, if $w \in K_\Delta$, then $\dot{x}(t) = f_x(\hat{w}(t))x(t) + f_u(\hat{w}(t))u(t)$ a.e. in $[0,1]$, whence

$$\|x\|_\infty \le c(|x(0)| + \|u\|_1)) \le c(|x(0)| + \|u\|_2)$$

with some $c > 0$. The required equivalence follows.

Remark 3.2 *Notice that if (14) is true for some $\Delta > 0$ and $c_\Delta > 0$, then it is true for any positive $\Delta' < \Delta$ and the same c_Δ.*

In the sequel we use the notations c, c', c'', c_1, c_2, etc. for constants which may have different values in different estimations.

We recall the following theorem, first published in [13] in a slightly different formulation.

Theorem 3.1 (sufficient second order condition) *Let Assumptions 2.1, 2.2, and 3.1 be fulfilled. Then there exist $\delta > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that*

$$J(w) - J(\hat{w}) \geq c\big(\|x - \hat{x}\|_\infty^2 + \|u - \hat{u}\|_2^2\big) \tag{16}$$

for all admissible $w = (x, u) \in W^{1,1} \times L^\infty$ such that $\|w - \hat{w}\|_\infty < \delta$.

In the next section, we discuss the equivalent formulation of this theorem and then provide references to the literature, where proofs can be found.

Concluding this section, we mention that Assumption 3.1 is not fulfilled for Example 3.1. Indeed, here $\hat{\lambda}(t) = t$, hence $M_\Delta^+(\hat{\lambda}) = [\Delta, 1]$. Since $\Omega(w) = -2\|u\|_2^2$ and $G'(\hat{u}(t))u(t) = -u(t)$, Assumption 3.1 cannot be fulfilled for all nonnegative functions u which are zero for $t \in M_\Delta^+(\hat{\lambda})$ and non-negative on $[0, \Delta]$.

4 An Equivalent Form of the Second-Order Sufficient Condition for Local Optimality

In this section we show that Assumption 3.1 can be reformulated in terms of the critical cone K, instead of K_Δ, provided that an additional condition of Legendre type is fulfilled.

Let $(\hat{w}, \hat{p}, \hat{\lambda}) \in \mathcal{W} \times W^{1,1} \times L^\infty$, and let Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 hold.

Assumption 4.1 *There exists $c_0 > 0$ such that*

$$\Omega(w) \geq c_0\big(|x(0)|^2 + \|u\|_2^2\big) \quad \forall\, w \in K. \tag{17}$$

Further, for any $\Delta > 0$ and any $t \in [0, 1]$ denote by $\mathcal{C}_\Delta(t)$ the cone of all vectors $v \in \mathbb{R}^m$ satisfying for all $j = 1, \ldots, k$ the conditions

$$\begin{cases} G_j'(\hat{u}(t))v \leq 0 & \text{if} \quad G_j(\hat{u}(t)) = 0, \\ G_j'(\hat{u}(t))v = 0 & \text{if} \quad \hat{\lambda}_j(t) > \Delta. \end{cases}$$

For any $\Delta > 0$ and any $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ we set

$$m_\Delta(\hat{\lambda}_j) := \{t \in [0, 1] :\ 0 < \hat{\lambda}_j(t) \leq \Delta\}, \quad m_\Delta := \bigcup_{j=1}^{k} m_\Delta(\hat{\lambda}_j).$$

Clearly, $\operatorname{meas} m_\Delta \to 0$ as $\Delta \to 0+$.

Assumption 4.2 (strengthened Legendre condition on m_Δ). *There exist $\Delta > 0$ and $c_\Delta^L > 0$ such that for a.a. $t \in m_\Delta$ we have*

$$\langle \bar{H}_{uu}(\hat{w}(t), \hat{p}(t), \hat{\lambda}(t))v, v\rangle \geq c_\Delta^L |v|^2 \quad \forall\, v \in \mathcal{C}_\Delta(t). \tag{18}$$

Remark 4.1 *Similarly as in Remark 3.2, if (18) is true for some $\Delta > 0$ and $c_\Delta^L > 0$, then it is true for any positive $\Delta' < \Delta$ and the same c_Δ^L.*

In the sequel, we often omit the argument t of x, u, $\hat{x}$, $\hat{u}$, etc.

The following lemma follows from the definition of Ω in (13).

Lemma 4.1 *Let $w = (x, u) \in \mathcal{W}$, $w' = (x', u') \in \mathcal{W}$. Then*

$$\Omega(w + w') = \Omega(w) + E(w, w'), \tag{19}$$

where

$$E(w, w') = \Omega(w') + 2\langle F''(\hat{q})q, q'\rangle$$
$$+2\int_0^1 \Big(\langle H_{xx}(\hat{w}, \hat{p})x, x'\rangle + \langle H_{xu}(\hat{w}, \hat{p})u, x'\rangle + \langle H_{ux}(\hat{w}, \hat{p})x, u'\rangle + \langle \bar{H}_{uu}(\hat{w}, \hat{p}, \hat{\lambda})u, u'\rangle\Big)\, \mathrm{d}t$$

Moreover, there exists a constant c, independent of w and w', such that

$$|E(w, w')| \le \int_0^1 \langle \bar{H}_{uu}(\hat{w}, \hat{p}, \hat{\lambda})u', u'\rangle\, \mathrm{d}t \tag{20}$$
$$+c\left(\|x\|_\infty\|x'\|_\infty + \|x'\|_\infty^2 + \|x'\|_\infty\|u'\|_1 + \|x\|_\infty\|u'\|_1 + \|x'\|_\infty\|u\|_1 + \|\, |u| \cdot |u'|\, \|_1\right).$$

Henceforth, for $w = (x, u) \in \mathcal{W}$ we set

$$\gamma_0(w) = |x(0)|^2 + \int_0^1 |u|^2\, \mathrm{d}t, \quad \gamma(w) = \|x\|_\infty^2 + \int_0^1 |u|^2\, \mathrm{d}t.$$

It is clear that $\gamma_0(w) \le \gamma(w)$, and, as shown in Remark 3.1, if $\dot{x} = f_w(\hat{w})w$, then there exists $c > 0$, independent of w, such that

$$\gamma(w) \le c\gamma_0(w).$$

Proposition 4.1 *Assumptions 4.1 and 4.2 imply Assumption 3.1.*

Proof. Let Assumptions 4.1 and 4.2 hold with some $c_0 > 0$, $\Delta > 0$ and $c_\Delta^L > 0$, where Δ will be fixed later as small enough, see Remark 4.1. Set

$$\alpha(\Delta) = \sqrt{\mathrm{meas}(m_\Delta)}. \tag{21}$$

Note that $\alpha(\Delta) \to 0+$ as $\Delta \to 0+$. We may assume that Δ is so small that $\alpha(\Delta) \le 1$.

Let $\tilde{w} \in K_\Delta$. Set

$$u' = \tilde{u}\chi_{m_\Delta},$$

where χ_{m_Δ} is the characteristic function of the set m_Δ. Obviously, $u'(t) \in \mathcal{C}_\Delta(t)$ a.e. on $[0, 1]$ and, therefore,

$$\langle \bar{H}_{uu}(\hat{w}(t), \hat{p}(t), \hat{\lambda}(t))u'(t), u'(t)\rangle \ge c_\Delta^L |u'(t)|^2 \quad \text{a.e. on} \quad [0, 1].$$

Hence,

$$\int_0^1 \langle \bar{H}_{uu}(\hat{w}, \hat{p}, \hat{\lambda})u', u'\rangle\, \mathrm{d}t \ge c_\Delta^L \int_0^1 |u'|^2\, \mathrm{d}t.$$

Let x' be the solution to the equation

$$\dot{x}' = f_x(\hat{w})x' + f_u(\hat{w})u', \quad x'(0) = 0.$$

Then

$$\|x'\|_\infty \le c\|u'\|_1 \le c\sqrt{\mathrm{meas}(m_\Delta)}\|u'\|_2 \le c\,\alpha(\Delta)\|\tilde{u}\|_2.$$

Hence,

$$\|x'\|_\infty \le c\,\alpha(\Delta)\sqrt{\gamma_0(\tilde{w})}, \quad \|u'\|_1 \le \alpha(\Delta)\sqrt{\gamma_0(\tilde{w})}.$$

Set

$$w' = (x', u'), \quad x = \tilde{x} - x', \quad u = \tilde{u} - u', \quad w = (x, u).$$

Since $x'(0) = 0$, we have

$$\gamma_0(w') = \int_0^1 |u'|^2 \,\mathrm{d}t. \tag{22}$$

Obviously,

$$w \in K, \quad \tilde{w} = w + w', \quad |u| \cdot |u'| = 0, \quad \gamma_0(\tilde{w}) = \gamma_0(w) + \gamma_0(w'). \tag{23}$$

Using the estimate (20) in Lemma 4.1, Assumption 4.2, Assumption 4.1, and the third relation in (23), we obtain the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega(\tilde{w}) \quad \ge \quad & c_0\gamma_0(w) + c_\Delta^L\|u'\|_2^2 \\ & -c\left(\|x\|_\infty\|x'\|_\infty + \|x'\|_\infty^2 + \|x'\|_\infty\|u'\|_1 + \|x\|_\infty\|u'\|_1 + \|x'\|_\infty\|u\|_1\right). \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

