

ERROR ESTIMATES FOR FRACTIONAL SEMILINEAR OPTIMAL CONTROL ON LIPSCHITZ POLYTOPES*

ENRIQUE OTÁROLA†

Abstract. We adopt the *integral* definition of the fractional Laplace operator and analyze discretization techniques for a fractional, semilinear, and elliptic optimal control problem posed on a Lipschitz polytope. We consider two strategies of discretization: a semidiscrete scheme where control variables are not discretized—the so-called variational discretization approach—and a fully discrete scheme where control variables are discretized with piecewise constant functions. We discretize the corresponding state and adjoint equations with a finite element scheme based on continuous piecewise linear functions and derive error estimates. With these estimates at hand, we derive error bounds for the semidiscrete scheme on quasi-uniform and suitable graded meshes, and improve the ones that are available in the literature for the fully discrete scheme.

Key words. optimal control problem, fractional diffusion, integral fractional Laplacian, semilinear equations, regularity estimates, finite element approximations, a priori error estimates.

AMS subject classifications. 35R11, 49J20, 49M25, 65K10, 65N15, 65N30.

1. Introduction. In this work we are interested in the analysis of suitable finite element discretization schemes for a distributed optimal control problem involving a *fractional*, *semilinear*, and *elliptic* partial differential equation (PDE). To make the discussion precise, we let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, with $n \geq 2$, be an open, bounded, and Lipschitz polytope. Given $\alpha > 0$, the so-called regularization parameter, and $L : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, a Carathéodory function of class C^2 with respect to the second variable, we introduce the cost functional

$$(1.1) \quad J(u, z) := \int_{\Omega} L(x, u(x)) dx + \frac{\alpha}{2} \int_{\Omega} |z(x)|^2 dx;$$

further assumptions on L will be deferred until section 2.3. The PDE-constrained optimization problem under consideration reads as follows: Find $\min J(u, z)$ subject to the *fractional*, *semilinear*, and *elliptic* PDE

$$(1.2) \quad (-\Delta)^s u + a(\cdot, u) = z \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \text{ in } \Omega^c,$$

and the *control constraints* $\mathbf{a} \leq z(x) \leq \mathbf{b}$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$. Here, $\Omega^c = \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega$. We adopt the *integral* definition of the fractional Laplace operator $(-\Delta)^s$. Assumptions on the nonlinear function a will be deferred until section 2.3. The control bounds $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}$ are such that $\mathbf{a} < \mathbf{b}$. We will refer to the previously defined PDE-constrained optimization problem as the *fractional semilinear optimal control problem*.

The development and analysis of solution techniques for problems involving suitable definitions of fractional diffusion is a relatively new but rapidly growing area of research. We refer the interested reader to [9, 17] for a complete overview of the available results and limitations. In contrast to these advances, the study of numerical methods for optimal control problems involving fractional diffusion has not been as developed. Restricting ourselves to problems that consider the *spectral definition*,

*Submitted to the editors June 27, 2022. The author is partially supported by ANID through FONDECYT project 1220156.

†Departamento de Matemática, Universidad Técnica Federico Santa María, Valparaíso, Chile (enrique.otarola@usm.cl).

we mention [3, 20, 34] within the linear–quadratic scenario, [35, 38] for sparse PDE-constrained optimization, and [37] for bilinear optimal control. Concerning problems involving the *integral* definition of fractional diffusion, we mention [18, 25] for the linear–quadratic case and [36] for semilinear optimal control. We also mention the advances in parameter identification for nonlocal/fractional operators of [19, 27, 12] and the ones, at the continuous level, in semilinear PDE-constrained optimization [5], external optimal control [2], and optimal control with state constraints [4].

This paper extends the recent work [36] in several directions. In what follows, we briefly detail our main contributions and improvements on the available theory:

1. *A finite element (FE) discretization for fractional semilinear PDEs:* We consider a basic FE discretization for fractional semilinear PDEs on conforming and shape regular families of simplicial triangulations. Under the assumption that Ω is merely Lipschitz, we obtain, on the basis of derived regularity estimates, error bounds; see Theorems 5.1 and 5.2. This extends [10] to a semilinear setting. For some values of s , these estimates can be improved at the expense of assuming that Ω satisfies an exterior ball condition. Under this geometric condition and the assumption that $s \geq n/(4(n-1))$, we derive in Theorem 5.3 error bounds on suitable graded meshes that improve the ones obtained in Theorems 5.1 and 5.2.
2. *Regularity estimates for optimal variables:* We derive regularity estimates, in Hölder and Sobolev spaces, for an optimal triplet $(\bar{u}, \bar{p}, \bar{z})$; see Theorems 4.7, 4.8, and 4.9. The results on Sobolev spaces hold under the assumption that Ω satisfies an exterior ball condition and improves upon [36], where $\partial\Omega \in C^\infty$.
3. *FE discretizations for the optimal control problem.* We derive quasi-optimal error estimates for the control approximation of the fully discrete scheme devised in [36]. In contrast to [36], that *operates under the assumption that* $\partial\Omega \in C^\infty$, we assume that Ω is a Lipschitz polytope. In addition, we devise a semi discrete scheme based on the so-called variational discretization approach [26] and derive error estimates on conforming and shape regular families of simplicial triangulations; see Theorem 7.7. Under the assumption that Ω satisfies an exterior ball condition, these error estimates can be improved upon utilizing suitable graded meshes; see Theorem 7.8.

2. Notation and preliminaries. We begin this section by fixing notation and the setting in which we will operate. Throughout this work $n \geq 2$ and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is an open, bounded, and Lipschitz polytope; we will impose additional assumptions on n and Ω when needed. We will denote by Ω^c the complement of Ω . If \mathfrak{X} and \mathfrak{Y} are Banach function spaces, we write $\mathfrak{X} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{Y}$ to denote that \mathfrak{X} is continuously embedded in \mathfrak{Y} . We denote by \mathfrak{X}' and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{X}}$ the dual and the norm of \mathfrak{X} , respectively. We denote by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathfrak{X}', \mathfrak{X}}$ the duality pairing between \mathfrak{X}' and \mathfrak{X} and simply write $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ when the spaces \mathfrak{X}' and \mathfrak{X} are clear from the context. Let $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence in \mathfrak{X} . We will denote by $x_n \rightarrow x$ and $x_n \rightharpoonup x$ the strong and weak convergence, respectively, of $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ to x . The relation $\mathbf{a} \lesssim \mathbf{b}$ indicates that $\mathbf{a} \leq C\mathbf{b}$, with a positive constant C that does not depend on either \mathbf{a} , \mathbf{b} , or the discretization parameters, but it might depend on s , n , and Ω . The value of C might change at each occurrence.

2.1. Function spaces. For any $s \geq 0$, we define $H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$, the Sobolev space of order s over \mathbb{R}^n , by [40, Definition 15.7], [31, Chapter 1, (7.1)]

$$H^s(\mathbb{R}^n) := \{v \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) : (1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{s}{2}} \mathcal{F}(v) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)\},$$

endowed with the norm $\|v\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)} := \|(1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{s}{2}} \mathcal{F}(v)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}$. A second fractional Sobolev space can be defined on the basis of the Slobodeckii–Gagliardo seminorm:

$$(2.1) \quad |w|_{\theta, D} := \left[\int_D \int_D \frac{|w(x) - w(y)|^2}{|x - y|^{n+2\theta}} dx dy \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad 0 < \theta < 1,$$

where D is a non-empty open subset of \mathbb{R}^n . Define, for $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $W^r(D)$ as the set of functions v in $L^2(D)$ which are such that $\partial^\alpha v \in L^2(D)$ for $|\alpha| \leq r$ [32, page 73]. Let $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\mu \in (0, 1)$ be such that $s = r + \mu$. We define $W^s(\mathbb{R}^n) := \{v \in W^r(\mathbb{R}^n) : |\partial^\alpha v|_{\mu, \mathbb{R}^n} < \infty \text{ for } |\alpha| = r\}$ with norm $\|\cdot\|_{W^s(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ [32, page 74], [40, (35.6)], where

$$(2.2) \quad \|v\|_{W^s(D)} = \left[\|v\|_{W^r(D)}^2 + \sum_{|\alpha|=r} |\partial^\alpha v|_{\mu, D}^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n.$$

For any $s \geq 0$, $W^s(\mathbb{R}^n) = H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with equivalent norms [32, Theorem 3.16].

Let Ω be a non-empty open and bounded subset of \mathbb{R}^n with Lipschitz boundary. We define $H^s(\Omega) := \{v \in \mathcal{D}'(\Omega) : v = V|_\Omega, V \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)\}$ with norm [32, (3.23)]

$$\|v\|_{H^s(\Omega)} := \min\{\|V\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)} : V \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^n), V|_\Omega = v\}.$$

We also define $W^s(\Omega) := \{v \in W^r(\Omega) : |\partial^\alpha v|_{\mu, \Omega} < \infty \text{ for } |\alpha| = r\}$, with r, μ as above, equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{W^s(\Omega)}$, defined in (2.2). Since Ω is Lipschitz, we have that $H^s(\Omega) = W^s(\Omega)$ with equivalent norms [32, Theorem 3.30]. We define $H_0^s(\Omega)$ and $\tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ as the closure of $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ in $H^s(\Omega)$ and $H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$, respectively [32, page 77] and notice that $\tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ can be equivalently characterized by [32, Theorem 3.29]

$$(2.3) \quad \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) = \{v|_\Omega : v \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^n), \text{supp } v \subset \overline{\Omega}\}, \quad \|v\|_{\tilde{H}^s(\Omega)} := \|v\|_{W^s(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

We denote by $H^{-s}(\Omega)$ the dual space of $\tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$.

We now explore the relation among $\tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$, $H_0^s(\Omega)$, and $H^s(\Omega)$. Since Ω is Lipschitz, for $s \geq 0$ we have that $\tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \subseteq H_0^s(\Omega)$ [32, Theorem 3.33]. In particular, $\tilde{H}^s(\Omega) = H_0^s(\Omega)$ provided $s \notin \{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}, \frac{5}{2}, \dots\}$. If $s \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$, then $H_0^s(\Omega) = H^s(\Omega)$ and if $s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, then $H_0^s(\Omega) \subsetneq H^s(\Omega)$ [31, Chapter 1, Theorem 11.1]. Consequently,

$$\tilde{H}^s(\Omega) = H_0^s(\Omega) = H^s(\Omega) \text{ for } s \in (0, \frac{1}{2}), \quad \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) = H_0^s(\Omega) \subsetneq H^s(\Omega) \text{ for } s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1).$$

$\tilde{H}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega)$ can be characterized as the Lions–Magenes space

$$H_{00}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega) = \left\{ v \in H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega) : \int_\Omega \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)^{-1} v^2(x) dx < \infty \right\};$$

see [15, Corollary 4.10]. We notice that $H_{00}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega) \subsetneq H_0^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega) : 1 \in H_0^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega), 1 \notin H_{00}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\Omega)$.

We conclude this section with the following Sobolev embedding result.

PROPOSITION 2.1 (embedding result). *If $q \in [1, 2n/(n - 2s)]$, then $H^s(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^q(\Omega)$. If $q \in [1, 2n/(n - 2s))$, then the embedding $H^s(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^q(\Omega)$ is compact.*

Proof. A proof of the continuous embedding can be found in [1, Theorem 7.34] while the compactness of the embedding follows from [1, Theorem 6.3]. \square

2.2. The fractional Laplace operator. For smooth functions $w : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $s \in (0, 1)$, we define $(-\Delta)^s$ in \mathbb{R}^n via Fourier transform: $\mathcal{F}((-\Delta)^s w)(\xi) = |\xi|^{2s} \mathcal{F}(w)(\xi)$. Equivalently, $(-\Delta)^s$ can be defined by means of the pointwise formula

$$(2.4) \quad (-\Delta)^s w(x) = C_{n,s} \text{p.v.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{w(x) - w(y)}{|x - y|^{n+2s}} dy, \quad C_{n,s} = \frac{2^{2s} s \Gamma(s + \frac{n}{2})}{\pi^{n/2} \Gamma(1 - s)},$$

where p.v. stands for the Cauchy principal value and $C_{n,s}$ corresponds to a normalization constant that is introduced to guarantee that the symbol of the resulting operator is $|\xi|^{2s}$. We refer the reader to [30, Chapter 1, §1] for a proof of the equivalence of these two definitions. We notice that the pointwise formula (2.4) clearly displays the nonlocal structure of $(-\Delta)^s$: computing $(-\Delta)^s w(x)$ requires the values of w at points arbitrarily far away from x . In addition to these two definitions, several other *equivalent definitions* of $(-\Delta)^s$ in \mathbb{R}^n are available in the literature [29]—for instance, the ones based on the Balakrishnan formula [6] and a suitable harmonic extension [13].

In bounded domains, there are also several ways to define a nonlocal operator related to the fractional Laplacian. In this work, we shall restrict ourselves to consider the *integral* definition. For functions supported in $\bar{\Omega}$, we may utilize the integral representation (2.4) to define $(-\Delta)^s$. This gives rise to the so-called *restricted* or *integral fractional Laplacian*, which, from now on, we shall simply refer to as the *integral fractional Laplacian*. Notice that we have materialized a zero Dirichlet condition by restricting the operator to acting only on functions that are zero outside Ω .

To present suitable weak formulations for problems involving $(-\Delta)^s$, we define

$$(2.5) \quad \mathcal{A}(v, w) := \frac{C_{n,s}}{2} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{(v(x) - v(y))(w(x) - w(y))}{|x - y|^{n+2s}} dx dy.$$

It is immediate that \mathcal{A} is a bilinear and bounded form on $\tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \times \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$. We denote by $\|\cdot\|_s$ the norm that $\mathcal{A}(\cdot, \cdot)$ induces, which is just a multiple of the $W^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ -seminorm: $\|v\|_s := \sqrt{\mathcal{A}(v, v)} = \mathfrak{C}_{n,s} |v|_{s, \mathbb{R}^n}$, where $\mathfrak{C}_{n,s} = \sqrt{C_{n,s}}/2$ and $|\cdot|_{s, \mathbb{R}^n}$ is defined in (2.1).

The nonlocality of $(-\Delta)^s$ is also reflected by the fact the natural space in which \mathcal{A} is set is the zero-extension fractional Sobolev space $\tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ and the norm therein is not sub-additive with respect to domain partitions.

2.3. Assumptions. We will operate under the following assumptions on a and L [36, Section 2.1]. We must, however, mention that some of the results obtained in this work are valid under less restrictive requirements; when possible we explicitly mention the assumptions on a and L that are needed to obtain a particular result.

- (A.1) $a : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Carathéodory function of class C^2 with respect to the second variable and $a(\cdot, 0) \in L^r(\Omega)$ for $r > n/2s$.
- (A.2) $\frac{\partial a}{\partial u}(x, u) \geq 0$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$.
- (A.3) For all $\mathfrak{m} > 0$, there exists a positive constant $C_{\mathfrak{m}}$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^2 \left| \frac{\partial^i a}{\partial u^i}(x, u) \right| \leq C_{\mathfrak{m}}, \quad \left| \frac{\partial^2 a}{\partial u^2}(x, v) - \frac{\partial^2 a}{\partial u^2}(x, w) \right| \leq C_{\mathfrak{m}} |v - w|$$

for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and $u, v, w \in [-\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{m}]$.

