

BILINEAR OPTIMAL CONTROL FOR THE FRACTIONAL LAPLACIAN: ERROR ESTIMATES ON LIPSCHITZ DOMAINS*

FRANCISCO BERSETCHE[†], FRANCISCO FUICA[‡], ENRIQUE OTÁROLA[§], AND DANIEL QUERO[¶]

Abstract. We adopt the *integral* definition of the fractional Laplace operator and study, on *Lipschitz domains*, an optimal control problem that involves a fractional elliptic partial differential equation (PDE) as state equation and a control variable that enters the state equation as a coefficient; pointwise constraints on the control variable are considered as well. We establish the existence of optimal solutions and analyze first and, necessary and sufficient, second order optimality conditions. Regularity estimates for optimal variables are also analyzed. We devise two strategies of finite element discretization: a semidiscrete scheme where the control variable is not discretized and a fully discrete scheme where the control variable is discretized with piecewise constant functions. For both solution techniques, we analyze convergence properties of discretizations and derive error estimates.

Key words. optimal control, fractional diffusion, integral fractional Laplacian, first and second order optimality conditions, regularity estimates, finite elements, convergence, error estimates.

AMS subject classifications. 35R11, 49J20, 49K20, 49M25, 65K10, 65N15, 65N30.

1. Introduction. In this work we are interested in the analysis and numerical approximation of an optimal control problem that involves a fractional elliptic PDE as state equation and a control variable that enters the state equation as a coefficient. To make matters precise, we let Ω be an open and bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^d ($d \geq 2$) with Lipschitz boundary $\partial\Omega$. Given a desired state $u_\Omega \in L^2(\Omega)$ and a regularization parameter $\lambda > 0$, we introduce the cost functional

$$(1.1) \quad J(u, q) := \frac{1}{2} \|u - u_\Omega\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|q\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$

Let f be a fixed function in $H^{-s}(\Omega)$. We shall be concerned with the following optimal control problem: Find $\min J(u, q)$ subject to the *fractional* and *elliptic* PDE

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

where $\Omega^c = \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega$, and the *control constraints*

$$(1.3) \quad q \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad}, \quad \mathbb{Q}_{ad} := \{v \in L^\infty(\Omega) : a \leq v(x) \leq b \text{ a.e. } x \in \Omega\}.$$

The control bounds a and b are such that $0 < a < b$. The operator $(-\Delta)^s$ corresponds to the *integral definition* of the fractional Laplace operator; see section 2.3 for its precise definition.

*FB is supported by ANID through FONDECYT grant 3220254. EO is partially supported by ANID through FONDECYT grant 1220156. DQ is supported by ANID/Subdirección del Capital Humano/Doctorado Nacional/2021–21210988.

[†]Departamento de Matemática, Universidad Técnica Federico Santa María, Valparaíso, Chile. francisco.bersetche@usm.cl

[‡]Departamento de Matemática, Universidad Técnica Federico Santa María, Valparaíso, Chile. francisco.fuica@sansano.usm.cl

[§]Departamento de Matemática, Universidad Técnica Federico Santa María, Valparaíso, Chile. enrique.otarola@usm.cl

[¶]Departamento de Matemática, Universidad Técnica Federico Santa María, Valparaíso, Chile. daniel.quero@alumnos.usm.cl

In (1.1)–(1.3), the control variable q enters the state equation as a coefficient and not as a source term. This creates the *nonlinear* coupling qu in (1.2), whose presence has motivated referring to these type of problems as *bilinear optimal control problems* or *control-affine problems* [8]. Mathematically, the aforementioned coupling complicates both the analysis and discretization. In particular, the solution of the state equation depends nonlinearly on the control and, as a consequence, the uniqueness of solutions may not be guaranteed [20]; a complete optimization study thus requires the analysis of second order optimality conditions [8]. Regarding applications, we mention that several processes in engineering, biology, and ecology, to name just a few, can be modeled by bilinear systems; see, for instance, [4, 11, 26].

Another important feature of (1.1)–(1.3) is that it is governed by the *fractional* and *nonlocal* operator $(-\Delta)^s$. Although using nonlocal models to describe natural and social phenomena has been of interest for a long time, it is only in recent years that such an interest has substantially grown. This has been mainly motivated by numerous applications of these models that attest to their relevance and versatility. It is then only natural that interest in efficient approximation schemes for nonlocal models arises and that one might be interested in their *control*. Here, by nonlocal models, we mean model descriptions that, at a given point in space, depend on the state of the system at points at a far distance from the given point. An important example in the family of nonlocal operators is the *integral* fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta)^s$ ($0 < s < 1$), which corresponds to the infinitesimal generator of a stable Lévy process. It can be shown that $(-\Delta)^s$ converges, in a suitable sense, to the Laplace operator supplemented with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions and to the identity operator when $s \uparrow 1$ and $s \downarrow 0$, respectively; see [14] for details.

For the *particular case* $s = 1$, there are several works in the literature that provide error estimates for finite element discretizations of (1.1)–(1.3). To the best of our knowledge, the first work that provides an analysis for suitable finite element discretizations is [20]. In this work, the authors propose two schemes that discretize the admissible control set with piecewise constant and piecewise linear functions and provide bounds for the error committed within the approximation of a control variable [20, Corollaries 5.6 and 5.10]. These results were later extended to mixed and stabilized finite element methods in [9] and [16], respectively. Recently, bilinear optimal control problems whose objective functionals do not depend on the controls have been analyzed in [8]. In particular, the authors investigate sufficient second order conditions for bang–bang controls and derive error estimates in L^1 -norms for a suitable finite element discretization. Regarding the analysis of *a posteriori* error estimates for problem (1.1)–(1.3) with $s = 1$, we refer the reader to [21] and [17]. We conclude this paragraph by mentioning the work [33], where the authors provide, on the basis of a posteriori error estimators, upper bounds for discretization errors with respect to a cost functional and with respect to a given quantity of interest.

To the best of our knowledge, the only work available in the literature that provides an advance concerning the *parabolic* version of (1.1)–(1.3) is the very recent manuscript [19]. In this work, the authors provide an analysis for the continuous parabolic problem including existence of solutions and first and second order optimality conditions; second order sufficiency requiring an additional assumption on the problem data (see also [20, Remark 2.21]). In contrast to this work and to the best of our knowledge, this exposition is the first one that studies approximation techniques for the optimal control problem (1.1)–(1.3); discretization techniques for the problem where the control variable enters (1.2) as a source term being available in [13, 28]. In what follows we list what, we believe, are the main contributions of our work:

- (i) *Existence of optimal solutions*: We prove that the optimal control problem (1.1)–(1.3) admits at least one optimal solution; see Theorem 4.1.
- (ii) *Optimality conditions*: We derive first and necessary and sufficient second order optimality conditions with a minimal gap; see §4.2 and §4.3.
- (iii) *Regularity estimates*: We analyze regularity properties for optimal variables. In particular, we prove that $\bar{u}, \bar{p}, \bar{q} \in H^{s+\kappa-\epsilon}(\Omega)$; see Theorem 4.4 for details.
- (iv) *Finite element discretizations*: We propose two different strategies: a semidiscrete scheme where the control set is not discretized and a fully discrete scheme where such a set is discretized with piecewise constant functions.
- (v) *Convergence of discretizations*: We prove the existence of subsequences of discrete global solutions that converge to global solutions of (1.1)–(1.3). We also prove that continuous strict local solutions can be approximated by local minima of discrete problems; see section 5.3.2 and section 5.3.3.
- (vi) *Error estimates*: For each discretization scheme, we provide estimates for the error committed within the approximation of optimal variables; see §6.

We organize our presentation as follows. In section 2, we present notation and gather some known facts that shall be useful for our purposes. In section 3, we review some regularity and finite element approximation results for problem (1.2). Section 4 is our first original contribution. We study a weak version of the optimal control problem (1.1)–(1.3). More precisely, we obtain the *existence* of optimal solutions and derive *first* and *second* order optimality conditions. The study of numerical schemes begins in section 5, where we devise two finite element schemes for (1.1)–(1.3) and analyze convergence properties. We derive error bounds in section 6. We conclude with section 7, where we provide a numerical example that illustrates our theory.

2. Notation and preliminaries. Let us set notation and recall some facts that will be useful later.

2.1. Notation. Throughout this work $d \geq 2$ and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is an open and bounded domain with Lipschitz boundary $\partial\Omega$. We denote by Ω^c the complement of Ω . If \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are Banach function spaces, we write $\mathcal{X} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ to denote that \mathcal{X} is continuously embedded in \mathcal{Y} . We denote by \mathcal{X}' and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{X}}$ the dual and the norm of \mathcal{X} , respectively. We denote by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{X}}$ the duality pairing between \mathcal{X}' and \mathcal{X} and simply write $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ when the spaces \mathcal{X}' and \mathcal{X} are clear from the context. 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 that might depend on s , d , and Ω . The value of C might change at each occurrence.

2.2. Function spaces. Fractional Sobolev spaces provide a natural setting for the analysis of the state equation (1.2). A first family of fractional Sobolev spaces can be defined on the basis of Fourier transform \mathcal{F} : For any $s \geq 0$, we define $H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$, a Sobolev space of order s over \mathbb{R}^d , by [30, Definition 15.7], [24, Chapter 1, Section 7]

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

endowed with the norm $\|v\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)} := \|(1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{s}{2}} \mathcal{F}(v)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}$. A second family of fractional Sobolev spaces can be defined in view of the Slobodeckii–Gagliardo seminorm: $W^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We refer the reader to [25, page 74] for a precise definition of $W^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ($s \geq 0$). The families $H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $W^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ are equivalent: If $s \geq 0$, then $H^s(\mathbb{R}^d) = W^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with equivalent norms; see [25, Theorem 3.16] and [30, Lemma 16.3].

With $H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ at hand, we define $\dot{H}^s(\Omega)$ as the closure of $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ in $H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ [25, page 77] and immediately notice that it can be equivalently characterized as the

following space of zero-extension functions [25, Theorem 3.29]:

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

We endow the space $\tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ with the following inner product and norm [25, page 75]:

$$(v, w)_{\tilde{H}^s(\Omega)} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{(v(x) - v(y))(w(x) - w(y))}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} dx dy, \quad \|v\|_{\tilde{H}^s(\Omega)} := (v, v)_{\tilde{H}^s(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Let us review a continuity of the product property in fractional Sobolev spaces.

LEMMA 2.1 (continuity of the product). *Let $t \in (0, \infty)$ and let $\varphi, \phi \in H^t(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then, the product $\varphi\phi$ belongs to the space $H^t(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$.*

Proof. The result follows from a direct application of the Runst-Sickel lemma [3, Lemma 4.1] (see also [29, Section 5.3.7]) with $s = t$, $p_1 = p_2 = q = 2$, and $r_1 = r_2 = \infty$. We notice that, as stated in [3, page 390], the Triebel-Lizorkin space $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{2,2}^t$ coincides with $H^t(\mathbb{R}^d)$; see also [31, Chapter 2, Section 2.3.5]. \square

We conclude this section with the following Sobolev embedding results.

LEMMA 2.2 (embedding results). *Let $s \in (0, 1)$. If $\tau \in [1, 2d/(d - 2s)]$, then $H^s(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^\tau(\Omega)$. If $\tau \in [1, 2d/(d - 2s))$, then embedding $H^s(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^\tau(\Omega)$ is compact.*

Proof. A proof of $H^s(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^\tau(\Omega)$ can be found in [1, Theorem 7.34]. The fact that the embedding is compact for $\tau < 2d/(d - 2s)$ follows from [14, Corollary 7.2]. \square

2.3. The fractional Laplace operator. For $s \in (0, 1)$ and smooth functions $w : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, there are several equivalent definitions of $(-\Delta)^s$ in \mathbb{R}^d . Indeed, $(-\Delta)^s$ can be naturally defined by means of the following pointwise formula:

$$(2.1) \quad (-\Delta)^s w(x) := C(d, s) \text{p.v.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{w(x) - w(y)}{|x - y|^{d+2s}} dy, \quad C(d, s) := \frac{2^{2s} s \Gamma(s + \frac{d}{2})}{\pi^{\frac{d}{2}} \Gamma(1 - s)},$$

where p.v. stands for the *Cauchy principal value* and $C(d, s)$ is a normalization constant. The constant $C(d, s)$ is introduced in order to guarantee that definition (2.1) is equivalent to the following one via Fourier transform: $\mathcal{F}((-\Delta)^s w)(\xi) = |\xi|^{2s} \mathcal{F}(w)(\xi)$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$; see [23, chapter 1, section 1] for details. In addition to these two definitions, several other equivalent definitions of $(-\Delta)^s$ in \mathbb{R}^d are available in the literature. We refer the reader to [22] for a discussion.

In bounded domains, for functions supported in $\overline{\Omega}$, we may use the integral representation (2.1) 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

$$\mathcal{A} : \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \times \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \mathcal{A}(v, w) := \frac{C(d, s)}{2} (v, w)_{\tilde{H}^s(\Omega)}.$$

We notice that \mathcal{A} is just a multiple of the inner product in $\tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ introduced in section 2.2; \mathcal{A} is bilinear and bounded. We denote by $\|\cdot\|_s$ the norm induced by \mathcal{A} :

$$\|v\|_s := \sqrt{\mathcal{A}(v, v)} = \mathfrak{C}(d, s) |v|_{\tilde{H}^s(\Omega)}, \quad \mathfrak{C}(d, s) = \sqrt{C(d, s)/2}.$$

3. The state equation. In this section, we introduce a suitable weak formulation for (1.2) and briefly review results concerning the well-posedness of such a formulation, regularity estimates for its solution, and finite element approximations.

3.1. Weak formulation. Let $s \in (0, 1)$, let $\mathbf{f} \in H^{-s}(\Omega)$ be a given forcing term, and let \mathbf{q} be an arbitrary element in \mathbb{Q}_{ad} . With this setting at hand, we introduce the following weak formulation of the state equation (1.2): Find $\mathbf{u} \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ such that

$$(3.1) \quad \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{u}, v) + (\mathbf{q}\mathbf{u}, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} = (\mathbf{f}, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall v \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega).$$

We notice that, since $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad} \subset L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $\mathbf{u}, v \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \subset L^2(\Omega)$, all the terms involved in (3.1) are well-defined. The well-posedness of problem (3.1) follows from the Lax-Milgram lemma. In particular, we have the *stability bound* $\|\mathbf{u}\|_s \lesssim \|\mathbf{f}\|_{H^{-s}(\Omega)}$.

