

Solvability and optimization for a class of mixed variational problems

Andaluzia Matei¹ * and Mircea Sofonea²

¹ *Department of Mathematics, University of Craiova
A.I. Cuza 13, 200585, Craiova, Romania
E-mail: andaluziamatei@inf.ucv.ro*

² *Laboratoire de Mathématiques et Physique
University of Perpignan Via Domitia
52 Avenue Paul Alduy, 66860 Perpignan, France
E-mail: sofonea@univ-perp.fr*

Abstract

We consider an abstract mixed variational problem governed by a nonlinear operator A and a bifunctional J , in a real reflexive Banach space X . The operator A is assumed to be continuous, Lipschitz continuous on each bounded subset of X , and generalized monotone. First, we pay attention to the unique solvability of the problem. Next, we prove a continuous dependence result of the solution with respect to the data. Based on this result we prove the existence of at least one solution for an associated optimization problem. Finally, we apply our abstract results to the well-posedness and the optimization of an antiplane frictional contact model for nonlinearly elastic materials of Hencky-type.

Key words : mixed variational problem, Lagrange multiplier, optimization problem, Hencky material, antiplane frictional contact problem, weak solution.

AMS subject classification: 35J65, 49J20, 65K10, 49K27, 49J40, 74M10, 74M15.

1 Introduction

Mixed variational formulations arise in the analysis of various nonlinear boundary value problems which appear in Solid, Fluid and Contact Mechanics, and in various Engineering

*This is a preprint. To cite the final version: Andaluzia Matei, Mircea Sofonea (2019) Solvability and optimization for a class of mixed variational problems, Optimization, DOI: 10.1080/02331934.2019.1676242

Applications, as well. Their solvability is based on arguments of saddle point, monotonicity, convexity and fixed-point techniques, among others. Existence and uniqueness results can be found in [4, 8, 10, 12, 27], for instance. Owing a specific structure and involving Lagrange multipliers, the numerical treatment of mixed variational problems is efficient and accurate. Reference in the field include [1, 2, 11, 13, 14], among others.

Recently, in [30] we considered a mixed variational problem in a real Hilbert space X , governed by a strongly monotone Lipschitz continuous operator A and a completely continuous operator π . The main result in [30] was the continuous dependence of the solution with respect to the data. A more general mixed variational problem was considered in [18], in the framework of a real reflexive Banach space. There, the existence of at least one solution of the problem was proved, under the assumptions that the operator A is generalized monotone and hemicontinuous.

The present paper represents a continuation of our previous papers [18, 30]. Its main novelty arises in the fact that here we extend the continuous dependence result in [30] to the generalized mixed variational problem in [18], assuming that the operator A is continuous, Lipschitz continuous on each bounded subset of X , and generalized monotone. Note that such an operator could fail to be globally Lipschitz continuous. Following a technique developed in [30], we apply our new results to study the solvability of an associated optimization problem. Finally, we use the abstract results in the study of the well-posedness and optimization of a nonlinear boundary value problem which describes an antiplane frictional contact problem with elastic materials of Hencky-type, see, e.g., [17] and the references therein.

The abstract problem under consideration can be stated as follows.

Problem 1. *Find $u \in X$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda \subset Y$ such that*

$$(Au, v - u)_{X',X} + b(v - u, \lambda) + J(u, v - u) \geq (f, \pi(v - u))_{Z',Z} \quad \text{for all } v \in X, \quad (1)$$

$$b(u, \mu - \lambda) \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } \mu \in \Lambda. \quad (2)$$

Here $(X, \|\cdot\|_X)$, $(Y, \|\cdot\|_Y)$ and $(Z, \|\cdot\|_Z)$ are real reflexive Banach spaces, $(\cdot, \cdot)_{X',X}$ denotes the duality pairing between X and its dual X' and $(\cdot, \cdot)_{Z',Z}$ denotes the duality pairing between Z and its dual Z' . Moreover, $A : X \rightarrow X'$, $b : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $J : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $f \in Z'$, $\pi : X \rightarrow Z$ and $\Lambda \subset Y$ are given. Below in this paper we use “ \rightarrow ” and “ \rightharpoonup ” for the strong and weak convergence in various normed spaces that will be specified and, unless stated otherwise, all the limits, upper limits and lower limits are considered when $n \rightarrow +\infty$.

In the study of Problem 1 we consider the following assumptions.

Assumption 1. *There exists a functional $h : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that:*

- (i₁) $h(tw) = t^r h(w)$ for all $t > 0$, $w \in X$, with a given $r > 1$;
- (i₂) $(Av - Au, v - u)_{X',X} \geq h(v - u)$ for all $u, v \in X$;
- (i₃) if $\{u_n\} \subset X$ is a sequence such that $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ in X , then $h(u) \leq \limsup h(u_n)$.

Assumption 2. *The operator $A : X \rightarrow X'$ is continuous.*

Assumption 3. $\frac{(Au, u)_{X',X}}{\|u\|_X} \rightarrow \infty$ as $\|u\|_X \rightarrow \infty$.

Assumption 4. The form $b : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is bilinear. In addition:

(i₁) for each sequence $\{u_n\} \subset X$ such that $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ in X we have $b(u_n, \mu) \rightarrow b(u, \mu)$, for all $\mu \in Y$;

(i₂) for each sequence $\{\lambda_n\} \subset Y$ such that $\lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda$ in Y we have $b(v, \lambda_n) \rightarrow b(v, \lambda)$, for all $v \in X$;

(i₃) b satisfies the so-called “inf-sup” condition, i.e., there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$\inf_{\mu \in Y, \mu \neq 0_Y} \sup_{v \in X, v \neq 0_X} \frac{b(v, \mu)}{\|v\|_X \|\mu\|_Y} \geq \alpha. \quad (3)$$

Assumption 5. The function $J : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is such that:

(i₁) for every $u \in X$, the application $X \ni v \rightarrow J(u, v) \in \mathbb{R}$ is positively homogeneous and subadditive on X ;

(i₂) there exists $c > 0$ such that

$$|J(u, v)| \leq c\|v\|_X \quad \text{for all } u, v \in X; \quad (4)$$

(i₃) the application $X \times X \ni (u, v) \rightarrow J(u, v) \in \mathbb{R}$ is weakly upper semicontinuous, i.e., if $\{u_n\} \subset X$, $\{v_n\} \subset X$ are such that $u_n \rightharpoonup u$, $v_n \rightharpoonup v$ in X , then

$$\limsup J(u_n, v_n) \leq J(u, v).$$

Assumption 6. $f \in Z'$.

Assumption 7. Λ is a closed convex bounded subset of Y such that $0_Y \in \Lambda$.

Assumption 8. The operator π is a linear and continuous operator.

The following existence result is a straightforward consequence of an existence result obtained in the recent paper [18].

Theorem 1. Under Assumptions 1–8 there exists at least one solution to Problem 1.

Note that Theorem 1 guarantees the solvability of Problem 1. Nevertheless, it leaves open a number of questions like the uniqueness of the solution and its continuous dependence on the data A , b , J , f , Λ , which represent crucial tools in the study of associated optimization and optimal control problems. The aim of this paper is to fill this gap. Thus, in Section 2 we provide sufficient assumptions on the data which guarantee the uniqueness of the solution to Problem 1. Moreover, we study the boundedness of the solution. We use these results in Section 3 where we prove a continuous dependence result of the solution with respect to the data. The proof follows the technique in [30], based on arguments of monotonicity, compactness and Mosco convergence. Then, we use this continuous dependence result to provide the existence of minimizers for an associated optimization problem. Our abstract results in this paper can be applied in the study of a large number of boundary value problems. To provide an example, we use them in Section 4 in the study of a nonlinear problem governed by the r -Laplace operator.