- (B.1) $L : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Carathéodory function of class C^2 with respect to the second variable and $L(\cdot, 0) \in L^1(\Omega)$.
- (B.2) For all $\mathfrak{m} > 0$, there exist $\psi_{\mathfrak{m}}, \phi_{\mathfrak{m}} \in L^r(\Omega)$, with $r > n/2s$, such that

$$\left| \frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(x, u) \right| \leq \psi_{\mathfrak{m}}(x), \quad \left| \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial u^2}(x, u) \right| \leq \phi_{\mathfrak{m}}(x),$$

for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and $u \in [-\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}]$.

3. Fractional semilinear PDEs. In this section, we review some results regarding the well-posedness of semilinear PDEs involving the integral fractional Laplacian. To formulate such results, we let $a = a(x, u) : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Carathéodory function that is monotone increasing in u and assume that, for every $\mathbf{m} > 0$, there exists $\varphi_{\mathbf{m}} \in L^t(\Omega)$, with $t = 2n/(n + 2s)$, such that

$$(3.1) \quad |a(x, u)| \leq |\varphi_{\mathbf{m}}(x)| \text{ a.e. } x \in \Omega, u \in [-\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}].$$

Let $f \in H^{-s}(\Omega)$ be a given forcing term. We consider the following *fractional, semilinear, and elliptic* problem: Find $u \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ such that

$$(3.2) \quad \mathcal{A}(u, v) + \langle a(\cdot, u), v \rangle = \langle f, v \rangle \quad \forall v \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega),$$

where the bilinear form \mathcal{A} is defined in (2.5).

We present the following existence and uniqueness result.

THEOREM 3.1 (well-posedness of problem (3.2)). *Let $n \geq 2$, $s \in (0, 1)$, and $r > n/2s$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open and bounded domain with Lipschitz boundary. If $f \in L^r(\Omega)$, a satisfies (3.1), and $a(\cdot, 0) \in L^r(\Omega)$, then problem (3.2) admits a unique solution $u \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$. In addition, we have the stability bound*

$$(3.3) \quad \|u\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f - a(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^r(\Omega)},$$

with a hidden constant that is independent of u , a , and f .

Proof. See [36, Theorem 3.1]. \square

3.1. Regularity estimates. In order to derive a priori error estimates for suitable finite element discretizations of problem (3.2), it is of fundamental importance the understanding of regularity properties for the solution to (3.2). We begin our studies by providing some basic regularity results for the linear case $a \equiv 0$.

PROPOSITION 3.2 (Hölder regularity on Lipschitz domains). *Let $s \in (0, 1)$, and let Ω be a bounded Lipschitz domain satisfying an exterior ball condition. Let \mathbf{u} be the solution to $(-\Delta)^s \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{f}$ in Ω and $\mathbf{u} = 0$ in Ω^c . If $\mathbf{f} \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, then $\mathbf{u} \in C^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and the following estimate holds:*

$$(3.4) \quad \|\mathbf{u}\|_{C^s(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)},$$

with a hidden constant that only depends on Ω and s .

Proof. See [39, Proposition 1.1] \square

The following example is important.

REMARK 3.1 (optimal regularity). Let $\Omega = B(0, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $f \equiv 1$. Within this setting, the solution to $(-\Delta)^s \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{f}$ in Ω and $\mathbf{u} = 0$ in Ω^c is given by [24, 7, 39]

$$\mathbf{u}(x) = \frac{2^{-2s}\Gamma(n/2)}{\Gamma((n+2s)/2)\Gamma(1+s)}(1 - |x|^2)_+^s, \quad t_+ = \max\{t, 0\}.$$

The solution $\mathbf{u} \in C^s(\bar{\Omega})$ but it does not belong to $C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega})$ for any $\alpha > s$. In this sense, the $C^s(\bar{\Omega})$ -regularity result stated in Proposition 3.2 is optimal [39, page 276].

We now present a regularity result on Sobolev spaces.

PROPOSITION 3.3 (Sobolev regularity on Lipschitz domains). *Let $s \in (0, 1)$, and let Ω be a bounded Lipschitz domain. Let \mathbf{u} be the solution to $(-\Delta)^s \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{f}$ in Ω and*

$\mathbf{u} = 0$ in Ω^c . If $\mathbf{f} \in L^2(\Omega)$, then $\mathbf{u} \in H^{s+\theta-\epsilon}(\Omega)$, where $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$ for $\frac{1}{2} < s < 1$ and $\theta = s - \epsilon > 0$ for $0 < s \leq \frac{1}{2}$; $0 < \epsilon < s$. In addition, the following estimates hold:

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^{s+\theta-\epsilon}(\Omega)} &\lesssim \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}-\iota} \|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad s \in (0, \frac{1}{2}], \quad \forall 0 < \epsilon < s, \\ \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}(\Omega)} &\lesssim \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1), \quad \forall 0 < \epsilon < s, \end{aligned}$$

where ι is ζ in the statement of [10, Theorem 2.1]. In both estimates the hidden constant is independent of ϵ but depend on Ω , n , and s .

Proof. See [10, Theorem 2.1]. \square

The following comments are now in order [10]. First, the Lipschitz assumption on the domain is optimal in the sense that if Ω is a C^∞ domain, then no further regularity can be inferred. Second, in general the smoothness of the right-hand side cannot make solutions any smoother than $\cap_{\epsilon>0} \tilde{H}^{s+1/2-\epsilon}(\Omega)$. These comments are illustrated within the setting of example of Remark 3.1.

When $s \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, the following result improves the regularity properties of the solution to the linear problem at the expense of considering a smoother domain and a smoother forcing term \mathbf{f} .

PROPOSITION 3.4 (Sobolev regularity on Lipschitz domains). *Let $s \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, and let Ω be a bounded Lipschitz domain satisfying an exterior ball condition. Let \mathbf{u} be the solution to $(-\Delta)^s \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{f}$ in Ω and $\mathbf{u} = 0$ in Ω^c . If $\mathbf{f} \in C^{\frac{1}{2}-s}(\bar{\Omega})$, then $\mathbf{u} \in H^{s+\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}(\Omega)$ for every $\epsilon > 0$. In addition, the following estimate hold:*

$$(3.6) \quad \|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}(\Omega)} \lesssim \epsilon^{-1} \|\mathbf{f}\|_{C^{\frac{1}{2}-s}(\bar{\Omega})}, \quad s \in (0, \frac{1}{2}), \quad \forall \epsilon > 0,$$

with a hidden constant that is independent of ϵ but depend on Ω , n , and s .

Proof. See [9, Theorem 3.3]. \square

We now derive a regularity result in Hölder spaces for the solution to (3.2).

THEOREM 3.5 (Hölder regularity on Lipschitz domains). *Let $n \geq 2$ and $s \in (0, 1)$. Let Ω be a bounded Lipschitz domain satisfying an exterior ball condition. Assume that a is such that the assumptions stated in Theorem 3.1 hold. Assume, in addition, that $a = a(x, u)$ is locally Lipschitz in u , uniformly for $x \in \Omega$. If $f, a(\cdot, 0) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, then $u \in C^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and*

$$\|u\|_{C^s(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \|f - a(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)},$$

with a hidden constant that depends on Ω and s .

Proof. Since $f - a(\cdot, u) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, the fact that $u \in C^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ follows immediately from Proposition 3.2. In addition, we have

$$\|u\|_{C^s(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \|f - a(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f - a(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}.$$

To obtain the last estimate, we have utilized the bound $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f - a(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$, which follows from Theorem 3.1. This concludes the proof. \square

In view of the regularity requirements on the forcing term \mathbf{f} stated in Proposition 3.4, the following remark, which provides necessary and sufficient conditions for the boundedness of a Nemitskii operator in Hölder spaces, is of particular importance.

REMARK 3.2 (The Nemitskii operator in Hölder spaces). Let g be a real-valued function defined on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$. We introduce the Nemitskii operator induced by g as follows: $G(x)(u) := g(x, u(x))$ with $x \in \Omega$ and u varying in a suitable space of real-valued functions defined on Ω . G maps $C^{0,\zeta}(\bar{\Omega})$, with $\zeta \in (0, 1]$, into itself if g satisfies the following condition: For every $\mathbf{m} > 0$, there exists $\mathfrak{M} = \mathfrak{M}(\mathbf{m}) > 0$ such that

$$(3.7) \quad |g(x, u) - g(y, v)| \leq \mathfrak{M} \{|x - y|^\zeta + \mathbf{m}^{-1}|u - v|\}$$

for all $x, y \in \bar{\Omega}$ and all $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $|u|, |v| \leq \mathfrak{m}$. In other words, we demand that $g = g(x, u)$ be Hölder continuous in x , uniformly for u in bounded intervals of \mathbb{R} , and locally Lipschitz in u , uniformly for $x \in \bar{\Omega}$. This condition is also *necessary* when $\Omega = (a, b)$ is a bounded interval of \mathbb{R} [8, Theorem 7.3] and when Ω is a general open and bounded set of \mathbb{R}^n [16, Theorem 1.1].

THEOREM 3.6 (Sobolev regularity on Lipschitz domains I). *Let $s \in [\frac{1}{4}, 1)$ and $n \geq 2$. Let Ω be a bounded Lipschitz domain such that it satisfies an exterior ball condition for $s < \frac{1}{2}$. Assume that a is as in the statement of Theorem 3.1. Assume, in addition, that $a = a(x, u)$ is locally Lipschitz in u , uniformly for $x \in \Omega$, $a(\cdot, 0) \in L^2(\Omega)$ for $s \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, $a(\cdot, 0) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ for $s \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2})$, and that a satisfies (3.7) with*

$$(3.8) \quad \zeta = \frac{1}{2} - s \text{ for } s \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}).$$

If $f \in L^r(\Omega)$, for $r > n/2s$ and, in addition,

$$(3.9) \quad f \in C^{\frac{1}{2}-s}(\bar{\Omega}) \text{ for } s \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}), \quad f \in L^2(\Omega) \text{ for } s \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1)$$

then, we have that $u \in H^{s+1/2-\epsilon}(\Omega)$ for every $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_*)$; the precise value of ϵ_* is described in estimates (3.10), (3.11), and (3.12).

Proof. We consider three cases.

Case 1: $s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. Since, within this case, the term $f - a(\cdot, u) \in L^2(\Omega)$, we can thus immediately apply the results of Proposition 3.3 to conclude that

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \|u\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}(\Omega)} &\lesssim \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\|f - a(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}) \\ &\lesssim \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|f - a(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall 0 < \epsilon < s, \quad s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1), \end{aligned}$$

upon utilizing that $a = a(x, u)$ is locally Lipschitz in u , uniformly for $x \in \Omega$, $a(\cdot, 0) \in L^2(\Omega)$, and the stability estimate $\|u\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \|f - a(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$, which follows from Theorem 3.1. In both estimates the hidden constant is independent of ϵ .

Case 2: $s = \frac{1}{2}$. Since $f - a(\cdot, 0) \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $a = a(x, u)$ is locally Lipschitz in u , uniformly for $x \in \Omega$, an application of Proposition 3.3 imply that, for every $\epsilon \in (0, s)$, the solution u belongs to $H^{s+1/2-2\epsilon}(\Omega)$. In addition, we have the estimate

$$(3.11) \quad \|u\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon}(\Omega)} \lesssim \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}-\iota} \|f - a(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall 0 < \epsilon < s, \quad s = \frac{1}{2}.$$

The hidden constant is independent of ϵ .

Case 3: $s \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2})$. We begin this case by noticing that Theorem 3.5 guarantees that $u \in C^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$. With this result at hand, we invoke the fact that a satisfies (3.7) with $\zeta = 1/2 - s$ and utilize the results in Remark 3.2 to obtain that $f - a(\cdot, u) \in C^\zeta(\bar{\Omega})$; observe that $1/2 - s \leq s$. We are thus in position to apply Proposition 3.4 to conclude that, for every $\epsilon > 0$, the solution $u \in H^{s+1/2-\epsilon}(\Omega)$. In addition, we have

$$(3.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \|u\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}(\Omega)} &\lesssim \epsilon^{-1} \left(\|f\|_{C^{\frac{1}{2}-s}(\bar{\Omega})} + \|a(\cdot, u)\|_{C^{\frac{1}{2}-s}(\bar{\Omega})} \right) \\ &\lesssim \epsilon^{-1} \left(1 + \|f\|_{C^{\frac{1}{2}-s}(\bar{\Omega})} + \|u\|_{C^s(\bar{\Omega})} \right) \quad \forall \epsilon > 0, \quad s \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}), \end{aligned}$$

with a hidden constant that is independent of ϵ . \square

We now present a regularity result for $s \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. When $s \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2})$ the result is weaker than the one obtained in Theorem 3.6. Nevertheless, it holds under weaker assumptions on the forcing term f and the nonlinear function a .

THEOREM 3.7 (Sobolev regularity on Lipschitz domains II). *Let $s \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $n \geq 2$. Let Ω be a bounded Lipschitz domain. Assume that a is as in the statement of*

Theorem 3.1. Assume, in addition, that $a = a(x, u)$ is locally Lipschitz in u , uniformly for $x \in \Omega$, and $a(\cdot, 0) \in L^2(\Omega)$. If $f \in L^r(\Omega) \cap L^2(\Omega)$, for $r > n/2s$, then, we have that $u \in H^{2s-2\epsilon}(\Omega)$ for every $\epsilon \in (0, s)$ and

$$\|u\|_{H^{2s-2\epsilon}(\Omega)} \lesssim \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}-\iota} \|f - a(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad s \in (0, \frac{1}{2}), \quad \forall 0 < \epsilon < s,$$

where ι is as in the statement of Proposition 3.3.

Proof. The proof follows similar arguments to those elaborated in the proof of Theorem 3.6. For brevity, we skip the details. \square

4. Fractional semilinear PDE-constrained optimization. In this section, we review the main results of [36] regarding the analysis of the following weak version of the *fractional semilinear optimal control problem*: Find

$$(4.1) \quad \min\{J(u, z) : (u, z) \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \times \mathbb{Z}_{ad}\}$$

subject to the *fractional, semilinear, and elliptic* state equation

$$(4.2) \quad \mathcal{A}(u, v) + (a(\cdot, u), v)_{L^2(\Omega)} = (z, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall v \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega).$$

\mathbb{Z}_{ad} denotes the set of *admissible controls* and is defined by $\mathbb{Z}_{ad} := \{v \in L^2(\Omega) : \mathbf{a} \leq v(x) \leq \mathbf{b} \text{ a.e. } x \in \Omega\}$, where $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}$ are such that $\mathbf{a} < \mathbf{b}$.

Let $r > n/2s$ and $a = a(x, u) : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a monotone increasing in u Carathéodory function satisfying (3.1) and $a(\cdot, 0) \in L^r(\Omega)$. In view of Theorem 3.1, the state equation (4.2) admits a unique solution $u \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$. We thus introduce the control to state map $\mathcal{S} : L^r(\Omega) \rightarrow \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ which, given a control z , associates to it the unique state u that solves (4.2). We also introduce the reduced cost functional $j : \mathbb{Z}_{ad} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by the relation $j(z) = J(\mathcal{S}z, z)$.