3.2. Regularity estimates. We present the following regularity result.

THEOREM 3.1 (Sobolev regularity). *Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $\mathbf{f} \in L^2(\Omega)$, and $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$. Then, the solution \mathbf{u} to problem (3.1) belongs to $H^{s+\kappa-\varepsilon}(\Omega)$ for all $0 < \varepsilon < s$, where $\kappa = \frac{1}{2}$ for $\frac{1}{2} < s < 1$ and $\kappa = s - \varepsilon$ for $0 < s \leq \frac{1}{2}$. In addition, we have the bound*

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{H^{s+\kappa-\varepsilon}(\Omega)} \leq C\varepsilon^{-\nu} \|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall \varepsilon \in (0, s),$$

where $\nu = \frac{1}{2}$ for $\frac{1}{2} < s < 1$ and $\nu = \frac{1}{2} + \nu_0$ for $0 < s \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Here, ν_0 and C denote positive constants that depend on Ω and d and Ω , d , and \mathbf{q} , respectively.

Proof. Since Ω is Lipschitz and $\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{q}\mathbf{u} \in L^2(\Omega)$, the proof follows immediately as an application of [2, Theorem 2.1 and inequality (2.6)]. \square

If we assume a higher integrability assumption on \mathbf{f} , it is possible to obtain an $L^\infty(\Omega)$ -regularity result for the solution \mathbf{u} of problem (3.1).

THEOREM 3.2 ($L^\infty(\Omega)$ -regularity). *Let $s \in (0, 1)$ and $r > d/2s$. If $\mathbf{f} \in L^r(\Omega)$, then the solution \mathbf{u} to problem (3.1) belongs to $\tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ and*

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_s + \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^r(\Omega)},$$

with a hidden constant that is independent of \mathbf{u} and the problem data.

Proof. See [28, Theorem 3.1]. \square

3.3. Finite element approximation. Under the extra assumption that Ω is a Lipschitz polytope, we now introduce a finite-element-like scheme to approximate the solution to (3.1). To that effect, we assume that we have at hand a collection of conforming and quasi-uniform meshes $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}_{h>0}$ of $\bar{\Omega}$ made of closed simplices. We denote by $h = \max\{h_T : T \in \mathcal{T}_h\}$ the mesh-size of $\mathcal{T}_h = \{T\}$, where $h_T = \text{diam}(T)$.

Given a mesh \mathcal{T}_h , we introduce the finite element space

$$(3.2) \quad \mathbb{V}_h := \{v_h \in C(\bar{\Omega}) : v_h|_T \in \mathbb{P}_1(T) \quad \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h, v_h = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}.$$

The following comments are now in order. First, for every $s \in (0, 1)$, $\mathbb{V}_h \subset \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$. Second, we enforce a classical homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition at $\partial\Omega$. Observe that discrete functions are trivially extended by zero to Ω^c .

With \mathbb{V}_h at hand, we introduce an approximation of the solution to (3.1):

$$(3.3) \quad \mathbf{u}_h \in \mathbb{V}_h : \quad \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{u}_h, v_h) + (\mathbf{q}\mathbf{u}_h, v_h)_{L^2(\Omega)} = (\mathbf{f}, v_h)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall v_h \in \mathbb{V}_h.$$

The existence and uniqueness of $\mathbf{u}_h \in \mathbb{V}_h$ follows from the Lax-Milgram lemma. In particular, for every $h > 0$, we have the *discrete stability bound* $\|\mathbf{u}_h\|_s \lesssim \|\mathbf{f}\|_{H^{-s}(\Omega)}$.

We present the following a priori error estimates.

THEOREM 3.3 (error estimates). *Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $f \in L^2(\Omega)$, and $q \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$. Let Ω be a Lipschitz polytope. Let $u \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ be the solution to (3.1) and let $u_h \in \mathbb{V}_h$ be its finite element approximation obtained as in (3.3). Then, we have the error bounds*

$$(3.4) \quad \|u - u_h\|_s \lesssim h^\gamma |\log h|^\varphi \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad \gamma = \min\{s, \frac{1}{2}\},$$

$$(3.5) \quad \|u - u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h^{2\gamma} |\log h|^{2\varphi} \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

where $\varphi = \nu$ if $s \neq \frac{1}{2}$, $\varphi = 1 + \nu$ if $s = \frac{1}{2}$, and $\nu \geq \frac{1}{2}$ is the constant in Theorem 3.1.

Proof. Let us begin the proof by introducing the symmetric, continuous, and coercive bilinear form on $\tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \times \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ and the induced norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{B}}$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{B}(v, w) := \mathcal{A}(v, w) + (qv, w)_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad \|v\|_{\mathcal{B}} := \mathcal{B}(v, v)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \forall v, w \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega).$$

We observe that $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{B}}$ is a norm on $\tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ which is equivalent to $\|\cdot\|_s$. In fact, for every $v \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$, $\|v\|_{\mathcal{B}}^2 \geq \|v\|_s^2$ and $\|v\|_{\mathcal{B}}^2 \leq C\|v\|_s^2$, where $C = C(\Omega, d, s, q)$; the second estimate follows from a Poincaré inequality.

Having introduced the bilinear form \mathcal{B} , we present the basic *Galerkin orthogonality property* $\mathcal{B}(u - u_h, v_h) = 0$, which holds for every $v_h \in \mathbb{V}_h$. This immediately yields the best approximation error result $\|u - u_h\|_{\mathcal{B}} = \min\{\|u - v_h\|_{\mathcal{B}} : v_h \in \mathbb{V}_h\}$. Consequently,

$$\|u - u_h\|_s \leq \|u - u_h\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq \|u - v_h\|_{\mathcal{B}} \lesssim \|u - v_h\|_s \quad \forall v_h \in \mathbb{V}_h.$$

With these estimates at hand, the desired error bounds (3.4) and (3.5) follow from the regularity estimates for u stated in Theorem 3.1 and the arguments developed in the proofs of [2, Theorem 3.5] and [2, Proposition 3.8]. For brevity, we skip details. \square

4. The optimal control problem. In this section, we analyze the following weak formulation of the optimal control problem (1.1)–(1.3): Find

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

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

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

where \mathbb{Q}_{ad} is defined in (1.3) and $f \in L^2(\Omega)$.

4.1. Existence of optimal controls. The existence of at least one optimal solution follows from the direct method of the calculus of variations [12, Chapter 1].

THEOREM 4.1 (existence of an optimal solution). *The optimal control problem (4.1)–(4.2) admits at least one global solution $(\bar{u}, \bar{q}) \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \times \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$.*

Proof. Let $i := \inf\{J(u, q) : (u, q) \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \times \mathbb{Q}_{ad}\}$. Let, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $q_k \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$ and $u_k \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ be such that $J(u_k, q_k) \rightarrow i$ as $k \uparrow \infty$ and

$$(4.3) \quad \mathcal{A}(u_k, v) + (q_k u_k, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} = (f, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall v \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega),$$

i.e., $\{(u_k, q_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \times \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$ is a minimizing sequence. Let us now invoke the fact that \mathbb{Q}_{ad} is bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ to deduce the existence of a nonrelabeled subsequence $\{q_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$ such that $q_k \xrightarrow{*} \bar{q}$ in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ as $k \uparrow \infty$; $\bar{q} \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$. On the other hand, since, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $q_k \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$, the well-posedness of (4.3) reveals that $\{u_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $\tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$. To be precise, $\|u_k\|_s \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We

can thus conclude the existence of a nonreabeled subsequence such that $u_k \rightharpoonup \bar{u}$ in $\tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ as $k \uparrow \infty$; \bar{u} being the natural candidate for an optimal state. We now prove that \bar{u} solves problem (4.2), with q being replaced by \bar{q} , and that (\bar{u}, \bar{q}) is optimal.

Since $u_k \rightharpoonup \bar{u}$ in $\tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$, as $k \uparrow \infty$, we immediately obtain that $\mathcal{A}(u_k, v) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(\bar{u}, v)$, as $k \uparrow \infty$, for every $v \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$. To analyze the convergence of the bilinear term, we utilize that $u_k \rightharpoonup \bar{u}$ in $\tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ as $k \uparrow \infty$, the compact embedding $H^s(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^2(\Omega)$ of Lemma 2.2, which holds because $2d/(d-2s) > 2$, the convergence $q_k \xrightarrow{*} \bar{q}$ in $L^\infty(\Omega)$, as $k \uparrow \infty$, and the fact that $\bar{u}v \in L^1(\Omega)$. These arguments allow us to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |(\bar{q}\bar{u}, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} - (q_k u_k, v)_{L^2(\Omega)}| &\leq |([\bar{q} - q_k]\bar{u}, v)_{L^2(\Omega)}| + |(q_k[\bar{u} - u_k], v)_{L^2(\Omega)}| \\ &\leq |(\bar{q} - q_k, \bar{u}v)_{L^2(\Omega)}| + b\|\bar{u} - u_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0, \quad k \uparrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

To conclude, we prove that (\bar{u}, \bar{q}) is optimal. To accomplish this task, we utilize the strong convergence $u_k \rightarrow \bar{u}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $k \uparrow \infty$ and the fact that the square of $\|q\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ is weakly lower semicontinuous in $L^2(\Omega)$. With these results at hand, we can thus conclude that $J(\bar{u}, \bar{q}) \leq \liminf_k J(u_k, q_k) \leq i$. Consequently, (\bar{u}, \bar{q}) is optimal. \square

4.2. First order optimality conditions. Since the control problem (4.1)–(4.2) is not convex, we discuss optimality conditions in the context of local solutions in $L^2(\Omega)$ [32, page 207], [5, Definition 14]. In particular, in this section we formulate first order necessary optimality conditions. We begin our analysis by introducing

$$\mathcal{Q} = \{q \in L^\infty(\Omega) : \exists c > 0 \text{ such that } q(x) \geq c > 0 \text{ for a.e. } x \in \Omega\}$$

[20, page 783] and the control to state map $\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$, which given a control q associates to it the unique state $u = \mathcal{S}q$ that solves (4.2).

The following result provides differentiability properties for the operator \mathcal{S} .

THEOREM 4.2 (differentiability properties of \mathcal{S}). *The control to state operator $\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ is of class C^2 with respect to the $L^\infty(\Omega)$ -topology. In addition, if $w \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, then $z = \mathcal{S}'(q)w \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ corresponds to the unique solution to*

$$(4.4) \quad \mathcal{A}(z, v) + (qz, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} = -(wu, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall v \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega),$$

where $u = \mathcal{S}q$. Moreover, if $w_1, w_2 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, then $\mathfrak{z} = \mathcal{S}''(q)(w_1, w_2) \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ is the unique solution to

$$(4.5) \quad \mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{z}, v) + (q\mathfrak{z}, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} = -(w_2 z_{w_1}, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} - (w_1 z_{w_2}, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall v \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega),$$

where $z_{w_i} = \mathcal{S}'(q)w_i$ and $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

Proof. The first order Fréchet differentiability of the control to state map \mathcal{S} follows from a slight modification of the arguments elaborated in the proof of [32, Theorem 4.17]. These arguments also show that $z = \mathcal{S}'(q)w$ corresponds to the unique solution to (4.4). Observe that (4.4) is well-posed. On the other hand, the second order Fréchet differentiability follow similar arguments. The fact that \mathfrak{z} solves problem (4.5) follows from differentiating; see [32, Theorem 4.24(ii)] for details. Observe that problem (4.5) is well-posed as well because $-w_2 z_{w_1} - w_1 z_{w_2}$ belongs to $L^2(\Omega)$. \square

In order to provide first order optimality conditions, we introduce the reduced cost functional $j : \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $j(q) = J(\mathcal{S}q, q)$ and present the following basic result: If $\bar{q} \in \mathcal{Q}_{ad}$ denotes a locally optimal control for (4.1)–(4.2), then [32, Lemma 4.18]

$$(4.6) \quad j'(\bar{q})(q - \bar{q}) \geq 0 \quad \forall q \in \mathcal{Q}_{ad}.$$

In (4.6), $j'(\bar{q})$ denotes the Gateaux derivative of j at \bar{q} . To explore (4.6), we introduce the *adjoint variable* $p \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ as the unique solution to the *adjoint equation*

$$(4.7) \quad \mathcal{A}(v, p) + (qp, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} = (u - u_\Omega, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall v \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega).$$

Here, $u = \mathcal{S}q$. The well-posedness of (4.7) follows from the Lax-Milgram lemma. In particular, we have the *stability bound* $\|p\|_s \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|u_\Omega\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$.

We have now all the ingredients to present first order optimality conditions.

THEOREM 4.3 (first order necessary optimality conditions). *Every locally optimal control $\bar{q} \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$ for problem (4.1)–(4.2) satisfies the variational inequality*

$$(4.8) \quad (\lambda\bar{q} - \bar{u}\bar{p}, q - \bar{q})_{L^2(\Omega)} \geq 0 \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad},$$

where $\bar{p} \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ solves (4.7) with q and u replaced by \bar{q} and $\bar{u} = \mathcal{S}\bar{q}$, respectively.

Proof. We begin the proof with simple computations which reveal that the variational inequality (4.6) can be rewritten as follows:

$$(4.9) \quad (\bar{u} - u_\Omega, \mathcal{S}'(\bar{q})(q - \bar{q}))_{L^2(\Omega)} + \lambda(\bar{q}, q - \bar{q})_{L^2(\Omega)} \geq 0 \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad},$$

where $\bar{u} = \mathcal{S}\bar{q}$. Since the second term on the left hand side of (4.9) is already present in the desired inequality (4.8), we thus concentrate on the first term. To accomplish this task, we define $z := \mathcal{S}'(\bar{q})(q - \bar{q})$. Observe that z solves problem (4.4) with q replaced by \bar{q} and $w = q - \bar{q}$. Setting $v = \bar{p}$ in this problems yields

$$(4.10) \quad \mathcal{A}(z, \bar{p}) + (\bar{q}z, \bar{p})_{L^2(\Omega)} = -((q - \bar{q})\bar{u}, \bar{p})_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

where $\bar{u} = \mathcal{S}\bar{q}$. On the other hand, we set $v = z$ as a test function in (4.7) to obtain

$$(4.11) \quad \mathcal{A}(z, \bar{p}) + (\bar{q}\bar{p}, z)_{L^2(\Omega)} = (\bar{u} - u_\Omega, z)_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

The desired variational inequality (4.8) thus follows from (4.9), (4.10), and (4.11). \square

The following projection formula is essential to derive regularity estimates: If \bar{q} denotes a locally optimal control for problem (4.1)–(4.2), then [32, section 4.6.1]

$$(4.12) \quad \bar{q}(x) := \Pi_{[a,b]}(\lambda^{-1}\bar{u}(x)\bar{p}(x)) \text{ a.e. } x \in \Omega,$$

where $\Pi_{[a,b]} : L^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$ is defined by $\Pi_{[a,b]}(v) := \min\{b, \max\{v, a\}\}$ a.e. in Ω .