We end this section recalling that comprehensive results on optimization and optimal control theory can be found in [3, 4, 15, 26, 31, 32]. For various results concerning the optimal control of variational and hemivariational inequalities we refer the reader to, e.g., [7, 19, 24, 25, 28]. The current paper completes part of the results in the aforementioned references, since here we deal with the minimization of cost functionals associated to mixed variational problems.

2 Uniqueness and bounds

In this section we provide the uniqueness of the solution (u, λ) of Problem 1 together with bounds for u and λ too. To this end, we consider the following additional assumptions.

Assumption 9. *There exist $M > 0$ and $q \geq 2$ such that*

$$h(v) \geq M \|v\|_X^q \quad \text{for all } v \in X. \quad (5)$$

Assumption 10. *There exists $m \geq 0$ such that*

$$J(w_1, w_2 - w_1) + J(w_2, w_1 - w_2) \leq m \|w_1 - w_2\|_X^q \quad \text{for all } w_1, w_2 \in X, \quad (6)$$

where q is the constant which appears in (5).

Assumption 11. $M > m$.

Our first result in this section is the following.

Theorem 2. *Under Assumptions 1–11 the solution of Problem 1 is unique in its first argument.*

Proof. Let (u_1, λ_1) and (u_2, λ_2) be two solutions of Problem 1. We write (1) with $u = u_1$, $\lambda = \lambda_1$ and $v = u_2$, then with $u = u_2$, $\lambda = \lambda_2$ and $v = u_1$. We add the resulting inequalities to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} (Au_1 - Au_2, u_1 - u_2)_{X', X} &\leq b(u_2, \lambda_1 - \lambda_2) + b(u_1, \lambda_2 - \lambda_1) \\ &\quad + J(u_1, u_2 - u_1) + J(u_2, u_1 - u_2). \end{aligned}$$

Next, since (2) implies that $b(u_2, \lambda_1 - \lambda_2) \leq 0$ and $b(u_1, \lambda_2 - \lambda_1) \leq 0$, we deduce that

$$(Au_1 - Au_2, u_1 - u_2)_{X', X} \leq J(u_1, u_2 - u_1) + J(u_2, u_1 - u_2).$$

This last inequality together with Assumptions 1 (i_2), 9 and 10 yields

$$(M - m) \|u_1 - u_2\|_X^q \leq 0.$$

Therefore, Assumption 11 implies that $u_1 = u_2$. □

In order to prove the uniqueness in the second argument, we need the following additional assumption.

Assumption 12. $J(u, v) + J(u, -v) \leq 0$ for all $u, v \in X$.

Our second result in this section is the following.

Theorem 3. *Under Assumptions 1–12, Problem 1 has a unique solution.*

Proof. Let (u_1, λ_1) and (u_2, λ_2) be two solutions of Problem 1 and let $w \in X$, $w \neq 0_X$. We write (1) with $u = u_1$, $\lambda = \lambda_1$ and $v = -w + u_1$, then with $u = u_2$, $\lambda = \lambda_2$ and $v = w + u_2$. By adding the resulting inequalities we obtain

$$b(w, \lambda_1 - \lambda_2) \leq \|Au_1 - Au_2\|_{X'} \|w\|_X + J(u_1, -w) + J(u_2, w).$$

Since Theorem 2 guarantees that $u_1 = u_2$, using Assumption 12 we are led to

$$\frac{b(w, \lambda_1 - \lambda_2)}{\|w\|_X} \leq 0. \quad (7)$$

Moreover, (3) implies that

$$\alpha \|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2\|_Y \leq \sup_{w \in X, w \neq 0_X} \frac{b(w, \lambda_1 - \lambda_2)}{\|w\|_X}. \quad (8)$$

We now combine inequalities (7) and (8) to deduce that $\|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2\|_Y \leq 0$, which concludes the proof. \square

We proceed with some boundedness results for the solution (u, λ) of Problem 1.

Proposition 1. *Under Assumptions 1–11 we have*

$$\|u\|_X \leq M^{1/(1-q)} (c_0 \|f\|_{Z'} + \|A0_X\|_{X'} + c)^{1/(q-1)},$$

c being the positive constant in (4).

Proof. We test with $v = 0_X$ in (1) to obtain that

$$(Au, u)_{X', X} \leq b(-u, \lambda) + J(u, -u) + (f, \pi u)_{Z', Z}. \quad (9)$$

Next, setting $\mu = 0_Y$ in (2) we get

$$b(-u, \lambda) \leq 0. \quad (10)$$

On the other hand, according to (4) we have

$$J(u, -u) \leq c \|u\|_X \quad (11)$$

and, since the operator π is a linear and continuous operator, there exists $c_0 > 0$ such that

$$\|\pi v\|_Z \leq c_0 \|v\|_X \quad \text{for all } v \in X. \quad (12)$$

We now combine inequalities (9)–(12) and use Assumption 1 (i_2) and (5) to see that

$$M \|u\|_X^{q-1} \leq c_0 \|f\|_{Z'} + \|A0_X\|_{X'} + c \quad (13)$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Next, we introduce the bounded set

$$K_1 = \{v \in X \mid \|v\|_X \leq M_1\}, \quad (14)$$

where

$$M_1 = M^{1/(1-q)} (c_0 \|f\|_{Z'} + \|A0_X\|_{X'} + c)^{1/(q-1)}. \quad (15)$$

Note that, under the assumptions of Proposition 1 we have $u \in K_1$. Consider now the following assumption.

Assumption 13. For each nonempty bounded subset $S \subset X$, there exists $L_S > 0$ such that

$$\|Au - Av\|_{X'} \leq L_S \|u - v\|_X \quad \text{for all } u, v \in S. \quad (16)$$

Then, the following result holds.

Proposition 2. Under Assumptions 1–13,

$$\|\lambda\|_Y \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} (c_0 \|f\|_{Z'} + L_{K_1} M_1 + \|A0_X\|_{X'} + c), \quad (17)$$

c_0 being the positive constant in (12), L_{K_1} the positive constant in (16) corresponding to the set $S = K_1$, and c the positive constant in (4).

Proof. Let $w \in X$ be arbitrarily fixed. Setting $v = u - w$ in (1) we have

$$\begin{aligned} b(w, \lambda) &\leq (Au, -w)_{X', X} + J(u, -w) + (f, \pi w)_{Z', Z} \\ &\leq \|Au\|_{X'} \|w\|_X + c \|w\|_X + c_0 \|f\|_{Z'} \|w\|_X. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we use the inf-sup property of the form b , see Assumption 4 (i_3), to write

$$\alpha \|\lambda\|_Y \leq c_0 \|f\|_{Z'} + \|Au\|_{X'} + c. \quad (18)$$

On the other hand, since $u \in K_1$, it follows that

$$\|Au\|_{X'} \leq L_{K_1} M_1 + \|A0_X\|_{X'}. \quad (19)$$

Combining now (18) and (19) we obtain

$$\alpha \|\lambda\|_Y \leq L_{K_1} M_1 + \|A0_X\|_{X'} + c + c_0 \|f\|_{Z'}$$

which implies (17) and concludes the proof. \square

3 Convergence and optimization

In the first part of this section we study the dependence of the solution of Problem 1 with respect to the data and prove a convergence result. This convergence result will be applied in the second part of this section in order to study an associated optimization problem. We suppose in what follows that Assumptions 1–13 hold and we denote by (u, λ) the unique solution of Problem 1 guaranteed by Theorem 3. Moreover, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we consider the following problem.