We consecutively estimate

$$\|x\|_\infty \le \|\tilde{x}\|_\infty + \|x'\|_\infty \le c\sqrt{\gamma_0(\tilde{w})} + c\,\alpha(\Delta)\sqrt{\gamma_0(\tilde{w})} \le c'\sqrt{\gamma_0(\tilde{w})},$$

$$\|x\|_\infty\|x'\|_\infty \le c''\alpha(\Delta)\gamma_0(\tilde{w}),$$

$$\|x'\|_\infty^2 \le c^2\alpha^2(\Delta)\gamma_0(\tilde{w}), \quad \|x'\|_\infty\|u'\|_1 \le c\alpha^2(\Delta)\gamma_0(\tilde{w}),$$

$$\|u\|_1\|x'\|_\infty \le \|\tilde{u}\|_2\|x'\|_\infty \le c\,\alpha(\Delta)\gamma_0(\tilde{w}), \quad \|x\|_\infty\|u'\|_1 \le c'\,\alpha(\Delta)\gamma_0(\tilde{w}),$$

where c' and c'' are appropriate constants. Using these relations and (22) in (24), we obtain that

$$\Omega(\tilde{w}) \ge c_0\gamma_0(w) + c_\Delta^L\gamma_0(w') - c'''\alpha(\Delta)\gamma_0(\tilde{w}).$$

with some constant c'''. Take $\Delta > 0$ such that

$$c_\Delta := \min\{c_0, c_\Delta^L\} - c'''\alpha(\Delta) > 0,$$

keeping in the same time c_Δ^L the same (see Remark 4.1). Then

$$\Omega(\tilde{w}) \ge c_\Delta\gamma_0(\tilde{w}),$$

which completes the proof, since c_Δ is independent of $\tilde{w} \in K_\Delta$. □

The converse is also true.

Proposition 4.2 *Assumption 3.1 implies Assumptions 4.1 and 4.2.*

Proof. Let Assumption 3.1 be fulfilled, i.e., there exist $\Delta > 0$ and $c_\Delta > 0$ such that

$$\Omega(w) \geq c_\Delta \gamma_0(w) \quad \forall\, w \in K_\Delta.$$

According to Remark 3.2, one may fix $\Delta > 0$ arbitrarily small without changing c_Δ, which will be done below.

Since $K \subset K_\Delta$, this inequality holds also on K, therefore Assumption 4.1 is fulfilled.

Let us prove that Assumption 4.2 is also fulfilled. Take any $u \in L^\infty$ satisfying the conditions

$$u(t) \in \mathcal{C}_\Delta(t) \quad \text{a.e. on} \quad m_\Delta, \quad u\chi_{m_\Delta} = u, \tag{25}$$

where χ_{m_Δ} is the characteristic function of the set m_Δ. Define x by the conditions

$$\dot{x} = f_x(\hat{w})x + f_u(\hat{w})u, \quad x(0) = 0.$$

Set $w = (x, u)$. Then, obviously, $w \in K_\Delta$, whence it follows that

$$\Omega(w) \geq c_\Delta \gamma_0(w), \quad \text{where} \quad \gamma_0(w) = \int_0^1 |u|^2 \, \mathrm{d}t.$$

Moreover,

$$\|x\|_\infty \leq c\|u\|_1 \leq c\sqrt{\operatorname{meas}(m_\Delta)}\|u\|_2 = c\,\alpha(\Delta)\sqrt{\gamma_0(w)},$$

where $\alpha(\Delta)$ is defined in (21). The latter implies that

$$|\langle F''(\hat{q})q, q\rangle| \leq c'\alpha^2(\Delta)\gamma_0(w),$$

$$\|\langle \bar{H}_{xx}(\hat{w}, \hat{p}, \hat{\lambda})x, x\rangle + 2\langle \bar{H}_{xu}(\hat{w}, \hat{p}, \hat{\lambda})u, x\rangle\|_1 \leq c'\alpha^2(\Delta)\gamma_0(w)$$

with some $c' > 0$. Using these estimates and (13), we get

$$2c'\alpha^2(\Delta)\gamma_0(w) + \int_0^1 \langle \bar{H}_{uu}(\hat{w}, \hat{p}, \hat{\lambda})u, u\rangle \, \mathrm{d}t \geq \Omega(w) \geq c_\Delta \gamma_0(w).$$

Take any $\Delta > 0$ such that

$$c_\Delta^L := -2c'\alpha^2(\Delta) + c_\Delta > 0.$$

Then we have

$$\int_0^1 \langle \bar{H}_{uu}(\hat{w}, \hat{p}, \hat{\lambda})u, u\rangle \, \mathrm{d}t \geq c_\Delta^L \int_0^1 |u|^2 \, \mathrm{d}t.$$

This inequality holds for any $u \in L^\infty$ satisfying (25). The strengthened Legendre condition on m_Δ follows. $\square$

Thus, instead of Assumption 3.1 we can use Assumptions 4.1 and 4.2 in the sufficient second-order conditions of Theorem 3.1.

The connection between the strengthened Legendre condition and the so-called "local quadratic growth of the Hamiltonian" (defined below) was studied in [4]. Let us formulate the corresponding result from [4] which may be useful for the problem under consideration.

Definition 4.1 *We say that the local quadratic growth condition of the Hamiltonian is fulfilled if there exist $c_H > 0$, $\delta > 0$ and $\Delta > 0$ such that for a.a. $t \in m_\Delta$ we have*

$$H(\hat{x}(t), u, \hat{p}(t)) - H(\hat{x}(t), \hat{u}(t), \hat{p}(t)) \geq c_H |u - \hat{u}(t)|^2$$

for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $G(u) \leq 0$ and $|u - \hat{u}(t)| < \delta$.

Proposition 4.3 [4] *Assumption 4.2 implies the local quadratic growth condition of the Hamiltonian.*

The converse is not true. As shown in [4], the condition of the local quadratic growth of the Hamiltonian is somewhat finer than Assumption 4.1.

There is the following more subtle second-order sufficient condition for a weak local minimum at the point $\hat{w}$ in problem (1)-(3).

Theorem 4.1 (sufficient second order condition) *Let Assumptions 2.1, 2.2, and 4.1 hold and the local quadratic growth condition of the Hamiltonian be satisfied. Then there exist $\delta > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that*

$$J(w) - J(\hat{w}) \geq c\big(\|x - \hat{x}\|_\infty^2 + \|u - \hat{u}\|_2^2\big) \tag{26}$$

for all admissible $w = (x, u) \in W^{1,1} \times L^\infty$ such that $\|w - \hat{w}\|_\infty < \delta$.

A sufficient second order condition of this type for a much more general optimal control problem (together with the corresponding second order necessary condition) was first published by the first author back in 1978 in [11]. A relatively simple proof of Theorem 4.1 in the case of $k = 1$ was recently published in [16]. Proofs of much more general results of this type can be found, for example, in [14] and [15].

5 Strong Metric Subegularity

In this section we formulate the main result in this paper, Namely, we prove that the optimality mapping associated with problem (1)–(3) is strongly metrically subregular at a reference solution $(\hat{w}, \hat{p}, \hat{\lambda}) = (\hat{x}, \hat{u}, \hat{p}, \hat{\lambda}) \in \mathcal{W} \times W^{1,1} \times L^\infty$ of the optimality system (4)–(9), provided that Assumptions 2.1, 2.2 and 3.1 hold.

In the sequel, for $w = (x, u) \in \mathcal{W}$ we set

$$\Delta w = w - \hat{w}, \quad \gamma(\Delta w) = \|\Delta x\|_\infty^2 + \|\Delta u\|_2^2.$$

Consider the *perturbed system* of optimality conditions (4)–(9):

$$\lambda \geq 0, \quad \lambda(G(u) - \eta) = 0, \tag{27}$$

$$(-p(0), p(1)) = F'(q) + \nu, \tag{28}$$

$$\dot{p} + p\, f_x(w) = \pi, \tag{29}$$

$$p f_u(w) + \lambda G'(u) = \rho, \tag{30}$$

$$-\dot{x} + f(x, u) = \xi \tag{31}$$

$$G(u) \leq \eta, \tag{32}$$

where $p \in W^{1,1}$, $\lambda \in L^\infty$, $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$, $\pi \in L^1$, $\rho \in L^\infty$, $\xi \in L^1$, $\eta \in L^\infty$. Note that ν, π, and ρ are treated as row vectors, while ξ and η are treated as column vectors. Below we set

$$\Delta x = x - \hat{x}, \quad \Delta u = u - \hat{u}, \quad \Delta w = (\Delta x, \Delta u) = w - \hat{w}, \quad \Delta p = p - \hat{p}, \quad \Delta\lambda = \lambda - \hat{\lambda},$$

$$\Delta q = (\Delta x(0), \Delta x(1)) = (x(0) - \hat{x}(0), x(1) - \hat{x}(1)) = (\Delta x_0, \Delta x_1),$$
$$\omega = (\nu, \pi, \rho, \xi, \eta), \quad \|\omega\| := |\nu| + \|\pi\|_1 + \|\rho\|_2 + \|\xi\|_1 + \|\eta\|_2. \tag{33}$$