We conclude this section with a regularity result for an optimal control variable which will be of importance for analyzing the schemes of §5. To present it, we define

$$(4.13) \quad \Lambda(f, u_\Omega) := \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} (\|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)} + \|u_\Omega\|_{L^r(\Omega)}) + \|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \|u_\Omega\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

THEOREM 4.4 (regularity of \bar{q}). *Let $s \in (0, 1)$ and $r > d/2s$. Let \bar{q} be a locally optimal control for (4.1)–(4.2). If $f, u_\Omega \in L^2(\Omega) \cap L^r(\Omega)$, then $\bar{q} \in H^{s+\kappa-\varepsilon}(\Omega)$ for all $0 < \varepsilon < s$, where $\kappa = \frac{1}{2}$ for $\frac{1}{2} < s < 1$ and $\kappa = s - \varepsilon$ for $0 < s \leq \frac{1}{2}$. In addition,*

$$(4.14) \quad \|\bar{q}\|_{H^{s+\kappa-\varepsilon}(\Omega)} \leq C\varepsilon^{-\nu}\Lambda(f, u_\Omega),$$

where ν is as in the statement of Theorem 3.1.

Proof. Let $\bar{u} = \mathcal{S}\bar{q}$ and \bar{p} be the solution to (4.7) with u and q replaced by \bar{u} and \bar{q} , respectively. Since $f, u_\Omega \in L^2(\Omega)$, an application of Theorem 3.1 immediately reveals that \bar{u} and \bar{p} belong to $H^{s+\kappa-\varepsilon}(\Omega)$, for all $0 < \varepsilon < s$, where κ is as in the

statement of the theorem. On the other hand, since $f \in L^r(\Omega)$, for some $r > d/2s$, the results of Theorem 3.2 allow us to conclude that $\bar{u} \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Observe that, in particular, $\bar{u} \in L^r(\Omega)$, for some $r > d/2s$. Consequently, $\bar{u} - u_\Omega \in L^r(\Omega)$. We can thus invoke Theorem 3.2 again to conclude that $\bar{p} \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Observe that we have obtained that $\bar{u}, \bar{p} \in H^{s+\kappa-\varepsilon}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$. This, in light of the continuity of the product property stated in Lemma 2.1, allows us to conclude that $\bar{u}\bar{p}$ belongs to $H^{s+\kappa-\varepsilon}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ together with the bound [3, estimate (25)] $\|\bar{u}\bar{p}\|_{H^{s+\kappa-\varepsilon}(\Omega)} \lesssim C\varepsilon^{-\nu} \Lambda(f, u_\Omega)$. The desired regularity property for \bar{q} and the estimate (4.14) follow from the projection formula (4.12), the fact that $\max\{0, \mathfrak{r}\} = (\mathfrak{r} + |\mathfrak{r}|)/2$ for all $\mathfrak{r} \in \mathbb{R}$, and [27, Theorem 1], which applies because $s + \kappa - \varepsilon = s + \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon < \frac{3}{2}$ if $\frac{1}{2} < s < 1$ and $s + \kappa - \varepsilon = 2s - 2\varepsilon \leq 1 - 2\varepsilon < \frac{3}{2}$ if $0 < s \leq \frac{1}{2}$. This concludes the proof. \square

4.3. Second order optimality conditions. In this section, we formulate necessary and sufficient second order optimality conditions.

4.3.1. Auxiliary results. We begin our studies with the following result.

THEOREM 4.5 (j is of class C^2 and j'' is Lipschitz). *The reduced cost functional $j : \mathbb{Q}_{ad} \subset \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is of class C^2 . Moreover, for every $q \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$ and $w \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, we have*

$$(4.15) \quad j''(q)w^2 = \lambda \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - 2(wz, p)_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|z\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2,$$

where p solves (4.7) and $z = \mathcal{S}'(q)w$. If, in addition, we assume that $f, u_\Omega \in L^r(\Omega)$, with $r > d/2s$, then, for $q_1, q_2 \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$ and $w \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, we have

$$(4.16) \quad |j''(q_1)w^2 - j''(q_2)w^2| \lesssim \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \|q_1 - q_2\|_{L^r(\Omega)}.$$

Proof. The fact that j is of class C^2 is a direct consequence of the differentiability properties of the control to state map \mathcal{S} given in Theorem 4.2. It thus suffices to derive the identity (4.15) and the inequality (4.16). To accomplish this task, we proceed on the basis of two steps.

Step 1. We first obtain (4.15). We begin with basic computations, which reveal that, for every $q \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$ and $w \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, we have

$$(4.17) \quad j''(q)w^2 = \lambda \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + (u - u_\Omega, \mathfrak{z})_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|z\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2,$$

where $z, \mathfrak{z} \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ are as in the statement of Theorem 4.2 with $w_1 = w_2 = w$ and $z_w = z$. To obtain the desired identity (4.15) we proceed as follows. We set $v = \mathfrak{z}$ in (4.7) and $v = p$ in (4.5). This yields the relation $(u - u_\Omega, \mathfrak{z})_{L^2(\Omega)} = -2(wz, p)_{L^2(\Omega)}$. Replacing this identity into (4.17) yields (4.15).

Step 2. We now derive (4.16). Let $q_1, q_2 \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$ and $w \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Define $z_1 = \mathcal{S}'(q_1)w$ and $z_2 = \mathcal{S}'(q_2)w$. Observe that z_1 and z_2 solve (4.4) with $u_1 := \mathcal{S}q_1$ and $u_2 := \mathcal{S}q_2$, respectively. Let us now invoke the derived identity (4.15) to obtain

$$(4.18) \quad j''(q_1)w^2 - j''(q_2)w^2 = 2(w[z_2 - z_1], p_2)_{L^2(\Omega)} + 2(wz_1, p_2 - p_1)_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ + (z_1 - z_2, z_1 + z_2)_{L^2(\Omega)} =: \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{II} + \mathbf{III},$$

where $p_i \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ corresponds to the solution to (4.7) with u and q replaced by u_i and q_i , respectively ($i \in \{1, 2\}$). In what follows we estimate **I**, **II**, and **III**, separately.

We begin by estimating **I**. In light of Theorem 3.2, the fact that $f, u_\Omega \in L^r(\Omega)$, for $r > d/2s$, yields the following bounds

$$(4.19) \quad \|u_2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)}, \quad \|p_2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)} + \|u_\Omega\|_{L^r(\Omega)}.$$

Consequently, $\mathbf{I} \lesssim \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|z_2 - z_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$, with a hidden constant that depends on $\|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)}$ and $\|u_\Omega\|_{L^r(\Omega)}$. To bound $\|z_2 - z_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$, we observe that $z_2 - z_1$ solves

$$\mathcal{A}(z_2 - z_1, v) + (q_2(z_2 - z_1), v)_{L^2(\Omega)} = (z_1[q_1 - q_2] - w[u_2 - u_1], v)_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

for all $v \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$. We also observe that the following stability estimate holds:

$$(4.20) \quad \|z_2 - z_1\|_s \lesssim \|z_1\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2s}}(\Omega)} \|q_1 - q_2\|_{L^r(\Omega)} + \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|u_2 - u_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}.$$

An estimate for the term $\|z_1\|_{L^{2d/(d-2s)}(\Omega)}$ follows immediately from the well-posedness of problem (4.4) and the Sobolev embedding of Lemma 2.2. In fact, we have

$$(4.21) \quad \|z_1\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2s}}(\Omega)} \lesssim \|z_1\|_s \lesssim \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|u_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \lesssim \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)}.$$

On the other hand, we notice that $u_2 - u_1 \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ solves the following problem:

$$\mathcal{A}(u_2 - u_1, v) + (q_2(u_2 - u_1), v)_{L^2(\Omega)} = (u_1[q_1 - q_2], v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall v \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega).$$

Since $u_1(q_1 - q_2) \in L^r(\Omega)$, an application of the results of Theorem 3.2 reveal that $\|u_2 - u_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \lesssim \|u_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|q_2 - q_1\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \|q_2 - q_1\|_{L^r(\Omega)}$. Replacing the estimates obtained for $\|z_1\|_{L^{2d/(d-2s)}(\Omega)}$ and $\|u_2 - u_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ into (4.20) yields $\|z_2 - z_1\|_s \lesssim \|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|q_1 - q_2\|_{L^r(\Omega)}$. Therefore, we can conclude that

$$(4.22) \quad \mathbf{I} \lesssim \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|z_2 - z_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|z_2 - z_1\|_s \lesssim \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \|q_1 - q_2\|_{L^r(\Omega)},$$

with a hidden constant that depends on $\|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)}$ and $\|u_\Omega\|_{L^r(\Omega)}$.

We now control the term \mathbf{II} . To accomplish this task, we utilize Hölder's inequality and (4.21) to obtain $\mathbf{II} \lesssim \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|z_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|p_2 - p_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \lesssim \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \|p_2 - p_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$. We now bound the term $\|p_2 - p_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ on the basis of the fact that $p_2 - p_1$ solves

$$\mathcal{A}(v, p_2 - p_1) + (q_2(p_2 - p_1), v)_{L^2(\Omega)} = ([u_2 - u_1] + p_1[q_1 - q_2], v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall v \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega).$$

Since the right hand side of the previous weak formulation belongs to $L^r(\Omega)$, Theorem 3.2 immediately implies that $p_2 - p_1 \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ together with the estimate

$$\|p_2 - p_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \lesssim \|u_2 - u_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|p_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|q_2 - q_1\|_{L^r(\Omega)}.$$

We thus obtain, in view of $\|u_2 - u_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \lesssim \|q_2 - q_1\|_{L^r(\Omega)}$ and an analogous of (4.19) for $\|p_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$, that $\|p_2 - p_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \lesssim \|q_2 - q_1\|_{L^r(\Omega)}$. Consequently,

$$(4.23) \quad \mathbf{II} \lesssim \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \|p_2 - p_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \lesssim \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \|q_2 - q_1\|_{L^r(\Omega)}.$$

Finally, we control \mathbf{III} . To do this, we invoke the bound (4.21), an analogous of (4.21) for z_2 , and $\|z_2 - z_1\|_s \lesssim \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|q_1 - q_2\|_{L^r(\Omega)}$. These arguments yield

$$(4.24) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{III} &\lesssim \|z_2 - z_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} (\|z_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|z_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)}) \\ &\lesssim \|z_2 - z_1\|_s \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \|q_2 - q_1\|_{L^r(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude (4.16) by replacing (4.22), (4.23), and (4.24) into (4.18). \square

4.3.2. Second order necessary optimality conditions. Let $(\bar{q}, \bar{u}, \bar{p}) \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad} \times \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \times \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ satisfy the first order optimality conditions (4.2), (4.7), and (4.8). Define $\bar{d} := \lambda\bar{q} - \bar{u}\bar{p}$. The variational inequality (4.8) immediately yields, a.e. $x \in \Omega$,

$$\bar{d}(x) = 0 \text{ if } a < \bar{q}(x) < b, \quad \bar{d}(x) \geq 0 \text{ if } \bar{q}(x) = a, \quad \bar{d}(x) \leq 0 \text{ if } \bar{q}(x) = b.$$

To formulate second order conditions, we introduce, inspired by [8, definition (2.7)] and [5, Section 6, page 20], the following *cone of critical directions*:

$$(4.25) \quad C_{\bar{q}} := \{w \in L^2(\Omega) \text{ satisfying (4.26) and } w(x) = 0 \text{ if } \bar{d}(x) \neq 0\},$$

where condition (4.26) reads as follows:

$$(4.26) \quad w(x) \geq 0 \text{ a.e. } x \in \Omega \text{ if } \bar{q}(x) = a, \quad w(x) \leq 0 \text{ a.e. } x \in \Omega \text{ if } \bar{q}(x) = b.$$

In what follows, we review the arguments developed in the proof of [5, Theorem 23] and present second order necessary optimality conditions.

THEOREM 4.6 (second order necessary optimality conditions). *If $\bar{q} \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$ denotes a locally optimal control for (4.1)–(4.2), then $j''(\bar{q})w^2 \geq 0$ for all $w \in C_{\bar{q}}$.*

Proof. Let $w \in C_{\bar{q}}$. Define, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and for a.e. $x \in \Omega$, the function

$$w_k(x) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x : a < \bar{q}(x) < a + k^{-1}, \quad b - k^{-1} < \bar{q}(x) < b, \\ \Pi_{[-k, k]}(w(x)) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since $w \in C_{\bar{q}}$, it is immediate that $w_k \in C_{\bar{q}} \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$. On the other hand, we have that $w_k(x) \rightarrow w(x)$ as $k \uparrow \infty$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and that $|w_k(x)| \leq |w(x)|$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$. Consequently, $w_k \rightarrow w$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $k \uparrow \infty$. Let us now observe that, for ρ sufficiently small, or more precisely, for $\rho \in (0, k^{-2}]$, $\bar{q} + \rho w_k$ belongs to \mathbb{Q}_{ad} for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\bar{q} + \rho w_k$ is thus admissible, we invoke the fact that \bar{q} is a local minimizer to arrive at the basic inequality $j(\bar{q}) \leq j(\bar{q} + \rho w_k)$ for ρ being sufficiently small. We now utilize the relation $j'(\bar{q})w_k = 0$, which follows from the fact that $w_k \in C_{\bar{q}}$, and Taylor's theorem for j at \bar{q} to obtain that, for ρ sufficiently small,

$$0 \leq j(\bar{q} + \rho w_k) - j(\bar{q}) = \rho j'(\bar{q})w_k + \frac{\rho^2}{2} j''(\bar{q} + \rho \theta_k w_k) w_k^2 = \frac{\rho^2}{2} j''(\bar{q} + \rho \theta_k w_k) w_k^2,$$

with $\theta_k \in (0, 1)$. We now let $\rho \downarrow 0$ to obtain, on the basis of estimate (4.16),

$$|j''(\bar{q} + \rho \theta_k w_k) w_k^2 - j''(\bar{q}) w_k^2| \lesssim \|w_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \rho \theta_k \|w_k\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0, \quad \rho \downarrow 0,$$

which implies that $j''(\bar{q})w_k^2 \geq 0$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Let us now invoke the convergence property $w_k \rightarrow w$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $k \uparrow \infty$ and (4.15) to deduce that $j''(\bar{q})w^2 \geq 0$; see the proof of Theorem 4.7 below for further details. This concludes the proof. \square

4.3.3. Second order sufficient optimality conditions. In this section, we follow the arguments elaborated in the proof of [7, Theorem 2.3] and [5, Theorem 23] and derive a sufficient second order optimality condition with a minimal gap with respect to the necessary one derived in Theorem 4.6.