Problem 2. Find $(u_n, \lambda_n) \in X \times \Lambda_n$ such that

$$(A_n u_n, v - u_n)_{X', X} + b_n(v - u_n, \lambda_n) + J_n(u_n, v - u_n) \geq (f_n, \pi(v - u_n))_{Z', Z} \quad (20)$$

$$b_n(u_n, \mu - \lambda_n) \leq 0. \quad (21)$$

for all $v \in X$, $\mu \in \Lambda_n$.

Herein, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the operator A_n , the form b_n , the function J_n , the element f_n and the set Λ_n represent a perturbation of A , b , J , f , Λ and are supposed to satisfy Assumptions 1–7, 9–13 with function h_n and constants α_n , c_n , M_n , q_n , m_n , L_S^n . To avoid any confusion, when used with n , we refer to these assumptions as Assumptions 1_n – 7_n , 9_n – 13_n . Recall that Theorem 3 guarantees the uniqueness of the solution of Problem 2, denoted by (u_n, λ_n) . To proceed, we consider the following additional assumptions.

Assumption 14. *There exists $\tilde{\delta}$ and, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist $F_n \geq 0$ and $\delta_n \geq 0$ such that:*

- (i₁) $\|A_n v - Av\|_{X'} \leq F_n(\|v\|_X + \delta_n)$ for all $v \in X$;
- (i₂) $\lim F_n = 0$;
- (i₃) $\delta_n \leq \tilde{\delta}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Assumption 15. *For each $u \in X$, the application $X \ni v \rightarrow J(u, v) \in \mathbb{R}$ is weakly lower semicontinuous. In addition, for each sequence $\{u_n\}$ such that $u_n \rightharpoonup \tilde{u}$ in X , the following inequalities hold:*

$$\limsup [J(\tilde{u}, u_n - \tilde{u}) - J_n(\tilde{u}, u_n - \tilde{u})] \leq 0; \quad (22)$$

$$\limsup [J_n(u_n, v - u_n) - J(u_n, v - u_n)] \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } v \in X. \quad (23)$$

Assumption 16. *There exists $M_0 > 0$ such that $M_n - m_n \geq M_0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Assumption 17. *There exists $\tilde{q} > 0$ such that $q_n \geq \tilde{q}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Assumption 18. *There exists \tilde{c} such that $c_n \leq \tilde{c}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Assumption 19. *For all sequences $\{z_n\} \subset X$, $\{\mu_n\} \subset Y$ such that $z_n \rightarrow z$ in X , $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$ in Y , we have $\limsup b_n(w - z_n, \mu_n) \leq b(w - z, \mu)$ for all $w \in X$.*

Assumption 20. *There exists $\alpha_0 > 0$ such that $\alpha_n \geq \alpha_0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Assumption 21. $\{\Lambda_n\}$ converge to Λ in the sense of Mosco, i.e.,

(i₁) *for each $\mu \in \Lambda$ there exists a sequence $\{\mu_n\}$ such that $\mu_n \in \Lambda_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$ in Y ;*

(i₂) *for each sequence $\{\mu_n\}$ such that $\mu_n \in \Lambda_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$ in Y , we have $\mu \in \Lambda$.*

Assumption 22. $f_n \rightharpoonup f$ in Z' .

Assumption 23. *The operator π is completely continuous, i.e., for each sequence $\{v_n\} \subset X$ such that $v_n \rightarrow v$ in X , we have*

$$\pi v_n \rightarrow \pi v \quad \text{in } Y.$$

Our first result in this section states the convergence of the solution to Problem 2 to the solution of Problem 1 and it is stated as follows.

Theorem 4. *Under Assumptions 1–13, 1_n–7_n, 9_n–13_n, 14–23 the following convergences hold:*

$$u_n \rightarrow u \quad \text{in } X, \quad (24)$$

$$\lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda \quad \text{in } Y. \quad (25)$$

Proof. The proof is carried out in several steps that we describe below.

Step 1. *We prove that the sequence $\{u_n\}$ is bounded in X .*

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Using arguments similar to those used to obtain (13) we can write

$$M_n \|u_n\|_X^{q_n-1} \leq (c_0 \|f_n\|_{Z'} + \|A_n 0_X\|_{X'} + c_n). \quad (26)$$

On the other hand, Assumptions 14, 22 imply that

$$\|A_n 0_X\|_{X'} \leq F_n \delta_n + \|A 0_X\|_{X'}, \quad (27)$$

and there exist $\tilde{F} > 0$ and $\tilde{f} > 0$ such that

$$|F_n| \leq \tilde{F} \quad \text{and} \quad \|f_n\|_{Z'} \leq \tilde{f} \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (28)$$

Therefore, combining the inequalities (26)–(28) and keeping in mind Assumption 18 we find that

$$M_0 \|u_n\|_X^{q_n-1} \leq c_0 \tilde{f} + \tilde{F} \tilde{\delta} + \|A 0_X\|_X + \tilde{c}.$$

Next, using Assumption 17 we deduce that

$$\|u_n\|_X \leq k, \quad (29)$$

where

$$k = M_0^{1/(1-\tilde{q})} (c_0 \tilde{f} + \tilde{F} \tilde{\delta} + \|A 0_X\|_X + \tilde{c})^{1/(\tilde{q}-1)}, \quad (30)$$

which ends the proof of this step.

Step 2. *We prove that the sequence $\{\lambda_n\}$ is bounded in Y .*

First, we remark that (29) implies that $\{u_n\} \subset K$ where

$$K = \{v \in X \mid \|v\| \leq k\}. \quad (31)$$

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By using the inf-sup property of the form b and arguments similar to those used in the proof of (18), we can write

$$\alpha_n \|\lambda_n\|_Y \leq c_0 \|f_n\|_{Z'} + \|A_n u_n\|_{X'} + c_n. \quad (32)$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_n u_n\|_{X'} &\leq \|A_n u_n - A u_n\|_{X'} + \|A u_n\|_X \\ &\leq F_n (\|u_n\|_X + \delta_n) + \|A u_n - A 0_X\|_{X'} + \|A 0_X\|_{X'} \\ &\leq \tilde{F} (k + \tilde{\delta}) + L_K k + \|A 0_X\|_{X'}, \end{aligned}$$

where K and k are given by (31) and (30), respectively.

Therefore,

$$\alpha_0 \|\lambda_n\|_Y \leq (c_0 \tilde{f} + \tilde{F} (k + \tilde{\delta}) + L_K k + \|A 0_X\|_{X'} + \tilde{c}), \quad (33)$$

which ends the proof of this step.

Step 3. We prove that there exists a pair $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\lambda}) \in X \times Y$ such that, passing to a subsequence still denoted $\{(u_n, \lambda_n)\}$, we have $u_n \rightarrow \tilde{u}$ in X and $\lambda_n \rightarrow \tilde{\lambda}$ in Y .