Theorem 5.1 *Let Assumptions 2.1, 2.2, and 3.1 be fulfilled. Then there exist reals $\delta > 0$ and $\kappa > 0$ such that if*

$$|\nu| + \|\pi\|_1 + \|\rho\|_\infty + \|\xi\|_1 + \|\eta\|_\infty \le \delta, \tag{34}$$

then for any solution (x, u, p, λ) of the perturbed system (27)–(32) such that $\|\Delta w\|_\infty \le \delta$ the following estimates hold:

$$\|\Delta x\|_{1,1} \le \kappa\|\omega\|, \quad \|\Delta u\|_2 \le \kappa\|\omega\|, \tag{35}$$

$$\|\Delta p\|_{1,1} \le \kappa\|\omega\|, \quad \|\Delta\lambda\|_2 \le \kappa\|\omega\|. \tag{36}$$

Observe that if the disturbance η is not present in the disturbed optimality system (27)–(32), that is, $\eta = 0$, then the inequality (34) follows (modulo a multiplicative constant) from the assumption $\|\Delta w\|_\infty \le \delta$, together with the equations (28)–(31). Therefore, the claim of the theorem in this case is valid without assuming (34). In this case again, two metrics are needed in Definition 1.1 of SMsR only in the space $Y := W^{1,1} \times L^\infty \times W^{1,1} \times L^\infty$. The neighborhood B_Y in Definition 1.1 is $B_Y := \{(w, p, \lambda) : \|w - \hat{w}\|_\infty \le \delta\}$ while the metric d_Y is induced by the norm $\|(w, p, \lambda)\| := \|x\|_{1,1} + \|p\|_{1,1} + \|u\|_2 + \|\lambda\|_2$. The metric in Z is induced by the norm $\|\omega\|$ in (33).

6 Proof of Theorem 5.1

1. We start with the following auxiliary statement related to the constraint $G(u) \le 0$. Let

$$I = \{i_1, \ldots, i_s\} \subset \{1, \ldots, k\}$$

be a nonempty set of indices, and let $G_I(v)$ be a column vector with elements $G_{i_1}(v), \ldots, G_{i_s}(v)$. Set

$$A_I(v) = G_I'(v)(G_I'(v))^*, \quad \mu_I(v) = |\det A_I(v)|, \quad Q_I = \{v \in B : \ G_I(v) = 0\},$$

where B is a fixed closed ball in $\mathbb{R}^m$. Then, according to Assumption 2.1,

$$\mu_I(v) > 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad v \in Q_I.$$

For any $\varepsilon > 0$, we set

$$Q_{I,\varepsilon} = \{v \in B : \ |G_i(v)| \le \varepsilon \quad \text{for all} \quad i \in I\}.$$

Lemma 6.1 *There exist positive numbers $\hat{c}$ and $\hat{\varepsilon}$ such that*

$$\mu_I(v) \ge \hat{c} \quad \textit{for all} \ \ I \subset \{1, \ldots, k\} \ \ \textit{and for all} \ \ v \in Q_{I,\hat{\varepsilon}}.$$

Proof. Since the sets I are finite number, it is enough to prove the lemma for a fixed I. If the statement is false, then there exists a sequence $v_s \in B$ such that $G_I(v_s) \to 0$ with $s \to \infty$ and $\mu_I(v_s) \le s^{-1}$. Without loss of generality we assume that v_s converges to some vector $v \in B$. Then $G_I(v) = 0$ and $\mu_I(v) = 0$. A contradiction. □

Since G is uniformly continuous on the compact set B, there exists $\hat{\delta} > 0$ such that

$$|G(v) - G(v')| \le \hat{\varepsilon} \quad \text{whenever} \quad v, v' \in B \quad \text{and} \quad |v - v'| \le \hat{\delta}. \tag{37}$$

Decreasing, if necessary, $\hat{\delta}$, we can assume that $\hat{\delta} \le \hat{\varepsilon}$.

2. We analyze conditions (27)–(32). Take any $\delta > 0$ such that $\delta \le \hat{\delta}$. Suppose that a collection $(\nu, \pi, \rho, \xi, \eta)$ satisfies condition (34) and there exists a solution (x, u, p, λ) of the perturbed system (27)–(32) such that $\|\Delta w\|_\infty \le \delta$. Consider this solution. It is clear, that $\|w\|_\infty$ is bounded (that is, $\|w\|_\infty \le C$, where $C > 0$ does not depend on w), and $\|\omega\| \le \delta$.

Further, note that $\|p\|_{1,1}$ is bounded due to conditions (28) and (29) and also because $\|w\|_\infty$, $|\nu|$ and $\|\pi\|_1$ are bounded. Therefore, $\|\Delta p\|_{1,1}$ is also bounded. Moreover, the following is true.

Proposition 6.1 *The norms $\|\lambda\|_\infty$ and $\|\Delta\lambda\|_\infty$ are bounded.*

Proof. For the ball appearing in Part 1 of the proof we choose $B := \{v \in \mathbb{R}^m \,:\, |v| \le \|\hat{u}\|_\infty + \delta\}$. Consider equation (30):

$$p(t) f_u(w(t)) + \lambda(t) G'(u(t)) = \rho(t) \quad \text{for a.a.} \quad t \in [0, 1].$$

We assume that $\lambda \ne 0$, otherwise the claims of the proposition are obvious. Set

$$M(\lambda) = \{t \in [0, 1] : \quad \lambda(t) \ne 0\}.$$

Then $\operatorname{meas} M(\lambda) > 0$. For any $t \in M(\lambda)$ we set

$$I(t) = \{i \in \{1, \dots, k\} \,:\, \lambda_i(t) > 0\}, \quad \lambda_{I(t)}(t) = \{\lambda_i(t)\}_{i \in I(t)}.$$

Let $t \in M(\lambda)$. The complementary slackness conditions

$$\lambda_i(t) \big(G_i(u(t)) - \eta_i(t) \big) = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, k,$$

imply that $G_i(u(t)) - \eta_i(t) = 0$ for all $i \in I(t)$, and then, $|G_i(u(t))| = |\eta_i(t)|$ for all $i \in I(t)$. Therefore, in virtue of (34),

$$|G_{I(t)}(u(t))| \le |\eta(t)| \le \delta.$$

Since $\delta \le \hat{\delta}$, we obtain

$$u(t) \in Q_{I(t), \hat{\delta}} \quad \text{for a.a.} \quad t \in M(\lambda).$$

Here $G_{I(t)}$ and $Q_{I(t), \hat{\delta}}$ are defined similarly to G_I and $Q_{I, \hat{\delta}}$ in Part 1 of the proof. Hence, by Lemma 6.1, and since $\hat{\delta} \le \hat{\varepsilon}$,

$$|\det A_{I(t)}(u(t))| \ge \hat{c} > 0 \quad \text{for a.a.} \quad t \in M(\lambda),$$

where
$$A_{I(t)}(u(t)) = G'_{I(t)}(u(t))(G'_{I(t)}(u(t)))^*.$$

Obviously, $\lambda(t)G'(u(t)) = \lambda_{I(t)}(t)G'_{I(t)}(u(t))$ for a.a. $t \in M(\lambda)$, and, therefore,
$$p(t)f_u(w(t)) + \lambda_{I(t)}(t)G'_{I(t)}(u(t)) = \rho(t) \quad \text{for a.a.} \quad t \in M(\lambda).$$

(Note that the dimensions of the vector $\lambda_{I(t)}(t)$ and the matrices $G'_{I(t)}(u(t))$ and $A_{I(t)}(u(t))$ depend on t.) Multiplying this equation by the transposed matrix $(G'_{I(t)}(u(t)))^*$ on the right, we get
$$p(t)f_u(w(t))(G'_{I(t)}(u(t)))^* + \lambda_{I(t)}(t)A_{I(t)}(u(t))) = \rho(t)(G'_{I(t)}(u(t)))^* \quad \text{for a.a.} \quad t \in M(\lambda).$$

Then
$$p(t)f_u(w(t))(G'_{I(t)}(u(t)))^*(A_{I(t)}(u(t)))^{-1} + \lambda_{I(t)}(t) = \rho(t)(G'_{I(t)}(u(t)))^*(A_{I(t)}(u(t)))^{-1}$$

for a.a. $t \in M(\lambda)$. Since here all matrices are essentially bounded and $|\lambda(t)| = |\lambda_{I(t)}(t)|$ for a.a. $t \in M(\lambda)$, we obtain the estimate
$$|\lambda(t)| \le C\big(|p(t)| + |\rho(t)|\big) \quad \text{for a.a.} \quad t \in M(\lambda)$$

with some $C > 0$, and therefore,
$$\|\lambda\|_\infty \le C(\|p\|_\infty + \|\rho\|_\infty).$$