4.1. Existence of optimal controls. The existence of an optimal state-control pair (\bar{u}, \bar{z}) is as follows.

THEOREM 4.1 (existence of an optimal pair). *Let $n \geq 2$, $s \in (0, 1)$, and $r > n/2s$. Let $a = a(x, u) : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Carathéodory function that is monotone increasing in u . Let $L = L(x, u) : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Carathéodory function. Assume that, for every $\mathbf{m} > 0$, there exist $\varphi_{\mathbf{m}} \in L^r(\Omega)$, with $r > n/2s$, and $\psi_{\mathbf{m}} \in L^1(\Omega)$ such that*

$$(4.3) \quad |a(x, u)| \leq \varphi_{\mathbf{m}}(x), \quad |L(x, u)| \leq \psi_{\mathbf{m}}(x), \quad \text{a.e. } x \in \Omega, \quad u \in [-\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}].$$

Thus, (4.1)–(4.2) admits at least one solution $(\bar{u}, \bar{z}) \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega) \times \mathbb{Z}_{ad}$.

Proof. See [36, Theorem 4.1]. \square

REMARK 4.1 (assumptions on a). To obtain the result of Theorem 4.1 we have assumed (4.3). Observe that (3.1) can be guaranteed because $n/2s > 2n/(n+2s)$.

4.2. First order necessary optimality conditions. In this section, we state first order necessary optimality conditions for the PDE-constrained optimization problem (4.1)–(4.2). We must immediately mention that, since (4.1)–(4.2) is not convex, we distinguish between local and global solutions and present optimality conditions in the context of local solutions.

DEFINITION 4.2 (local minimum). *Let $q \in [1, \infty]$. We say that $\bar{z} \in \mathbb{Z}_{ad}$ is a local minimum in $L^q(\Omega)$ for (4.1)–(4.2) if there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $j(\bar{z}) \leq j(z)$ for every $z \in B_\epsilon(\bar{z}) \cap \mathbb{Z}_{ad}$; $B_\epsilon(\bar{z})$ denotes the closed ball in $L^q(\Omega)$ of radius ϵ centered at \bar{z} . We*

say that $\bar{z} \in \mathbb{Z}_{ad}$ is a strict local minimum if the inequality $j(\bar{z}) < j(z)$ holds for every $z \in B_\epsilon(\bar{z}) \cap \mathbb{Z}_{ad}$ with $z \neq \bar{z}$.

REMARK 4.2 (local optimality in $L^2(\Omega) \implies$ local optimality in $L^q(\Omega)$). If $\bar{z} \in \mathbb{Z}_{ad}$ is a (strict) local minimum in $L^2(\Omega)$, then $\bar{z} \in \mathbb{Z}_{ad}$ is a (strict) local minimum in $L^q(\Omega)$ for $q \in [1, \infty]$ because \mathbb{Z}_{ad} is bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega)$; see [14, Section 5].

In what follows, we will operate in $L^2(\Omega)$ regarding local optimality.

Let us now formulate first order optimality conditions for problem (4.1)–(4.2). To accomplish this task, we first introduce the adjoint state $p \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ as the solution to the *adjoint equation*, which corresponds to the following *fractional, linear, and elliptic* PDE:

$$(4.4) \quad \mathcal{A}(v, p) + \left(\frac{\partial a}{\partial u}(\cdot, u)p, v \right)_{L^2(\Omega)} = \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(\cdot, u), v \right)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall v \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega).$$

In view of assumptions (A.2) and (B.2) we have that $\partial a / \partial u(x, u) \geq 0$, for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$, and that $\partial L / \partial u(\cdot, u) \in L^r(\Omega)$, for $r > n/2s$, respectively. These two ingredients allow us to conclude that the adjoint equation (4.4) is well-posed.

THEOREM 4.3 (first order necessary optimality conditions). *Let $n \geq 2$, $s \in (0, 1)$, and $r > n/2s$. Assume that (A.1)–(A.3) and (B.1)–(B.2) hold. Then, every locally optimal control $\bar{z} \in \mathbb{Z}_{ad}$ satisfies the variational inequality*

$$(4.5) \quad (\bar{p} + \alpha \bar{z}, z - \bar{z})_{L^2(\Omega)} \geq 0 \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{Z}_{ad},$$

where $\bar{p} \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ denotes the solution to (4.4) with u replaced by $\bar{u} = \mathcal{S}\bar{z}$.

Proof. See [36, Theorem 4.4]. \square

We now present a projection formula that is of fundamental importance to derive regularity estimates; see the forthcoming section 4.4. Define the map $\Pi_{[a, b]} : L^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{ad}$ by $\Pi_{[a, b]}(v) := \min\{b, \max\{v, a\}\}$ a.e. in Ω . With $\Pi_{[a, b]}$ at hand, we present the following projection formula: If $\bar{z} \in \mathbb{Z}_{ad}$ denotes a locally optimal control for problem (4.1)–(4.2), then [41, Section 4.6, page 217]

$$(4.6) \quad \bar{z}(x) := \Pi_{[a, b]}(-\alpha^{-1}\bar{p}(x)) \text{ a.e. } x \in \Omega.$$

Since $\bar{p} \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $s \in (0, 1)$, it is immediate that $\bar{z} \in H^s(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$.

4.3. Second order optimality conditions. In Theorem 4.3 we stated a first order *necessary* optimality condition. Since our optimal control problem is not convex, sufficiency requires the use of second order optimality conditions. In what follows, we present second order *necessary* and *sufficient* optimality conditions for (4.1)–(4.2).

Let us begin by introducing some preliminary concepts. Let $\bar{z} \in \mathbb{Z}_{ad}$ satisfy (4.5). Define $\bar{\mathfrak{p}} := \bar{p} + \alpha \bar{z}$. Observe that (4.5) immediately yields

$$(4.7) \quad \bar{\mathfrak{p}}(x) \begin{cases} = 0 & \text{a.e. } x \in \Omega \text{ if } a < \bar{z}(x) < b, \\ \geq 0 & \text{a.e. } x \in \Omega \text{ if } \bar{z}(x) = a, \\ \leq 0 & \text{a.e. } x \in \Omega \text{ if } \bar{z}(x) = b. \end{cases}$$

The following *cone of critical directions* is essential in the formulation of second order optimality conditions:

$$(4.8) \quad \mathcal{C}_{\bar{z}} := \{v \in L^2(\Omega) : (4.9) \text{ holds and } \bar{\mathfrak{p}}(x) \neq 0 \implies v(x) = 0\},$$

where condition (4.9) reads as follows:

$$(4.9) \quad v(x) \geq 0 \text{ a.e. } x \in \Omega \text{ if } \bar{z}(x) = \mathbf{a}, \quad v(x) \leq 0 \text{ a.e. } x \in \Omega \text{ if } \bar{z}(x) = \mathbf{b}.$$

We now formulate second order *necessary* optimality conditions.

THEOREM 4.4 (second order necessary optimality conditions). *Let $n \in \{2, 3\}$ and $s > n/4$. If $\bar{z} \in \mathbb{Z}_{ad}$ denotes a locally minimum for problem (4.1)–(4.2), then*

$$(4.10) \quad j''(\bar{z})v^2 \geq 0 \quad \forall v \in C_{\bar{z}},$$

where $C_{\bar{z}}$ is defined in (4.8).

Proof. See [36, Theorem 4.6]. \square

We now state a *sufficient* second order optimality condition with a minimal gap with respect to the *necessary* one provided in Theorem 4.4.

THEOREM 4.5 (second order sufficient optimality conditions). *Let $n \in \{2, 3\}$ and $s > n/4$. Let $\bar{u} \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$, $\bar{p} \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$, and $\bar{z} \in \mathbb{Z}_{ad}$ satisfy the first order optimality conditions (4.2), (4.4), and (4.5). If*

$$(4.11) \quad j''(\bar{z})v^2 > 0 \quad \forall v \in C_{\bar{z}} \setminus \{0\},$$

then there exists $\kappa > 0$ and $\mu > 0$ such that

$$(4.12) \quad j(z) \geq j(\bar{z}) + \frac{\kappa}{2} \|z - \bar{z}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2$$

for every $z \in \mathbb{Z}_{ad}$ such that $\|\bar{z} - z\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \mu$.

Proof. See [36, Theorem 4.7]. \square

To present the following result, we define, for $\tau > 0$,

$$(4.13) \quad C_{\bar{z}}^\tau := \{v \in L^2(\Omega) : (4.9) \text{ holds and } |\bar{p}(x)| > \tau \implies v(x) = 0\}.$$

THEOREM 4.6 (equivalent optimality conditions). *Let $n \in \{2, 3\}$ and $s > n/4$. Let $\bar{u} \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$, $\bar{p} \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$, and $\bar{z} \in \mathbb{Z}_{ad}$ satisfy the first order optimality conditions (4.2), (4.4), and (4.5). Thus, (4.11) is equivalent to*

$$(4.14) \quad \exists \mu, \tau > 0 : \quad j''(\bar{z})v^2 \geq \mu \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \quad \forall v \in C_{\bar{z}}^\tau,$$

where $C_{\bar{z}}^\tau$ is defined in (4.13).

Proof. See [36, Theorem 4.8]. \square

4.4. Regularity estimates. In this section, we analyze regularity properties for an optimal triplet $(\bar{u}, \bar{p}, \bar{z}) \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \times \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \times \mathbb{Z}_{ad}$. To accomplish this task, we will assume that, in addition to (A.1)–(A.3) and (B.1)–(B.2), the nonlinear functions a and L satisfy the following assumptions:

(C.1) For $s \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2})$ and for all $\mathbf{m} > 0$, there exists a positive constant $C_{\mathbf{m}}$ such that

$$|a(x, u)| \leq C_{\mathbf{m}}, \quad \left| \frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(x, u) \right| \leq C_{\mathbf{m}}, \quad \text{a.e. } x \in \Omega, \quad u \in [-\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}].$$

With assumption (C.1) at hand, we derive a first instrumental regularity result for an optimal triplet $(\bar{u}, \bar{p}, \bar{z})$ in Hölder spaces.

THEOREM 4.7 (Hölder regularity on Lipschitz domains). *Let $s \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2})$ and $n \geq 2$. Let $\tilde{\Omega}$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain satisfying an exterior ball condition. Let $(\bar{u}, \bar{p}, \bar{z}) \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \times \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \times \mathbb{Z}_{ad}$ be an optimal triplet. Then, we have that $\bar{u} \in C^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $\bar{p} \in C^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and $\bar{z} \in C^s(\bar{\Omega})$.*

Proof. Since, in view of assumption (C.1), the term $\bar{z} - a(\cdot, \bar{u}) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, we are in position to utilize the regularity results for the linear case of Proposition 3.2 to obtain that $\bar{u} \in C^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ together with the estimate

$$(4.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\bar{u}\|_{C^s(\mathbb{R}^n)} &\lesssim \|\bar{z} - a(\cdot, \bar{u})\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\bar{z} - a(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \\ &\lesssim \|\bar{z} - a(\cdot, \bar{0})\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \quad s \in [\tfrac{1}{4}, \tfrac{1}{2}]. \end{aligned}$$

In all three estimates the hidden constant is independent of \bar{u} and \bar{z} but it depends on Ω and s . To obtain the second estimate in (4.15) we have utilized the fact that $a = a(x, u)$ is locally Lipschitz in u , uniformly for $x \in \Omega$. The third estimate in (4.15) follows from the stability bound (3.3). To derive a regularity result for \bar{p} , we first observe that $\bar{p} \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. This is a consequence of the fact that there exists $r > n/2s$ such that $\partial L/\partial u(\cdot, \bar{u}) \in L^r(\Omega)$, which follows from assumption (B.2), and the fact that $\partial a/\partial u(\cdot, \bar{u}) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, which follows from assumption (A.3). Consequently, assumption (C.1) guarantees that $\partial L/\partial u(\cdot, \bar{u}) - \partial a/\partial u(\cdot, \bar{u})\bar{p} \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. We can thus invoke the regularity results of Proposition 3.2 to conclude that $\bar{p} \in C^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ together with the bound

$$(4.16) \quad \|\bar{p}\|_{C^s(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \left\| \frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(\cdot, \bar{u}) - \frac{\partial a}{\partial u}(\cdot, \bar{u})\bar{p} \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \lesssim \left\| \frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(\cdot, \bar{u}) \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|\bar{p}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)},$$

upon utilizing the first estimate in (A.3). Finally, the projection formula (4.6) and [28, Theorem A.1] allow us to conclude that $\bar{z} \in C^s(\bar{\Omega})$ with a similar estimate. \square

To present regularity results on Sobolev spaces we will assume that, in addition, a , $\partial a/\partial u$, and $\partial L/\partial u$ satisfy the following assumptions:

(D.1) Let $s \geq \frac{1}{2}$. For all $\mathbf{m} > 0$ and $u \in [-\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}]$, $a(\cdot, u), \partial L/\partial u(\cdot, u) \in L^2(\Omega)$.

(D.2) For $s \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2})$, a , $\partial a/\partial u$, and $\partial L/\partial u$ satisfy (3.7) with $\zeta = \frac{1}{2} - s$.

THEOREM 4.8 (Sobolev regularity on Lipschitz domains I). *Let $s \in [\frac{1}{4}, 1)$, $n \geq 2$, and let Ω be a bounded Lipschitz domain such that it satisfies an exterior ball condition for $s < \frac{1}{2}$. If $(\bar{u}, \bar{p}, \bar{z}) \in \dot{H}^s(\Omega) \times \dot{H}^s(\Omega) \times \mathbb{Z}_{ad}$ denotes an optimal triplet, then*

$$(4.17) \quad \bar{u}, \bar{p}, \bar{z} \in H^{s+\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}(\Omega)$$

for every $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_*)$; $\epsilon_* > 0$ being described in estimates (4.18)–(4.23).

Proof. We consider three cases.

Case 1: $s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. Since $\bar{z} - a(\cdot, \bar{u}) \in L^2(\Omega)$, we can invoke the regularity results of Proposition 3.3 to obtain that $\bar{u} \in H^{s+1/2-\epsilon}(\Omega)$, for every $\epsilon \in (0, s)$. In addition,

$$(4.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\bar{u}\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}(\Omega)} &\lesssim \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\|\bar{z} - a(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right) \\ &\lesssim \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\bar{z} - a(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall \epsilon \in (0, s), \quad s \in (\tfrac{1}{2}, 1), \end{aligned}$$

upon utilizing that a is locally Lipschitz with respect to the second variable and the stability bound $\|\bar{u}\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \|f - a(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$. Similarly, the regularity results of Proposition 3.3 applied now to the adjoint equation (4.4) allow us to derive that $\bar{p} \in H^{s+1/2-\epsilon}(\Omega)$, for every $\epsilon \in (0, s)$, together with the regularity estimate

$$(4.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\bar{p}\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}(\Omega)} &\lesssim \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\left\| \frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(\cdot, \bar{u}) \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \left\| \frac{\partial a}{\partial u}(\cdot, \bar{u})\bar{p} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right) \\ &\lesssim \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\left\| \frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(\cdot, \bar{u}) \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\bar{p}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right) \lesssim \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left\| \frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(\cdot, \bar{u}) \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall \epsilon \in (0, s), \quad s \in (\tfrac{1}{2}, 1). \end{aligned}$$

On the basis of the projection formula (4.6), an application of [33, Theorem 1] reveals that, for every $\epsilon \in (0, s)$, $\bar{z} \in H^{s+1/2-\epsilon}(\Omega)$ with a similar estimate.