The existence of an element $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\lambda}) \in X \times Y$ as well as the weak convergences $u_n \rightharpoonup \tilde{u}$ in X and $\lambda_n \rightharpoonup \tilde{\lambda}$ in Y follows from Steps 1 and 2 combined with a standard reflexivity argument. In order to prove the strong convergence $u_n \rightarrow \tilde{u}$ in X we start by testing in (20) with $v = \tilde{u}$. We have

$$(A_n u_n, \tilde{u} - u_n)_{X', X} + b_n(\tilde{u} - u_n, \lambda_n) + J_n(u_n, \tilde{u} - u_n) \geq (f_n, \pi(\tilde{u} - u_n))_{Z', Z}$$

and, therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & (A_n u_n - A_n \tilde{u}, u_n - \tilde{u})_{X', X} - J_n(u_n, \tilde{u} - u_n) - J_n(\tilde{u}, u_n - \tilde{u}) \leq \\ & (A_n \tilde{u}, \tilde{u} - u_n)_{X', X} + b_n(\tilde{u} - u_n, \lambda_n) + (f_n, \pi u_n - \pi \tilde{u})_{Z', Z} - J_n(\tilde{u}, u_n - \tilde{u}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, using Assumptions 1_n, 9_n 10_n and the inequalities $M_n - m_n \geq M_0$ and $q_n \geq \tilde{q}$, guaranteed by Assumptions 16 and 17, respectively, we find that

$$M_0 \|u_n - \tilde{u}\|_X^{\tilde{q}} \leq (A_n \tilde{u}, \tilde{u} - u_n)_{X', X} + b_n(\tilde{u} - u_n, \lambda_n) + (f_n, \pi u_n - \pi \tilde{u})_{Z', Z} - J_n(\tilde{u}, u_n - \tilde{u}). \quad (34)$$

Next, we use Assumption 14 (i_1) and write

$$\begin{aligned} (A_n \tilde{u}, \tilde{u} - u_n)_{X', X} &= (A_n \tilde{u} - A \tilde{u}, \tilde{u} - u_n)_{X', X} + (A \tilde{u}, \tilde{u} - u_n)_{X', X} \\ &\leq F_n(\|\tilde{u}\|_X + \delta_n) \|u_n - \tilde{u}\|_X + (A \tilde{u}, \tilde{u} - u_n)_{X', X}, \end{aligned}$$

then we pass to the upper limit in this inequality, and use Assumption 14 (i_2), (i_3) to deduce that

$$\limsup (A_n \tilde{u}, \tilde{u} - u_n)_{X', X} \leq 0. \quad (35)$$

Notice also that Assumptions 22, 19 together with the convergences $u_n \rightharpoonup \tilde{u}$ in X and $\lambda_n \rightharpoonup \tilde{\lambda}$ in Y imply that

$$(f_n, \pi u_n - \pi \tilde{u})_{Z', Z} \rightarrow 0, \quad (36)$$

$$\limsup b_n(\tilde{u} - u_n, \lambda_n) \leq 0. \quad (37)$$

Next, we use Assumption 15 to write

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup [-J_n(\tilde{u}, u_n - \tilde{u})] \\ &= \limsup [J(\tilde{u}, u_n - \tilde{u}) - J_n(\tilde{u}, u_n - \tilde{u}) - J(\tilde{u}, u_n - \tilde{u})] \\ &\leq \limsup [J(\tilde{u}, u_n - \tilde{u}) - J_n(\tilde{u}, u_n - \tilde{u})] + \limsup [-J(\tilde{u}, u_n - \tilde{u})] \\ &\leq -\liminf J(\tilde{u}, u_n - \tilde{u}) \leq -J(\tilde{u}, 0_X). \end{aligned}$$

Using now Assumption 5 (i_2) we have $J(\tilde{u}, 0_X) = 0$ and, therefore,

$$\limsup [-J_n(\tilde{u}, u_n - \tilde{u})] \leq 0. \quad (38)$$

We now pass to the upper limit in the inequality (34) and we obtain

$$\limsup M_0 \|u_n - \tilde{u}\|_X^{\tilde{q}} \leq 0.$$

This implies that $u_n \rightarrow \tilde{u}$ in X and concludes the proof of this step.

Step 4. We prove that the pair $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\lambda}) \in X \times Y$ is a solution of Problem 1.

First, we recall that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\lambda_n \in \Lambda_n$. Keeping in mind Assumption 21 (i_2) we deduce that

$$\tilde{\lambda} \in \Lambda. \quad (39)$$

On the other hand, recall that $\{u_n\} \subset K$ where K is the closed subset of X defined by (31). Therefore, since $u_n \rightarrow \tilde{u}$ in X , we deduce that $\tilde{u} \in K$.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $v \in X$. We use Assumption 14 to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_n u_n - A\tilde{u}\|_{X',X} &\leq \|A_n u_n - A u_n\|_{X'} + \|A u_n - A\tilde{u}\|_{X'} \\ &\leq F_n(\|u_n\|_X + \delta_n) + L_K \|u_n - \tilde{u}\|_X \end{aligned}$$

and, therefore,

$$A_n u_n \rightarrow A\tilde{u} \quad \text{in } X'. \quad (40)$$

By using Assumption 19 with $z_n = 0_X$, $\mu_n = \lambda_n$, $w = v$, and then with $z_n = v$, $\mu_n = \lambda_n$ and $w = 0_X$ we obtain

$$\limsup b_n(v, \lambda_n) \leq b(v, \tilde{\lambda}) \quad \text{and} \quad b(v, \tilde{\lambda}) \leq \liminf b_n(v, \lambda_n),$$

respectively. These inequalities show that

$$b_n(v, \lambda_n) \rightarrow b(v, \tilde{\lambda}).$$

Similarly, taking $w = 0_X$, $z_n = u_n$ and $\mu_n = \lambda_n$, by Assumption 19 we obtain,

$$\limsup b_n(-u_n, \lambda_n) \leq b(-\tilde{u}, \tilde{\lambda}).$$

Consequently,

$$\limsup b_n(v - u_n, \lambda_n) \leq b(v - \tilde{u}, \tilde{\lambda}). \quad (41)$$

Moreover, note that Assumptions 22 and the convergence $u_n \rightarrow \tilde{u}$ in X imply that

$$(f_n, \pi(v - u_n))_{Z',Z} \rightarrow (f, \pi(v - \tilde{u}))_{Z',Z}. \quad (42)$$

Next we write

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup J_n(u_n, v - u_n) &\leq \limsup [J_n(u_n, v - u_n) - J(u_n, v - u_n)] \\ &\quad + \limsup J(u_n, v - u_n), \end{aligned}$$

and, therefore, Assumptions 15 and 5 yield

$$\limsup J_n(u_n, v - u_n) \leq J(\tilde{u}, v - \tilde{u}) \quad \text{for all } v \in X. \quad (43)$$

Keeping in mind (40)-(43), we pass to the upper limit in the inequality (20) to see that

$$(A\tilde{u}, v - \tilde{u})_{X',X} + b(v - \tilde{u}, \tilde{\lambda}) + J(\tilde{u}, v - \tilde{u}) \geq (f, \pi(v - \tilde{u}))_{Z',Z}. \quad (44)$$

Consider now an arbitrary element $\mu \in \Lambda$. Using Assumption 21 we know that there exists a sequence $\{\xi_n\}$ such that $\xi_n \in \Lambda_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\xi_n \rightarrow \mu$ in Y . This allows to use the inequality (21) to see that

$$b_n(u_n, \xi_n - \lambda_n) \leq 0,$$

which implies that

$$\liminf b_n(u_n, \xi_n - \lambda_n) \leq 0. \quad (45)$$

On the other hand, by Assumption 19 with $w = 0_X, z_n = u_n$ and $\mu_n = \xi_n - \lambda_n$ we deduce that

$$\limsup b_n(-u_n, \xi_n - \lambda_n) \leq b(-\tilde{u}, \mu - \tilde{\lambda})$$

or, equivalently,

$$b(\tilde{u}, \mu - \tilde{\lambda}) \leq \liminf b_n(u_n, \xi_n - \lambda_n). \quad (46)$$