THEOREM 4.7 (second order sufficient optimality conditions). *Let $(\bar{q}, \bar{u}, \bar{p}) \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad} \times \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \times \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ satisfy the first order optimality conditions (4.2), (4.7), and (4.8). If $j''(\bar{q})w^2 > 0$ for all $w \in C_{\bar{q}} \setminus \{0\}$, then there exist $\delta > 0$ and $\sigma > 0$ such that*

$$j(q) \geq j(\bar{q}) + \frac{\delta}{2} \|q - \bar{q}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad} : \|q - \bar{q}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \sigma.$$

In particular, \bar{q} is a locally optimal control in the sense of $L^2(\Omega)$.

Proof. We proceed by contradiction and assume that for every natural number k there exists an element $q_k \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$ such that

$$(4.27) \quad \|\bar{q} - q_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} < k^{-1}, \quad j(q_k) < j(\bar{q}) + \frac{1}{2k} \|\bar{q} - q_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$

Let us introduce, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\rho_k := \|\bar{q} - q_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ and $w_k := \rho_k^{-1}(q_k - \bar{q})$. Observe that, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\|w_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = 1$. We can thus assume, taking a subsequence if necessary, that $w_k \rightharpoonup w$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $k \uparrow \infty$. We now prove that the limit point w belongs to the cone $C_{\bar{q}}$ and then that $w \equiv 0$. We proceed on the basis of three steps.

Step 1. $w \in C_{\bar{q}}$. We begin by noticing that the set of elements satisfying (4.26) is closed and convex in $L^2(\Omega)$; it is thus weakly sequentially closed and therefore w satisfies (4.26) as well. To verify the remaining condition in (4.25), we invoke the mean value theorem and the right hand side estimate in (4.27) to obtain

$$(4.28) \quad j'(\bar{q}_k)w_k = \rho_k^{-1}(j(q_k) - j(\bar{q})) < \rho_k(2k)^{-1} \rightarrow 0, \quad k \uparrow \infty,$$

where $\bar{q}_k = \bar{q} + \theta_k(q_k - \bar{q})$ and $\theta_k \in (0, 1)$. Define $\tilde{u}_k := \mathcal{S}\bar{q}_k$ and \tilde{p}_k as the unique solution to (4.7) with u and q replaced by \tilde{u}_k and \bar{q}_k , respectively. Since $\bar{q}_k \rightarrow \bar{q}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $k \uparrow \infty$, a basic stability bound for the problem that $\tilde{u} - \tilde{u}_k$ solves reveals that $\tilde{u}_k \rightarrow \tilde{u}$ in $\tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ as $k \uparrow \infty$. With this convergence property at hand, a similar argument yields $\tilde{p}_k \rightarrow \tilde{p}$ in $\tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ as $k \uparrow \infty$. In particular, $\tilde{p}_k \rightarrow \tilde{p}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $k \uparrow \infty$. We can thus conclude that $\lambda\tilde{q}_k - \tilde{u}_k\tilde{p}_k =: \tilde{\mathfrak{d}}_k \rightarrow \tilde{\mathfrak{d}} = \lambda\bar{q} - \tilde{u}\tilde{p}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $k \uparrow \infty$, upon utilizing that $\{\tilde{u}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\tilde{p}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ are uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega)$. We now invoke the weak convergence $w_k \rightharpoonup w$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $k \uparrow \infty$ and (4.28) to deduce that

$$j'(\bar{q})w = \int_{\Omega} \tilde{\mathfrak{d}}(x)w(x)dx = \lim_{k \uparrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} \tilde{\mathfrak{d}}_k(x)w_k(x)dx = \lim_{k \uparrow \infty} j'(\bar{q}_k)w_k \leq 0.$$

On the other hand, proceeding as in the proof of [5, Theorem 23, ii), Step 1], we can obtain that $\int_{\Omega} \tilde{\mathfrak{d}}(x)w(x)dx \geq 0$ and thus that $\int_{\Omega} |\tilde{\mathfrak{d}}(x)w(x)|dx = \int_{\Omega} \tilde{\mathfrak{d}}(x)w(x)dx = 0$. This proves that, a.e. in Ω , $\tilde{\mathfrak{d}} \neq 0$ implies that $w = 0$. Consequently, $w \in C_{\bar{q}}$.

Step 2. $w \equiv 0$. We invoke Taylor's theorem, the basic inequality $j'(\bar{q})(q_k - \bar{q}) \geq 0$, and the right hand side estimate in (4.27) to arrive at

$$\frac{\rho_k^2}{2} j''(\hat{q}_k)w_k^2 = j(q_k) - j(\bar{q}) - j'(\bar{q})(q_k - \bar{q}) \leq j(q_k) - j(\bar{q}) < \rho_k^2(2k)^{-1}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N},$$

where $\hat{q}_k := \bar{q} + \hat{\theta}_k(q_k - \bar{q})$ and $\hat{\theta}_k \in (0, 1)$. Thus, $j''(\hat{q}_k)w_k^2 < k^{-1} \rightarrow 0$ as $k \uparrow \infty$.

Let us now show that $j''(\bar{q})w^2 \leq \liminf_{k \uparrow \infty} j''(\hat{q}_k)w_k^2$. As a first step, we invoke the characterization (4.15) to write

$$j''(\hat{q}_k)w_k^2 = \lambda\|w_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - 2(w_k\hat{z}_k, \hat{p}_k)_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\hat{z}_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$

Here, \hat{p}_k denotes the solution to (4.7) with q and u replaced by \hat{q}_k and $\hat{u}_k := \mathcal{S}\hat{q}_k$, respectively, and \hat{z}_k solves (4.4) with q , w , and u replaced by \hat{q}_k , w_k , and \hat{u}_k , respectively. We note that $\{\hat{u}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\hat{p}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ are uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega)$. In fact, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\|\hat{u}_k\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)}$ and $\|\hat{p}_k\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)} + \|u_\Omega\|_{L^r(\Omega)}$. With the estimates at hand, we can thus derive

$$\|\bar{u} - \hat{u}_k\|_s + \|\bar{p} - \hat{p}_k\|_s \lesssim (\|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)} + \|u_\Omega\|_{L^r(\Omega)}) \|\bar{q} - \hat{q}_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0, \quad k \uparrow \infty,$$

upon utilizing basic stability bounds for the problems that $\bar{u} - \hat{u}_k$ and $\bar{p} - \hat{p}_k$ solve.

We now investigate the convergence of $\{\hat{z}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ to z . To accomplish this task, we first write the problem that $z - \hat{z}_k$ solves

$$\begin{aligned} A(z - \hat{z}_k, v) + (\bar{q}(z - \hat{z}_k), v)_{L^2(\Omega)} &= -((w - w_k)\bar{u}, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ (w_k(\hat{u}_k - \bar{u}), v)_{L^2(\Omega)} + ((\hat{q}_k - \bar{q})\hat{z}_k, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} &=: \text{I}_k + \text{II}_k + \text{III}_k \quad \forall v \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\bar{u} \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $w_k \rightharpoonup w$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $k \uparrow \infty$, it is immediate that $|\text{I}_k| \rightarrow 0$. To analyze the convergence of II_k , we observe that, for every $\tau \in (2, \infty)$, we have

$$(4.29) \quad \|\bar{u} - \hat{u}_k\|_{L^\tau(\Omega)}^\tau \leq \| |\bar{u} - \hat{u}_k|^{\tau-2} \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|\bar{u} - \hat{u}_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \lesssim \|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)}^{\tau-2} \|\bar{u} - \hat{u}_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \rightarrow 0$$

as $k \uparrow \infty$, upon utilizing that $\{\hat{u}_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ and the bound of Theorem 3.2. With this result at hand, we control the term II_k as follows:

$$|\text{II}_k| \leq \|w_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\bar{u} - \hat{u}_k\|_{L^\tau(\Omega)} \|v\|_{L^\mu(\Omega)}, \quad 2^{-1} + \tau^{-1} + \mu^{-1} = 1.$$

Set $\mu = 2d/(d-2s)$ (see Lemma 2.2) and observe that $\mu > 2$. Since $\hat{u}_k \rightarrow \bar{u}$ in $L^\tau(\Omega)$ for every $\tau \in (2, \infty)$, we can thus conclude that $|\text{II}_k| \rightarrow 0$ as $k \uparrow \infty$. We now analyze the convergence of III_k . First, we notice that a stability bound for the problem that \hat{z}_k solves, namely $\|\hat{z}_k\|_s \lesssim \|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)}$, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, yields

$$\|\hat{z}_k\|_{L^t(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad t \in \left[1, \frac{2d}{d-2s}\right].$$

Second, as in (4.29), $\hat{q}_k \rightarrow \bar{q}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $k \uparrow \infty$ combined with the fact that $\{\hat{q}_k\}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ allow us to obtain that $\hat{q}_k \rightarrow \bar{q}$ in $L^\tau(\Omega)$ for every $\tau \in (2, \infty)$. A basic application of Hölder's inequality thus reveals that

$$|\text{III}_k| \leq \|\hat{z}_k\|_{L^t(\Omega)} \|\hat{q}_k - \bar{q}\|_{L^\tau(\Omega)} \|v\|_{L^\mu(\Omega)}, \quad t^{-1} + \tau^{-1} + \mu^{-1} = 1.$$

Since $\hat{q}_k \rightarrow \bar{q}$ in $L^\tau(\Omega)$, for every $\tau < \infty$, we conclude that $|\text{III}_k| \rightarrow 0$ as $k \uparrow \infty$. We have thus proved that $|\text{I}_k|, |\text{II}_k|, |\text{III}_k| \rightarrow 0$ as $k \uparrow \infty$. Consequently, $\hat{z}_k \rightharpoonup z$ in $H^s(\Omega)$. This, in view of Lemma 2.2, yields

$$(4.30) \quad \hat{z}_k \rightarrow z \text{ in } L^\sigma(\Omega), \quad \sigma < 2d/(d-2s) \implies \|\hat{z}_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \rightarrow \|z\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2, \quad k \uparrow \infty.$$

On the other hand,

$$(4.31) \quad |(wz, \bar{p})_{L^2(\Omega)} - (w_k \hat{z}_k, \hat{p}_k)_{L^2(\Omega)}| \leq |((w - w_k)z, \bar{p})_{L^2(\Omega)}| \\ + |(w_k(z - \hat{z}_k), \bar{p})_{L^2(\Omega)}| + |(w_k \hat{z}_k, \bar{p} - \hat{p}_k)_{L^2(\Omega)}| \rightarrow 0, \quad k \uparrow \infty,$$

because $w_k \rightharpoonup w$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $k \uparrow \infty$, $z\bar{p} \in L^2(\Omega)$, $\|w_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = 1$, $\|z - \hat{z}_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0$ as $k \uparrow \infty$, $\bar{p} \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, and $\|\bar{p} - \hat{p}_k\|_{L^\tau(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0$, as $k \uparrow \infty$, for every $\tau \in (2, \infty)$.

Finally, we invoke (4.30), (4.31), and the fact that the square of the $L^2(\Omega)$ -norm is weakly lower semicontinuous in $L^2(\Omega)$ to deduce that $j''(\bar{q})w^2 \leq \liminf_k j''(\hat{q}_k)w_k^2$.

As a result, since $j''(\bar{q})w^2 \leq \liminf_k j''(\hat{q}_k)w_k^2$, $j''(\hat{q}_k)w_k^2 < k^{-1} \rightarrow 0$ as $k \uparrow \infty$, and $w \in C_{\bar{q}}$, the optimality condition $j''(\bar{q})w^2 > 0$, for all $w \in C_{\bar{q}} \setminus \{0\}$, yields $w \equiv 0$.

Step 3. Contradiction. We finally arrive at the contradiction. Since $w \equiv 0$, it is immediate that $\hat{z}_k \rightarrow 0$ in $\tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ as $k \uparrow \infty$. Hence, from the equalities

$$\lambda = \lambda \|w_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 = j''(\hat{q}_k)w_k^2 + 2(w_k \hat{z}_k, \hat{p}_k)_{L^2(\Omega)} - \|\hat{z}_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2,$$

and the fact that $\liminf_k j''(\hat{q}_k)w_k^2 \leq 0$, we conclude that $\lambda \leq 0$. This is a contradiction and concludes the proof. \square

The following result establishes an equivalent representation of the second order optimality condition introduced in Theorem 4.7. This equivalence will be of importance to derive error estimates for the schemes that we propose in our work. To present it, we introduce $C_{\bar{q}}^\tau := \{w \in L^2(\Omega) \text{ satisfying (4.26) and } w(x) = 0 \text{ if } |\bar{d}(x)| > \tau\}$.

