

ANALYSIS OF 4D-VARIATIONAL DATA ASSIMILATION PROBLEMS IN LOW REGULARITY SPACES

P. CASTRO[†], J.C. DE LOS REYES[†] AND I. NEITZEL[‡]

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we carry out a rigorous analysis of four-dimensional variational data assimilation problems for linear and semilinear parabolic equations with control in the initial condition, coming from a Lebesgue space. Due to the nature of the data assimilation problem, spatial pointwise observations of the state have to be considered in the cost functional, which requires continuity of the solution with respect to the spatial variable. To obtain this for an initial condition in $L^\beta(\Omega)$, with $\beta > d$, we make use of maximal parabolic regularity tools, jointly with real and complex interpolation theory. We prove that the data assimilation problems admit an optimal solution and derive a first-order necessary optimality system. For the semilinear case, the situation is more involved. Indeed, due to the differentiability properties of the control-to-state mapping, we can derive first-order necessary optimality conditions just for values of $\beta > 4$. Due to the same reason, the study of the second-order sufficient optimality conditions is carried out for $d = 2$ and taking $\beta > 6$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Data assimilation can be described as the process through which available measurements/observations are incorporated in a given model in order to more accurately estimate the system state at a given time. Its applicability is crucial in fields such as atmospheric sciences, environmental sciences, geosciences, biology, and medicine, to name a few (see [6] and the references therein). The two main approaches for dealing with data assimilation problems are based on Kalman filters, on the one hand, and on variational models on the other hand, although both methodologies are usually combined with each other to exploit their different advantages and avoid their shortcomings (see, e.g., [6, 31, 55]).

Four-dimensional variational data assimilation (4D-VAR) was originally proposed by Le Dimet and Talagrand [35], aiming to assimilate observations acquired over an entire time interval $[t_0, t_n]$ instead of a single instant of time, as was up to that point the case with 3D-VAR. Mathematically, the finite-dimensional 4D-VAR problem may be formulated as the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \min_u \quad & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n [H(y(t_i)) - z_o(t_i)]^T R_i^{-1} [H(y(t_i)) - z_o(t_i)] + \frac{1}{2} (u - u_b)^T B^{-1} (u - u_b) \\
 \text{(P)} \quad & \text{subject to:} \\
 & y(t_i) = M_i(y(t_0)) \quad (\text{System model}), \\
 & y(t_0) = u \quad (\text{Initial condition}),
 \end{aligned}$$

where n is the number of time instants t_i at which observations are taken, $z_o(t_i)$ represents the observed state at time t_i , and u_b is the background initial condition. For each $i = 1, \dots, n$, R_i represents the observation error covariance matrix at time t_i , B is the background error covariance matrix, and H is the observation operator that maps the

Partially funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) - Project-ID 211504053 - SFB 1060.

model state to observable variables. The system model operators M_i usually correspond to integration formulas of underlying differential equation models.

Most of the analysis of 4D-VAR problems has been carried out in finite dimensions, due to its practical widespread use; analytical results in function spaces are rather scarce. Let us remark that pointwise observations in space are important in practice, since the location of many observation stations and measurement devices is fixed, while the acquisition may occur at different time intervals. Indeed, a main analytical challenge consists in considering, within the cost functional, both pointwise-in-space observations of the state and an L^2 -energy for the background error, to mimic the structure of problem (P).

In this regard, let us start by mentioning the seminal paper [35] and the more recent contributions [36, 32], where the 4D-VAR problem is posed and treated in Hilbert or Banach spaces using a general Bayesian setting. Although mathematically rigorous, the Bayesian framework considered there departs from the finite-dimensional problem (P), as the norms in the cost functional are significantly different. In fact, to get well-posedness, artificial stronger norms in either the observation error or the background error terms typically appear. Pointwise-in-space observations of the state together with an L^2 -energy for the background error cannot be considered within this framework.

An alternative path consists in exploiting the regularity properties of the underlying PDE model, at least for some type of nonlinear parabolic equations. However, for a lot of problems typically considered, imposing a continuity requirement on the state involves additional assumptions or restrictions, such as requiring continuity of the initial state or further constraints on the controls, see, e.g., [51] for semilinear problems, and [32] for an atmospheric primitive-equations model, which would require in turn either a much stronger norm for the background error or additional pointwise box constraints on u , to get well-posedness of the data assimilation problem (see also [17]). Nevertheless, parabolic optimal control problems and related regularity analysis are an active field of research even for quasilinear PDEs, e.g., [43, 16, 8, 29], where the latter paper also works with continuity in order to handle state constraints.