We combine the inequalities (45) and (46) to find that

$$b(\tilde{u}, \mu - \tilde{\lambda}) \leq 0. \quad (47)$$

Finally, we gather (39), (44) and (47) to conclude the proof of this step. \square

Step 5. *We now prove the convergences (24) and (25).*

Recall that Theorem 3 states the existence of a unique solution to Problem 1, denoted (u, λ) . Therefore, it follows from Step 4 that $\tilde{u} = u$ and $\tilde{\lambda} = \lambda$. A careful examination of the steps 1–4 reveals the fact that the sequence $\{(u_n, \lambda_n)\}$ is bounded in $X \times Y$ and every subsequence of $\{(u_n, \lambda_n)\}$ which converges weakly in $X \times Y$ has the same limit (u, λ) . Therefore, by a standard argument we deduce that the whole sequence $\{(u_n, \lambda_n)\}$ converges weakly in $X \times Y$ to (u, λ) or, equivalently, $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ in X and $\lambda_n \rightharpoonup \lambda$ in Y . This implies that (25) holds. Moreover, by repeating the arguments in Step 3 one shows that the strong convergence (24) holds, which concludes the proof of the theorem. \square

To proceed, we pay attention to the optimization of the solution to the mixed variational problem (1)–(2). To this end, we consider a reflexive Banach space W endowed with the norm $\|\cdot\|_W$ and a nonempty subset $U \subset W$. For each $p \in U$ we consider an operator A_p , a form b_p , a function J_p , a set Λ_p and an element f_p which satisfy Assumptions 1–7, 9–13 with function h_p and constants $\alpha_p, c_p, M_p, m_p, q_p, L_S^p$. To avoid any confusion, when used with p , we refer to these assumptions as Assumptions 1_p – $7_p, 9_p$ – 13_p . Then, if Assumption 8 is satisfied, we deduce from Theorem 3 that for each $p \in U$ there exists a unique solution (u_p, λ_p) for the following problem.

Problem 3. *Find $(u_p, \lambda_p) \in X \times \Lambda_p$ such that*

$$(A_p u_p, v - u_p)_{X', X} + b_p(v - u_p, \lambda_p) + J_p(u_p, v - u_p) \geq (f_p, \pi(v - u_p))_{Z', Z}, \quad (48)$$

$$b_p(u_p, \mu - \lambda_p) \leq 0 \quad (49)$$

for all $v \in X, \mu \in \Lambda_p$.

Consider also a cost functional $J : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$J(p) = \mathcal{L}(u_p, \lambda_p, p) \quad \text{for all } p \in U \quad (50)$$

where $\mathcal{L} : X \times Y \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a given function which will be described below. Then, the optimization problem we are interested in is the following.

Problem 4. Find $p^* \in U$ such that

$$J(p^*) = \min_{p \in U} J(p). \quad (51)$$

To solve Problem 4 we consider the following assumptions.

Assumption 24. U is a nonempty weakly closed subset of W .

Assumption 25. For all sequences $\{u_n\} \subset X$, $\{\lambda_n\} \subset Y$ and $\{p_n\} \subset U$ such that $u_n \rightarrow u$ in X , $\lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda$ in Y , $p_n \rightarrow p$ in W , we have $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}(u_n, \lambda_n, p_n) \geq \mathcal{L}(u, \lambda, p)$.

Assumption 26. There exists $\psi : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that:

- (i₁) $\mathcal{L}(u, \lambda, p) \geq \psi(p)$ for all $u \in X$, $\lambda \in Y$, $p \in U$;
- (i₂) $\|p_n\|_W \rightarrow +\infty \implies \psi(p_n) \rightarrow \infty$.

Assumption 27. U is a bounded subset of W .

Our main result in this section is the following.

Theorem 5. Keep Assumptions 1_p–7_p, 9_p–13_p for any $p \in U$, together with Assumptions 8, 23, 24, 25 and either 26 or 27. In addition, assume that for any sequence $\{p_n\} \subset U$ such that $p_n \rightarrow p$ in W , Assumptions 14–22 are satisfied with $A_n = A_{p_n}$, $A = A_p$, $b_n = b_{p_n}$, $J_n = J_{p_n}$, $J = J_p$, $\Lambda_n = \Lambda_{p_n}$, $\Lambda = \Lambda_p$, $f_n = f_{p_n}$, $f = f_p$. Then Problem 4 has at least one solution.

Proof. Assume that $\{p_n\} \subset U$ is such that $p_n \rightarrow p$ in W . Since Assumptions 14–22 are satisfied in the sense prescribed in the statement of Theorem 5, we are in a position to apply Theorem 4 in order to obtain that $u_{p_n} \rightarrow u_p$ in X and $\lambda_{p_n} \rightarrow \lambda_p$ in Y . Therefore, using the definition (50) and Assumption 25 we deduce that

$$\liminf J(p_n) = \liminf \mathcal{L}(u_{p_n}, \lambda_{p_n}, p_n) \geq \mathcal{L}(u_p, \lambda_p, p) = J(p).$$

It follows from here that the function $J : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is weakly lower semicontinuous.

If Assumption 26 is satisfied then, for each sequence $\{p_n\} \subset U$, using (i₁) we have

$$J(p_n) = \mathcal{L}(u_{p_n}, \lambda_{p_n}, p_n) \geq \psi(p_n).$$

Therefore, if $\|p_n\|_W \rightarrow \infty$, using (i₂) we deduce that $J(p_n) \rightarrow \infty$ which shows that $J : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is coercive. Recall also Assumption 24 and the reflexivity of the space W . The existence of at least one solution to Problem 4 is now a direct consequence of a minimization theorem of the Weierstrass-type. On the other hand, if Assumption 27 is satisfied, we are still in a position to apply a Weierstrass argument, since now we minimize the function J on a bounded set and, therefore, we do not need its coercivity. We deduce from here that, if either Assumption 26 or Assumption 27 holds, then there exists at least one solution $p^* \in U$ to the optimization problem (51), which concludes the proof. \square

4 An example

The results in the previous sections can be applied to the variational analysis of various nonlinear boundary value problems. To give an example, we consider here a nonlinear boundary value problem governed by the r -Laplace operator.

Problem 5. Find $u : \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^* \operatorname{div} (\|\nabla u(\mathbf{x})\|^{r-2} \nabla u(\mathbf{x})) &= 0 && \text{in } \Omega, \\ u(\mathbf{x}) &= 0 && \text{on } \Gamma_1, \\ \mu^* \|\nabla u(\mathbf{x})\|^{r-2} \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}(\mathbf{x}) &= f(\mathbf{x}) && \text{on } \Gamma_2, \\ \left. \begin{aligned} \left| \mu^* \|\nabla u(\mathbf{x})\|^{r-2} \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}(\mathbf{x}) \right| &\leq \vartheta, \\ \mu^* \|\nabla u(\mathbf{x})\|^{r-2} \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}(\mathbf{x}) &= -\vartheta \frac{u(\mathbf{x})}{|u(\mathbf{x})|} \quad \text{if } u(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0 \end{aligned} \right\} && \text{on } \Gamma_3, \\ -\mu^* \|\nabla u(\mathbf{x})\|^{r-2} \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}(\mathbf{x}) &= gj(u(\mathbf{x})) && \text{on } \Gamma_4. \end{aligned}$$

Here Ω is a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^2 with smooth boundary Γ partitioned in four measurable parts Γ_i , such that $\operatorname{meas}(\Gamma_i) > 0$, $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Moreover, ν denotes the unit outward normal on Γ , r is a real number such that $2 \leq r < \infty$, μ^* , ϑ , g are given constants, and $f : \Gamma_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $j : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are given functions.