Since $\|p\|_\infty$ is bounded and $\|\rho\|_\infty \le \delta$, we obtain that $\|\lambda\|_\infty$ is bounded. Hence $\|\Delta\lambda\|_\infty$ is also bounded. □

3. Further, subtracting (8) from (31) we obtain that
$$-\Delta\dot{x} + f(w) - f(\hat{w}) = \xi. \tag{38}$$

It follows that
$$|\Delta x(t)| \le |\Delta x_0| + \|\xi\|_1 + L\|\Delta u\|_1 + L\int_0^t |\Delta x(\tau)|\,\mathrm{d}\tau, \quad t \in [0,1],$$

with some $L > 0$, where
$$\Delta x_0 = \Delta x(0).$$

Using the Grönwall inequality, we get
$$\|\Delta x\|_{1,1} \le C\big(|\Delta x_0| + \|\Delta u\|_1 + \|\xi\|_1\big) \tag{39}$$

with some $C > 0$. In what follows we use a more rough estimate. Namely, since $\|\Delta u\|_1 \le \|\Delta u\|_2$ and $\|\xi\|_1 \le \|\omega\|$, we have
$$\|\Delta x\|_{1,1} \le C\big(|\Delta x_0| + \|\Delta u\|_2 + \|\omega\|\big). \tag{40}$$

Consequently,
$$|\Delta q| \le 2C\big(|\Delta x_0| + \|\Delta u\|_2 + \|\omega\|\big). \tag{41}$$

Clearly, relation (38) implies

$$-\Delta\dot{x} + f'(\hat{w})\Delta w + O(|\Delta w|^2) = \xi. \tag{42}$$

As usual, for $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_+$, the symbol $O(\varepsilon)$ means that there exists a constant $C > 0$, independent of ε, such that $|O(\varepsilon)| \le C|\varepsilon|$ as $\varepsilon \to 0+$, and the symbol $o(\varepsilon)$ means that $o(\varepsilon)/\varepsilon \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0+$. We use these symbols for $O(\varepsilon)$ and $o(\varepsilon)$, taking values in $\mathbb{R}$ or in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Moreover, throughout the paper, the functions O and o may directly depend on Δw, not only on the norms appearing as arguments at the place of ε. However, the "smallness" with respect to the arguments of O and o will be uniform in Δw, satisfying $\|\Delta w\|_\infty \le \delta$. For example, $O(|\Delta w|^2)$ in (42), which is a shortening of $O(|\Delta w(t)|^2)$, means that there exists a constant C such that $O(|\Delta w(t)|^2) \le C|\Delta w(t)|^2$ for all Δw satisfying $\|\Delta w\|_\infty \le \delta$ and for a.e. $t \in [0, 1]$. Similarly, $o(\gamma(\Delta w))$, appearing later, means that $o(\gamma(\Delta w))/\gamma(\Delta w) \to 0$ with $\gamma(\Delta w) \to 0$, uniformly with respect Δw satisfying $\|\Delta w\|_\infty \le \delta$.

4. Subtracting (5) from (28) we obtain

$$(-\Delta p(0), \Delta p(1)) = F'(q) - F'(\hat{q}) + \nu,$$

hence,

$$(-\Delta p(0), \Delta p(1)) = F''(\hat{q})\Delta q + o(|\Delta q|) + \nu. \tag{43}$$

This implies that

$$|\Delta p(0)| + |\Delta p(1)| \le C\big(|\Delta q| + |\nu|\big) \tag{44}$$

with some $C > 0$. Multiplying (43) by $\Delta q = (\Delta x(0), \Delta x(1))$, we obtain

$$\Delta p \Delta x \,|_0^1 = \langle F''(\hat{q})\Delta q, \Delta q\rangle + o(|\Delta q|^2) + \nu\Delta q. \tag{45}$$

5. Subtracting (6) from (29) we obtain

$$\Delta\dot{p} + p\, f_x(w) - \hat{p} f_x(\hat{w}) = \pi. \tag{46}$$

Using the Grönwall inequality and the inequality $\|\Delta u\|_1 \le \|\Delta u\|_2$ we get

$$\|\Delta p\|_{1,1} \le c\big(|\Delta p(0)| + \|\Delta x\|_\infty + \|\Delta u\|_2 + \|\pi\|_1\big) \tag{47}$$

with some $c > 0$. Using (40), (41), (44) in this inequality, and also taking into account the definition of $\|\omega\|$, we obtain

$$\|\Delta p\|_{1,1} \le C\big(|\Delta x_0| + \|\Delta u\|_2 + \|\omega\|\big) \tag{48}$$

with some $C > 0$. Moreover, since $\|\Delta w\|_\infty \le \delta$ and $\|\omega\| \le \delta$, we also get

$$\|\Delta p\|_{1,1} \le 2C\delta. \tag{49}$$

Further, we have

$$\begin{aligned} p\, f_x(w) - \hat{p} f_x(\hat{w}) &= \hat{p}(f_x(w) - f_x(\hat{w})) + \Delta p f_x(w) \\ &= \hat{p} f_{xw}(\hat{w})\Delta w + \Delta p f_x(\hat{w}) + \Delta p f_{xw}(\hat{w})\Delta w + o(|\Delta w|) \\ &= H_{xw}(\hat{w}, \hat{p})\Delta w + \Delta p f_x(\hat{w}) + \Delta p f_{xw}(\hat{w})\Delta w + o(|\Delta w|). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, relation (46) implies

$$\Delta\dot{p} + H_{xw}(\hat{w},\hat{p})\Delta w + \Delta p f_x(\hat{w}) + \Delta p f_{xw}(\hat{w})\Delta w + o(|\Delta w|) = \pi. \tag{50}$$

6. Next we analyze condition (30). Subtracting (7) from (30), we obtain

$$pf_u(w) - \hat{p}f_u(\hat{w}) + \lambda G'(u) - \hat{\lambda}G'(\hat{u}) = \rho.$$

Consequently,

$$\hat{p}(f_u(w) - f_u(\hat{w})) + \Delta p f_u(w) + \hat{\lambda}(G'(u) - G'(\hat{u})) + \Delta\lambda G'(u) = \rho.$$

From here

$$\hat{p}f_{uw}(\hat{w})\Delta w + \Delta p f_u(\hat{w}) + \Delta p f_{uw}(\hat{w})\Delta w + \hat{\lambda}G''(\hat{u})\Delta u + \Delta\lambda G'(u) + o(|\Delta w|) = \rho.$$

Here,

$$\hat{p}f_{uw}(\hat{w})\Delta w = H_{uw}(\hat{w},\hat{p})\Delta w = H_{ux}(\hat{w},\hat{p})\Delta x + H_{uu}(\hat{w},\hat{p})\Delta u.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{gathered} H_{ux}(\hat{w},\hat{p})\Delta x + H_{uu}(\hat{w},\hat{p})\Delta u + \Delta p f_u(\hat{w}) + \Delta p f_{uw}(\hat{w})\Delta w \\ + \hat{\lambda}G''(\hat{u})\Delta u + \Delta\lambda G'(u) + o(|\Delta w|) = \rho. \end{gathered}$$

Since $\bar{H} = H + \lambda G$,

$$H_{ux}(\hat{w},\hat{p})\Delta x + \bar{H}_{uu}(\hat{w},\hat{p},\hat{\lambda})\Delta u + \Delta p f_u(\hat{w}) + \Delta p f_{uw}(\hat{w})\Delta w + \Delta\lambda G'(u) + o(|\Delta w|) = \rho. \tag{51}$$

Using this equality and the boundedness of $\|\Delta\lambda\|_\infty$ and $\|\Delta w\|_\infty$, we estimate

$$|\Delta\lambda G'(u)| \le C\big(|\Delta x| + |\Delta u| + |\Delta p| + |\rho|\big) \tag{52}$$

with some $C > 0$.

In the next paragraphs, we shall utilize Assumption 2.1 and Lemma 6.1 to estimate for a.e $t \in [0,1]$

$$|\Delta\lambda| \le C'\big(|\Delta x| + |\Delta u| + |\Delta p| + |\rho|\big). \tag{53}$$

with some $C' > 0$.

Set

$$M(\Delta\lambda) = \{t \in [0,1] : \quad \Delta\lambda(t) \neq 0\}.$$

If $\operatorname{meas} M(\Delta\lambda) = 0$ the estimate is trivial, therefore we assume that $\operatorname{meas} M(\Delta\lambda) > 0$. For any $t \in M(\Delta\lambda)$, we set

$$J(t) = \{j \in \{1,\dots,k\} : \quad \Delta\lambda_j(t) \neq 0\}.$$

Let $\Delta\lambda_{J(t)}(t)$ be a row vector, composed of all nonzero components of $\Delta\lambda(t)$, and let $G_{J(t)}$ be a column vector with the components G_j for all $j \in J(t)$. Then, obviously,

$$|\Delta\lambda(t)| = |\Delta\lambda_{J(t)}(t)|, \quad \Delta\lambda(t)G'(u(t)) = \Delta\lambda_{J(t)}(t)G'_{J(t)}(u(t)) \quad \text{for a.a.} \quad t \in M(\Delta\lambda). \tag{54}$$

Let $t \in M(\Delta\lambda)$, $j \in J(t)$. If $\lambda_j(t) > 0$, then, by the complementary slackness condition in (27), we have $G_j(u(t)) = \eta_j(t)$, and hence, $|G_j(u(t))| \le \hat{\varepsilon}$ since $\|\eta\|_\infty \le \delta \le \hat{\delta} \le \hat{\varepsilon}$.