In this paper, we aim at further bridging the theoretical gap for 4D-VAR problems subject to linear and semilinear parabolic PDE-constraints by considering both pointwise observations in space and an L^2 -energy for the background error. First, we study the required regularity and well-posedness of the four-dimensional variational data assimilation problems solely using the natural L^2 -norm in the cost. To do so, we consider the initial condition in the integrable Lebesgue space $L^\beta(\Omega)$, and make use of *maximal parabolic regularity theory* for $\beta > 2$ ($d = 2$) or $3 < \beta < 6$ ($d = 3$), where d stands for the spatial dimension, to justify the corresponding continuous-in-space states, as has recently also been considered for quasilinear problems, see e.g., [8, 16, 28], yet with some types of distributed or boundary control rather than controlling the initial condition itself. After that, we establish first and second-order optimality conditions for characterizing the optimal initial conditions. We start with the linear parabolic problem and discuss the existence of optimal solutions in the low-regularity spaces, as well as first-order necessary and sufficient optimality conditions. Then, we focus on the semilinear problem, where we deal with the differentiability of the control-to-state mapping. It is important to mention that due to the presence of nonlinearity, we only can get even first-order differentiability results for specific values of β , for instance, $\beta > 4$. The second-order differentiability is more involved. In fact, we only get this result for the two-dimensional case with $\beta > 6$. Consequently, the first- and second-order optimality conditions are derived for these values of β .

Let us put our work into perspective. The requirement of continuous state functions and related challenges in the optimality systems are also well-known from PDE-constrained optimal control problems with pointwise state constraints, a meanwhile well-studied problem class with challenges in the optimality conditions. When relying on Slater-type constraint qualifications, continuity of the states is usually required, and Lagrange multipliers in the first-order optimality system are then obtained in the space of regular Borel measures (see, e.g., [10]), which in turn leads to low regularity of the adjoint state. More recently [12], the authors showed improved regularity for the Lagrange multipliers in the elliptic setting under certain conditions, inspired by a result for sparse optimal controls, see [48]. We point out that problems with either finitely many control parameters or finitely many time-dependent control functions and pointwise state constraints are a particularly interesting subclass with low regularity in the multipliers, cf. [45, 44] in the elliptic setting, or [20] where the authors also discuss questions of second-order sufficient conditions (SSC). This class is particularly similar to the case considered in the present paper. From meanwhile, a very rich literature on different aspects of purely state-constrained problems, we refer only to [50, 51] for some earlier results on semilinear parabolic problems, to [40] for parabolic problems subject to state constraints pointwise in time, and to more recent results in [18] or [28, 16].

Second-order sufficient optimality conditions are of particular interest in the presence of nonlinear PDE-constraints, since the first-order optimality conditions are no longer sufficient due to nonconvexity. The review article [14] and the reference therein offer a general overview of this topic. A regularity analysis of the underlying nonlinearity or additional constraints for the control and state leads to specific restrictions that have to be treated when studying the second-order conditions. For example, in [11, 33, 49] the authors provide second-order optimality conditions for semilinear parabolic problems with pointwise state constraints. We also mention the recent work on quasilinear state-constrained problems either in the whole space-time domain or pointwise in space only [28]. However, in those papers and others, it is rather usual to consider the control variable constrained in a box of L^∞ -type and acting as some type of source term in the right-hand-side or in the boundary conditions, which makes more treatable the characterization of the cone of feasible directions by exploiting the structure of the L^∞ -norm (see, e.g., [13, 14, 54]). On the other hand, in [38] the authors consider more general restrictions and characterize the cone, for the second-order conditions, directly through the approximation of the tangent cone. In this paper, we follow this approach since we do not want to impose L^∞ -regularity for the control variable. We also point out that sparse control became a field of active research rather recently. These problems resemble both state-constrained problems and our problem class in the way that comparable regularity difficulties appear in the state equation instead of the adjoint equation in the case of pointwise state constraints. We only mention [37, 15], which are related to our problem setting.