Case 2: $s = \frac{1}{2}$. An immediate application of the regularity results of Proposition 3.3 reveal that $\bar{u} \in H^{s+1/2-2\epsilon}(\Omega)$, for every $\epsilon \in (0, s)$, together with the bound

$$(4.20) \quad \|\bar{u}\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon}(\Omega)} \lesssim \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}-\iota} \|\bar{z} - a(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall \epsilon \in (0, s), \quad s = \frac{1}{2},$$

upon utilizing that $a = a(x, u)$ is locally Lipschitz in u , uniformly for $x \in \Omega$. We now notice that assumptions (A.3) and (D.1) and the well-posedness of the adjoint equation in $\tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ reveal that $\partial L/\partial L(\cdot, \bar{u}) - \partial a/\partial u(\cdot, \bar{u})\bar{p} \in L^2(\Omega)$. We thus apply Proposition 3.3 to obtain that $\bar{p} \in H^{s+1/2-2\epsilon}(\Omega)$, for every $\epsilon \in (0, s)$, together with

$$(4.21) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\bar{p}\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}-2\epsilon}(\Omega)} &\lesssim \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}+\iota} \left(\left\| \frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(\cdot, \bar{u}) \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \left\| \frac{\partial a}{\partial u}(\cdot, \bar{u})\bar{p} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right) \\ &\lesssim \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}+\iota} \left\| \frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(\cdot, \bar{u}) \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall \epsilon \in (0, s), \quad s = \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

The projection formula (4.6) combined with an application of [33, Theorem 1] reveal that, for every $\epsilon \in (0, s)$, $\bar{z} \in H^{s+1/2-2\epsilon}(\Omega)$ with a similar estimate.

Case 3: $s \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2})$. We first observe that $\bar{z} \in C^{1/2-s}(\bar{\Omega})$. This follows from the trivial inequality $1/2 - s \leq s$ and the results of Theorem 4.7. We can thus invoke assumption (D.2) and Proposition 3.4 to conclude that $\bar{u} \in H^{s+1/2-\epsilon}(\Omega)$ for every $\epsilon > 0$. In addition, we have the estimate

$$(4.22) \quad \|\bar{u}\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}(\Omega)} \lesssim \epsilon^{-1} (1 + \|\bar{z}\|_{C^s(\bar{\Omega})} + \|\bar{u}\|_{C^s(\bar{\Omega})}) \quad \forall \epsilon > 0, \quad s \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}).$$

On the other hand, $\partial L/\partial L(\cdot, \bar{u}) - \partial a/\partial u(\cdot, \bar{u})\bar{p} \in C^{1/2-s}(\bar{\Omega})$. In fact, by assumption (D.2) we have that $\partial L/\partial L(\cdot, \bar{u}) \in C^{1/2-s}(\bar{\Omega})$. On the other hand, notice that Theorem 4.7 guarantees that $\bar{p} \in C^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$. This combined with assumption (D.2) allow us to conclude that $\partial a/\partial u(\cdot, \bar{u})\bar{p} \in C^{1/2-s}(\bar{\Omega})$; observe that $1/2 - s \leq s$. We thus invoke Proposition 3.4 to arrive at $\bar{p} \in H^{s+1/2-\epsilon}(\Omega)$, for every $\epsilon > 0$, together with

$$(4.23) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\bar{p}\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}(\Omega)} &\lesssim \epsilon^{-1} \left(\left\| \frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(\cdot, \bar{u}) \right\|_{C^{\frac{1}{2}-s}(\bar{\Omega})} + \left\| \frac{\partial a}{\partial u}(\cdot, \bar{u})\bar{p} \right\|_{C^{\frac{1}{2}-s}(\bar{\Omega})} \right) \\ &\lesssim \epsilon^{-1} \left(\left\| \frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(\cdot, \bar{u}) \right\|_{C^{\frac{1}{2}-s}(\bar{\Omega})} + \|\bar{p}\|_{C^{\frac{1}{2}-s}(\bar{\Omega})} + \|\bar{p}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \left[1 + \|\bar{u}\|_{C^{\frac{1}{2}-s}(\bar{\Omega})} \right] \right) \end{aligned}$$

for $s \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2})$. The projection formula (4.6) and [33, Theorem 1] reveal that, for every $\epsilon > 0$, $\bar{z} \in H^{s+1/2-\epsilon}(\Omega)$ with a similar estimate. This concludes the proof. \square

We now present a regularity result for $s \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. When $s \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2})$ the result is weaker than the one obtained in Theorem 4.8. However, it holds under weaker assumptions on the control problem data. In fact, in what follows, *we do not operate under assumptions (C.1), (D.1) and (D.2)*.

THEOREM 4.9 (Sobolev regularity on Lipschitz domains II). *Let $s \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, $n \geq 2$, and let Ω be a bounded Lipschitz domain. Assume that, for all $m > 0$ and $u \in [-m, m]$, $a(\cdot, u), \partial L/\partial u(\cdot, u) \in L^2(\Omega)$. If $(\bar{u}, \bar{p}, \bar{z}) \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \times \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \times \mathbb{Z}_{ad}$ denotes an optimal triplet, then*

$$(4.24) \quad \bar{u}, \bar{p}, \bar{z} \in H^{2s-2\epsilon}(\Omega)$$

for every $\epsilon \in (0, s)$.

Proof. The proof follows similar arguments to those elaborated in the proof of Theorem 4.8. For brevity, we skip the details. \square

5. Finite element approximation of fractional semilinear PDEs. Let us begin by describing the finite element framework that we will adopt. To avoid technical difficulties, we shall assume that Ω is a Lipschitz polytope. When needed, we shall additionally assume that Ω satisfies an exterior ball condition.

Let \mathbb{T} be a collection of conforming and simplicial triangulations $\mathcal{T} = \{T\}$ of $\bar{\Omega}$, which are obtained by subsequent refinements of an initial mesh \mathcal{T}_0 . We assume that the collection \mathbb{T} is *shape regular* [11, 21]. Let $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$ and $T \in \mathcal{T}$, we set $h_T = \text{diam}(T)$ and $h_{\mathcal{T}} = \max\{h_T : T \in \mathcal{T}\}$.

Given a mesh $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$, we define the finite element space of continuous piecewise polynomials of degree one as

$$(5.1) \quad \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T}) = \{v_{\mathcal{T}} \in C^0(\bar{\Omega}) : v_{\mathcal{T}}|_T \in \mathbb{P}_1(T) \ \forall T \in \mathcal{T}, v_{\mathcal{T}} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}.$$

Note that discrete functions are trivially extended by zero to Ω^c and that we enforce a classical homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition at the degrees of freedom that are located at the boundary of Ω . We also note that $\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T}) \subset \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ for every $s \in (0, 1)$.

5.1. The discrete problem. We introduce the following finite element approximation of the semilinear elliptic PDE (3.2): Find $\mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T})$ such that

$$(5.2) \quad \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}, v_{\mathcal{T}}) + \int_{\Omega} a(x, \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}(x))v_{\mathcal{T}}(x)dx = \int_{\Omega} f(x)v_{\mathcal{T}}(x)dx \quad \forall v_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T}).$$

Let $r > n/2s$ and $f \in L^r(\Omega)$. Let $a = a(x, u) : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Carathéodory function that is monotone increasing in u and satisfies (3.1) and $a(\cdot, 0) \in L^r(\Omega)$. Within this setting, Theorem 3.1 guarantees that the continuous problem (3.2) admits a unique solution $u \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ satisfying (3.3). Since \mathcal{A} is coercive and a is monotone increasing in u , an application of Brouwer's fixed point theorem [42, Proposition 2.6] yields the existence of a unique solution for (5.2); see also the proof of [43, Theorem 26.A]. In addition, we have the stability bound $\|\mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s \lesssim \|f\|_{H^{-s}(\Omega)}$.

5.2. Error estimates. In what follows, we derive error estimates for the proposed finite element scheme. To accomplish this task, we will assume that

$$(5.3) \quad |a(x, u) - a(x, v)| \leq |\phi(x)||u - v| \text{ a.e. } x \in \Omega, \quad u, v \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \phi \in L^r(\Omega), \quad r = \frac{n}{2s}.$$

To simplify the presentation of the derived error bounds, we define

$$(5.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \Lambda(f, a) &:= 1 + \|f\|_{C^{\frac{1}{2}-s}(\bar{\Omega})} + \|f - a(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \\ \Sigma(f, a) &:= \|f - a(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

THEOREM 5.1 (a priori error estimates). *Let $n \geq 2$, $s \in (0, 1)$, and $r > n/2s$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open and bounded Lipschitz polytope. Assume that a is as in the statement of Theorem 3.1. Assume, in addition, that a satisfies (5.3). Let $u \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ be the solution to (3.2), and let $\mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T})$ be its finite element approximation obtained as the solution to (5.2). Then, we have the quasi-best approximation result*

$$(5.5) \quad \|u - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s \lesssim \|u - v_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s \quad \forall v_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T}).$$

If, in addition, $s \in [\frac{1}{4}, 1)$, Ω satisfies an exterior ball condition for $s < \frac{1}{2}$, $a = a(x, u)$ is locally Lipschitz in u , uniformly for $x \in \Omega$, $a(\cdot, 0) \in L^2(\Omega)$ for $s \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, $a(\cdot, 0) \in$

$L^\infty(\Omega)$ for $s \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2})$, a satisfies (3.7) with ζ as in (3.8), and $f \in L^r(\Omega)$ satisfies (3.9), then we have the quasi-optimal a priori error estimates

$$(5.6) \quad \|u - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}| \Lambda(f, a), \quad s \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}),$$

$$(5.7) \quad \|u - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|^{\frac{3}{2}+\iota} \Sigma(f, a), \quad s = \frac{1}{2},$$

$$(5.8) \quad \|u - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma(f, a), \quad s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1).$$

Here, ι is as in the statement of Proposition 3.3. If, in addition, estimate (5.3) holds with $\mathfrak{r} = n/s$, then we have the following a priori error estimates in $L^2(\Omega)$:

$$(5.9) \quad \|u - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}^{\vartheta+\frac{1}{2}} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|^{\frac{3}{2}+\iota} \Lambda(f, a), \quad s \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}).$$

$$(5.10) \quad \|u - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}^{\vartheta+\frac{1}{2}} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|^{2(\frac{3}{2}+\iota)} \Sigma(f, a), \quad s = \frac{1}{2}.$$

$$(5.11) \quad \|u - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}^{\vartheta+\frac{1}{2}} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}| \Sigma(f, a), \quad s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1).$$

Here, $\vartheta = \min\{s, \frac{1}{2}\}$. In all estimates the hidden constant is independent of u , $\mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}$, and $h_{\mathcal{T}}$.

Proof. The proof of estimate (5.5) follows from the monotonicity of a in the second variable, Galerkin orthogonality, assumption (5.3), and the Sobolev embedding $H^s(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^q(\Omega)$, which holds for every $q \in [1, 2n/(n-2s)]$ [36, Theorem 5.2]:

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s^2 &\leq \mathcal{A}(u - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}, u - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}) + (a(\cdot, u) - a(\cdot, \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}), u - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}})_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &= \mathcal{A}(u - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}, u - v_{\mathcal{T}}) + (a(\cdot, u) - a(\cdot, \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}), u - v_{\mathcal{T}})_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \|u - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s \|u - v_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s [1 + C \|\phi\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2s}}(\Omega)}], \quad v_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T}), \quad C > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Assume now that Ω satisfies an exterior ball condition when $s < \frac{1}{2}$ so that we have at hand the regularity results of Theorem 3.6. Let $s \in (0, 1) \setminus \{\frac{1}{2}\}$. To derive the error estimates (5.6) and (5.8), we bound the term $\|u - v_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s$ in (5.5) on the basis of two ingredients. The first one is the bound that is utilized to prove that $\tilde{H}^s(\Omega) = H_0^s(\Omega)$ for $s \in (0, 1) \setminus \{\frac{1}{2}\}$ [32, Theorem 3.33]:

$$\|u - v_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s \lesssim \|u - v_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{H^s(\Omega)} \quad \forall v_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T}), \quad s \in (0, 1) \setminus \{\frac{1}{2}\}.$$

The second ingredient is the localization of fractional order Sobolev seminorms [22, 23]:

$$|v|_{H^s(\Omega)}^2 \leq \sum_T \left[\int_T \int_{S_T} \frac{|v(x) - v(y)|^2}{|x - y|^{n+2s}} dy dx + \frac{\mathfrak{c}(n, \sigma)}{sh_T^{2s}} \|v\|_{L^2(T)}^2 \right], \quad s \in (0, 1),$$

for $v \in H^s(\Omega)$. Here, S_T denotes a suitable patch associated to T and $\mathfrak{c}(n, \sigma) > 0$; σ being the shape regularity coefficient of the family \mathbb{T} . With these two ingredients at hand, the rest of the proof relies on utilizing interpolation error estimates for the Scott–Zhang operator [9, Proposition 3.6], [10, Proposition 3.1] on the basis of the regularity results obtained in Theorem 3.6. Since the regularity estimate (3.10) depends on ϵ as $\epsilon^{-1/2}$, we obtain, for every $\epsilon \in (0, s)$, the error estimate

$$\|u - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} h^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon} \|f - a(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1), \quad \epsilon \in (0, s),$$

with a hidden constant that is independent of ϵ . We thus set $\epsilon = |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|^{-1}$ to arrive at the error estimate (5.8). The error estimate (5.6) follows similar argument upon

utilizing the regularity estimate (3.12). Let us now analyze the special case $s = \frac{1}{2}$ and derive the error estimate (5.7). To accomplish this task, we utilize a fractional Hardy inequality and an interpolation error estimate for the Scott–Zhang operator: Let $t \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ and $\delta \in (0, t - \frac{1}{2})$, then [10, inequality (3.11)]

$$\|v - \Pi_{\mathcal{T}} v\|_{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \frac{1}{\delta} h_{\mathcal{T}}^{t-\frac{1}{2}-\delta} |v|_{H^t(\Omega)}, \quad v \in H^t(\Omega).$$

We thus invoke the regularity estimate (3.11) and utilize the previous estimate with $v = u$ and $t = 1 - \varepsilon$, where $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrarily small, to conclude that

$$(5.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \|u - u_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{\frac{1}{2}} &\lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta^{-1} h_{\mathcal{T}}^{-\delta} \epsilon^{-1/2-\iota} h_{\mathcal{T}}^{-\varepsilon} \|f - a(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|^{\frac{3}{2}+\iota} \|f - a(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

upon taking $\varepsilon = \delta = |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|^{-1}$.