If $\lambda_j(t)=0$, then $\hat\lambda_j(t)>0$, and then, by the complementary slackness condition in (4), we have $G_j(\hat u(t))=0$. But then, since $\|u-\hat u\|_\infty\le\hat\delta$, by condition (37) we again have $|G_j(u(t))|\le\hat\varepsilon$.

Thus, for all $j\in J(t)$ we have $|G_j(u(t))|\le\hat\varepsilon$. This implies that

$$u(t)\in Q_{J(t)\hat{,}\varepsilon}\quad\text{for a.a.}\quad t\in M(\Delta\lambda),$$

where the set $Q_{J(t)\hat\varepsilon}$ is defined similarly to the set $Q_{I,\varepsilon}$ and the ball B is defined as at the beginning of the proof of Proposition 6.1. By Lemma 6.1, it follows that

$$|\det A_{J(t)}(u(t))|\ge\hat c>0\quad\text{for a.a.}\quad t\in M(\Delta\lambda),$$

where

$$A_{J(t)}(u(t))=G'_{J(t)}(u(t))(G'_{J(t)}(u(t)))^*.$$

Let

$$z(t):=\Delta\lambda(t)G'(u(t)),\quad t\in[0,1].$$

According to (52) and the second equality in (54) we have

$$|z(t)|\le C\big(|\Delta x(t)|+|\Delta u(t)|+|\Delta p(t)|+|\rho(t)|\big),\quad z(t)=\Delta\lambda_{J(t)}(t)G'_{J(t)}(u(t))\tag{55}$$

for a.a. $t\in M(\Delta\lambda)$. Consequently,

$$z(t)(G'_{J(t)}(u(t)))^*=\Delta\lambda_{J(t)}(t)A_{J(t)}(u(t)),$$

hence,

$$z(t)(G'_{J(t)}(u(t)))^*A^{-1}_{J(t)}(u(t))=\Delta\lambda_{J(t)}(t).$$

This equality, the inequality in (55), and the equality $|\Delta\lambda(t)|=|\Delta\lambda_{J(t)}(t)|$, satisfied for a.a. $t\in M(\Delta\lambda)$, imply estimate (53).

Estimate (53) together with the inequalities $\|\Delta w\|_\infty\le\delta$, (34), and (49) imply

$$\|\Delta\lambda\|_\infty\le C\delta\tag{56}$$

with some $C>0$. In addition, from (40), (48), and (53) it follows that

$$\|\Delta\lambda\|_2\le C\big(|\Delta x_0|+\|\Delta u\|_2+\|\omega\|\big)\tag{57}$$

with some $C>0$.

7. Next, we estimate $\Omega(\Delta w)$. Multiplying (50) by Δx, we get

$$\Delta\dot p\,\Delta x+\langle H_{xw}(\hat w,\hat p)\Delta w,\Delta x\rangle+\Delta pf_x(\hat w)\Delta x+\langle\Delta pf_{xw}(\hat w)\Delta w,\Delta x\rangle+o(|\Delta w|^2)=\pi\Delta x.\tag{58}$$

Further, since

$$G'(u)=G'(\hat u)+G''(\hat u)\Delta u+o(|\Delta u|)$$

and $\|\Delta\lambda\|_\infty$ is bounded, relation (51) implies

$$H_{ux}(\hat w,\hat p)\Delta x+\bar H_{uu}(\hat w,\hat p,\hat\lambda)\Delta u+\Delta pf_u(\hat w)+\Delta pf_{uw}(\hat w)\Delta w$$

$$+\Delta\lambda G'(\hat u)+\Delta\lambda G''(\hat u)\Delta u+o(|\Delta w|)=\rho.$$

Multiplying this relation by Δu, we get

$$\langle H_{ux}(\hat{w},\hat{p})\Delta x, \Delta u\rangle + \langle \bar{H}_{uu}(\hat{w},\hat{p})\Delta u, \Delta u\rangle + \Delta p f_u(\hat{w})\Delta u + \langle \Delta p f_{uw}(\hat{w})\Delta w, \Delta u\rangle$$
$$+\Delta\lambda G'(\hat{u})\Delta u + \langle \Delta\lambda G''(\hat{u})\Delta u, \Delta u\rangle + o(|\Delta w|^2) = \rho\Delta u. \tag{59}$$

Adding equalities (58) and (59), we get

$$\Delta\dot{p}\,\Delta x + \langle H_{xw}(\hat{w},\hat{p})\Delta w, \Delta x\rangle + \langle H_{ux}(\hat{w},\hat{p})\Delta x, \Delta u\rangle + \langle \bar{H}_{uu}(\hat{w},\hat{p})\Delta u, \Delta u\rangle$$
$$+\Delta p f_x(\hat{w})\Delta x + \langle \Delta p f_{xw}(\hat{w})\Delta w, \Delta x\rangle + \Delta p f_u(\hat{w})\Delta u + \langle \Delta p f_{uw}(\hat{w})\Delta w, \Delta u\rangle$$
$$+\Delta\lambda G'(\hat{u})\Delta u + \langle \Delta\lambda G''(\hat{u})\Delta u, \Delta u\rangle + o(|\Delta w|^2) = \pi\Delta x + \rho\Delta u.$$

Further, we have

$$\langle H_{xw}(\hat{w},\hat{p})\Delta w, \Delta x\rangle + \langle H_{ux}(\hat{w},\hat{p})\Delta x, \Delta u\rangle + \langle \bar{H}_{uu}(\hat{w},\hat{p})\Delta u, \Delta u\rangle$$
$$= \langle \bar{H}_{xw}(\hat{w},\hat{p},\hat{\lambda})\Delta w, \Delta x\rangle + \langle \bar{H}_{uw}(\hat{w},\hat{p},\hat{\lambda})\Delta w, \Delta u\rangle = \langle \bar{H}_{ww}(\hat{w},\hat{p},\hat{\lambda})\Delta w, \Delta w\rangle.$$

Moreover,

$$\Delta p f_x(\hat{w})\Delta x + \langle \Delta p f_{xw}(\hat{w})\Delta w, \Delta x\rangle + \Delta p f_u(\hat{w})\Delta u + \langle \Delta p f_{uw}(\hat{w})\Delta w, \Delta u\rangle$$
$$= \Delta p f_w(\hat{w})\Delta w + \langle \Delta p f''(\hat{w})\Delta w, \Delta w\rangle.$$

Consequently,

$$\Delta\dot{p}\,\Delta x + \langle \bar{H}_{ww}(\hat{w},\hat{p},\hat{\lambda})\Delta w, \Delta w\rangle + \Delta p f_w(\hat{w})\Delta w + \langle \Delta p f''(\hat{w})\Delta w, \Delta w\rangle$$
$$+\Delta\lambda G'(\hat{u})\Delta u + \langle \Delta\lambda G''(\hat{u})\Delta u, \Delta u\rangle + o(|\Delta w|^2) = \pi\Delta x + \rho\Delta u.$$

Integrating this equality over the segment [0,1], we obtain

$$\int_0^1 \Delta\dot{p}\,\Delta x\,\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^1 \langle \bar{H}_{ww}(\hat{w},\hat{p},\hat{\lambda})\Delta w, \Delta w\rangle\,\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^1 \Delta p f_w(\hat{w})\Delta w\,\mathrm{d}t$$
$$+ \int_0^1 \langle \Delta p f''(\hat{w})\Delta w, \Delta w\rangle\,\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^1 \Delta\lambda G'(\hat{u})\Delta u\,\mathrm{d}t$$
$$+ \int_0^1 \langle \Delta\lambda G''(\hat{u})\Delta u, \Delta u\rangle\,\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^1 o(|\Delta w|^2)\,\mathrm{d}t = \int_0^1 (\pi\Delta x + \rho\Delta u)\ \mathrm{d}t.$$

Integrating by parts the first integral on the left side of this equality and applying (45), we get

$$\int_0^1 \Delta\dot{p}\,\Delta x\,\mathrm{d}t = \Delta p\,\Delta x\mid_0^1 - \int_0^1 \Delta p\,\Delta\dot{x}\,\mathrm{d}t$$
$$= \langle F''(\hat{q})\Delta q, \Delta q\rangle + o(|\Delta q|^2) + \nu\Delta q - \int_0^1 \Delta p\,\Delta\dot{x}\,\mathrm{d}t.$$