In this paper, the analysis of the state equation will be done via maximal parabolic regularity jointly with real and complex interpolation results. General principles on maximal parabolic regularity can be found in [2, Chapter III]. The analysis of optimal control problems of semilinear and quasilinear equations using maximal parabolic regularity has been addressed by some authors, among them, we can mention: Rehberg and coauthors in [21, 22], Meinlschmidt et al. in [41, 42], Bonifacius and Neitzel in [8], Meyer and Susu in [46], and Herzog et al. in [27], as well as Casas et al. in [16]. Likewise, when nonautonomous operators are taken into account, maximal parabolic regularity is also used to provide the state equation's analysis; see, e.g., the work of Amann in [4], Haller-Dintelmann and Rehberg in [26], and Rehberg and Meinlschmidt in [43].

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces definitions and results of interpolation spaces and maximal parabolic regularity. We use these results as foundations for our analysis. Here, we also introduce the functional analytic framework we will use throughout the paper. Section 3 is devoted to studying the convex variational data assimilation problem. First, we analyze the linear restriction using the maximal parabolic regularity of the second-order differential operator appearing in the PDE. After that, we find its necessary - and due to the linearity - also sufficient optimality condition. In Section 4, we study the semilinear variational data assimilation problem. First of all, we prove well-posedness in the semilinear case, achieving the same regularity as the linear case. Moreover, we present a detailed analysis of the differentiability properties of the solution operator needed to state results for the necessary and sufficient second-order conditions. The latter considers the discrepancy between the spaces where the function is coercive and differentiable, cf. [30].

2. STANDING ASSUMPTIONS AND PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we collect and present important known preliminary results and definitions required for the analysis of the state equations and the adjoint equations appearing later on in our optimization problems and in the optimality systems. Let us first consider the following general assumptions.

Assumption 2.1.

1. $T > 0$ is a given real number that represents the final time of a fixed time interval $I := (0, T)$.
2. X and Y are real reflexive Banach spaces such that Y is continuously and densely embedded in X , i.e., $Y \xhookrightarrow{d} X$.
3. $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d = 2, 3$, is a bounded domain of class C^2 , with Γ denoting its boundary.

Moreover, $Q := \Omega \times (0, T)$ denotes the space-time-cylinder and $\Sigma := \Gamma \times (0, T)$. On the other hand, let us recall that the closure of $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ in $W^{1,\beta}(\Omega)$ is denoted by $W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega)$. Additionally, letting β' be the conjugate exponent of β , then, $W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)$ will represent the dual space of $W_0^{1,\beta'}(\Omega)$. Additionally, if we take $X = W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)$ and $Y = W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega)$, then Assumption 2.1.2 is satisfied.

For the rest of the manuscript, we adopt the notation from [2, section I.2] and write $[X, Y]_\theta$ for complex and $(X, Y)_{\theta,r}$ for real interpolation spaces, where $0 < \theta < 1$ and $1 \leq r \leq \infty$. Since X and Y are assumed to be reflexive spaces, for $r \in]1, \infty[$, it holds $(L^r(I; X))^* = L^{r'}(I; X^*)$ and $(L^r(I; Y))^* = L^{r'}(I; Y^*)$, where r' stands for the conjugate exponent, i.e., $1 = \frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{r'}$, cf. [46, Remark 2.4].

Next, we state useful propositions that guarantee embedding results for interpolation spaces. We refer to [2, section I.2.5] and [7, section 4.4.7] for the proof.

Proposition 2.1. *Let X and Y be Banach spaces where $Y \xhookrightarrow{d} X$. For $0 < \theta < 1$, the following is satisfied*

$$(2.1) \quad Y \xhookrightarrow{d} (X, Y)_{\theta,1} \xhookrightarrow{d} (X, Y)_{\theta,q} \xhookrightarrow{d} (X, Y)_{\theta,p} \hookrightarrow (X, Y)_{\theta,\infty} \xhookrightarrow{d} (X, Y)_{\vartheta,1} \xhookrightarrow{d} X$$

for $1 < q < p < \infty$ and $0 < \vartheta < \theta < 1$. Moreover,

$$(2.2) \quad (X, Y)_{\theta,1} \xhookrightarrow{d} [X, Y]_\theta \hookrightarrow (X, Y)_{\theta,\infty}.$$

A key concept in our analysis is the maximal parabolic regularity of the operator and the embeddings that its solution space satisfies. We recall its definition and some significant embedding results below, see e.g., [2].