Recall that Problem 5 represents a mathematical model which describes the frictional contact of an elastic cylinder with a rigid obstacle, in the antiplane framework, Ω being the cross section of the cylinder. Here u represents the axial component of the displacement field, f is related to the density of the surface tractions, ϑ and g are given friction bounds and j is a friction potential. Moreover, r and μ^* are coefficients related to the constitutive law of the material, a law of Hencky-type, see, e.g., [17]. For the particular case $r = 2$ and $\Gamma_4 = \emptyset$ we refer the reader to [29]. There, details on the mathematical treatment as well as mechanical interpretations for the antiplane frictional contact models in a setting governed by variational inequalities of the second kind can be found.

In order to study Problem 5 we consider the space

$$X = \{v : v \in W^{1,r}(\Omega), \gamma v(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \text{ a.e. on } \Gamma_1\}$$

where $\gamma : W^{1,r}(\Omega) \rightarrow L^r(\Gamma)$ is the trace operator. As it is known, γ is a linear continuous and compact operator. In particular, there exists $c_{tr} > 0$ such that

$$\|\gamma v\|_{L^r(\Gamma)} \leq c_{tr} \|v\|_{W^{1,r}(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } v \in W^{1,r}(\Omega). \quad (52)$$

Now, since $r \geq 2$, according to the trace theorem, $\gamma : W^{1,r}(\Omega) \rightarrow L^s(\Gamma)$ is also a linear continuous and compact operator, for all $s \geq 1$. These properties will be used repeatedly in this section, with $s = 1$ or $s = r$, even if we do not mention it explicitly.

It is known that the space X is a real reflexive Banach space endowed with the norm

$$\|u\|_X = \|\nabla u\|_{L^r(\Omega)^2}.$$

Moreover, we follow [17] and recall that there exists $c_P = c_P(\Omega, \Gamma_1) > 0$ such that

$$\|u\|_{W^{1,r}(\Omega)} \leq c_P \|\nabla u\|_{L^r(\Omega)^2}. \quad (53)$$

Let r' be the conjugate exponent of r , i.e. $\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{r'} = 1$ and consider the real reflexive Banach spaces

$$Y = L^{r'}(\Gamma_3), \quad Z = L^r(\Gamma_2). \quad (54)$$

We denote by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ the duality pairing between $L^{r'}(\Gamma_3)$ and $L^r(\Gamma_3)$, and by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{Z',Z}$ the duality pairing between Z and its dual $Z' = L^{r'}(\Gamma_2)$.

The analysis of Problem 5 is made under the following assumptions.

Assumption 28. $f \in Z'$.

Assumption 29. $\mu^* > 0$, $\vartheta \geq 0$, $g \geq 0$.

Assumption 30. The function $j : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is nondecreasing, bounded of rank $M_j > 0$ and Lipschitz of rank $L_j > 0$.

To give an example fulfilling Assumption 30, we can consider the function

$$j : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \quad j(s) = \frac{s}{\sqrt{s^2 + 1}}.$$

Note that the nonhomogeneous case, in which μ^* , ϑ , g , and j depend on the spatial variable \mathbf{x} can be considered. Nevertheless, for simplicity, we restrict below to the homogeneous case.

Next, we use “ \cdot ” for the inner product in \mathbb{R}^2 and $\gamma v|_{\Gamma_2}$, $\gamma v|_{\Gamma_3}$ for the restriction of the trace of $v \in X$ to the parts Γ_2 and Γ_3 of the boundary of Ω , respectively. We also define the operator $A : X \rightarrow X'$, the form $b : X \times L^{r'}(\Gamma_3) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the function $J : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the operator $\pi : Z \rightarrow Z'$ and the set $\Lambda \subset Y$ by equalities

$$(Au, v)_{X',X} = \mu^* \int_{\Omega} \|\nabla u(\mathbf{x})\|^{r-2} \nabla u(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla v(\mathbf{x}) \, dx \quad \text{for all } u, v \in X, \quad (55)$$

$$b(v, \zeta) = \langle \zeta, \gamma v|_{\Gamma_3} \rangle \quad \text{for all } v \in X, \zeta \in L^{r'}(\Gamma_3), \quad (56)$$

$$J(u, v) = g \int_{\Gamma_4} j(\gamma u(\mathbf{x})) \gamma v(\mathbf{x}) \, d\Gamma \quad \text{for all } u, v \in X, \quad (57)$$

$$\pi v = \gamma v|_{\Gamma_2} \quad \text{for all } v \in X, \quad (58)$$

$$\Lambda = \left\{ \zeta \in Y : \langle \zeta, \gamma v|_{\Gamma_3} \rangle \leq \vartheta \int_{\Gamma_3} |\gamma v(\mathbf{x})| \, d\Gamma \quad \text{for all } v \in X \right\}. \quad (59)$$

By standard arguments we can deliver the following mixed variational formulation of Problem 5.

Problem 6. Find $(u, \lambda) \in X \times \Lambda$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} (Au, v - u)_{X',X} + b(v - u, \lambda) + J(u, v - u) &\geq (f, \pi(v - u))_{Z',Z} \quad \text{for all } v \in X, \\ b(u, \mu - \lambda) &\leq 0 \quad \text{for all } \mu \in \Lambda. \end{aligned}$$

We have the following existence and uniqueness result.

Theorem 6. *Under Assumptions 28, 29 and 30, Problem 6 has a unique solution.*

Proof. We apply Theorem 1 (for the existence part) and Theorem 3 for (for the uniqueness part). To this end, we need to check the validity of the Assumptions 1–12.

First, we use the basic properties of the r -Laplace operator (see [6, 9, 17], for instance) to see that Assumptions 1, 2, 3 and 9 are fulfilled with $q = r$, $h(v) = \frac{\mu^*}{2^{r-2r}} \|v\|_X^r$ and $M = \frac{\mu^*}{2^{r-2r}}$. Next, we follow [16] to recall that Assumptions 4 and 7 are satisfied. Moreover, using the properties of the trace operator we see that Assumption 8 holds, too.

Let us now verify Assumption 5. First, condition (i_1) is obviously satisfied. Next, we use the definition of J , the properties of the trace operator and Assumption 30 to see that

$$|J(u, v)| \leq gM_j \int_{\Gamma_4} |\gamma v(\mathbf{x})| d\Gamma \leq gM_j c_{tr} c_P \text{meas}(\Gamma_4)^{\frac{1}{r'}} \|v\|_X,$$

for all $u, v \in X$. We conclude from here that condition (i_2) in Assumption 5 is satisfied with $c = gM_j c_{tr} c_P \text{meas}(\Gamma_4)^{\frac{1}{r'}}$. Recall that M_j , c_{tr} and c_P are the constants which appear in Assumption 30, (52) and (53), respectively. Moreover, since

$$J(u_n, v_n) - J(u, v) = g \left[\int_{\Gamma_4} (j(\gamma u_n) - j(\gamma u)) \gamma v_n d\Gamma - \int_{\Gamma_4} j(\gamma u) (\gamma v_n - \gamma v) d\Gamma \right],$$

by using Assumption 30, as γ is completely continuous (being linear and compact), we deduce that, if $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ and $v_n \rightharpoonup v$ in X , then $J(u_n, v_n) \rightarrow J(u, v)$. Thus, the point (i_3) in Assumption 5 holds, too.