Substituting this expression into the previous equality and taking into account definition (13) of Ω, we get

$$\Omega(\Delta w) + o(|\Delta q|^2) + \nu\Delta q + \int_0^1 \Delta p\left(f_w(\hat{w})\Delta w - \Delta\dot{x}\right)\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^1 \langle \Delta p f''(\hat{w})\Delta w, \Delta w\rangle\,\mathrm{d}t$$

$$+\int_0^1 \Delta\lambda G'(\hat{u})\Delta u\,\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^1 \langle \Delta\lambda G''(\hat{u})\Delta u, \Delta u\rangle\,\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^1 o(|\Delta w|^2)\,\mathrm{d}t = \int_0^1 \big(\pi\Delta x + \rho\Delta u\big)\,\mathrm{d}t. \quad (60)$$

Notice that

$$o(|\Delta q|^2) + \int_0^1 o(|\Delta w|^2)\,\mathrm{d}t = o(\gamma(\Delta w)).$$

Using this equality and equality (42) in equality (60), we obtain

$$\Omega(\Delta w) + \nu\Delta q - \int_0^1 \Delta p\, O(|\Delta w|^2)\,\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^1 \Delta p\,\xi\,\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^1 \langle \Delta p f''(\hat{w})\Delta w, \Delta w\rangle\,\mathrm{d}t$$

$$+\int_0^1 \Delta\lambda G'(\hat{u})\Delta u\,\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^1 \langle \Delta\lambda G''(\hat{u})\Delta u, \Delta u\rangle\,\mathrm{d}t + o(\gamma(\Delta w)) = \int_0^1 \big(\pi\Delta x + \rho\Delta u\big)\,\mathrm{d}t. \quad (61)$$

According to (49), we have $\|\Delta p\|_\infty \le 2C\delta$. Therefore,

$$\left|\int_0^1 \Delta p\, O(|\Delta w|^2)\,\mathrm{d}t\right| \le \|\Delta p\|_\infty \int_0^1 |O(|\Delta w|^2)|\,\mathrm{d}t \le c\delta\gamma(\Delta w) \quad (62)$$

with some $c > 0$. Similarly,

$$\left|\int_0^1 \langle \Delta p f''(\hat{w})\Delta w, \Delta w\rangle\,\mathrm{d}t\right| \le c\delta\gamma(\Delta w). \quad (63)$$

In addition, in view of (56),

$$\left|\int_0^1 \langle \Delta\lambda G''(\hat{u})\Delta u, \Delta u\rangle\,\mathrm{d}t\right| \le c\delta\gamma(\Delta w) \quad (64)$$

with some $c > 0$. Hence, (61) gives

$$\Omega(\Delta w) \le -\int_0^1 \Delta\lambda G'(\hat{u})\Delta u\,\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^1 \big(-\Delta p\,\xi + \pi\Delta x + \rho\Delta u\big)\,\mathrm{d}t - \nu\Delta q + C\delta\gamma(\Delta w) \quad (65)$$

with some $C > 0$.

8. Now we estimate the first term

$$-\int_0^1 \Delta\lambda G'(\hat{u})\Delta u\,\mathrm{d}t = -\sum_{j=1}^k \int_0^1 \Delta\lambda_j G_j'(\hat{u})\Delta u\,\mathrm{d}t$$

in the righ-handt side of inequality (65). Let us fix $j \in \{1,\dots,k\}$ and consider the term

$$-\int_0^1 \Delta\lambda_j G_j'(\hat{u})\Delta u\,\mathrm{d}t.$$

We use conditions (4), (9), (27), and (32). If $\Delta\lambda_j = 0$, then this term is equal to zero. Therefore, we assume that the set

$$M(\Delta\lambda_j) = \{t \in [0,1]:\quad \Delta\lambda_j(t) \ne 0\}$$

has a positive Lebesgue measure.

8.1. Consider the set

$$\{t \in M(\Delta\lambda_j) \, : \lambda_j(t) = 0\}.$$

A.e. on this set we have

$$\Delta\lambda_j = -\hat{\lambda}_j < 0.$$

Then, by the complementary slackness condition in (4), $G_j(\hat{u}) = 0$. In this case, the condition $G_j(u) \le \eta_j$ yields $G_j'(\hat{u})\Delta u + O(|\Delta u|^2) \le \eta_j$, whence, multiplying by $-\Delta\lambda_j > 0$, we get

$$-\Delta\lambda_j G_j'(\hat{u})\Delta u - \Delta\lambda_j \, O(|\Delta u|^2) \le -\Delta\lambda_j \cdot \eta_j. \tag{66}$$

8.2. Consider the set

$$\{t \in M(\Delta\lambda_j) \, : \, \lambda_j(t) > 0\}.$$

Then, by the complementary slackness condition in (27), a.e. on this set we have

$$G_j(u) = \eta_j.$$

(a) Let also $G_j(\hat{u}) = 0$. Then

$$G_j'(\hat{u})\Delta u + O(|\Delta u|^2) = \eta_j.$$

Multiplying this equality by $-\Delta\lambda_j$, we get

$$-\Delta\lambda_j G_j'(\hat{u})\Delta u - \Delta\lambda_j \cdot O(|\Delta u|^2) = -\Delta\lambda_j \cdot \eta_j.$$

(b) Let now $G_j(\hat{u}) < 0$. Then, by the complementary slackness condition in (4), we have $\hat{\lambda}_j = 0$, and then $\Delta\lambda_j = \lambda_j > 0$.

Again, by the complementary slackness condition (but now in (27)), we have $G_j(u) = \eta_j$, which implies

$$G_j(\hat{u}) + G_j'(\hat{u})\Delta u + O(|\Delta u|^2) = \eta_j.$$

Multiplying this equality by $-\Delta\lambda_j < 0$, we get

$$-\Delta\lambda_j \cdot G_j(\hat{u}) - \Delta\lambda_j \cdot G_j'(\hat{u})\Delta u - \Delta\lambda_j \cdot O(|\Delta u|^2) = -\Delta\lambda_j \cdot \eta_j.$$

Since $-\Delta\lambda_j \cdot G_j(\hat{u}) > 0$, we obtain

$$-\Delta\lambda_j G_j'(\hat{u})\Delta u - \Delta\lambda_j \cdot O(|\Delta u|^2) < -\Delta\lambda_j \cdot \eta_j.$$

Consequently, inequality (66) holds a.e. on the set $M(\Delta\lambda_j)$, and then it holds a.e. on [0.1]. This implies that

$$-\int_0^1 \Delta\lambda_j G_j'(\hat{u})\Delta u \, \mathrm{d}t - \int_0^1 \Delta\lambda_j \, O(|\Delta u|^2) \, \mathrm{d}t \le -\int_0^1 \Delta\lambda_j \cdot \eta_j \, \mathrm{d}t. \tag{67}$$

Recall that according to (56), $\|\Delta\lambda\|_\infty \le C\delta$. Therefore,

$$\int_0^1 |\Delta\lambda_j| \cdot |O(|\Delta u|^2)| \, \mathrm{d}t \le C'\delta \, \cdot \gamma(\Delta w)$$

with some $C' > 0$. This and (67) imply

$$-\int_0^1 \Delta\lambda_j G_j'(\hat{u})\Delta u \,\mathrm{d}t \leq -\int_0^1 \Delta\lambda_j \cdot \eta_j \,\mathrm{d}t + C'\delta\gamma(\Delta w).$$

If $\Delta\lambda_j = 0$, then this equality also holds. Thus, it is true for all $j = 1, \ldots, k$. Consequently,

$$-\int_0^1 \Delta\lambda G'(\hat{u})\Delta u \,\mathrm{d}t \leq \int_0^1 |\Delta\lambda| \cdot |\eta| \,\mathrm{d}t + C'\delta\gamma(\Delta w).$$

This and inequality (65) imply

$$\Omega(\Delta w) \leq \int_0^1 |\Delta\lambda| \cdot |\eta| \,\mathrm{d}t + \int_0^1 \big(-\Delta p\,\xi + \pi\Delta x + \rho\Delta u\big)\,\mathrm{d}t - \nu\Delta q + c\,\delta\,\gamma(\Delta w) \tag{68}$$

with some $c > 0$. Using now the inequality $\|\eta\|_2 \leq \|\omega\|$, we obtain from this that

$$\Omega(\Delta w) \leq \|\Delta\lambda\|_2\|\omega\| + \int_0^1 \big(-\Delta p\,\xi + \pi\Delta x + \rho\Delta u\big)\,\mathrm{d}t - \nu\Delta q + c\,\delta\,\gamma(\Delta w). \tag{69}$$

9. Let $\Delta > 0$ appearing in Assumption 3.1 be given. In order to apply this assumption, with the help of (31) and (32), we pass from the element Δw to an element $\delta w \in K_\Delta$, using a "small correction" $w' = \delta w - \Delta w$.