THEOREM 4.8 (equivalent optimality conditions). *Let $(\bar{q}, \bar{u}, \bar{p}) \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad} \times \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) \times \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ satisfy the first order optimality conditions (4.2), (4.7), and (4.8). Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

$$(4.32) \quad j''(\bar{q})w^2 > 0 \forall w \in C_{\bar{q}} \setminus \{0\} \iff \exists \mu, \tau > 0 : j''(\bar{q})w^2 \geq \mu \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \quad \forall w \in C_{\bar{q}}^\tau.$$

Proof. The proof of the equivalence (4.32) follows from a combination of the arguments elaborated in the proofs of [5, Theorem 25], Theorem 4.6, and Theorem 4.7. For brevity, we skip details. \square

5. Discretization schemes for the control problem. We propose two different finite element discretization schemes to approximate solutions to the optimal control problem (4.1)–(4.2): a fully discrete one, where the admissible control set is discretized with piecewise constant functions, and a semidiscrete scheme, based on the so-called variational discretization approach, where the control set is not discretized.

5.1. A fully discrete scheme. The solution technique reads as follows: Find $\min J(u_h, q_h)$ subject to the *discrete state equation*

$$(5.1) \quad \mathcal{A}(u_h, v_h) + (q_h u_h, v_h)_{L^2(\Omega)} = (f, v_h)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall v_h \in \mathbb{V}_h,$$

and the *control constraints* $q_h \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad,h}$. Here, $\mathbb{Q}_{ad,h} := \mathbb{Q}_h \cap \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$, where $\mathbb{Q}_h = \{q_h \in L^\infty(\Omega) : q_h|_T \in \mathbb{P}_0(T) \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h\}$. We recall that \mathbb{V}_h , defined in (3.2), corresponds to the space of standard continuous and piecewise linear functions that vanish on $\partial\Omega$.

The existence of a discrete solution follows from the compactness of $\mathbb{Q}_{ad,h}$ and the continuity of J . To formulate first order optimality conditions, we introduce the discrete control to state map $\mathcal{S}_h : \mathbb{Q}_{ad,h} \ni q_h \mapsto u_h \in \mathbb{V}_h$, with u_h being the solution to (5.1), and the reduced cost functional $j_h(q_h) := J(\mathcal{S}_h q_h, q_h)$. With these ingredients at hand, first order conditions read as follows: If $\bar{q}_h \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad,h}$ is a local solution, then

$$(5.2) \quad j'_h(\bar{q}_h)(q_h - \bar{q}_h) = (\lambda \bar{q}_h - \bar{u}_h \bar{p}_h, q_h - \bar{q}_h)_{L^2(\Omega)} \geq 0 \quad \forall q_h \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad,h}.$$

Here, $\bar{p}_h \in \mathbb{V}_h$ corresponds to the *discrete adjoint state*, which solves

$$(5.3) \quad \mathcal{A}(v_h, \bar{p}_h) + (\bar{q}_h \bar{p}_h, v_h)_{L^2(\Omega)} = (\bar{u}_h - u_\Omega, v_h)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall v_h \in \mathbb{V}_h.$$

5.2. A semidiscrete scheme. In this section, we propose a semidiscrete scheme based on the so-called variational discretization approach [18]. The scheme, which involves discretization only on the state space (the control space is not discretized), reads as follows: Find $\min J(u_h, \mathbf{q})$ subject to the *discrete state equation*

$$\mathcal{A}(u_h, v_h) + (\mathbf{q} u_h, v_h)_{L^2(\Omega)} = (f, v_h)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall v_h \in \mathbb{V}_h,$$

and the *control constraints* $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$. The existence of a discrete solution and first order optimality conditions for the semidiscrete scheme follow standard arguments. In particular, if $\bar{\mathbf{q}} \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$ denotes a local solution, then

$$(5.4) \quad j'_h(\bar{\mathbf{q}})(q - \bar{\mathbf{q}}) = (\lambda \bar{\mathbf{q}} - \bar{u}_h \bar{p}_h, q - \bar{\mathbf{q}})_{L^2(\Omega)} \geq 0 \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad},$$

where $\bar{p}_h \in \mathbb{V}_h$ solves problem (5.3). We immediately notice that, in view of the variational inequality (5.4), the following projection formula holds [32, Section 4.6]:

$$\bar{q}(x) := \Pi_{[a,b]}(\lambda^{-1}\bar{u}_h(x)\bar{p}_h(x)) \text{ a.e. } x \in \Omega.$$

Since \bar{q} implicitly depends on h , in what follows we will adopt the notation \bar{q}_h .

5.3. Convergence of discretizations. In this section, we analyze convergence properties for the fully and semidiscrete schemes. To accomplish this task, we begin our studies by providing some auxiliary convergence properties and error bounds for suitable finite element discretizations related to the state and adjoint equations.

5.3.1. Auxiliary error bounds. Let us first provide a convergence property and bounds for the errors $\|u - u_h\|_s$ and $\|u - u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$.

THEOREM 5.1 (convergence properties). *Let $s \in (0, 1)$ and let $f \in H^{-s}(\Omega)$. Let u and u_h be the unique solutions to problems (4.2) and (5.1), respectively. Then,*

$$(5.5) \quad q_h \rightharpoonup q \text{ in } L^{\frac{d}{2s}}(\Omega), \quad h \downarrow 0 \implies u_h \rightarrow u \text{ in } \tilde{H}^s(\Omega), \quad h \downarrow 0.$$

Let $r > d/2s$. If, in addition, $f \in L^2(\Omega) \cap L^r(\Omega)$, then we have the error bounds

$$(5.6) \quad \|u - u_h\|_s \lesssim h^\gamma |\log h|^\varphi \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|q - q_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad \gamma = \min\{s, \frac{1}{2}\},$$

$$(5.7) \quad \|u - u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h^{2\gamma} |\log h|^{2\varphi} \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|q - q_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

where $\varphi = \nu$ if $s \neq \frac{1}{2}$, $\varphi = 1 + \nu$ if $s = \frac{1}{2}$, and $\nu \geq \frac{1}{2}$ is the constant in Theorem 3.1.

Proof. Let us first derive the convergence property (5.5). We begin with a basic application of a triangle inequality to write $\|u - u_h\|_s \leq \|u - u_h(q)\|_s + \|u_h(q) - u_h\|_s$. Here, $u_h(q)$ denotes the solution to (5.1) with q_h replaced by q . The control of $\|u - u_h(q)\|_s$ follows from Theorem 3.3 and a density argument as the one developed in the proof of [10, Theorem 3.2.3] (see also [15, Corollary 1.109]): $\|u - u_h(q)\|_s \rightarrow 0$ as $h \downarrow 0$. To bound $\|u_h(q) - u_h\|_s$, we invoke the discrete problem that $u_h(q) - u_h$ solves and utilize the fact that $q_h \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad,h} = \mathbb{Q}_{ad} \cap \mathbb{Q}_h$ to obtain

$$\|u_h(q) - u_h\|_s \leq \|u_h(q)(q_h - q)\|_{H^{-s}(\Omega)}.$$

The weak convergence $q_h \rightharpoonup q$ in $L^{\frac{d}{2s}}(\Omega)$ and the strong one $u_h(q)v \rightarrow uv$ in $L^{\frac{d}{d-2s}}(\Omega)$ as $h \downarrow 0$, which holds for every $v \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$, allow us to conclude.

To derive (5.6), we proceed similarly: $\|u - u_h\|_s \leq \|u - u(q_h)\|_s + \|u(q_h) - u_h\|_s$. Here, $u(q_h)$ denotes the solution to (4.2) with q replaced by q_h . Since u_h , the solution to (5.1), corresponds to the finite element approximation of $u(q_h)$ within the discrete setting of section 3.3, we can invoke the error bound of Theorem 3.3 to deduce

$$(5.8) \quad \|u(q_h) - u_h\|_s \lesssim h^\gamma |\log h|^\varphi \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

On the other hand, let us observe that $u - u(q_h) \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ uniquely solves

$$(5.9) \quad \mathcal{A}(u - u(q_h), v) + (q(u - u(q_h)), v)_{L^2(\Omega)} = (u(q_h)(q_h - q), v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall v \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega).$$

Since $f \in L^r(\Omega)$ and $q_h \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad,h}$, Theorem 3.2 guarantees $\|u(q_h)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)}$, which is a uniform bound with respect to discretization. As a consequence, a basic stability bound for problem (5.9) yields $\|u - u(q_h)\|_s \lesssim \|u(q_h)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|q - q_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \|q - q_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$. This bound and estimate (5.8) yield the desired bound (5.6). The proof of (5.7) follows similar arguments. \square

Let us introduce the variables \mathbf{p} and p_h as follows:

$$(5.10) \quad \mathbf{p} \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) : \quad \mathcal{A}(v, \mathbf{p}) + (q_h \mathbf{p}, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} = (u_h - u_\Omega, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall v \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega).$$

$$(5.11) \quad p_h \in \mathbb{V}_h : \quad \mathcal{A}(v_h, p_h) + (q_h p_h, v_h)_{L^2(\Omega)} = (u_h - u_\Omega, v_h)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall v_h \in \mathbb{V}_h.$$

In what follows, we present error bounds for $p - p_h$.

THEOREM 5.2 (convergence properties). *Let $s \in (0, 1)$ and $r > d/2s$. Let p and p_h be the unique solutions to problems (4.7) and (5.11), respectively. If $f, u_\Omega \in L^2(\Omega) \cap L^r(\Omega)$ and $\{u_h\}_{h>0}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^r(\Omega)$, then*

$$(5.12) \quad \|p - p_h\|_s \lesssim h^\gamma |\log h|^\varphi + \|q - q_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad \gamma = \min\{s, \frac{1}{2}\},$$

$$(5.13) \quad \|p - p_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h^{2\gamma} |\log h|^{2\varphi} + \|q - q_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

where $\varphi = \nu$ if $s \neq \frac{1}{2}$, $\varphi = 1 + \nu$ if $s = \frac{1}{2}$, and $\nu \geq \frac{1}{2}$ is the constant in Theorem 3.1.

Proof. We invoke \mathbf{p} and write $\|p - p_h\|_s \leq \|p - \mathbf{p}\|_s + \|\mathbf{p} - p_h\|_s$. To control $\|\mathbf{p} - p_h\|_s$ we apply the error estimate (3.4) of Theorem 3.3:

$$(5.14) \quad \|\mathbf{p} - p_h\|_s \lesssim h^\gamma |\log h|^\varphi (\|f\|_{H^{-s}(\Omega)} + \|u_\Omega\|_{L^2(\Omega)}),$$

upon utilizing $\|u_h\|_s \lesssim \|f\|_{H^{-s}(\Omega)}$, which is uniform with respect to discretization. To control $\|p - \mathbf{p}\|_s$ we observe that $p - \mathbf{p}$ solves

$$\mathcal{A}(v, p - \mathbf{p}) + (q(p - \mathbf{p}), v)_{L^2(\Omega)} = (\mathbf{p}(q_h - q) + (u - u_h), v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall v \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega).$$

Since, by assumption, $\{u_h\}_{h>0}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^r(\Omega)$ ($r > d/2s$), we obtain

$$(5.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \|p - \mathbf{p}\|_s &\lesssim \|\mathbf{p}\|_{L^{\frac{d}{s}}(\Omega)} \|q - q_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|u - u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\lesssim \|q - q_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + h^{2\gamma} |\log h|^{2\varphi} \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

upon utilizing (5.7) and the uniform bound $\|\mathbf{p}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \lesssim \|u_h\|_{L^r(\Omega)} + \|u_\Omega\|_{L^r(\Omega)}$. The bound (5.15) combined (5.14) imply (5.12). The proof of (5.13) follows similar arguments. For brevity, we skip details. \square

5.3.2. Convergence of discretizations: the fully discrete scheme. We begin this section by providing a convergence result that, in essence, guarantees that a sequence of discrete global solutions $\{\bar{q}_h\}_{h>0}$ contains subsequences that converge, as $h \downarrow 0$, to global solutions of the optimal control problem (4.1)–(4.2).

THEOREM 5.3 (convergence of global solutions). *Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $r > d/2s$, and $f, u_\Omega \in L^2(\Omega) \cap L^r(\Omega)$. Let $h > 0$ and let $\bar{q}_h \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad,h}$ be a global solution of the fully discrete optimal control problem. Then, there exist nonrelabeled subsequences of $\{\bar{q}_h\}_{h>0}$ such that $\bar{q}_h \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \bar{q}$ in the weak* topology of $L^\infty(\Omega)$ as $h \downarrow 0$, with \bar{q} being a global solution of the optimal control problem (4.1)–(4.2). In addition, we have*

$$(5.16) \quad \lim_{h \downarrow 0} \|\bar{q} - \bar{q}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = 0, \quad \lim_{h \downarrow 0} j_h(\bar{q}_h) = j(\bar{q}).$$

Proof. Since $\{\bar{q}_h\}_{h>0} \subset \mathbb{Q}_{ad,h}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega)$, there exists a nonrelabeled subsequence such that $\bar{q}_h \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \bar{q}$ in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ as $h \downarrow 0$. In what follows, we prove that $\bar{q} \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$ is a global solution to (4.1)–(4.2) and that (5.16) holds.

Let $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$ be a global solution to (4.1)–(4.2). Let $\mathcal{P}_h : L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_h$ be the orthogonal projection operator. Define $\mathbf{q}_h := \mathcal{P}_h(\mathbf{q})$ and observe that $\mathbf{q}_h \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad,h}$.

Invoke the regularity result of Theorem 4.4 and a standard interpolation error estimate for \mathcal{P}_h to obtain $\|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0$ as $h \downarrow 0$. Hence, the global optimality of \mathbf{q} , Theorem 5.1, the global optimality of \bar{q}_h , and $\mathbf{q}_h \rightarrow \mathbf{q}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ allow us to obtain that

$$j(\mathbf{q}) \leq j(\bar{q}) \leq \liminf_{h \downarrow 0} j_h(\bar{q}_h) \leq \limsup_{h \downarrow 0} j_h(\bar{q}_h) \leq \limsup_{h \downarrow 0} j_h(\mathbf{q}_h) = j(\mathbf{q}).$$

This shows that \bar{q} is a global solution of (4.1)–(4.2) and that $\lim_{h \downarrow 0} j_h(\bar{q}_h) = j(\bar{q})$. To prove the strong convergence of $\{\bar{q}_h\}_{h>0}$ to \bar{q} in $L^2(\Omega)$, we utilize the convergence result of Theorem 5.1 to deduce that $\bar{u}_h \rightarrow \bar{u}$ in $L^t(\Omega)$ for every $t \leq 2d/(d-2s)$. With this convergence result at hand, we invoke the property $j_h(\bar{q}_h) \rightarrow j(\bar{q})$ to deduce that $\|\bar{q}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \rightarrow \|\bar{q}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$. The fact that $\bar{q}_h \xrightarrow{*} \bar{q}$ in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ as $h \downarrow 0$ allows us to conclude. \square

Our second convergence result is as follows: strict local solutions of (4.1)–(4.2) can be approximated by local solutions of the fully discrete optimal control problems.