Using again Assumption 30, it follows that Assumption 10 is satisfied with $m = 0$. Obviously, Assumption 11 is fulfilled. Finally, we observe that

$$J(u, v) + J(u, -v) = g \int_{\Gamma_4} j(\gamma u(\mathbf{x})) \gamma v(\mathbf{x}) d\Gamma - g \int_{\Gamma_4} j(\gamma u(\mathbf{x})) \gamma v(\mathbf{x}) d\Gamma = 0$$

which shows that Assumption 12 is fulfilled, too. We also remark that Assumptions 6 and 8 are obviously satisfied. Theorem 6 is now a direct consequence of Theorems 1 and 3. \square

The solution of Problem 6 depends on the data f , ϑ and g and, therefore, we denote it in what follows by $(u(f, \vartheta, g), \lambda(f, \vartheta, g))$. Its dependence with respect to these data is provided by the following result.

Theorem 7. *Let $\{f_n\} \subset Z'$, $\{\vartheta_n\} \subset [0, +\infty)$, $\{g_n\} \subset [0, \infty)$ be three sequences such that*

$$f_n \rightharpoonup f \quad \text{in } L^{r'}(\Gamma_2), \quad \vartheta_n \rightarrow \vartheta \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}, \quad g_n \rightarrow g \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}. \quad (60)$$

Then, under Assumptions 28–30, the following convergence hold:

$$u(f_{2n}, \vartheta_n, g_n) \rightarrow u(f_2, \vartheta, g) \quad \text{in } X, \quad (61)$$

$$\lambda(f_{2n}, \vartheta_n, g_n) \rightharpoonup \lambda(f_2, \vartheta, g) \quad \text{in } Y. \quad (62)$$

Proof. We use Theorem 4 with $A_n = A$, $b_n = b$ and J_n, Λ_n defined by

$$J_n(u, v) = g_n \int_{\Gamma_4} j(\gamma u(\mathbf{x})) \gamma v(\mathbf{x}) d\Gamma \quad \text{for all } u, v \in X,$$

$$\Lambda_n = \{ \zeta \in Y : \langle \zeta, \gamma v|_{\Gamma_3} \rangle \leq \vartheta_n \int_{\Gamma_3} |\gamma v(\mathbf{x})| d\Gamma \quad \text{for all } v \in X \}.$$

Let us verify the validity of Assumptions 13–23.

First, we note that Assumption 13 holds from the properties of the r -Laplacian operator, as shown in [6, 9], for instance. Next, we note that, since $A_n = A$ and $b_n = b$, the Assumptions 14, 17, 19, 20 are obviously satisfied. Moreover, Assumption 22 is a consequence of (60) and Assumption 23 follows from the properties of the trace operator.

Next Assumption 15 is a consequence of Assumption 30, the properties of the trace operator and the convergence $g_n \rightarrow g$ in (60). Indeed, by the boundedness of j and the completely continuity of the trace operator, it follows that for each $u \in X$, the function $J(u, \cdot) : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is weakly continuous. Assume now that $u_n \rightharpoonup \tilde{u}$ in X . Then, using Assumption 30, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |J(\tilde{u}, u_n - \tilde{u}) - J_n(\tilde{u}, u_n - \tilde{u})| \\ & \leq |g - g_n| \int_{\Gamma_4} |j(\gamma \tilde{u}(\mathbf{x}))| |\gamma u_n(\mathbf{x}) - \gamma \tilde{u}(\mathbf{x})| d\Gamma \\ & \leq M_j |g_n - g| \|\gamma \tilde{u} - \gamma u_n\|_{L^1(\Gamma_4)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the completely continuity of the trace operator $\gamma : W^{1,r}(\Omega) \rightarrow L^1(\Gamma)$ combined with the convergences $u_n \rightharpoonup \tilde{u}$ in X and $g_n \rightarrow g$, in \mathbb{R} implies that

$$J(\tilde{u}, u_n - \tilde{u}) - J_n(\tilde{u}, u_n - \tilde{u}) \rightarrow 0.$$

By a similar argument,

$$\begin{aligned} & |J_n(u_n, v - u_n) - J(u_n, v - u_n)| \\ & = |g_n - g| \int_{\Gamma_4} |j(\gamma u_n(\mathbf{x}))| |\gamma v(\mathbf{x}) - \gamma u_n(\mathbf{x})| d\Gamma \\ & \leq M_j |g_n - g| \|\gamma v - \gamma u_n\|_{L^1(\Gamma_4)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we are led to

$$J_n(u_n, v - u_n) - J(u_n, v - u_n) \rightarrow 0.$$

We conclude from here that Assumption 15 is verified.

Moreover, Assumptions 16 and 18 are verified since

$$M_n = M = \frac{\mu^*}{2^{r-2r}}, \quad m_n = 0, \quad c_n = g_n M_j c_{tr} c_P \text{meas}(\Gamma_4)^{\frac{1}{r}},$$

for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that Assumption 17 also holds, since $q = q_n = r$.

On the other hand, Assumption 21 is a consequence of the definitions of the sets Λ_n and Λ , combined with the convergence $\vartheta_n \rightarrow \vartheta$ in (60). Finally, Assumption 22 is a consequence of the convergence $f_n \rightharpoonup f$ in (60) and Assumption 23 is obviously satisfied.

It follows from above that we are in a position to apply Theorem 4 and, in this way, we deduce that the convergences (61), (62) hold, which concludes the proof. \square

Besides the mathematical interest in the convergence results (61) and (62), this results is important from mechanical point of view since it provides the continuous dependence of the weak solution of Problem 5 with respect to the densities of the surface tractions, and the friction bounds.

We now provide three examples of optimization problems associated to Problem 6 for which the existence result in Theorem 5 works. Everywhere below we assume that $\mu^* > 0$ and $r \geq 2$ are given. In addition, the function j is given as well, and satisfies Assumption 30. The three problems we consider below have a common feature and can be casted in the following general form.

Problem 7. Find $p^* \in U$ such that

$$\mathcal{L}(u_{p^*}, \lambda_{p^*}, p^*) = \min_{p \in U} \mathcal{L}(u_p, \lambda_p, p). \quad (63)$$

Here U is a subset of a reflexive Banach space W , $\mathcal{L} : X \times Y \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the cost functional and, for each $p \in U$, (u_p, λ_p) represents the solution of Problem 6 in which part of the data are related to the parameter p . Both the set U , the space W , the functional \mathcal{L} and the mapping $p \mapsto (u_p, \lambda_p)$ will change from example to example and, therefore, will be described below.

Example 1. Let $W = Y \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$, $U = Y \times [0, +\infty) \times [0, +\infty)$,

$$\mathcal{L}(u, \lambda, p) = \alpha \|u - u_d\|_X^r + \beta \|\lambda - \lambda_d\|_Y^{r'} + \delta \|p\|_W^2, \quad (64)$$

where $\alpha, \beta, \delta > 0$ are given constants and $(u_d, \lambda_d) \in X \times Y$ is a given optimal target. An element $p \in U$ is of the form $p = (f, \vartheta, g)$ and (u_p, λ_p) denotes the solution of Problem 6 with the data $f, \vartheta, g, \mu^*, j$ and r . It is easy to see that in this case Assumptions 24, 25 and 26 are satisfied. Therefore, using Theorem 5 we deduce the existence of at least one solution for the corresponding optimization problem (63).