The error estimate in $L^2(\Omega)$ follows from duality. Define $0 \leq \chi \in L^{\frac{n}{s}}(\Omega)$ by

$$\chi(x) = \frac{a(x, u(x)) - a(x, \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}(x))}{u(x) - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}(x)} \text{ if } u(x) \neq \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}(x), \quad \chi(x) = 0 \text{ if } u(x) = \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}(x).$$

Let $\mathfrak{z} \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ be the solution to $\mathcal{A}(v, \mathfrak{z}) + (\chi \mathfrak{z}, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} = \langle \mathfrak{f}, v \rangle$ for all $v \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$; $\mathfrak{f} \in H^{-s}(\Omega)$. Let $\mathfrak{z}_{\mathcal{T}}$ be the finite element approximation of \mathfrak{z} within $\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T})$. Thus, an estimate taken from the proof of [36, Theorem 5.2] reveals that

$$(5.13) \quad \langle \mathfrak{f}, u - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}} \rangle \leq \|u - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s \|\mathfrak{z} - \mathfrak{z}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s + \|\phi\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2s}}(\Omega)} \|u - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \|\mathfrak{z} - \mathfrak{z}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^q(\Omega)},$$

where $q = 2n/(n - 2s)$. Set $\mathfrak{f} = u - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}} \in L^2(\Omega)$. Notice that, since $\phi \in L^{\frac{n}{s}}(\Omega)$, $\chi \mathfrak{z} \in L^2(\Omega)$. We thus invoke Proposition 3.3 to obtain the regularity estimate

$$(5.14) \quad \|\mathfrak{z}\|_{H^{s+\theta-\epsilon}(\Omega)} \lesssim \frac{1}{\epsilon^{\xi}} \|u - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall 0 < \epsilon < s, \quad \theta = \min\{s - \epsilon, \frac{1}{2}\},$$

where $\xi = \frac{1}{2}$ if $s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ and $\xi = \frac{1}{2} + \iota$ if $s \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$. If $s \neq \frac{1}{2}$, we thus obtain the following error estimate:

$$\|\mathfrak{z} - \mathfrak{z}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}^{\theta-\epsilon} |\mathfrak{z}|_{H^{s+\theta-\epsilon}(\Omega)} \lesssim \epsilon^{-\xi} h_{\mathcal{T}}^{\theta-\epsilon} \|u - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall 0 < \epsilon < s.$$

Set $\epsilon = |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|^{-1}$ to conclude that $\|\mathfrak{z} - \mathfrak{z}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}^{\vartheta} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|^{\xi} \|u - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$. Here, $\vartheta = \min\{s, \frac{1}{2}\}$. We now invoke (5.13) and the bound (5.8) to obtain, for $s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 &\lesssim \|u - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s \|\mathfrak{z} - \mathfrak{z}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s \\ &\lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}+\vartheta} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}| \|u - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|f - a(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

The case $s \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}]$ follows similar arguments. This concludes the proof. \square

REMARK 5.1 (error estimates). The global energy-norm error bounds (5.6)–(5.8) improve the ones recently obtained in [36, Theorem 5.2, estimate (5.6)]: the factor h^{ϵ} in [36, Theorem 5.2, estimate (5.6)], where $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrarily small, has been removed. We also mention that the derived error estimates are in agreement with respect to regularity. The global $L^2(\Omega)$ -norm error estimates (5.9)–(5.11) read, up to logarithm factors, as follows:

$$\|u - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}^{s+\frac{1}{2}}, \quad s \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}], \quad \|u - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}, \quad s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1).$$

Both error estimates improve the ones recently derived in [36, Theorem 5.2, estimate (5.7)]. In addition, if $s \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}]$, the global $L^2(\Omega)$ -norm error estimate is in agreement with respect to regularity. In contrast, when $s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, the derived error estimate is suboptimal with respect to regularity. To conclude, we notice that the error estimates derived in [36, Theorem 5.2] hold under the assumption that $\partial\Omega \in C^\infty$. We improve upon them by assuming that Ω is Lipschitz polytope that additionally satisfies an exterior ball condition when $s < \frac{1}{2}$.

We now present error estimates for $s \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ that are suboptimal in terms of regularity. When $s \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2})$ the derived error estimates holds under weaker regularity assumptions that the ones stated in Theorem 5.1.

THEOREM 5.2 (a priori error estimates). *Let $n \geq 2$, $s \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, and $r > n/2s$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open and bounded Lipschitz polytope. Assume that a is as in the statement of Theorem 3.1 and satisfies, in addition, (5.3). If, in addition, $a = a(x, u)$ is locally Lipschitz in u , uniformly for $x \in \Omega$, $a(\cdot, 0) \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $f \in L^2(\Omega) \cap L^r(\Omega)$, then we have the following a priori error estimate in energy-norm:*

$$(5.15) \quad \|u - u_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}^s |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|^{\frac{1}{2} + \iota} \|f - a(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad s \in (0, \frac{1}{2}),$$

Here, ι is as in the statement of Proposition 3.3. If, in addition, estimate (5.3) holds with $\tau = n/s$, then we have the following a priori error estimate in $L^2(\Omega)$:

$$(5.16) \quad \|u - u_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}^{2s} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|^{2(\frac{1}{2} + \iota)} \|f - a(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad s \in (0, \frac{1}{2}).$$

In both estimates the hidden constant is independent of u , $u_{\mathcal{T}}$, and $h_{\mathcal{T}}$.

Proof. The proof follows similar arguments to those elaborated in the proof of Theorem 5.1 upon utilizing the regularity results provided in Theorem 3.7. For brevity, we skip details. \square

5.2.1. Error estimates on suitable graded meshes. In this section, we assume that we have at hand a family of meshes $\{\mathcal{T}\}$ of $\bar{\Omega}$ such that, in addition to shape regularity, the family $\{\mathcal{T}\}$ satisfies a suitable mesh refinement near the boundary of Ω [9, 10]: Given a mesh parameter $h > 0$, there is a number $\mu \geq 1$ such that for every $T \in \mathcal{T}$

$$(5.17) \quad h_T \leq C(\sigma)h^\mu \text{ if } T \cap \partial\Omega \neq \emptyset, \quad h_T \leq C(\sigma)h \text{dist}(T, \partial\Omega)^{(\mu-1)/\mu} \text{ if } T \cap \partial\Omega = \emptyset.$$

Here, $C(\sigma)$ denotes a constant that only depends on the shape regularity coefficient σ of $\{\mathcal{T}\}$. The number of degrees of freedom \mathcal{N} of the corresponding finite element space $\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T})$ can be related to the discretization parameter h as follows [10, (3.13)]:

$$\mathcal{N} \approx h^{-n} \text{ if } \mu < \frac{n}{n-1}, \quad \mathcal{N} \approx h^{-n} |\log h| \text{ if } \mu = \frac{n}{n-1}, \quad \mathcal{N} \approx h^{(1-n)\mu} \text{ if } \mu > \frac{n}{n-1}.$$

If $\mu \leq n/(n-1)$, h and \mathcal{N} satisfy the optimal relation $h \approx \mathcal{N}^{-\frac{1}{n}}$ (up to a logarithmic factor if $\mu = n/(n-1)$.)

We now present error estimates on the graded meshes dictated by (5.17) that improve the ones obtained in Theorem 5.1 for shape regular families of conforming and simplicial triangulations. Since we will utilize the results of Theorem 3.5, we will assume that Ω satisfies an exterior ball condition.

THEOREM 5.3 (a priori error estimates on graded meshes). *Let $n \geq 2$, $s \in (0, 1)$, and $r > n/2s$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open and bounded Lipschitz polytope satisfying an exterior ball condition. Let $\mu = n/(n-1)$ be the parameter that dictates the mesh*

refinement (5.17), and let $\beta_\star = n/(2(n-1)) - s$. Assume that a is as in the statement of Theorem 3.1. If, in addition, $s \geq n/(4(n-1))$, $a(\cdot, 0) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, a satisfies (3.7) with $\zeta = \beta_\star$, and $f \in C^\beta(\bar{\Omega})$, where $\beta \geq \beta_\star$, then we have the following a priori error estimate in energy-norm:

$$(5.18) \quad \|u - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s \lesssim h^{\frac{n}{2(n-1)}} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|^v, \quad s \in \left[\frac{n}{4(n-1)}, 1 \right),$$

where $v = 1$ if $s \neq \frac{1}{2}$ and $v = 2$ if $s = \frac{1}{2}$. In addition, we have the following a priori error estimate in $L^2(\Omega)$:

$$(5.19) \quad \|u - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h^{\frac{n}{2(n-1)} + \vartheta} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|^v, \quad s \in \left[\frac{n}{4(n-1)}, 1 \right).$$

Here, $\vartheta = \min\{s, \frac{1}{2}\}$, $v = \frac{3}{2}$ if $s > \frac{1}{2}$, $v = \frac{5}{2} + \iota$ if $s = \frac{1}{2}$, and $v = \frac{3}{2} + \iota$ if $s < \frac{1}{2}$. The constant ι is as in the statement of Proposition 3.3. In both estimates the hidden constant is independent of u , $\mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}$, and $h_{\mathcal{T}}$.

Proof. We begin the proof by noticing that, since a satisfies (3.7) with $\zeta = \beta_\star$, then (5.3) holds. We can thus invoke the best approximation result (5.5) of Theorem 5.1 to immediately deduce the error bound $\|u - \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s \lesssim \|u - \Pi_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbf{u}\|_s$, where $\Pi_{\mathcal{T}}$ denotes the Scott–Zhang operator. The desired error estimate (5.18) is thus a consequence of [10, estimate (3.14)] and [10, Theorem 3.5] upon obtaining that $f - a(\cdot, u) \in C^{\beta_\star}(\bar{\Omega})$. To accomplish this task, we invoke the regularity results of Theorem 3.5 to deduce that $u \in C^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Since a satisfies (3.7) with $\zeta = \beta_\star$, the arguments in Remark 3.2 reveal that $a(\cdot, u) \in C^{\beta_\star}(\bar{\Omega})$. Notice that $s \geq \beta_\star = n/(2(n-1)) - s$ because $s \geq n/(4(n-1))$. Consequently, $f - a(\cdot, u) \in C^\gamma(\bar{\Omega})$, where $\gamma = \min\{\beta, \beta_\star\} = \beta_\star$.

With the previous regularity result at hand, the error estimate (5.19) in $L^2(\Omega)$ follows from [10, Proposition (3.10)]. This concludes the proof. \square

5.3. Convergence properties. We present the following convergence result.

PROPOSITION 5.4 (convergence). *Let $n \geq 2$, $s \in (0, 1)$, and $r > n/2s$. Let Ω be an open and bounded Lipschitz polytope. Assume that a is as in the statement of Theorem 3.1 and satisfies, in addition, (5.3). Let $u \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ be the solution to (3.2), and let $\mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T})$ be the solution to (5.2) with f replaced by $f_{\mathcal{T}} \in L^r(\Omega)$. Then,*

$$f_{\mathcal{T}} \rightharpoonup f \text{ in } L^r(\Omega) \implies \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{T}} \rightarrow u \text{ in } L^q(\Omega), \quad h_{\mathcal{T}} \downarrow 0,$$

for every $q \leq 2n/(n-2s)$.

Proof. See [36, Proposition 5.3 and Remark 5.3]. \square

6. Finite element approximation of the adjoint equation. We introduce the following finite element approximation of (4.4): Find $q_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T})$ such that

$$(6.1) \quad \mathcal{A}(v_{\mathcal{T}}, q_{\mathcal{T}}) + \left(\frac{\partial a}{\partial u}(\cdot, u) q_{\mathcal{T}}, v_{\mathcal{T}} \right)_{L^2(\Omega)} = \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(\cdot, u), v_{\mathcal{T}} \right)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall v_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T}),$$

where $u \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ corresponds to the unique solution to (4.2). We observe that assumption (B.2) guarantees that $\partial L/\partial u(\cdot, u) \in L^r(\Omega)$ for $r > n/2s$ while assumption (A.2) reveals that $\partial a/\partial u(x, u) \geq 0$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$. The existence and uniqueness of a discrete solution $q_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T})$ to problem (6.1) is thus immediate.

In what follows, we analyze error estimates for the finite element approximation (6.1) of the adjoint equation (4.4).

THEOREM 6.1 (a priori error estimates). *Let $n \geq 2$ and $s \in [\frac{1}{4}, 1)$. Let Ω be an open and bounded Lipschitz polytope such that it satisfies an exterior ball condition for*

$s < 1/2$. Assume that (A.1)–(A.3), (B.1)–(B.2), (C.1), and (D.1)–(D.2) hold. Let $p \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ be the solution to (4.4), and let $q_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T})$ be the solution to the discrete problem (6.1). Then, we have the following a priori error estimates in energy-norm:

$$(6.2) \quad \|p - q_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|, \quad s \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}),$$

$$(6.3) \quad \|p - q_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|^{\frac{3}{2} + \iota}, \quad s = \frac{1}{2},$$

$$(6.4) \quad \|p - q_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1).$$

Here, ι is as in the statement of Proposition 3.3. In addition, we have the following a priori error estimates in $L^2(\Omega)$:

$$(6.5) \quad \|p - q_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}^{\vartheta + \frac{1}{2}} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|^{\frac{3}{2} + \iota}, \quad s \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}).$$

$$(6.6) \quad \|p - q_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}^{\vartheta + \frac{1}{2}} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|^{2(\frac{3}{2} + \iota)}, \quad s = \frac{1}{2}.$$

$$(6.7) \quad \|p - q_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}^{\vartheta + \frac{1}{2}} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|, \quad s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1).$$

Here, $\vartheta = \min\{s, \frac{1}{2}\}$. In all estimates, the hidden constant is independent of p , q_h , and $h_{\mathcal{T}}$.

Proof. We follow [36, Theorem 6.1] and write

$$\begin{aligned} \|p - q_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s^2 &= \mathcal{A}(p - q_{\mathcal{T}}, p) + \left(\frac{\partial a}{\partial u}(\cdot, u)(p - q_{\mathcal{T}}), q_{\mathcal{T}} \right)_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &= \mathcal{A}(p - q_{\mathcal{T}}, p - v_{\mathcal{T}}) + \left(\frac{\partial a}{\partial u}(\cdot, u)(p - q_{\mathcal{T}}), q_{\mathcal{T}} - v_{\mathcal{T}} \right)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall v_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T}), \end{aligned}$$

upon utilizing that $\mathcal{A}(v_{\mathcal{T}}, p - q_{\mathcal{T}}) + \left(\frac{\partial a}{\partial u}(\cdot, u)(p - q_{\mathcal{T}}), v_{\mathcal{T}} \right)_{L^2(\Omega)} = 0$ for $v_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T})$.