THEOREM 5.4 (convergence of local solutions). *Let the assumptions of Theorem 5.3 hold. Let $\bar{q} \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$ be a strict local minimum of (4.1)–(4.2). Then, there exists a sequence of local minima $\{\bar{q}_h\}_{h>0}$ of the fully discrete scheme such that (5.16) holds.*

Proof. Since \bar{q} is a strict local minimum of (4.1)–(4.2), there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the problem: Find $\min\{j(q) : q \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad} \cap B_\varepsilon(\bar{q})\}$ admits as a unique solution \bar{q} . Here, $B_\varepsilon(\bar{q}) := \{q \in L^2(\Omega) : \|\bar{q} - q\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon\}$. Let us now introduce, for $h > 0$, the discrete problem: Find $\min\{j_h(q_h) : q_h \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad,h} \cap B_\varepsilon(\bar{q})\}$. To conclude that this problem admits at least a solution, we need to verify that the set where the minimum is sought is nonempty; notice that such a set is compact. To accomplish this task, we observe that there exists $h_\varepsilon > 0$ such that, for every $h \leq h_\varepsilon$, $\mathcal{P}_h(\bar{q}) \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad,h} \cap B_\varepsilon(\bar{q})$.

Let $h \in (0, h_\varepsilon]$ and let \bar{q}_h be a global solution of the introduced discrete problem. The arguments elaborated in the proof of Theorem 5.3 allow us to conclude the existence of a subsequence of $\{\bar{q}_h\}_{h \leq h_\varepsilon}$ such that it converges strongly in $L^2(\Omega)$ to a solution of $\min\{j(q) : q \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad} \cap B_\varepsilon(\bar{q})\}$. Since this problem admits a unique solution \bar{q} , we must have $\bar{q}_h \rightarrow \bar{q}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $h \downarrow 0$. This, in particular, guarantees that the constraint $\bar{q}_h \in B_\varepsilon(\bar{q})$ is not active for h sufficiently small. Consequently, \bar{q}_h solves the fully discrete scheme and the convergence properties stated in (5.16) hold. \square

5.3.3. Convergence of discretizations: the semidiscrete scheme. We present the following results. Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $r > d/2s$, and $f, u_\Omega \in L^2(\Omega) \cap L^r(\Omega)$.

- Let $h > 0$ and let $\bar{q}_h \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$ be a global solution of the semidiscrete scheme. Then, there exist nonrelabeled subsequences of $\{\bar{q}_h\}_{h>0}$ such that $\bar{q}_h \xrightarrow{*} \bar{q}$ in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ as $h \downarrow 0$ and (5.16) holds; \bar{q} is a global solution to (4.1)–(4.2).
- Let $\bar{q} \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$ be a strict local minimum of (4.1)–(4.2). Then, there exists a sequence of local minima $\{\bar{q}_h\}_{h>0}$ of the semidiscrete scheme satisfying (5.16).

The proof of these results follow very similar arguments to the ones developed in the proof of Theorems 5.3 and 5.4. For brevity, we do not present further details.

6. Error estimates. In this section, we derive error estimates for the fully and semidiscrete schemes introduced in sections 5.1 and 5.2, respectively.

6.1. Error estimates for the fully discrete scheme. Let $\{\bar{q}_h\}_{h>0} \subset \mathbb{Q}_{ad,h}$ be a sequence of local minima of the fully discrete optimal control problems such that $\bar{q}_h \rightarrow \bar{q}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $h \downarrow 0$; $\bar{q} \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$ denotes a local solution of (4.1)–(4.2) (see Theorems 5.3 and 5.4). The main goal of this section is to derive the error bound

$$(6.1) \quad \|\bar{q} - \bar{q}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h^{2\gamma} |\log h|^{2\varphi} \quad \forall h < h_\dagger, \quad \gamma = \min\{s, \frac{1}{2}\}, \quad h_\dagger > 0.$$

Here, $\varphi = \nu$ if $s \neq \frac{1}{2}$, $\varphi = 1 + \nu$ if $s = \frac{1}{2}$, and $\nu \geq \frac{1}{2}$ is the constant in Theorem 3.1.

In the upcoming analysis, we will operate under the *assumption* that discrete solutions u_h to problem (5.1) are uniformly bounded in $L^{d/s}(\Omega)$, i.e.,

$$(6.2) \quad \exists C > 0 : \quad \|u_h\|_{L^{d/s}(\Omega)} \leq C \quad \forall h > 0.$$

The following result is instrumental to derive the error bound (6.1).

LEMMA 6.1 (auxiliary error estimate). *Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $r > d/2s$, and $f, u_\Omega \in L^2(\Omega) \cap L^r(\Omega)$. Let us assume that (6.2) holds and that $\bar{q} \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$ satisfy the second order optimality conditions (4.32). If (6.1) is false, then there exists $h_\dagger > 0$ such that*

$$(6.3) \quad \mathfrak{C} \|\bar{q} - \bar{q}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq [j'(\bar{q}_h) - j'(\bar{q})](\bar{q}_h - \bar{q}) \quad \forall h < h_\dagger, \quad \mathfrak{C} = 2^{-1} \min\{\mu, \lambda\}.$$

Here, λ is the control cost and μ denotes the constant appearing in (4.32).

Proof. We follow [6, Section 7] and proceed by contradiction. In fact, since by assumption (6.1) is false, there exists a subsequence $\{h_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ such that

$$(6.4) \quad \lim_{h_k \downarrow 0} \|\bar{q} - \bar{q}_{h_k}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0, \quad \lim_{h_k \downarrow 0} \frac{\|\bar{q} - \bar{q}_{h_k}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}}{h_k^{2\gamma} |\log h_k|^{2\varphi}} = +\infty.$$

In what follows, in an attempt to simplify the exposition of the material, we will drop the subindex k and denote $\bar{q}_{h_k} = \bar{q}_h$. Notice that $h \downarrow 0$ as $k \uparrow \infty$.

Define $w_h := (\bar{q}_h - \bar{q}) / \|\bar{q}_h - \bar{q}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$. Since $\{w_h\}_{h>0}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^2(\Omega)$, up to a subsequence if necessary, we can assume that $w_h \rightharpoonup w$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $h \downarrow 0$. In what follows, we prove that $w \in C_{\bar{q}}$. We recall that $C_{\bar{q}}$ is defined in (4.25). Since, for each $h > 0$, $\bar{q}_h \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad,h} \subset \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$, w_h satisfies the sign conditions (4.26). Consequently, w satisfies (4.26) as well. To show that $\bar{\mathfrak{d}}(x) \neq 0$ implies that $w(x) = 0$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$, we introduce $\bar{\mathfrak{d}}_h := \lambda \bar{q}_h - \bar{u}_h \bar{p}_h$ and recall that $\bar{\mathfrak{d}} = \lambda \bar{q} - \bar{u} \bar{p}$. Let us now invoke $\|\bar{q} - \bar{q}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0$ as $h \downarrow 0$, (6.2), and estimates (5.12) and (5.7) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{\mathfrak{d}} - \bar{\mathfrak{d}}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq \lambda \|\bar{q} - \bar{q}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\bar{u}_h\|_{L^{\frac{d}{s}}(\Omega)} \|\bar{p} - \bar{p}_h\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-2s}}(\Omega)} \\ &+ \|\bar{p}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|\bar{u} - \bar{u}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\bar{q} - \bar{q}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + h^\gamma |\log h|^\varphi \rightarrow 0, \quad h \downarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have that $\bar{\mathfrak{d}}_h \rightarrow \bar{\mathfrak{d}}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $h \downarrow 0$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \bar{\mathfrak{d}}(x) w(x) dx &= \lim_{h \downarrow 0} \int_{\Omega} \bar{\mathfrak{d}}_h(x) w_h(x) dx \\ &= \lim_{h \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\|\bar{q}_h - \bar{q}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}} \left(\int_{\Omega} \bar{\mathfrak{d}}_h(\mathcal{P}_h(\bar{q}) - \bar{q}) dx + \int_{\Omega} \bar{\mathfrak{d}}_h(\bar{q}_h - \mathcal{P}_h(\bar{q})) dx \right), \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{P}_h denotes the L^2 -orthogonal projection operator into piecewise constant functions over \mathcal{T}_h . Since $\mathcal{P}_h(\bar{q}) \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad,h}$, the discrete variational inequality (5.2) implies that $(\bar{\mathfrak{d}}_h, \bar{q}_h - \mathcal{P}_h(\bar{q}))_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq 0$. The uniform boundedness of $\{\|\bar{\mathfrak{d}}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\}_{h < h_{\infty}}$, which follows from $\|\bar{\mathfrak{d}}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|\bar{\mathfrak{d}}_h - \bar{\mathfrak{d}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\bar{\mathfrak{d}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim 1$, for $h < h_{\infty}$, thus implies that

$$\int_{\Omega} \bar{\mathfrak{d}}(x) w(x) dx \leq \lim_{h \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\|\bar{q}_h - \bar{q}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}} \int_{\Omega} \bar{\mathfrak{d}}_h(\mathcal{P}_h(\bar{q}) - \bar{q}) dx \lesssim \lim_{h \downarrow 0} \frac{\|\mathcal{P}_h(\bar{q}) - \bar{q}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}}{\|\bar{q}_h - \bar{q}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}} = 0.$$

To obtain the last equality we have used (6.4) and the regularity results for \bar{q} provided in Theorem 4.4 combined with standard error estimates for \mathcal{P}_h , which yield

$$(6.5) \quad \|\bar{q} - \mathcal{P}_h(\bar{q})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h\Lambda \text{ for } s > \frac{1}{2}, \quad \|\bar{q} - \mathcal{P}_h(\bar{q})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h^{2s} |\log h|^\nu \Lambda \text{ for } s \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Here, $\Lambda = \Lambda(f, u_\Omega)$ is defined in (4.13). Now, since w satisfies the sign conditions (4.26), we have $\bar{\mathfrak{d}}(x)w(x) \geq 0$. Consequently, $\int_\Omega |\bar{\mathfrak{d}}(x)w(x)| dx \leq 0$. As a result, if $\bar{\mathfrak{d}}(x) \neq 0$, then $w(x) = 0$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$. We have thus obtained that $w \in C_{\bar{q}}$.

Having proved that $w \in C_{\bar{q}}$, let us now derive the auxiliary error estimate (6.3) by utilizing (4.32). To begin, we invoke the mean value theorem to obtain

$$(6.6) \quad [j'(\bar{q}_h) - j'(\bar{q})](\bar{q}_h - \bar{q}) = j''(\hat{q}_h)(\bar{q}_h - \bar{q})^2, \quad \hat{q}_h = \bar{q} + \theta_h(\bar{q}_h - \bar{q}),$$

where $\theta_h \in (0, 1)$. Let $u(\hat{q}_h)$ be unique solution to (4.2) with q replaced by \hat{q}_h and let $p(\hat{q}_h)$ be the unique solution to (4.7) with u and q replaced by $u(\hat{q}_h)$ and \hat{q}_h , respectively. Since $\hat{q}_h(x) \geq a$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and $\bar{u} \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, a basic stability bound for the problem that $\bar{u} - u(\hat{q}_h)$ solves combined with the fact that $\bar{q}_h \rightarrow \bar{q}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $h \downarrow 0$ reveal that $u(\hat{q}_h) \rightarrow \bar{u}$ in $\tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$. Similarly, $p(\hat{q}_h) \rightarrow \bar{p}$ in $\tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ as $h \downarrow 0$. We now define $z(w_h)$ as the unique solution to (4.4) with q , u and w replaced by \hat{q}_h , $u(\hat{q}_h)$, and w_h , respectively. Proceeding as in the Step 2 of the proof of Theorem 4.7, we can show that $w_h \rightarrow w$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $h \downarrow 0$ guarantees that $z(w_h) \rightarrow z$ in $\tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$. With all these convergence properties at hand, we invoke the characterization (4.15), the definition of w_h , and the second order condition (4.32) to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{h \downarrow 0} j''(\hat{q}_h)w_h^2 &= \lim_{h \downarrow 0} \left[\lambda \|w_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - 2(w_h z(w_h), p(\hat{q}_h))_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|z(w_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right] \\ &= \lambda - 2(wz, \bar{p})_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|z\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 = \lambda + j''(\bar{q})w^2 - \lambda \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \geq \lambda + (\mu - \lambda) \|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, since $\|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq 1$, we arrive at $\lim_{h \downarrow 0} j''(\hat{q}_h)w_h^2 \geq \min\{\mu, \lambda\} > 0$. We can thus obtain the existence of $h_\dagger > 0$ such that $j''(\hat{q}_h)w_h^2 \geq \min\{\mu, \lambda\}/2$ for every $h < h_\dagger$. This, in view of the definition of w_h and (6.6), allows us to conclude. \square

We now proceed to derive the error bound (6.1). To this end, we strengthen assumption (6.2) as follows: solutions to (5.1) are uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega)$, i.e.,

$$(6.7) \quad \exists C > 0: \quad \|u_h\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C \quad \forall h > 0.$$

THEOREM 6.2 (error estimate). *Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $r > d/2s$, and $f, u_\Omega \in L^2(\Omega) \cap L^r(\Omega)$. Let us assume that (6.7) holds and that $\bar{q} \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$ satisfies the second order optimality conditions (4.32). Then, there exists $h_\dagger > 0$ such that*

$$(6.8) \quad \|\bar{q} - \bar{q}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h^{2\gamma} |\log h|^{2\varphi} \quad \forall h < h_\dagger, \quad \gamma = \min\{s, \frac{1}{2}\}.$$

Here, $\varphi = \nu$ if $s \neq \frac{1}{2}$, $\varphi = 1 + \nu$ if $s = \frac{1}{2}$, and $\nu \geq \frac{1}{2}$ is the constant in Theorem 3.1.