First we use the condition $G(u) \leq \eta$. Let $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. We remind the notations $M_j := \{t \in [0,1] \,:\, G_j(\hat{u}(t) = 0\}$ and $M_\Delta^+(\hat{\lambda}_j) := \{t \in [0,1] \,:\, \hat{\lambda}_j(t) > \Delta\}$ used in the definition (12) of the cone K_Δ. Set

$$M_\Delta(\hat{\lambda}_j) = \{t \in M_j :\, \hat{\lambda}_j \leq \Delta\}.$$

Then

$$M_j = M_\Delta(\hat{\lambda}_j) \cup M_\Delta^+(\hat{\lambda}_j).$$

Since $G_j(u) \leq \eta_j$ and $G_j(\hat{u}) = 0$ a.e. on M_j, and since $M_\Delta(\hat{\lambda}_j) \subset M_j$, we obtain that

$$G_j'(\hat{u})\Delta u \leq \eta_j - O(|\Delta u|^2) \quad \text{a.e. on} \quad M_\Delta(\hat{\lambda}_j). \tag{70}$$

Now we use the complementary slackness condition in (27). According to this condition, we have $\lambda_j(G_j(u) - \eta_j) = 0$. Using (56), we get

$$\lambda_j = \hat{\lambda}_j + \Delta\lambda_j \geq \Delta - |\Delta\lambda_j| \geq \Delta - C\,\delta > 0 \quad \text{a.e. on} \quad M_\Delta^+(\hat{\lambda}_j),$$

whenever $C\,\delta < \Delta$. Let $\delta > 0$ be so small that this condition is fulfilled. Then, it follows that $G_j(u) = \eta_j$ a.e. on $M_\Delta^+(\hat{\lambda}_j)$. Since $G_j(\hat{u}) = 0$ on M_j, we get

$$G_j'(\hat{u})\Delta u = \eta_j - O(|\Delta u|^2) \quad \text{a.e. on} \quad M_\Delta^+(\hat{\lambda}_j). \tag{71}$$

By virtue of Assumption 2.1, relations (70) and (71) imply that there exists u' such that for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ we have

$$G_j'(\hat{u})\big(\Delta u + u'\big) \leq 0 \quad \text{a.e. on} \quad M_\Delta(\hat{\lambda}_j), \tag{72}$$

$$G_j'(\hat{u})\big(\Delta u + u'\big) = 0, \quad \text{a.e. on} \quad M_\Delta^+(\hat{\lambda}_j), \tag{73}$$

$$|u'| \le c\big(|\eta| + O(|\Delta u|^2)\big) \tag{74}$$

with some $c > 0$, and, therefore,

$$\|u'\|_1 \le c\|\eta\|_1 + O(\|\Delta u\|_2^2) \le c\|\omega\| + O(\|\Delta u\|_2^2). \tag{75}$$

Here we use $\|\eta\|_1 \le \|\eta\|_2 \le \|\omega\|$. Moreover, due to (74) and since $\|\Delta u\|_\infty \le \delta$, the product of functions $|\Delta u| \cdot |u'|$ satisfies the estimate

$$\int_0^1 |\Delta u| \cdot |u'| \, \mathrm{d}t \le c\|\Delta u\|_2 \|\omega\| + c'\delta\|\Delta u\|_2^2 \tag{76}$$

with some $c' > 0$, and also by virtue of (74) for the function $|u'|^2$ we have the estimate

$$\int_0^1 |u'|^2 \, \mathrm{d}t = \|u'\|_2^2 \le 2c^2\|\eta\|_2^2 + c'\int_0^1 |\Delta u|^4 \, \mathrm{d}t \le c\|\omega\|^2 + c'\delta^2\|\Delta u\|_2^2 \tag{77}$$

with some $c > 0$ and $c' > 0$.

10. Set

$$\delta u = \Delta u + u'.$$

There exists $\delta x \in W^{1,1}$ such that

$$\delta\dot{x} = f_x(\hat{w})\delta x + f_u(\hat{w})\delta u, \quad \delta x(0) = \Delta x(0). \tag{78}$$

Recall that by (42)

$$\Delta\dot{x} = f_x(\hat{w})\Delta x + f_u(\hat{w})\Delta u + O(|\Delta w|^2) - \xi.$$

Then $\delta x = \Delta x + x'$, where x' satisfies

$$\dot{x}' = f_x(\hat{w})x' + f_u(\hat{w})u' - O(|\Delta w|^2) + \xi, \quad x'(0) = 0.$$

This and (75) imply the following estimate

$$\|x'\|_\infty \le c(\|u'\|_1 + \|\xi\|_1) + O(\|\Delta w\|_2^2) \le c'\|\omega\| + O(\|\Delta w\|_2^2) \tag{79}$$

with some $c > 0$ and $c' > 0$. Set $w' = (x', u')$. Then $\delta w = \Delta w + w'$. Due to (72) and (73), it is easy to verify that

$$\delta w = (\delta x, \delta u) \in K_\Delta,$$

and hence, by Assumption 3.1 (see also Remark 3.1),

$$\Omega(\delta w) \ge c_\Delta \gamma(\delta w). \tag{80}$$

11. Let us compare $\Omega(\delta w)$ with $\Omega(\Delta w)$. According to Lemma 4.1, we have

$$\Omega(\delta w) = \Omega(\Delta w + w') = \Omega(\Delta w) + E(\Delta w, w'), \tag{81}$$

where

$$|E(\Delta w, w')| \le c_E\big(\|\Delta x\|_\infty \|x'\|_\infty + \|x'\|_\infty^2 + \|x'\|_\infty \|\Delta u\|_1$$

$$+\|\Delta x\|_\infty\|u'\|_1+\|x'\|_\infty\|u'\|_1+\|u'\|_2^2+\||\Delta u|\cdot|u'|\|_1\big). \tag{82}$$

According to the above estimates (74)-(77), and (79) (we replace c' with c, taking the maximum of these two constants as the new c), we have

$$\|\Delta x\|_\infty\|x'\|_\infty\le c\|\Delta x\|_\infty\|\omega\|+o(\gamma(\Delta w)),$$

$$\|x'\|_\infty^2\le\big(c\|\omega\|+O(\|\Delta w\|_2^2)\big)^2\le 2c^2\|\omega\|^2+2O(\|\Delta w\|_2^4)\le 2c^2\|\omega\|^2+o(\gamma(\Delta w)),$$

$$\|\Delta u\|_1\|x'\|_\infty\le\|\Delta u\|_2\|x'\|_\infty\le c\|\Delta u\|_2\|\omega\|+o(\gamma(\Delta w)),$$

$$\|\Delta x\|_\infty\|u'\|_1\le c\|\Delta x\|_\infty\|\omega\|+o(\gamma(\Delta w)),$$

$$\|x'\|_\infty\|u'\|_1\le\big(c\|\omega\|+O(\gamma(\Delta w)\big)^2\le 2c^2\|\omega\|^2+o(\gamma(\Delta w)),$$

$$\|u'\|_2^2\le c\|\omega\|^2+c\delta^2\|\Delta u\|_2^2,$$

$$\||\Delta u|\cdot|u'|\|_1\le c\|\omega\|\|\Delta u\|_2+c\delta\|\Delta u\|_2^2.$$

This implies that

$$|E(\Delta w,w')|\le c_\Omega R_\delta(\Delta w,\omega) \tag{83}$$

with some $c_\Omega>0$, where (provided that $\delta>0$ is sufficiently small)

$$R_\delta(\Delta w,\omega):=\|\omega\|^2+\|\omega\|\|\Delta x\|_\infty+\|\omega\|\|\Delta u\|_2+\delta\gamma(\Delta w).$$

12. Let us compare $\gamma(\delta w)$ with $\gamma(\Delta w)$. We have

$$\gamma(\delta w)=\gamma(\Delta w)+r_\gamma(\Delta w,w'), \tag{84}$$

where

$$r_\gamma(\Delta w,w'):=\|\Delta x+x'\|_\infty^2-\|\Delta x\|_\infty^2+2\int_0^1\langle\Delta u,u'\rangle\,\mathrm{d}t+\int_0^1\langle u',u'\rangle\,\mathrm{d}t.$$

Here

$$\begin{aligned}\big|\|\Delta x+x'\|_\infty-\|\Delta x\|_\infty^2\big|&=\big|\|\Delta x+x'\|_\infty-\|\Delta x\|_\infty\big|\cdot\big|\|\Delta x+x'\|_\infty+\|\Delta x\|_\infty\big|\\&\le c\|x'\|\big(2\|\Delta x\|+\|x'\|\big)\end{aligned}$$

with some $c>0$. This implies that

$$|r_\gamma(\Delta w,w')|\le c_r\big(\|\Delta x\|_\infty\|x'\|_\infty+\|x'\|_\infty^2+\||\Delta u|\cdot|u'|\|_1+\|u'\|_2^2\big)$$

with some $c_r>0$. All these terms are contained in the estimate (82) for $|E(\Delta w,w')|$. Consequently,

$$|r_\gamma(\Delta w,w')|\le c_\gamma\,R_\delta(\Delta w,\omega) \tag{85}$$

with some $c_\gamma>0$.