We now write $q_{\mathcal{T}} - v_{\mathcal{T}}$ as $(q_{\mathcal{T}} - p) + (p - v_{\mathcal{T}})$, observe that $(\partial a / \partial u(\cdot, u)(p - q_{\mathcal{T}}), q_{\mathcal{T}} - p)_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq 0$, and utilize assumption (A.3) and $u \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ to obtain

$$\|p - q_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s^2 \leq \|p - q_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s \|p - v_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s + C_m \|p - q_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|p - v_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad v_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T}).$$

This bound allows us to obtain the quasi-best approximation property: $\|p - q_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s \lesssim \inf\{\|p - v_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s : v_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T})\}$. The energy-norm error estimates (6.2)–(6.4) thus follow from similar arguments to the ones developed in the proof of Theorem 5.1 upon utilizing the regularity estimates (4.19), (4.21), and (4.23) derived in the proof of Theorem 4.8. The $L^2(\Omega)$ -norm error estimates (6.5)–(6.7) follow from a duality argument. This concludes the proof. \square

Let us now introduce $u_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T})$ as the solution to (5.2) with f being replaced by $z_{\mathcal{T}}$; $z_{\mathcal{T}}$ corresponds to an arbitrary piecewise constant function over the mesh \mathcal{T} . We also introduce the discrete function $p_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T})$ as the solution to

$$(6.8) \quad \mathcal{A}(v_{\mathcal{T}}, p_{\mathcal{T}}) + \left(\frac{\partial a}{\partial u}(\cdot, u_{\mathcal{T}}) p_{\mathcal{T}}, v_{\mathcal{T}} \right)_{L^2(\Omega)} = \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(\cdot, u_{\mathcal{T}}), v_{\mathcal{T}} \right)_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

for all $v_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T})$. In what follows, we analyze error estimates for the quantity $p - p_{\mathcal{T}}$. To accomplish this task, we define the auxiliary variable q as the solution to the following weak problem: Find $q \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ such that

$$(6.9) \quad \mathcal{A}(v, q) + \left(\frac{\partial a}{\partial u}(\cdot, u_{\mathcal{T}}) q, v \right)_{L^2(\Omega)} = \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(\cdot, u_{\mathcal{T}}), v \right)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall v \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega).$$

Since we are operating under *local* assumptions on the nonlinear functions a and L , i.e., assumptions on $a = a(x, u)$ and $L = L(x, u)$ that hold for u on bounded intervals of \mathbb{R} , in what follows we assume that discrete solutions $u_{\mathcal{T}}$ to problem (5.2) are uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega)$, i.e.,

$$(6.10) \quad \exists C > 0 : \quad \|u_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C \quad \forall \mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}.$$

With this bound at hand, the assumptions imposed on the data allow us to conclude that problems (6.8) and (6.9) are well-posed. In particular, there exists a unique solution $q \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ to problem (6.9). If, for every $\mathbf{m} > 0$ and $u \in [-\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}]$, $\partial L / \partial u(\cdot, u)$ belongs to $L^2(\Omega)$, we can apply the regularity results of Proposition 3.3 to conclude that $q \in H^{s+\theta-\epsilon}(\Omega)$ together with the estimates

$$(6.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \|q\|_{H^{s+\theta-\epsilon}(\Omega)} &\lesssim \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}-\iota} \|\frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(\cdot, u_{\mathcal{T}})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad s \in (0, \frac{1}{2}], \quad \forall 0 < \epsilon < s, \\ \|q\|_{H^{s+\theta-\epsilon}(\Omega)} &\lesssim \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(\cdot, u_{\mathcal{T}})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1), \quad \forall 0 < \epsilon < s. \end{aligned}$$

Here, $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$ for $\frac{1}{2} < s < 1$ and $\theta = s - \epsilon > 0$ for $0 < s \leq \frac{1}{2}$. With such a regularity results at hand, the arguments elaborated in the proof of Theorem 6.1 yield

$$(6.12) \quad \|q - p_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}^{\vartheta} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|^v \|\frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(\cdot, u_{\mathcal{T}})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad 0 < s < 1.$$

Here, $v = \frac{1}{2}$ if $s > \frac{1}{2}$, $v = \frac{3}{2} + \iota$ if $s = \frac{1}{2}$, and $v = \frac{1}{2} + \iota$ if $s < \frac{1}{2}$, and $\vartheta = \min\{s, \frac{1}{2}\}$. ι is as in the statement of Proposition 3.3. In addition, we have the following error estimate in $L^2(\Omega)$:

$$(6.13) \quad \|q - p_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}^{2\vartheta} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|^{2v} \|\frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(\cdot, u_{\mathcal{T}})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad 0 < s < 1.$$

A second ingredient within the analysis of error bounds for the quantity $p - p_{\mathcal{T}}$ is to introduce another auxiliary variable y , which is such that

$$(6.14) \quad y \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) : \quad \mathcal{A}(y, v) + \langle a(\cdot, y), v \rangle = \langle z_{\mathcal{T}}, v \rangle \quad \forall v \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega).$$

The well-posedness of problem (6.14) follows from Theorem 3.1; observe that $z_{\mathcal{T}} \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ for every $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$. In particular, we have that $y \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$. If, for every $\mathbf{m} > 0$ and $u \in [-\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}]$, $a(\cdot, u) \in L^2(\Omega)$, the fact that $z_{\mathcal{T}} \in L^2(\Omega)$, uniformly with respect to discretization, allows us to conclude the following result: $y \in H^{s+\theta-\epsilon}(\Omega)$, where $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$ for $\frac{1}{2} < s < 1$ and $\theta = s - \epsilon > 0$ for $0 < s \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Here, $\epsilon \in (0, s)$.

After introducing all these ingredients, we are now in position to present the following a priori error estimates.

THEOREM 6.2 (a priori error estimates). *Let $n \geq 2$ and $s \in (0, 1)$. Let Ω be an open and bounded Lipschitz polytope. Assume that (A.1)–(A.3), (B.1)–(B.2), and (5.3) hold. Assume, in addition, that, for every $\mathbf{m} > 0$ and $u \in [-\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}]$,*

$$(6.15) \quad a(\cdot, u), \frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(\cdot, u) \in L^2(\Omega)$$

and that $\partial L / \partial u$ is locally Lipschitz with respect to the second variable. Let $p \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ be the solution to (4.4), and let $p_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T})$ be the solution to (6.8). Then, we have the following a priori error estimates in energy-norm:

$$(6.16) \quad \|p - p_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}^{\vartheta} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|^v + \|z - z_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

If, in addition, a satisfies (5.3) with $\tau = n/s$, then

$$(6.17) \quad \|p - p_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}^{2\vartheta} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|^{2v} + \|z - z_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Here, $v = \frac{1}{2}$ if $s > \frac{1}{2}$, $v = \frac{3}{2} + \iota$ if $s = \frac{1}{2}$, and $v = \frac{1}{2} + \iota$ if $s < \frac{1}{2}$, $\vartheta = \min\{s, \frac{1}{2}\}$, and ι is as in the statement of Proposition 3.3. In both estimates, the hidden constant is independent of $h_{\mathcal{T}}$.

Proof. We follow the proof of [36, Theorem 6.2] and bound $\|p - p_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s$ as follows: $\|p - p_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s \leq \|p - q\|_s + \|q - p_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s$, where q denotes the solution to (6.9). The term $\|q - p_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s$ is already controlled in (6.12). In fact, we have $\|q - p_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s \lesssim h^{\vartheta} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|^v$, where v and θ are as in the statement of the theorem. It thus suffices to bound the term $\|p - q\|_s$. To accomplish this task, let us first observe that

$$\begin{aligned} p - q \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) : \quad & \mathcal{A}(v, p - q) + \left(\frac{\partial a}{\partial u}(\cdot, u)(p - q), v \right)_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ & = \left(\left[\frac{\partial a}{\partial u}(\cdot, u_{\mathcal{T}}) - \frac{\partial a}{\partial u}(\cdot, u) \right] q, v \right)_{L^2(\Omega)} + \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(\cdot, u) - \frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(\cdot, u_{\mathcal{T}}), v \right)_{L^2(\Omega)} \end{aligned}$$

for all $v \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$. Set $v = p - q \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ and utilize that $\frac{\partial a}{\partial u}$ and $\frac{\partial L}{\partial u}$ are locally Lipschitz with respect to the second variable to obtain $\|p - q\|_s \lesssim \|u - u_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} [1 + \|q\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}]$.

To bound $\|u - u_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ we proceed similarly: $\|u - u_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|u - y\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|y - u_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$, where y denotes the solution to problem (6.14). Since $z_{\mathcal{T}} \in L^2(\Omega)$, uniformly with respect to discretization, and (6.15) holds, we have at hand the regularity estimates (3.5) for y , which combined with the arguments utilized in the proof of Theorems 5.1 and 6.1 reveal that $\|y - u_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h^{\vartheta} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|^v$. To bound $\|u - y\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$, we write the problem that $u - y$ solves and derive a stability estimate on the basis of assumptions (A.1)–(A.3): $\|u - y\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|z - z_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$. A collection of the derived estimates yield (6.16). The proof of (6.17) follows similar arguments. \square

7. Finite element approximation of the fractional control problem. We consider two strategies to discretize the optimal control problem (4.1)–(4.2): a semidiscrete approach where *the admissible control set is not discretized*—the so-called variational discretization approach [26]—and a fully discrete strategy where control variables are discretized with piecewise constant functions.

7.1. A fully discrete scheme. We consider the following fully discrete approximation of the PDE-constrained optimization problem (4.1)–(4.2): Find

$$(7.1) \quad \min\{J(u_{\mathcal{T}}, z_{\mathcal{T}}) : (u_{\mathcal{T}}, z_{\mathcal{T}}) \in \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T}) \times \mathbb{Z}_{\text{ad}}(\mathcal{T})\}$$

subject to the *discrete state equation*

$$(7.2) \quad \mathcal{A}(u_{\mathcal{T}}, v_{\mathcal{T}}) + \int_{\Omega} a(x, u_{\mathcal{T}}(x)) v_{\mathcal{T}}(x) dx = \int_{\Omega} z_{\mathcal{T}}(x) v_{\mathcal{T}}(x) dx \quad \forall v_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T}).$$

Here, $\mathbb{Z}_{\text{ad}}(\mathcal{T}) = \mathbb{Z}_{\text{ad}} \cap \mathbb{Z}(\mathcal{T})$ and $\mathbb{Z}(\mathcal{T})$ denotes the finite element space of piecewise constant functions, i.e., $\mathbb{Z}(\mathcal{T}) = \{v_{\mathcal{T}} \in L^\infty(\Omega) : v_{\mathcal{T}}|_T \in \mathbb{P}_0(T) \forall T \in \mathcal{T}\}$.

The existence of a solution follows standard arguments. Let us introduce the discrete control to state map $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}} : \mathbb{Z}(\mathcal{T}) \ni z_{\mathcal{T}} \mapsto u_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T})$ and the reduced cost functional $j_{\mathcal{T}}(z_{\mathcal{T}}) := J(\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}} z_{\mathcal{T}}, z_{\mathcal{T}})$. With these ingredients at hand, first order

optimality conditions reads as follows: If $\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}$ denotes a local minimum for (7.1)–(7.2), then the triple $(\bar{u}_{\mathcal{T}}, \bar{p}_{\mathcal{T}}, \bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}) \in \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T}) \times \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T}) \times \mathbb{Z}_{ad}(\mathcal{T})$ satisfies the optimality system

$$(7.3) \quad \mathcal{A}(\bar{u}_{\mathcal{T}}, v_{\mathcal{T}}) + (a(\cdot, \bar{u}_{\mathcal{T}}), v_{\mathcal{T}})_{L^2(\Omega)} = (\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}, v_{\mathcal{T}})_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall v_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{V}_{\mathcal{T}},$$

$$(7.4) \quad \mathcal{A}(v_{\mathcal{T}}, \bar{p}_{\mathcal{T}}) + \left(\frac{\partial a}{\partial u}(\cdot, \bar{u}_{\mathcal{T}}) \bar{p}_{\mathcal{T}}, v_{\mathcal{T}}\right)_{L^2(\Omega)} = \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(\cdot, \bar{u}_{\mathcal{T}}), v_{\mathcal{T}}\right)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall v_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T}),$$

$$(7.5) \quad (\bar{p}_{\mathcal{T}} + \alpha \bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}, z_{\mathcal{T}} - \bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}})_{L^2(\Omega)} \geq 0 \quad \forall z_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{Z}_{ad}(\mathcal{T}).$$

7.1.1. Convergence of discretizations. We present the following results.

THEOREM 7.1 (convergence). *Let $n \geq 2$ and $s \in (0, 1)$. Let Ω be a Lipschitz polytope. Assume that (A.1)–(A.3) and (B.1)–(B.2) hold. Assume that $a = a(x, u)$ satisfies (5.3) and that a and L satisfies, in addition, (6.15). Let $\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}$ be a global solution of the fully discrete optimal control problem for $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$. Then, there exist nonrelabelled subsequences $\{\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}\}$ such that $\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}} \xrightarrow{*} \bar{z}$ as $h_{\mathcal{T}} \downarrow 0$, in $L^\infty(\Omega)$, with \bar{z} being a global solution of (4.1)–(4.2). In addition, we have*

$$(7.6) \quad \|\bar{z} - \bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0, \quad j_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}) \rightarrow j(\bar{z}),$$

as $h_{\mathcal{T}} \downarrow 0$.

Proof. Since $\{\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}\}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega)$, we deduce the existence of a nonrelabelled subsequence $\{\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}\}$ such that $\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}} \xrightarrow{*} \bar{z}$ in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ as $h_{\mathcal{T}} \downarrow 0$. Let $\tilde{z} \in \mathbb{Z}_{ad}$ be a global solution of (4.1)–(4.2) and define $\tilde{z}_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{Z}(\mathcal{T})$ by $\tilde{z}_{\mathcal{T}}|_T := \int_T \tilde{z}(x) dx / |T|$ for $T \in \mathcal{T}$; observe that $\tilde{z}_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{Z}_{ad}(\mathcal{T})$. We also define \tilde{p} as the solution to (4.4), with u replaced by $\tilde{u} := \mathcal{S}\tilde{z}$. We now notice that in view of assumptions (A.3) and (6.15), we have that $\partial L / \partial u(\cdot, \tilde{u}) - \partial a / \partial u(\cdot, \tilde{u}) \tilde{p} \in L^2(\Omega)$. We can thus invoke Proposition 3.3 to obtain that $\tilde{p} \in H^{s+\theta-\epsilon}(\Omega)$, where θ and ϵ are as in the statement of Proposition 3.3. The projection formula (4.6) and [33, Theorem 1] thus yield $\tilde{z} \in H^{s+\theta-\epsilon}(\Omega)$. Consequently, $\|\tilde{z} - \tilde{z}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0$ as $h_{\mathcal{T}} \downarrow 0$. The rest of the proof follows the arguments elaborated in [36, Theorem 7.2]. \square

We now state a somehow reciprocal result: *every strict local minimum of the continuous problem (4.1)–(4.2) can be approximated by local minima of the fully discrete optimal control problems.*

THEOREM 7.2 (convergence). *Let the assumptions of Theorem 7.1 hold. Let \bar{z} be a strict local minimum of problem (4.1)–(4.2). Then, there exists a sequence $\{\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}\}$ of local minima of the discrete optimal control problems such that*

$$(7.7) \quad \|\bar{z} - \bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0, \quad j_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}) \rightarrow j(\bar{z}),$$

as $h_{\mathcal{T}} \downarrow 0$.