Proof. We proceed by contradiction and assume that (6.8) does not hold. We can thus invoke the result of Lemma 6.1 to conclude that (6.3) holds for every $h < h_\dagger$. Let us now set $q = \bar{q}_h$ in (4.6) and $q_h = \mathcal{P}_h(\bar{q})$ in (5.2) to obtain $-j'(\bar{q})(\bar{q}_h - \bar{q}) \leq 0$ and $j'_h(\bar{q}_h)(\mathcal{P}_h(\bar{q}) - \bar{q}_h) \geq 0$, respectively. In view of these two inequalities we invoke the auxiliary error estimate (6.3) to obtain

$$(6.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\bar{q} - \bar{q}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 &\lesssim j'(\bar{q}_h)(\bar{q}_h - \bar{q}) + j'_h(\bar{q}_h)(\mathcal{P}_h(\bar{q}) - \bar{q}_h) \\ &= j'(\bar{q}_h)(\mathcal{P}_h(\bar{q}) - \bar{q}) + [j'(\bar{q}_h) - j'_h(\bar{q}_h)](\bar{q}_h - \mathcal{P}_h(\bar{q})) =: \mathbf{I}_h + \mathbf{II}_h. \end{aligned}$$

Let us first bound the term \mathbf{I}_h . To accomplish this task, we introduce the following auxiliary variables: We define \hat{u} and \hat{p} to be the solutions to the problems

$$(6.10) \quad \mathcal{A}(\hat{u}, v) + (\bar{q}_h \hat{u}, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} = (f, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall v \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega),$$

$$(6.11) \quad \mathcal{A}(\hat{p}, v) + (\bar{q}_h \hat{p}, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} = (\hat{u} - u_\Omega, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall v \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega).$$

With these variables at hand, we control the term \mathbf{I}_h as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{I}_h &= (\lambda \bar{q}_h - \hat{u}\hat{p}, \mathcal{P}_h(\bar{q}) - \bar{q})_{L^2(\Omega)} = (\mathcal{P}_h(\hat{u}\hat{p}) - \hat{u}\hat{p}, \mathcal{P}_h(\bar{q}) - \bar{q})_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \|\hat{u}\hat{p} - \mathcal{P}_h(\hat{u}\hat{p})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\mathcal{P}_h(\bar{q}) - \bar{q}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

upon utilizing the basic property $(\mathcal{P}_h(\bar{q}) - \bar{q}, q_h) = 0$ for $q_h \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad,h}$. The term $\|\mathcal{P}_h(\bar{q}) - \bar{q}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ was previously controlled in the proof of Lemma 6.1; see (6.5). In what follows we control $\|\hat{u}\hat{p} - \mathcal{P}_h(\hat{u}\hat{p})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$. First, since f and $\hat{u} - u_\Omega$ belong to $L^2(\Omega) \cap L^r(\Omega)$, we invoke the regularity results of Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 combined with the continuity of the product property of Lemma 2.1 to deduce that

$$\hat{u}\hat{p} \in H^{s+\kappa-\varepsilon}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega), \quad \|\hat{u}\hat{p}\|_{H^{s+\kappa-\varepsilon}(\Omega)} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-\nu} \Lambda \quad \forall 0 < \varepsilon < s.$$

Here, κ and ν are as in the statement of Theorem 3.1 and $\Lambda = \Lambda(f, u_\Omega)$ is defined in (4.13). In view of this regularity result, a standard approximation property for \mathcal{P}_h reveals that $\mathbf{e} := \hat{u}\hat{p} - \mathcal{P}_h(\hat{u}\hat{p})$ satisfies

$$\|\mathbf{e}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h\Lambda \text{ for } s \in (\tfrac{1}{2}, 1), \quad \|\mathbf{e}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h^{2s} |\log h|^\nu \Lambda \text{ for } s \in (0, \tfrac{1}{2}].$$

Consequently, $\mathbf{I}_h \lesssim h^2\Lambda^2$ if $s \in (\tfrac{1}{2}, 1)$ and $\mathbf{I}_h \lesssim h^{4s} |\log h|^{2\nu} \Lambda^2$ if $s \in (0, \tfrac{1}{2}]$.

We now bound the term \mathbf{II}_h . To accomplish this task, we first notice that $\mathbf{II}_h = (\hat{u}\hat{p} - \bar{u}_h\bar{p}_h, \bar{q}_h - \mathcal{P}_h(\bar{q}))_{L^2(\Omega)} = (\hat{u}\hat{p} - \bar{u}_h\bar{p}_h, \mathcal{P}_h(\bar{q}_h - \bar{q}))_{L^2(\Omega)}$. Second, by adding and subtracting $\hat{p}\bar{u}_h$ and utilizing assumption (6.7) and basic inequalities, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{II}_h &\leq (\|\hat{p}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|\hat{u} - \bar{u}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\bar{u}_h\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|\hat{p} - \bar{p}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}) \|\bar{q} - \bar{q}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \mathbf{c} \left(\|\hat{u} - \bar{u}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\hat{p} - \bar{p}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \right) + \tfrac{1}{2} \|\bar{q} - \bar{q}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2, \quad \mathbf{c} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

A bound for $\|\hat{u} - \bar{u}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ follows from the fact that \bar{u}_h corresponds to the finite element approximation of \hat{u} within the setting of section 3.3. In fact, as an application of Theorem 3.3, we have the bound $\|\hat{u} - \bar{u}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h^{2\gamma} |\log h|^{2\varphi}$. We now define

$$(6.12) \quad \tilde{p} \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega) : \quad \mathcal{A}(\tilde{p}, v) + (\bar{q}_h \tilde{p}, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} = (\bar{u}_h - u_\Omega, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall v \in \tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$$

and proceed as in the proof of Theorem 5.2 to obtain $\|\hat{p} - \bar{p}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|\hat{p} - \tilde{p}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\tilde{p} - \bar{p}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\hat{u} - u_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + h^{2\gamma} |\log h|^{2\varphi}$. Consequently, we can thus arrive at

$$\mathbf{II}_h \lesssim h^{4\gamma} |\log h|^{4\varphi} + \tfrac{1}{2} \|\bar{q} - \bar{q}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$

We finally replace the bounds obtained for \mathbf{I}_h and \mathbf{II}_h into (6.9) to obtain (6.8). This is a contradiction and concludes the proof. \square

Remark 6.3 (nearly optimality). The error estimate (6.8) is, in terms of approximation, nearly optimal for $s \geq \frac{1}{2}$ and suboptimal for $s < \frac{1}{2}$; suboptimality being dictated by the regularity properties derived in Theorem 4.4.

COROLLARY 6.4 (error estimates). *Let the assumptions of Theorem 6.2 hold. Then, there exists $h_{\dagger} > 0$ such that, for all $h < h_{\dagger}$,*

$$(6.13) \quad \|\bar{u} - \bar{u}_h\|_s \lesssim h^\gamma |\log h|^\varphi, \quad \|\bar{p} - \bar{p}_h\|_s \lesssim h^\gamma |\log h|^\varphi, \quad \gamma = \min\{s, \tfrac{1}{2}\}.$$

$$(6.14) \quad \|\bar{u} - \bar{u}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h^{2\gamma} |\log h|^{2\varphi}, \quad \|\bar{p} - \bar{p}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h^{2\gamma} |\log h|^{2\varphi}.$$

Here, $\varphi = \nu$ if $s \neq \frac{1}{2}$, $\varphi = 1 + \nu$ if $s = \frac{1}{2}$, and $\nu \geq \frac{1}{2}$ is the constant in Theorem 3.1.

Proof. The proof of the estimates in (6.13) and (6.14) follows immediately from combining the estimates in Theorems 5.1, 5.2, and 6.2. \square

6.2. Error estimates for the semidiscrete scheme. Let $\{\bar{q}_h\}_{h>0} \subset \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$ be a sequence of local minima of the semidiscrete optimal control problems such that $\bar{q}_h \rightarrow \bar{q}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $h \downarrow 0$; $\bar{q} \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$ denotes a local solution to (4.1)–(4.2) (see section 5.3.3). The main goal of this section is to obtain an estimate for the error $\|\bar{q} - \bar{q}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$.

The following result, which is instrumental, is analogous to Lemma 6.1.

LEMMA 6.5 (auxiliary error estimate). *Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $r > d/2s$, and $f, u_\Omega \in L^2(\Omega) \cap L^r(\Omega)$. Assume that (6.2) holds and that $\bar{q} \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$ satisfies the second order optimality conditions (4.32). If (6.16) is false, then there exists $h_\dagger > 0$ such that*

$$(6.15) \quad \mathfrak{C} \|\bar{q} - \bar{q}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq [j'(\bar{q}_h) - j'(\bar{q})](\bar{q}_h - \bar{q}) \quad \forall h < h_\dagger, \quad \mathfrak{C} = 2^{-1} \min\{\mu, \lambda\}.$$

Here, λ is the control cost and μ denotes the constant appearing in (4.32).

Proof. We adapt the proof of Lemma 6.1 and proceed by contradiction. Since (6.16) is false, there exists a subsequence $\{h_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ such that both limits in (6.4) hold with \bar{q}_{h_k} replaced by \bar{q}_{h_k} . As in the proof of Lemma 6.1, we will omit the subindex k and simply denote $\bar{q}_{h_k} = \bar{q}_h$.

Define $w_h := (\bar{q}_h - \bar{q})/\|\bar{q}_h - \bar{q}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$. We assume that (up to a subsequence if necessary) $w_h \rightharpoonup w$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $h \downarrow 0$. The arguments elaborated in the proof of Lemma 6.1 guarantee that w satisfies (4.26) and that $\bar{d}_h \rightarrow \bar{d}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $h \downarrow 0$. We recall that $\bar{d} = \lambda\bar{q} - \bar{u}\bar{p}$ and $\bar{d}_h = \lambda\bar{q}_h - \bar{u}_h\bar{p}_h$. Invoke (5.4) with $q = \bar{q}$ to thus obtain

$$\int_\Omega \bar{d}(x)w(x)dx = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\|\bar{q}_h - \bar{q}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}} \int_\Omega \bar{d}_h(x)(\bar{q}_h(x) - \bar{q}(x))dx \leq 0.$$

Thus, since $\int_\Omega |\bar{d}(x)w(x)|dx = \int_\Omega \bar{d}(x)w(x)dx \leq 0$, we deduce that if $\bar{d}(x) \neq 0$, then $w(x) = 0$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$. Consequently, $w \in C_{\bar{q}}$.

The rest of the proof follows the same arguments developed in the proof of Lemma 6.1. For brevity, we skip details. \square

We are now in position to derive an estimate for the error committed when approximating a locally optimal control variable \bar{q} .

THEOREM 6.6 (error estimate). *Let $s \in (0, 1)$, $r > d/2s$, and $f, u_\Omega \in L^2(\Omega) \cap L^r(\Omega)$. Let us assume that (6.7) holds and that $\bar{q} \in \mathbb{Q}_{ad}$ satisfies the second order optimality conditions (4.32). Then, there exists $h_\dagger > 0$ such that*

$$(6.16) \quad \|\bar{q} - \bar{q}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h^{2\gamma} |\log h|^{2\varphi} \quad \forall h < h_\dagger, \quad \gamma = \min\{s, \frac{1}{2}\}.$$

Here $\varphi = \nu$ if $s \neq \frac{1}{2}$, $\varphi = 1 + \nu$ if $s = \frac{1}{2}$, and $\nu \geq \frac{1}{2}$ is the constant in Theorem 3.1.

Proof. We proceed by contradiction, assume that (6.16) does not hold, and follow the arguments elaborated in the proof of Theorem 6.2. Notice that we have at hand the auxiliary error estimate (6.15). Let us now set $q = \bar{q}_h$ in (4.6) and $q = \bar{q}$ in (5.4) to obtain $-j'(\bar{q})(\bar{q}_h - \bar{q}) \leq 0$ and $j'_h(\bar{q}_h)(\bar{q} - \bar{q}_h) \geq 0$, respectively. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{q} - \bar{q}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 &\lesssim [j'(\bar{q}_h) - j'_h(\bar{q}_h)](\bar{q}_h - \bar{q}) = (\bar{u}_h\bar{p}_h - \hat{u}\hat{p}, \bar{q}_h - \bar{q})_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &= (\hat{p}(\bar{u}_h - \hat{u}), \bar{q}_h - \bar{q})_{L^2(\Omega)} + (\bar{u}_h(\bar{p}_h - \hat{p}), \bar{q}_h - \bar{q})_{L^2(\Omega)} = \mathfrak{J}_h + \mathfrak{K}_h. \end{aligned}$$

Here, \hat{u} and \hat{p} in $\tilde{H}^s(\Omega)$ denote auxiliary variables which are defined as solutions to (6.10) and (6.11), respectively but with \bar{q}_h replaced by \bar{q}_h .

Let us estimate \mathfrak{J}_h . Since $f, u_\Omega \in L^r(\Omega)$, as an application of Theorem 3.2 we deduce that $\hat{u}, \hat{p} \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Hence, the error estimate (3.5) allows us to conclude that

$$(6.17) \quad \mathfrak{J}_h \leq \|\hat{p}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \|\hat{u} - \bar{u}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\bar{q} - \bar{q}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h^{2\gamma} |\log h|^{2\varphi} \|\bar{q} - \bar{q}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Here, γ and φ are as in the statement of the theorem. We now focus on estimating \mathfrak{K}_h . To accomplish this task, we introduce the auxiliary variable \tilde{p} as in (6.12) but with \bar{q}_h replaced by \bar{q}_h . With this variable at hand, we invoke (6.7) to obtain

$$\mathfrak{K}_h \leq \|\bar{u}_h\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} (\|\hat{p} - \tilde{p}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\tilde{p} - \bar{p}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}) \|\bar{q} - \bar{q}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

A stability estimate for the problem that $\hat{p} - \tilde{p}$ solves yields $\|\hat{p} - \tilde{p}\|_s \lesssim \|\hat{u} - \bar{u}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$. The control of $\|\tilde{p} - \bar{p}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ follows from noticing that \bar{p}_h corresponds to the finite element approximation of \tilde{p} within the setting of §3.3: $\|\tilde{p} - \bar{p}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h^{2\gamma} |\log h|^{2\varphi}$. A collection of these estimates allows us to conclude that $\mathfrak{K}_h \lesssim h^{2\gamma} |\log h|^{2\varphi} \|\bar{q} - \bar{q}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$.