Example 2. In this example, besides μ^*, j and r , we assume that $\vartheta \geq 0$ and $g \geq 0$ and are given. Let $W = U = Y$,

$$\mathcal{L}(u, \lambda, p) = \alpha \|\gamma u|_{\Gamma_2} - u_d\|_Z^2 + \delta \|f\|_{Z'}^2, \quad (65)$$

where $\alpha, \delta > 0$ are positive constants and $u_d \in Z$ is a given optimal target. An element $p \in U$ is of the form $p = f$ and (u_p, λ_p) denotes the solution of Problem 6 with the data $f, \vartheta, g, \mu^*, j$ and r . It is easy to see that in this case Assumptions 24, 25 and 26 are satisfied. Therefore, using Theorem 5 we deduce the existence of at least one solution for the corresponding optimization problem (63).

Example 3. In this example, besides μ^*, j and r , we assume that $f \in Z'$, $\vartheta \geq 0$ and $\tilde{g} > 0$ are given. Let $W = \mathbb{R}$, $U = [0, \tilde{g}]$,

$$\mathcal{L}(u, \lambda, p) = \|\gamma u|_{\Gamma_3} - u_d\|_Y \quad (66)$$

where $u_d \in Y$ is a given target. An element $p \in U$ is of the form $p = g$ and (u_p, λ_p) denotes the solution of Problem 6 with the data $f, \vartheta, g, \mu^*, j$ and r . It is easy to see that in this case Assumptions 24, 25 and 27 are satisfied. Therefore, using Theorem 5 we deduce the existence of at least one solution for the corresponding optimization problem (63).

Acknowledgements This project has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Grant Agreement No 823731 CONMECH.

References

- [1] S. Amdouni, P. Hild, V. Lleras, M. Moakher, Y. Renard, A stabilized Lagrange multiplier method for the enriched finite-element approximation of contact problems of cracked elastic bodies, *ESAIM: M2AN Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis* **46** (2012), 813–839.
- [2] M. Barboteu, A. Matei and M. Sofonea, Analysis of quasistatic viscoplastic contact problems with normal compliance, *Quart. J. Mech. Appl. Math.* **65** (2012), 555–579.
- [3] V. Barbu, *Optimal Control of Variational Inequalities*, Pitman, Boston, 1984.
- [4] J. Céa, *Optimization. Théorie et Algorithmes*, Dunod, Paris, 1971.
- [5] F.H. Clarke, *Optimization and Nonsmooth Analysis*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1983.
- [6] G. Dinca, P. Jebelean and J. Mawhin, Variational and topological methods for Dirichlet problems with p-Laplacian, *Portugalia Mathematica*, **58**(3) (2001), Nova Série.
- [7] A. Freidman, Optimal control for variational inequalities, *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization* **24** (1986), 439–451.
- [8] R. Glowinski, J.L. Lions and R. Trémolières, *Numerical Analysis of Variational Inequalities*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1981.
- [9] R. Glowinski and A. Marrocco, Sur l’approximation par éléments finis d’ordre un, et la résolution par pénalisation-dualité d’une classe de problèmes de Dirichlet non linéaires, *RAIRO Anal. Numer.*, **2** (1975), 41–76.
- [10] J. Haslinger, I. Hlaváček and J. Nečas, *Numerical Methods for Unilateral Problems in Solid Mechanics*, in Lions J.L. and Ciarlet P.G. (eds): Handbook of Numerical Analysis, Vol. IV, pp.313–485. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1996.
- [11] P. Hild and Y. Renard, A stabilized Lagrange multiplier method for the finite element approximation of contact problems in elastostatics, *Numer. Math.* **115** (2010), 101–129.
- [12] I. Hlaváček, J. Haslinger, J. Nečas and J. Lovíšek, *Solution of Variational Inequalities in Mechanic*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1988.
- [13] S. Hübner, A. Matei and B. Wohlmuth, A mixed variational formulation and an optimal a priori error estimate for a frictional contact problem in elasto-piezoelectricity, *Bull. Math. Soc. Sci. Math. Roumanie* **48** (2005), 209–232.

- [14] S. Hübner, A. Matei and B. Wohlmuth, Efficient algorithms for problems with friction, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* **29** (2007), 70–92.
- [15] J.-L. Lions, *Contrôle optimal des systèmes gouvernés par des équations aux dérivées partielles*, Dunod, Paris, 1968.
- [16] A. Matei, An existence result for a mixed variational problem arising from Contact Mechanics, *Nonlinear Analysis Series B: Real World Application* **20** (2014), 74–81.
- [17] A. Matei, S. Micu, C. Niță, Optimal control for antiplane frictional contact problems involving nonlinearly elastic materials of Hencky-type, *Mathematics and Mechanics of Solids* **23** 2018, 308–328.
- [18] A. Matei, A mixed hemivariational-variational problem and applications, *Computers and Mathematics with Applications (CAMWA)*, doi.org/10.1016/j.camwa.2018.08.068.
- [19] Z. H. Liu and B. Zeng, Optimal control of generalized quasi-variational hemivariational inequalities and its applications, *Applied Mathematics and Optimization* **72** (2015), 305–323.
- [20] S. Migorski, A. Ochal and M. Sofonea, *Nonlinear Inclusions and Hemivariational Inequalities. Models and Analysis of Contact Problems*, Advanced in Mechanics and Mathematics 26, Springer, (2013).
- [21] D. Motreanu and V. Rădulescu, *Variational and Non-variational Methods in Nonlinear Analysis and Boundary Value Problems*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston-Dordrecht-London, 2003.
- [22] Z. Naniewicz and P.D. Panagiotopoulos, *Mathematical Theory of Hemivariational Inequalities and Applications*, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1995.
- [23] P.D. Panagiotopoulos, *Hemivariational Inequalities, Applications in Mechanics and Engineering*, Springer, Berlin, 1993.
- [24] R. Mignot, Contrôle dans les inéquations variationnelles elliptiques, *J. Func. Anal.* **22** (1976), 130–185.
- [25] F. Mignot and J.-P. Puel, Optimal control in some variational inequalities, *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization* **22** (1984), 466–476.
- [26] P. Neittaanmaki, J. Sprekels and D. Tiba, *Optimization of Elliptic Systems: Theory and Applications*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer, New York, 2006. Berlin, 1993.
- [27] B.D. Reddy, Mixed variational inequalities arising in elastoplasticity, *Nonlinear Anal.* **19** (1992), 1071–1089.
- [28] M. Sofonea, Convergence Results and Optimal Control for a Class of Hemivariational Inequalities, *SIAM Journal of Mathematical Analysis* **50** (2018) 4066–4086.

- [29] M. Sofonea and A. Matei, *Variational Inequalities with Applications. A Study of Antiplane Frictional Contact Problems* in “Advances in Mechanics and Mathematics,” Vol 18, Springer, New York, 2009.
- [30] M. Sofonea, A. Matei and Y.B. Xiao, Optimal control for a class of Mixed Variational Problems, submitted.
- [31] D. Tiba, *Lectures on the Optimal Control of Elliptic Equations*, Lecture Notes **32**, University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä, 1995.
- [32] D. Tiba, *Optimal Control of Nonsmooth Distributed Parameter Systems*, Springer, Berlin, 1990.