Proof. See [36, Theorem 7.3]. \square

7.1.2. Error estimates. Let $\{\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}\} \in \mathbb{Z}_{ad}(\mathcal{T})$ be a sequence of local minima of the fully discrete optimal control problems such that $\|\bar{z} - \bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0$ as $h_{\mathcal{T}} \downarrow 0$; \bar{z} being a local solution of the continuous problem (4.1)–(4.2); see Theorems 7.1 and 7.2. The main goal of this section is to derive the error estimate

$$(7.8) \quad \|\bar{z} - \bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}| \quad \forall h_{\mathcal{T}} \leq h_{\star}.$$

To accomplish this task, we present the following instrumental result.

THEOREM 7.3 (instrumental error estimate). *Let $n \in \{2, 3\}$ and $s > n/4$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open and bounded Lipschitz polytope. Assume that (A.1)–(A.3), (B.1)–(B.2), and (D.1) hold. Assume, in addition, that (5.3) and (6.10) hold. Let $\bar{z} \in \mathbb{Z}_{ad}$*

satisfies the second order optimality condition (4.11), or equivalently (4.14). Let us assume that (7.8) is false. Then, there exists $h_\star > 0$ such that

$$(7.9) \quad \mathfrak{C} \|\bar{z} - \bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq [j'(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}) - j'(\bar{z})](\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}} - \bar{z})$$

for every $h_{\mathcal{T}} \leq h_\star$, where $\mathfrak{C} = 2^{-1} \min\{\mu, \alpha\}$, μ is the constant appearing in (4.14), and α denotes the regularization parameter.

Proof. See [36, Theorem 7.4]. \square

With (7.9) at hand, we are ready to derive a bound for the error $\bar{z} - \bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$.

THEOREM 7.4 (bound for error approximation of a control variable). *Let $n \in \{2, 3\}$ and $s > n/4$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open and bounded Lipschitz polytope. Assume that (A.1)–(A.3), (B.1)–(B.2), and (D.1) hold. Assume, in addition, that (5.3) and (6.10) hold and that $\partial L/\partial u$ is locally Lipschitz with respect to the second variable. If $\bar{z} \in \mathbb{Z}_{ad}$ satisfies the optimality condition (4.11), then there exist $h_\star > 0$ such that*

$$(7.10) \quad \|\bar{z} - \bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|$$

for every $h_{\mathcal{T}} \leq h_\star$.

Proof. We proceed by contradiction and assume that the desired error estimate (7.10) does not hold so that we have at hand the instrumental one of Theorem 7.3.

In view of the discrete variational inequality (7.5), we immediately deduce that $j'_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}})(\Pi_{\mathcal{T}}\bar{z} - \bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}) \geq 0$. Here, $\Pi_{\mathcal{T}} : L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}(\mathcal{T})$ denotes the orthogonal projection operator onto piecewise constant functions over \mathcal{T} . We now invoke the continuous variational inequality (4.5) to arrive at $j'(\bar{z})(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}} - \bar{z}) \geq 0$. With these two inequalities at hand, we obtain, on the basis of the basic estimate (7.9), the error bound

$$\mathfrak{C} \|\bar{z} - \bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq [j'_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}) - j'(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}})](\Pi_{\mathcal{T}}\bar{z} - \bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}) + j'(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}})(\Pi_{\mathcal{T}}\bar{z} - \bar{z}) =: \text{I} + \text{II}.$$

To control the term $\text{I} = [j'_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}) - j'(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}})](\Pi_{\mathcal{T}}\bar{z} - \bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}})$ we proceed as follows:

$$(7.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{I} &:= (\bar{p}_{\mathcal{T}} - p(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}), \Pi_{\mathcal{T}}\bar{z} - \bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}})_{L^2(\Omega)} = (\bar{p}_{\mathcal{T}} - p(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}), \Pi_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{z} - \bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}))_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\lesssim \|\bar{p}_{\mathcal{T}} - p(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\bar{z} - \bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq Ch_{\mathcal{T}}^2 |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|^2 + \frac{\mathfrak{C}}{4} \|\bar{z} - \bar{z}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Here, $p(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}})$ denotes the solution to (4.4) with u replaced by $\mathcal{S}\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}$. The error bound $\|\bar{p}_{\mathcal{T}} - p(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|$ follows from the arguments elaborated within the proof of Theorems 6.1 and 6.2. We observe that, assumptions (A.3) and (D.1) guarantee that the term $\partial L/\partial u(\cdot, \mathcal{S}\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}) - \partial a/\partial u(\cdot, \mathcal{S}\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}})p(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}})$ belongs to $L^2(\Omega)$ uniformly with discretization. We can thus utilize the results of Proposition 3.3 to arrive at the bounds (3.5) with u replaced by $p(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}})$ and $\mathbf{f} = \partial L/\partial u(\cdot, \mathcal{S}\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}) - \partial a/\partial u(\cdot, \mathcal{S}\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}})p(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}})$.

We control the term $\text{II} = j'(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}})(\Pi_{\mathcal{T}}\bar{z} - \bar{z})$ in view of standard properties of the operator $\Pi_{\mathcal{T}}$. In fact, we have that

$$(7.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{II} &:= (p(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}) + \alpha\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}, \Pi_{\mathcal{T}}\bar{z} - \bar{z})_{L^2(\Omega)} = (p(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}), \Pi_{\mathcal{T}}\bar{z} - \bar{z})_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &= (p(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}) - \Pi_{\mathcal{T}}p(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}), \Pi_{\mathcal{T}}\bar{z} - \bar{z})_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}^{s+\frac{3}{2}} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

upon utilizing $\|p(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}) - \Pi_{\mathcal{T}}p(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}^{s+\frac{1}{2}} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\|\Pi_{\mathcal{T}}\bar{z} - \bar{z}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}$.

The estimates obtained for I and II reveal that $\|\bar{z} - \bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|$. This is a contradiction and concludes the proof. \square

REMARK 7.1 (optimality). The error bound (7.10) is nearly-optimal in terms of approximation.

We conclude the section with the following error estimates.

THEOREM 7.5 (error estimates for approximation of state and adjoint variables). *Let the assumptions of Theorem 7.4 hold. Then, there exist $h_\star > 0$ such that*

$$(7.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\bar{u} - \bar{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s &\lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|^{\frac{1}{2}}, & \|\bar{u} - \bar{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|, \\ \|\bar{p} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s &\lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|^{\frac{1}{2}}, & \|\bar{p} - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|, \end{aligned}$$

for every $h \leq h_\star$.

Proof. A simple application of the triangle inequality allows us to control the term $\|\bar{u} - \bar{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s$ as follows: $\|\bar{u} - \bar{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s \leq \|\bar{u} - \bar{y}\|_s + \|\bar{y} - \bar{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s$. Here, \bar{y} denotes the solution to (6.14) with $z_{\mathcal{T}}$ being replaced by $\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}$. The assumptions (A.1)–(A.3) on the nonlinear function a and the error bounds (7.10) and (5.8) reveal the estimates

$$\|\bar{u} - \bar{y}\|_s \lesssim \|\bar{z} - \bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|, \quad \|\bar{y} - \bar{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Consequently, $\|\bar{u} - \bar{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_s \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}}^{\frac{1}{2}} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|^{\frac{1}{2}}$. The desired bound for $\|\bar{u} - \bar{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ follows similar arguments upon utilizing (5.11). The bounds for the error committed within the approximation of \bar{p} are the content of Theorem 6.2. \square

7.2. The variational discretization approach. In this section, we propose a *semidiscrete scheme* that is based on the so-called variational discretization approach [26]. The scheme, which only discretizes the state space (the control space is not discretized), reads as follows: Find $\min\{J(u_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathbf{z}) : (u_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T}) \times \mathbb{Z}_{ad}\}$ subject to

$$(7.14) \quad \mathcal{A}(u_{\mathcal{T}}, v_{\mathcal{T}}) + \int_{\Omega} a(x, u_{\mathcal{T}}(x)) v_{\mathcal{T}}(x) dx = \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{z}(x) v_{\mathcal{T}}(x) dx \quad \forall v_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T}).$$

The existence of a solution and first order optimality conditions for the semidiscrete scheme follow standard arguments. In particular, if $\bar{\mathbf{z}}$ denotes a local minimum, then we have the following variational inequality:

$$(7.15) \quad j'_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{\mathbf{z}})(\mathbf{z} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}) = (\bar{p}_{\mathcal{T}} + \alpha \bar{\mathbf{z}}, \mathbf{z} - \bar{\mathbf{z}})_{L^2(\Omega)} \geq 0 \quad \forall \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}_{ad},$$

where $\bar{p}_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T})$ solves the discrete problem (7.4) with $\bar{u}_{\mathcal{T}} = S_{\mathcal{T}} \bar{\mathbf{z}}$, i.e., $\bar{u}_{\mathcal{T}}$ solves (7.14) with \mathbf{z} replaced by $\bar{\mathbf{z}}$. Notice that, in view of the variational inequality (7.15), the following projection formula holds [41, section 4.6]:

$$\bar{\mathbf{z}}(x) = \Pi_{[a,b]}(-\alpha^{-1} \bar{p}_{\mathcal{T}}(x)) \quad \text{a.e. } x \in \Omega.$$

We observe that the semidiscrete scheme induces a discretization of optimal controls by projecting the optimal discrete adjoint state into the admissible control set. Since $\bar{\mathbf{z}}$ implicitly depends on \mathcal{T} , in what follows we will adopt the notation $\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathcal{T}}$.

7.2.1. Error estimates. Let $\{\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathcal{T}}\} \subset \mathbb{Z}_{ad}$ be a sequence of local minima of the semidiscrete optimal control problems such that $\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathcal{T}} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{z}}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$, as $h_{\mathcal{T}} \downarrow 0$, where $\bar{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{Z}_{ad}$ denotes a local solution of the continuous optimal control problem (4.1)–(4.2). In what follows, we derive an error estimate for $\bar{\mathbf{z}} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathcal{T}}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$.

The following result is instrumental.

THEOREM 7.6 (instrumental error estimate). *Let $n \in \{2, 3\}$ and $s > n/4$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open and bounded Lipschitz polytope. Assume that (A.1)–(A.3), (B.1)–(B.2), and (D.1) hold. Assume, in addition, that (5.3) and (6.10) hold. If $\bar{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{Z}_{ad}$ satisfies the optimality condition (4.11), then there exists $h_\star > 0$ such that*

$$(7.16) \quad \mathfrak{C} \|\bar{\mathbf{z}} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq [j'(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathcal{T}}) - j'(\bar{\mathbf{z}})](\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathcal{T}} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}) \quad \forall h_{\mathcal{T}} \leq h_\star, \quad \mathfrak{C} = 2^{-1} \min\{\mu, \alpha\},$$

where α is the regularization parameter and μ is the constant appearing in (4.14).

Proof. Define $v_{\mathcal{J}} = (\bar{z}_{\mathcal{J}} - \bar{z}) / \|\bar{z}_{\mathcal{J}} - \bar{z}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$. We assume that (up to a subsequence if necessary) $v_{\mathcal{J}} \rightharpoonup v$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $h_{\mathcal{J}} \downarrow 0$. In what follows, we prove that $v \in C_{\bar{z}}$, where $C_{\bar{z}}$ is defined in (4.8). Since $\bar{z}_{\mathcal{J}} \in \mathbb{Z}_{ad}$, it is immediate that $v_{\mathcal{J}}$ satisfies (4.9). Invoke the fact that $v_{\mathcal{J}} \rightharpoonup v$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $h_{\mathcal{J}} \downarrow 0$ to deduce that v satisfies (4.9) as well. We now prove that $v(x) = 0$ if $\bar{p}(x) \neq 0$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$. We recall that $\bar{p} = \bar{p} + \alpha\bar{z}$. Define $\bar{p}_{\mathcal{J}}(x) := \bar{p}_{\mathcal{J}}(x) + \alpha\bar{z}_{\mathcal{J}}(x)$. The results of Proposition 5.4 and Theorem 6.2 allow us to conclude that $\bar{z}_{\mathcal{J}} \rightarrow \bar{z}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ guarantee that $\bar{p}_{\mathcal{J}} \rightarrow \bar{p}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $h_{\mathcal{J}} \downarrow 0$. This convergence result and the variational inequality (7.15) with $z = \bar{z}$ allow us to conclude that

$$\int_{\Omega} \bar{p}(x)v(x)dx = \lim_{h_{\mathcal{J}} \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\|\bar{z}_{\mathcal{J}} - \bar{z}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}} \left[\int_{\Omega} [\bar{p}_{\mathcal{J}}(x) + \alpha\bar{z}_{\mathcal{J}}(x)][\bar{z}_{\mathcal{J}}(x) - \bar{z}(x)]dx \right] \leq 0.$$

On the other hand, since v satisfies the sign condition (4.9), we obtain $\bar{p}(x)v(x) \geq 0$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$. Therefore, $\int_{\Omega} \bar{p}(x)v(x)dx = \int_{\Omega} |\bar{p}(x)v(x)|dx = 0$. Consequently, $\bar{p}(x) \neq 0$ implies that $v(x) = 0$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$. We have thus proved that $v \in C_{\bar{z}}$.

We now invoke the mean value theorem to deduce that

$$(7.17) \quad (j'(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{J}}) - j'(\bar{z}))(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{J}} - \bar{z}) = j''(\hat{z}_{\mathcal{J}})(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{J}} - \bar{z})^2, \quad \hat{z}_{\mathcal{J}} := \bar{z} + \theta_{\mathcal{J}}(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{J}} - \bar{z}),$$

where $\theta_{\mathcal{J}} \in (0, 1)$. Let $u_{\hat{z}_{\mathcal{J}}} = S\hat{z}_{\mathcal{J}}$, i.e., $u_{\hat{z}_{\mathcal{J}}}$ corresponds to the solution to (4.2) with z replaced by $\hat{z}_{\mathcal{J}}$, and let $p_{\hat{z}_{\mathcal{J}}}$ be the solution to (4.4) with u replaced by $u_{\hat{z}_{\mathcal{J}}}$. Since $\bar{z}_{\mathcal{J}} \rightarrow \bar{z}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$, as $h_{\mathcal{J}} \downarrow 0$, we have that

$$u_{\hat{z}_{\mathcal{J}}} \rightarrow \bar{u}, \quad p_{\hat{z}_{\mathcal{J}}} \rightarrow \bar{p}, \quad h_{\mathcal{J}} \downarrow 0$$

in $\tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$. Similarly, we have that $\phi_{\mathcal{J}} := S'(\hat{z}_{\mathcal{J}})v_{\mathcal{J}} \rightharpoonup S'(\bar{z})v =: \phi$ in $\tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ as $h_{\mathcal{J}} \downarrow 0$, because $v_{\mathcal{J}} \rightharpoonup v$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $h_{\mathcal{J}} \downarrow 0$. We thus obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{h_{\mathcal{J}} \rightarrow 0} j''(\hat{z}_{\mathcal{J}})v_{\mathcal{J}}^2 &= \lim_{h_{\mathcal{J}} \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} \left[\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial u^2}(x, u_{\hat{z}_{\mathcal{J}}})\phi_{\mathcal{J}}^2 - p_{\hat{z}_{\mathcal{J}}} \frac{\partial^2 a}{\partial u^2}(x, u_{\hat{z}_{\mathcal{J}}})\phi_{\mathcal{J}}^2 + \alpha v_{\mathcal{J}}^2 \right] dx \\ &= \alpha + \int_{\Omega} \left[\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial u^2}(x, \bar{u})\phi^2 - \bar{p} \frac{\partial^2 a}{\partial u^2}(x, \bar{u})\phi^2 \right] dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since \bar{z} satisfies the second order optimality condition (4.11), Theorem 4.6 yields

$$\lim_{h_{\mathcal{J}} \rightarrow 0} j''(\hat{z}_{\mathcal{J}})v_{\mathcal{J}}^2 = \alpha + j''(\bar{z})v^2 - \alpha\|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \geq \alpha + (\mu - \alpha)\|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$

Thus, $j''(\hat{z}_{\mathcal{J}})v_{\mathcal{J}}^2 \geq \min\{\mu, \alpha\}$ when $h_{\mathcal{J}} \rightarrow 0$, upon utilizing that $\|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq 1$. This proves the existence of $h_* > 0$ such that

$$j''(\hat{z}_{\mathcal{J}})v_{\mathcal{J}}^2 \geq 2^{-1} \min\{\mu, \alpha\} \quad \forall h_{\mathcal{J}} \leq h_*.$$

This, in light of the definition of $v_{\mathcal{J}}$ and identity (7.17), allows to conclude (7.16). \square

We are now ready to derive a bound for the error $\bar{z} - \bar{z}_{\mathcal{J}}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$.