13. Inequality (80) along with relations (81) and (84) implies the inequality

$$\Omega(\Delta w)+E(\Delta w,w')\ge c_\Delta\big(\gamma(\Delta w)+r_\gamma(\Delta w,w')\big),$$

whence

$$c_\Delta\gamma(\Delta w)-c_\Delta|r_\gamma(\Delta w,w')|-|E(\Delta w,w')|\le\Omega(\Delta w).$$

Using estimates (83) and (85) in this inequality, we get

$$c_\Delta \gamma(\Delta w) - (c_\Delta c_\gamma + c_\Omega)\, R_\delta(\Delta w, \omega) \le \Omega(\Delta w). \tag{86}$$

14. Combining inequality (69) with (86) we get

$$c_\Delta \gamma(\Delta w) - (c_\Delta c_\gamma + c_\Omega)\, R_\delta(\Delta w, \omega) \le \Omega(\Delta w)$$

$$\le \|\Delta\lambda\|_2 \|\omega\| + \int_0^1 \big(- \Delta p\, \xi + \pi \Delta x + \rho \Delta u\big)\, \mathrm{d}t - \nu \Delta q + c\,\delta\,\gamma(\Delta w).$$

Consequently,

$$c_\Delta \gamma(\Delta w) \le (c_\Delta c_\gamma + c_\Omega)\, R_\delta(\Delta w, \omega) + \|\Delta\lambda\|_2 \|\omega\|$$

$$+ \|\Delta p\|_\infty \|\xi\|_1 + \|\pi\|_1 \|\Delta x\|_\infty + \|\rho\|_2 \|\Delta u\|_2 + |\nu| \cdot |\Delta q| + c\,\delta\,\gamma(\Delta w).$$

Substituting the expression for $R_\delta(\Delta w, \omega)$ in this inequality, we obtain that

$$c_\Delta \gamma(\Delta w) \le \tilde{c}\Big(\|\omega\|^2 + \|\omega\| \|\Delta x\|_\infty + \|\omega\| \|\Delta u\|_2 + \delta \gamma(\Delta w)) \Big) + \|\Delta\lambda\|_2 \|\omega\|$$

$$+ \|\Delta p\|_\infty \|\xi\|_1 + \|\pi\|_1 \|\Delta x\|_\infty + \|\rho\|_2 \|\Delta u\|_2 + |\nu| \cdot |\Delta q| + c\,\delta\,\gamma(\Delta w),$$

where $\tilde{c} = c_\Delta c_\gamma + c_\Omega$. Then

$$(c_\Delta - \tilde{c}\,\delta - c\,\delta)\gamma(\Delta w) \le \tilde{c}\Big(\|\omega\|^2 + \|\omega\| \|\Delta x\|_\infty + \|\omega\| \|\Delta u\|_2 \Big) + \|\Delta\lambda\|_2 \|\omega\|$$

$$+ \|\Delta p\|_\infty \|\xi\|_1 + \|\pi\|_1 \|\Delta x\|_\infty + \|\rho\|_2 \|\Delta u\|_2 + |\nu| \cdot |\Delta q|.$$

Take $\delta > 0$ so small that $c'_\Delta := c_\Delta - \tilde{c}\,\delta - c\,\delta > 0$. Then

$$c'_\Delta (\|\Delta x\|_\infty^2 + \|\Delta u\|_2^2) \le \|\omega\|^2 + \|\omega\| \|\Delta x\|_\infty + \|\omega\| \|\Delta u\|_2 + \|\Delta\lambda\|_2 \|\omega\|$$

$$+ \|\Delta p\|_\infty \|\xi\|_1 + \|\pi\|_1 \|\Delta x\|_\infty + \|\rho\|_2 \|\Delta u\|_2 + |\nu| \cdot |\Delta q|. \tag{87}$$

Relations (40) and (48) imply

$$\|\Delta x\|_\infty \le C\big(|\Delta x_0| + \|\Delta u\|_2 + \|\omega\|\big), \quad \|\Delta p\|_\infty \le C\big(|\Delta x_0| + \|\Delta u\|_2 + \|\omega\|\big).$$

Moreover, according (57), we have

$$\|\Delta\lambda\|_2 \le C\big(|\Delta x_0| + \|\Delta u\|_2 + \|\omega\|\big).$$

Using these relations in (87) together with the definition $\|\omega\| := |\nu| + \|\pi\|_1 + \|\rho\|_2 + \|\xi\|_1 + \|\eta\|_2$ and taking into account the inequalities $|\Delta x_0| \le |\Delta q| \le 2\|\Delta x\|_\infty$, we get

$$c''_\Delta \big(|\Delta x_0|^2 + \|\Delta u\|_2^2\big) \le (|\Delta x_0| + \|\Delta u\|_2)\|\omega\| + \|\omega\|^2$$

with some $c''_\Delta > 0$ provided that $\delta > 0$ is small enough. Set $z = |\Delta x_0| + \|\Delta u\|_2$, $y = \|\omega\|$. Since $|\Delta x_0|^2 + \|\Delta u\|_2^2 \ge \frac{1}{2} z^2$, we obtain

$$a z^2 \le zy + y^2,$$

where $a = c''_\Delta/2$. This implies that

$$bz \le y, \quad \text{where} \quad b = \frac{\sqrt{4a+1}-1}{2}.$$

Consequently, $b(|\Delta x_0| + \|\Delta u\|_2) \le \|\omega\|$, or equivalently,

$$|\Delta x_0| + \|\Delta u\|_2 \le c_1 \|\omega\|, \tag{88}$$

where $c_1 = 1/b$. Then relations (40), (48), and (57) imply

$$\|\Delta x\|_{1,1} \le c_2 \|\omega\|, \quad \|\Delta p\|_{1,1} \le c_3 \|\omega\|, \quad \|\Delta \lambda\|_2 \le c_4 \|\omega\| \tag{89}$$

with some $c_2 > 0$, $c_3 > 0$, and $c_4 > 0$. The theorem is proved.

References

[1] Alt W., Schneider C., Seydenschwanz M.: Regularization and implicit Euler discretization of linear-quadratic optimal control problems with bang-bang solutions. Appl. Math. and Comp. 287-288, 104–124 (2016)

[2] Angelov G., Domnguez Corella A., Veliov V.M.: On the accuracy of the model predictive control method. To appear in SIAM Journal of Control and Optimization. Availlable as Research Report 2021-05, ORCOS, TU Wien (2021)

[3] Bonnans F.J.: Local analysis of Newton-type methods for variational inequalities and nonlinear programming. Appl. Math. Optim. 29, 161–186 (1994)

[4] Bonnans F.J., Osmolovskii N.P.: Characterization of a local quadratic growth of the Hamiltonian for control constrained optimal control problems. Dynamics of Continuous, Discrete and Impulsive Systems, Series B (DCDIS-B), 19, 1-2, 1–16 (2012)

[5] Bonnans F.J., ShapiroA.: Perturbation analysis of optimization problems. Springer (2000)

[6] Cibulka R., Dontchev A.L., Kruger A.Y.: Strong metric subregularity of mappings in variational analysis and optimization. Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Application. 457, 1247–1282 (2018)

[7] Domnguez Corella A., Jork N., Veliov V.M.: Stability in affine optimal control problems constrained by semilinear elliptic partial differential equations. Submitted. Available as Research Report 2022-01, ORCOS, TU Wien (2022)

[8] Dontchev A.L., Rockafellar R.T.: Regularity and conditioning of solution mappings in variational analysis. Set-Valued Analysis. 12, 79–109 (2004)

[9] Dontchev A.L., Rockafellar T.R.: Implicit Functions and Solution Mappings: A View from Variational Analysis. Second edition. Springer, New York (2014)

[10] Klatte D., Kummer B.: Nonsmooth equations in optimization. Kluwer Academic Publisher (2002)

[11] Levitin E.S., Milyutin A.A., Osmolovskii N.P.: Higher-order local minimum conditions in problems with constraints. Uspekhi Mat. Nauk. 33, 85148 (1978); English translation in Russian Math. Surveys, 33, 97168 (1978)

[12] Milyutin A.A., Osmolovskii N.P.: Calculus of Variations and Optimal Control. Translations of mathematical monographs, 180, American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island (1998)

[13] Osmolovskii N.P.: Second-order conditions for a weak local minimum in an optimal control problem (necessity, sufficiency), Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR, 225, 2, 259-262 (1975); Soviet Math. Dokl. 16, 3, 1480-1484 (1975)

[14] Osmolovskii N.P.: Sufficient quadratic conditions of extremum for discontinuous controls in optimal control problems with mixed constraints. J. Math. Science. 173, 1106 (2011)

[15] Osmolovskii N.P.: Second-order sufficient optimality conditions for control problems with linearly independent gradients of control constraints. ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations. 18, Number 2, Issue 02, 452-482 (2012)

[16] Osmolovskii N.P.: A Second-Order Sufficient Condition for a Weak Local Minimum in an Optimal Control Problem with an Inequality Control Constraint. Control and Cybernetic, submitted.

[17] Osmolovskii N.P., Veliov V.M.: Metric sub-regularity in optimal control of affine problems with free end state. ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations. 26, 47 (2020)

[18] Preininger J., Scarinci T., Veliov V.M.: Metric regularity properties in bang-bang type linear-quadratic optimal control problems. Set-Valued and Variational Analysis. 27, 381–404 (2019)

[19] Quincampoix M., Veliov V.M.: Metric regularity and stability of optimal control problems for linear systems. SIAM J. Contr. Optim. 51, 5, 4118–4137 (2013)