The bound derived for \mathfrak{K}_h combined with the one in (6.17) for \mathfrak{J}_h yield the bound $\|\bar{q} - \bar{q}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h^{2\gamma} |\log h|^{2\varphi}$. This, which is a contradiction, concludes the proof. \square

We conclude this section with the following error estimates.

COROLLARY 6.7 (error estimates). *Let the assumptions of Theorem 6.6 hold. Then, there exists $h_\dagger > 0$ such that, for all $h < h_\dagger$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{u} - \bar{u}_h\|_s &\lesssim h^\gamma |\log h|^\varphi, & \|\bar{p} - \bar{p}_h\|_s &\lesssim h^\gamma |\log h|^\varphi, & \gamma &= \min\{s, \tfrac{1}{2}\}. \\ \|\bar{u} - \bar{u}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\lesssim h^{2\gamma} |\log h|^{2\varphi}, & \|\bar{p} - \bar{p}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\lesssim h^{2\gamma} |\log h|^{2\varphi}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, $\varphi = \nu$ if $s \neq \frac{1}{2}$, $\varphi = 1 + \nu$ if $s = \frac{1}{2}$, and $\nu \geq \frac{1}{2}$ is the constant in Theorem 3.1.

7. A numerical example. We present a numerical experiment that illustrates the performance of the fully and semidiscrete schemes, introduced in sections 5.1 and 5.2, respectively, when are used to approximate a solution of the control problem (4.1)–(4.2). We go beyond the presented theory and consider $a = 0$. The experiment has been carried out with the help of a code that was implemented using MATLAB and the schemes have been solved on the basis of a semi-smooth Newton method.

The setting of the experiment is as follows: we let $d = 2$, $\Omega = B(0, 1)$, $s \in (0, 1)$, $b = 0.5$, $a = 0$, and $\lambda = 1$; $B(0, 1)$ denotes the unit disc. The exact optimal state and optimal adjoint state are given by

$$(7.1) \quad \bar{u}(x) = \bar{p}(x) = (2^{2s} \Gamma^2(1+s))^{-1} (1 - |x|^2)_+^s, \quad t_+ = \max\{0, t\}.$$

In Figures 7.1–7.3, we present the results obtained for both the fully and semi discrete schemes. In Figure 7.1, we present, for $s \in \{0.1, 0.2, \dots, 0.9\}$, experimental rates of convergence for $\|\bar{u} - \bar{u}_h\|_s$ and $\|\bar{p} - \bar{p}_h\|_s$. We observe that the rates predicted by Corollaries 6.4 and 6.7 are attained when $s \geq \frac{1}{2}$. We present experimental rates of convergence for $\|\bar{u} - \bar{u}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$, $\|\bar{p} - \bar{p}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$, and $\|\bar{q} - \bar{q}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ for $s \in \{0.1, \dots, 0.5\}$ and $s \in \{0.6, \dots, 0.9\}$ in Figures 7.2 and 7.3, respectively. It is observed that, when $s \geq 0.5$, the experimental rates of convergence for all the involved approximation errors are in agreement with the error estimates obtained in section 6. However, when $s < 0.5$, the reported experimental rates of convergence exceed those predicted in our manuscript. These cases are particularly discussed in Remarks 7.1 and 7.2.

Remark 7.1 (rates of convergence: state and adjoint variables). Figures 7.1 and 7.2 show that, when $s < 0.5$, the experimental rates of convergence for the approximation errors associated to the state and adjoint variables exceed those predicted by




FIG. 7.1. Experimental rates of convergence for $\|\bar{u} - \bar{u}_h\|_s$ and $\|\bar{p} - \bar{p}_h\|_s$ considering the fully (A.1)–(A.2) and semidiscrete scheme (B.1)–(B.2) for $s \in \{0.1, 0.2, \dots, 0.9\}$.

Corollaries 6.4 and 6.7 but are in agreement with respect to the *maximal regularity*

$$(7.2) \quad H^{s+\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}(\Omega), \quad 0 < \epsilon < s + \frac{1}{2}.$$

The error bounds that we derive in Corollaries 6.4 and 6.7 are based on the regularity estimates of Theorem 4.4 which, in turn, are inspired by the results in Theorem 3.1 ([2, Theorem 2.1]). When $s \in (0, 0.5]$, $u \in H^{2s-2\epsilon}(\Omega)$ for every $\epsilon \in (0, s)$, which is weaker than (7.2). As commented in [2, page 1921], when the forcing term $f \in H^r(\Omega)$, for some $r > 0$, solutions are expected to be smoother than just $H^{2s}(\Omega)$; however, such a higher regularity result can not be derived from [2, Theorem 2.1]. In spite of this fact, it is important to emphasize that the estimates in [2, Theorem 2.1] hold under the assumption that $\partial\Omega$ is *merely* Lipschitz. As a final observation, we notice that the functions \bar{u} and \bar{p} defined in (7.1) satisfy (7.2).

Remark 7.2 (rates of convergence: control variable). Figure 7.2 (Subfigures (C.3) and (D.3)) reveals that the experimental rates of convergence obtained for the control variable are higher than those predicted by (6.8) and (6.16) when $s < 0.5$. To explain this, we further explore regularity properties of \bar{q} within our particular setting. Observe that $\bar{u}(x)\bar{p}(x) = \mathfrak{C}(1 - |x|^2)_+^\sigma$, where $\sigma = 2s$ and $\mathfrak{C}^{-1} = (2^{2\sigma}\Gamma^4(1+s))$. $\bar{u}\bar{p}$ can be thus seen as the solution to (1.2) with s replaced by σ , $q \equiv 0$, and $f \equiv \Gamma^{-2}(1+s)$. Consequently, the maximal regularity property (7.2) in this case reads $\bar{u}\bar{p} \in H^\nu(\Omega)$,




FIG. 7.2. *Experimental rates of convergence for $\|\bar{u} - \bar{u}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$, $\|\bar{p} - \bar{p}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$, and $\|\bar{q} - \bar{q}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ considering the fully (C.1)–(C.3) and semidiscrete scheme (D.1)–(D.3) for $s \in \{0.1, 0.2, \dots, 0.5\}$.*

where $\iota = \sigma + 0.5 - \epsilon$ and $\epsilon \in (0, \sigma + 0.5)$. In view of the projection formula (4.12), we apply [27, Theorem 1] to arrive at $\bar{q} \in H^\iota(\Omega)$; observe that $\iota < 1.5$. As a result, in terms of regularity and approximation degree, we would expect, for the fully discrete scheme, $\|\bar{q} - \bar{q}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h^\omega$, where $\omega = \min\{2s + 0.5 - \epsilon, 1\}$. This is the behaviour observed in Subfigure (C.3). A similar conclusion holds for the semidiscrete scheme. Since \bar{q}_h is implicitly discretized with piecewise linear functions, we would expect $\|\bar{q} - \bar{q}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \lesssim h^\varpi$, where $\varpi = \min\{2s + 0.5 - \epsilon, 2\}$. However, we observe $\mathcal{O}(h^\omega)$. A key observation in favor of this behaviour is the fact that it has been experimentally observed that $\|\bar{u} - \bar{u}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ and $\|\bar{p} - \bar{p}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ do not exceed $\mathcal{O}(h)$; see [2, §6.1].

REFERENCES

- [1] R. A. ADAMS AND J. J. F. FOURNIER, *Sobolev spaces*, vol. 140 of Pure and Applied Mathematics (Amsterdam), Elsevier/Academic Press, Amsterdam, second ed., 2003.
- [2] J. P. BORTHAGARAY, D. LEYKEKHMAN, AND R. H. NOCHETTO, *Local energy estimates for the fractional Laplacian*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 59 (2021), pp. 1918–1947, <https://doi.org/10.1137/20M1335509>.
- [3] H. BREZIS AND P. MIRONESCU, *Gagliardo-Nirenberg, composition and products in fractional Sobolev spaces*, vol. 1, 2001, pp. 387–404, <https://doi.org/10.1007/PL00001378>.
- [4] C. BRUNI, G. DIPILLO, AND G. KOCH, *Bilinear systems: an appealing class of “nearly linear” systems in theory and applications*, IEEE Trans. Automatic Control, AC-19 (1974), pp. 334–348, <https://doi.org/10.1109/tac.1974.1100617>.
- [5] E. CASAS AND M. MATEOS, *Optimal control of partial differential equations*, in Computational mathematics, numerical analysis and applications, vol. 13 of SEMA SIMAI Springer Ser., Springer, Cham, 2017, pp. 3–59.
- [6] E. CASAS AND J.-P. RAYMOND, *Error estimates for the numerical approximation of Dirichlet*




FIG. 7.3. Experimental rates of convergence for $\|\bar{u} - \bar{u}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$, $\|\bar{p} - \bar{p}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$, and $\|\bar{q} - \bar{q}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ considering the fully (E.1)–(E.3) and semidiscrete scheme (F.1)–(F.3) for $s \in \{0.6, 0.7, 0.8, 0.9\}$.

boundary control for semilinear elliptic equations, SIAM J. Control Optim., 45 (2006), pp. 1586–1611, <https://doi.org/10.1137/050626600>.

[7] E. CASAS AND F. TRÖLTZSCH, *Second order analysis for optimal control problems: improving results expected from abstract theory*, SIAM J. Optim., 22 (2012), pp. 261–279, <https://doi.org/10.1137/110840406>.

[8] E. CASAS, D. WACHSMUTH, AND G. WACHSMUTH, *Second-order analysis and numerical approximation for bang-bang bilinear control problems*, SIAM J. Control Optim., 56 (2018), pp. 4203–4227, <https://doi.org/10.1137/17M1139953>.

[9] Y. CHEN, Z. LU, AND Y. HUANG, *Superconvergence of triangular Raviart-Thomas mixed finite element methods for a bilinear constrained optimal control problem*, Comput. Math. Appl., 66 (2013), pp. 1498–1513, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.camwa.2013.08.019>.

[10] P. G. CIARLET, *The finite element method for elliptic problems*, SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 2002, <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9780898719208>.

[11] D. COLTON AND R. KRESS, *Inverse acoustic and electromagnetic scattering theory*, vol. 93 of Applied Mathematical Sciences, Springer, New York, third ed., 2013, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-4942-3>.

[12] G. DAL MASO, *An introduction to Γ -convergence*, vol. 8 of Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1993, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-0327-8>.

[13] 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 (2019), pp. 2775–2798, <https://doi.org/10.1137/18M1219989>.

[14] E. DI NEZZA, G. PALATUCCI, AND E. VALDINOCI, *Hitchhiker’s guide to the fractional Sobolev spaces*, Bull. Sci. Math., 136 (2012), pp. 521–573, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bulsci.2011.12.004>.

[15] A. ERN AND J.-L. GUERMOND, *Theory and practice of finite elements*, vol. 159 of Applied Mathematical Sciences, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2004, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-4355-5>.

[16] H. FU, H. GUO, J. HOU, AND J. ZHANG, *A stabilized mixed finite element approximation of*

- bilinear state optimal control problems*, *Comput. Math. Appl.*, 74 (2017), pp. 1246–1261, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.camwa.2017.06.010>.
- [17] F. FUICA AND E. OTÁROLA, *A posteriori error estimates for an optimal control problem with a bilinear state equation*, *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, 194 (2022), pp. 543–569, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10957-022-02039-6>.
- [18] M. HINZE, *A variational discretization concept in control constrained optimization: the linear-quadratic case*, *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, 30 (2005), pp. 45–61, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10589-005-4559-5>.
- [19] C. KENNE, G. MOPHOU, AND M. WARMA, *Bilinear optimal control for a fractional diffusive equation*, *arXiv e-prints*, (2022), p. arXiv:2210.17494, <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2210.17494>.
- [20] A. KRÖNER AND B. VEXLER, *A priori error estimates for elliptic optimal control problems with a bilinear state equation*, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 230 (2009), pp. 781–802, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cam.2009.01.023>.
- [21] K. KUNISCH, W. LIU, Y. CHANG, N. YAN, AND R. LI, *Adaptive finite element approximation for a class of parameter estimation problems*, *J. Comput. Math.*, 28 (2010), pp. 645–675, <https://doi.org/10.4208/jcm.2009.10-m1003>.
- [22] M. KWAŚNICKI, *Ten equivalent definitions of the fractional Laplace operator*, *Fract. Calc. Appl. Anal.*, 20 (2017), pp. 7–51, <https://doi.org/10.1515/fca-2017-0002>.
- [23] N. S. LANDKOF, *Foundations of modern potential theory*, *Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften*, Band 180, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1972.
- [24] J.-L. LIONS AND E. MAGENES, *Non-homogeneous boundary value problems and applications. Vol. I*, *Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften*, Band 182, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1972. Translated from the French by P. Kenneth.
- [25] W. MCLEAN, *Strongly elliptic systems and boundary integral equations*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.
- [26] R. R. MOHLER, *Bilinear control processes. With applications to engineering, ecology, and medicine*, *Mathematics in Science and Engineering*, Vol. 106, Academic Press [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], New York-London, 1973.
- [27] P. OSWALD, *On the boundedness of the mapping $f \rightarrow |f|$ in Besov spaces*, *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin.*, 33 (1992), pp. 57–66.
- [28] E. OTÁROLA, *Fractional semilinear optimal control: optimality conditions, convergence, and error analysis*, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 60 (2022), pp. 1–27, <https://doi.org/10.1137/20M1356294>.
- [29] T. RUNST AND W. SICKEL, *Sobolev spaces of fractional order, Nemytskij operators, and nonlinear partial differential equations*, vol. 3 of *De Gruyter Series in Nonlinear Analysis and Applications*, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1996, <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110812411>.
- [30] L. TARTAR, *An introduction to Sobolev spaces and interpolation spaces*, vol. 3 of *Lecture Notes of the Unione Matematica Italiana*, Springer, Berlin; UMI, Bologna, 2007.
- [31] H. TRIEBEL, *Theory of function spaces*, vol. 78 of *Monographs in Mathematics*, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1983, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-0346-0416-1>.
- [32] F. TRÖLTZSCH, *Optimal control of partial differential equations*, vol. 112 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010, <https://doi.org/10.1090/gsm/112>.
- [33] B. VEXLER AND W. WOLLNER, *Adaptive finite elements for elliptic optimization problems with control constraints*, *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 47 (2008), pp. 509–534, <https://doi.org/10.1137/070683416>.