THEOREM 7.7 (bound for error approximation of a control variable). *Let the assumptions of Theorem 7.6 hold. Assume, in addition, that $\partial L/\partial u$ is locally Lipschitz with respect to the second variable. Then, there exists $h_* > 0$ such that*

$$(7.18) \quad \|\bar{z} - \bar{z}_{\mathcal{J}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h_{\mathcal{J}} |\log h_{\mathcal{J}}| \quad \forall h_{\mathcal{J}} \leq h_*,$$

with a hidden constant that is independent of $h_{\mathcal{T}}$.

Proof. Invoke the instrumental estimate (7.16), the continuous variational inequality (4.5), and the semidiscrete one (7.15) to arrive at

$$\mathfrak{C} \|\bar{z} - \bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq [j'(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}) - j'_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}})] (\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}} - \bar{z}).$$

We now notice that $(j'(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}) - j'_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}))(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}} - \bar{z}) = (p(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}) - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{T}}, \bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}} - \bar{z})_{L^2(\Omega)}$. Here, $\bar{p}_{\mathcal{T}}$ solves (7.4) and $p(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}})$ denotes the solution to the adjoint equation (4.4) with u being the solution to (4.2) with z replaced by $\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}$. Similar arguments to the ones elaborated within the proof of Theorems 6.1 and 6.2 can be utilized to obtain the error estimate $\|p(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}) - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h_{\mathcal{T}} |\log h_{\mathcal{T}}|$. This bound implies the desired error estimate (7.18) and concludes the proof. \square

7.2.2. Error estimates on graded meshes. In this section, we operate under the family of graded meshes $\{\mathcal{T}\}$ of $\bar{\Omega}$ dictated by (5.17) and obtain an estimate for the error $\bar{z} - \bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$. The derived error bound improves the one obtained for the fully discrete scheme in Theorem 7.4 and the one obtained for the semidiscrete scheme in Theorem 7.7.

THEOREM 7.8 (bound for error approximation of a control variable). *Let the assumptions of Theorem 7.6 hold. Assume that Ω satisfies an exterior ball condition. Let $\mu = n/(n-1)$ be the parameter that dictates the mesh refinement (5.17). Assume that, in addition, a , $\partial a/\partial u$, and $\partial L/\partial u$ satisfy (3.7) with $\zeta = \beta_*$, where $\beta_* = n/(2(n-1)) - s$. If $a(\cdot, 0) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}, \bar{u}_{\mathcal{T}} \in C^{\beta_*}(\bar{\Omega})$, uniformly with respect to discretization, then there exists $h_{\nabla} > 0$ such that*

$$(7.19) \quad \|\bar{z} - \bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h^{\frac{n}{2(n-1)} + \frac{1}{2}} |\log h|^v \quad \forall h \leq h_{\nabla},$$

with a hidden constant that is independent of h . Here, $v = \frac{3}{2}$ if $s > \frac{1}{2}$, $v = \frac{5}{2} + \iota$ if $s = \frac{1}{2}$, and $v = \frac{3}{2} + \iota$ if $s < \frac{1}{2}$. The constant ι is as in the statement of Proposition 3.3.

Proof. We begin the proof by noticing that by considering h sufficiently small, we can guarantee that $h_{\mathcal{T}} \leq h_*$, where h_* is as in (7.16). Consequently, we are in position to apply the auxiliary error estimate (7.16). The arguments elaborated within the proof of Theorem 7.7 reveal that it suffices to bound the term $p(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}) - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{T}}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$. To accomplish this task, we define the auxiliary variable r as the solution to the following problem: Find $r \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ such that

$$(7.20) \quad \mathcal{A}(v, r) + \left(\frac{\partial a}{\partial u}(\cdot, \bar{u}_{\mathcal{T}}) r, v \right)_{L^2(\Omega)} = \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(\cdot, \bar{u}_{\mathcal{T}}), v \right)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall v \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega).$$

Write the problem $p(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}) - r$ solves, invoke a basic stability estimate, and utilize the fact that $\partial a/\partial u$ and $\partial L/\partial u$ are locally Lipschitz with respect to the second variable to obtain the estimates

$$(7.21) \quad \|p(\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}) - r\|_s \lesssim \left\| \frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(\cdot, S\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}) - \frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(\cdot, \bar{u}_{\mathcal{T}}) \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ + \left\| \frac{\partial a}{\partial u}(\cdot, \bar{u}_{\mathcal{T}}) - \frac{\partial a}{\partial u}(\cdot, S\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}) \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|S\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}} - \bar{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Since $\{\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}\} \subset \mathbb{Z}_{ad} \subset L^\infty(\Omega)$, Ω satisfies an exterior ball condition, and $a(\cdot, 0) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, the results of Proposition 3.2 reveal that $S\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}} \in C^s(\bar{\Omega})$. We now invoke the fact that a satisfies (3.7) with $\zeta = \beta_*$ and that $\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}$ belongs to $C^{\beta_*}(\bar{\Omega})$, uniformly with

respect to discretization, to deduce that $\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}} - a(\cdot, S\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}}) \in C^{\beta_{\star}}(\bar{\Omega})$. Notice that we have also used the results of Remark 3.2 and the basic inequality $\beta_{\star} = n/(2(n-1)) - s \leq s$. Since $s > n/4 \geq n/(4(n-1))$, we are thus in position to apply the error estimate (5.19) of Theorem 5.3 to deduce that

$$\|S\bar{z}_{\mathcal{T}} - \bar{u}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h^{\frac{n}{2(n-1)} + \frac{1}{2}} |\log h|^v,$$

where $v = \frac{3}{2}$ if $s > \frac{1}{2}$, $v = \frac{5}{2} + \iota$ if $s = \frac{1}{2}$, and $v = \frac{3}{2} + \iota$ if $s < \frac{1}{2}$; ι is as in the statement of Proposition 3.3. To bound the difference $r - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{T}}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$, we notice that $\bar{p}_{\mathcal{T}}$ can be seen as the finite element approximation of r within $\mathbb{V}(\mathcal{T})$. Consequently, [10, Proposition 3.10] reveals that

$$\|r - \bar{p}_{\mathcal{T}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h^{\frac{n}{2(n-1)} + \frac{1}{2}} |\log h|^v.$$

Notice that, since $\partial a/\partial u$ and $\partial L/\partial u$ satisfy (3.7) with $\zeta = \beta_{\star}$ and $\bar{u}_{\mathcal{T}} \in C^{\beta_{\star}}(\bar{\Omega})$, $\partial L/\partial u(\cdot, \bar{u}_{\mathcal{T}}) - \partial a/\partial u(\cdot, \bar{u}_{\mathcal{T}})r \in C^{\beta_{\star}}(\bar{\Omega})$, uniformly with respect to discretization. Observe that $r \in C^s(\bar{\Omega})$ and $s \geq \beta_{\star}$. This concludes the proof. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] R. A. Adams and J. F. Fournier. *Sobolev spaces*, volume 140 of *Pure and Applied Mathematics (Amsterdam)*. Elsevier/Academic Press, Amsterdam, second edition, 2003.
- [2] H. Antil, R. Khatri, and M. Warma. External optimal control of nonlocal PDEs. *Inverse Problems*, 35(8):084003, 35, 2019.
- [3] H. Antil and E. Otárola. A FEM for an optimal control problem of fractional powers of elliptic operators. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 53(6):3432–3456, 2015.
- [4] H. Antil, D. Verma, and M. Warma. Optimal control of fractional elliptic PDEs with state constraints and characterization of the dual of fractional-order Sobolev spaces. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 186(1):1–23, 2020.
- [5] H. Antil and M. Warma. Optimal control of fractional semilinear PDEs. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 26:Paper No. 5, 30, 2020.
- [6] A. V. Balakrishnan. Fractional powers of closed operators and the semigroups generated by them. *Pacific J. Math.*, 10:419–437, 1960.
- [7] K. Bogdan, T. Grzywny, and M. Ryznar. Heat kernel estimates for the fractional Laplacian with Dirichlet conditions. *Ann. Probab.*, 38(5):1901–1923, 2010.
- [8] V. A. Bondarenko and P. P. Zabreiko. The superposition operator in Hölder spaces of functions. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 222(6):1265–1268, 1975.
- [9] A. Bonito, J. P. Borthagaray, R. H. Nochetto, E. Otárola, and A. J. Salgado. Numerical methods for fractional diffusion. *Comput. Vis. Sci.*, 19(5-6):19–46, 2018.
- [10] J. P. Borthagaray, D. Leykekhman, and R. H. Nochetto. Local energy estimates for the fractional Laplacian. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 59(4):1918–1947, 2021.
- [11] S. C. Brenner and L. R. Scott. *The mathematical theory of finite element methods*, volume 15 of *Texts in Applied Mathematics*. Springer, New York, third edition, 2008.
- [12] O. Burkovska, C. Glusa, and M. D’Elia. An optimization-based approach to parameter learning for fractional type nonlocal models. *Comput. Math. Appl.*, 116:229–244, 2022.
- [13] L. Caffarelli and L. Silvestre. An extension problem related to the fractional Laplacian. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 32(7-9):1245–1260, 2007.
- [14] E. Casas and M. Mateos. Optimal control of partial differential equations. In *Computational mathematics, numerical analysis and applications*, volume 13 of *SEMA SIMAI Springer Ser.*, pages 3–59. Springer, Cham, 2017.
- [15] S. N. Chandler-Wilde, D. P. Hewett, and A. Moiola. Interpolation of Hilbert and Sobolev spaces: quantitative estimates and counterexamples. *Mathematika*, 61(2):414–443, 2015.
- [16] R. Chiappinelli and R. Nugari. The Nemitskii operator in Hölder spaces: some necessary and sufficient conditions. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 51(2):365–372, 1995.
- [17] M. D’Elia, Q. Du, C. Glusa, M. Gunzburger, X. Tian, and Z. Zhou. Numerical methods for nonlocal and fractional models. *Acta Numer.*, 29:1–124, 2020.
- [18] M. D’Elia, C. Glusa, and E. Otárola. A priori error estimates for the optimal control of the integral fractional Laplacian. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 57(4):2775–2798, 2019.

- [19] M. D’Elia and M. Gunzburger. Identification of the diffusion parameter in nonlocal steady diffusion problems. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 73(2):227–249, 2016.
- [20] S. Dohr, C. Kahle, S. Rogovs, and P. Swierczynski. A FEM for an optimal control problem subject to the fractional Laplace equation. *Calcolo*, 56(4):Paper No. 37, 21, 2019.
- [21] A. Ern and J.-L. Guermond. *Theory and practice of finite elements*, volume 159 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2004.
- [22] B. Faermann. Localization of the Aronszajn-Slobodeckij norm and application to adaptive boundary element methods. I. The two-dimensional case. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 20(2):203–234, 2000.
- [23] B. Faermann. Localization of the Aronszajn-Slobodeckij norm and application to adaptive boundary element methods. II. The three-dimensional case. *Numer. Math.*, 92(3):467–499, 2002.
- [24] R. K. Gettoor. First passage times for symmetric stable processes in space. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 101:75–90, 1961.
- [25] C. Glusa and E. Otárola. Error estimates for the optimal control of a parabolic fractional PDE. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 59(2):1140–1165, 2021.
- [26] M. Hinze. A variational discretization concept in control constrained optimization: the linear-quadratic case. *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, 30(1):45–61, 2005.
- [27] G. Holler and K. Kunisch. Learning nonlocal regularization operators. *Math. Control Relat. Fields*, 12(1):81–114, 2022.
- [28] D. Kinderlehrer and G. Stampacchia. *An introduction to variational inequalities and their applications*, volume 31 of *Classics in Applied Mathematics*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2000.
- [29] M. Kwaśnicki. Ten equivalent definitions of the fractional Laplace operator. *Fract. Calc. Appl. Anal.*, 20(1):7–51, 2017.
- [30] N. S. Landkof. *Foundations of modern potential theory*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1972. Translated from the Russian by A. P. Doohovskoy, Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 180.
- [31] J.-L. Lions and E. Magenes. *Non-homogeneous boundary value problems and applications. Vol. I*. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 181. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1972. Translated from the French by P. Kenneth.
- [32] W. McLean. *Strongly elliptic systems and boundary integral equations*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.
- [33] P. Oswald. On the boundedness of the mapping $f \rightarrow |f|$ in Besov spaces. *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin.*, 33(1):57–66, 1992.
- [34] E. Otárola. A piecewise linear FEM for an optimal control problem of fractional operators: error analysis on curved domains. *ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 51(4):1473–1500, 2017.
- [35] E. Otárola. An adaptive finite element method for the sparse optimal control of fractional diffusion. *Numer. Methods Partial Differential Equations*, 36(2):302–328, 2020.
- [36] E. Otárola. Fractional semilinear optimal control: optimality conditions, convergence, and error analysis. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 60(1):1–27, 2022.
- [37] E. Otárola and T. N. T. Quyen. A reaction coefficient identification problem for fractional diffusion. *Inverse Problems*, 35(4):045010, 33, 2019.
- [38] E. Otárola and A. J. Salgado. Sparse optimal control for fractional diffusion. *Comput. Methods Appl. Math.*, 18(1):95–110, 2018.
- [39] X. Ros-Oton and J. Serra. The Dirichlet problem for the fractional Laplacian: regularity up to the boundary. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 101(3):275–302, 2014.
- [40] L. Tartar. *An introduction to Sobolev spaces and interpolation spaces*, volume 3 of *Lecture Notes of the Unione Matematica Italiana*. Springer, Berlin; UMI, Bologna, 2007.
- [41] F. Tröltzsch. *Optimal control of partial differential equations*, volume 112 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010.
- [42] E. Zeidler. *Nonlinear functional analysis and its applications. I*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1986. Fixed-point theorems, Translated from German by Peter R. Wadsack.
- [43] E. Zeidler. *Nonlinear functional analysis and its applications. II/B*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1990. Nonlinear monotone operators, Translated from German by the author and Leo F. Boron.