Definition 2.1. We say that the operator $A : X \rightarrow Y$ satisfies maximal parabolic $L^r(I; X)$ -regularity, with $r \in]1, \infty[$, if for every $\ell \in L^r(I; X)$ and $y_0 \in (X, Y)_{1-\frac{1}{r}, r}$, the equation

$$(2.3) \quad \frac{\partial y}{\partial t} + Ay = \ell, \quad y(0) = y_0,$$

admits a unique solution $y \in W^{1,r}(I; X) \cap L^r(I; Y)$.

It can be shown, see e.g., [22, Remark 3.3], that this solution satisfies

$$(2.4) \quad \|y\|_{\mathbb{W}^r(Y, X)} \leq c \left(\|\ell\|_{L^r(I; X)} + \|y_0\|_{(X, Y)_{1-\frac{1}{r}, r}} \right), \quad \text{for some constant } c > 0.$$

We write $\mathbb{W}^r(Y, X) := W^{1,r}(I; X) \cap L^r(I; Y)$, and, if the context is clear, we drop $L^r(I; X)$ and just talk of maximal parabolic regularity. Note that $\mathbb{W}^r(Y, X)$ is a reflexive Banach space, since the spaces X and Y are reflexive [46, Remark 2.10].

Similarly, Proposition 2.2 states useful embedding results that are satisfied by the solution space $\mathbb{W}^r(Y, X)$. The proof of this result can be found in [3, Theorem 3] and [2, Theorem 4.10.2].

Proposition 2.2. Let X, Y be Banach spaces such that $Y \xhookrightarrow{d} X$. Given $1 \leq r < \infty$ and r' its conjugate exponent, we have:

- (i) If $0 < \theta - \frac{1}{r'} < \frac{1}{q} \leq 1$, then $\mathbb{W}^r(Y, X) \hookrightarrow L^q(I; (X, Y)_{\theta, 1})$
- (ii) If $\theta = \frac{1}{r'}$, then $\mathbb{W}^r(Y, X) \hookrightarrow C(I; (X, Y)_{\frac{1}{r'}, r})$
- (iii) If $0 \leq \gamma < \frac{1}{r'} - \theta$, then $\mathbb{W}^r(Y, X) \hookrightarrow C^\gamma(I; (X, Y)_{\theta, 1})$.

Moreover, if $\theta \neq \frac{1}{r'}$ and Y are compactly embedded in X , the embeddings are compact.

The operator A , that we will use throughout the paper, is a linear elliptic second-order differential operator of the form:

$$A : W_0^{1, \beta}(\Omega) \longrightarrow W^{-1, \beta}(\Omega), \quad y \mapsto -\operatorname{div} k \nabla y$$

such that

$$\langle Ay, v \rangle = \int_{\Omega} k \nabla y \cdot \nabla v \, dx, \quad y \in W_0^{1, \beta}(\Omega), \quad v \in W_0^{1, \beta'}(\Omega),$$

where the coefficient function $k \in L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$ is uniformly elliptic and symmetric. It is important for our analysis to note that the operator A satisfies maximal parabolic regularity for certain values of β . We formalize this result in the following proposition, for its proof, we refer to [46, Lemma 6.4].

Proposition 2.3. The operator $A : W_0^{1, \beta}(\Omega) \rightarrow W^{-1, \beta}(\Omega)$, $A = -\operatorname{div} k \nabla$ satisfies maximal parabolic $L^r(I; W^{-1, \beta}(\Omega))$ -regularity for $\beta \in]d, \frac{2d}{d-2}[$ and for any $r > 1$.

As a consequence of the maximal parabolic regularity of A , $-A$ generates the strongly continuous analytic semigroup $\{e^{-tA} : t \geq 0\}$ (see, e.g., [4, Section 3]). Additionally, from [47, Thm. 1.2.2], the semigroup is bounded on X , i.e., there exists $\mathcal{M} > 0$ such that

$$(2.5) \quad \|e^{-tA}\|_{\mathcal{L}(Y, X)} \leq \mathcal{M}.$$

Further, our specific operator is such that $0 \notin \sigma(A)$, where $\sigma(A)$ denotes the spectrum of A , see [46, Lemma 6.4]. Therefore, A forms an isomorphism between $Y = W_0^{1, \beta}(\Omega)$ and $X = W^{1, -\beta}(\Omega)$ (see e.g., [46, pp.2208]).

Remark 2.1. Note that we assume C^2 -regularity on the domain for simplicity. In fact, C^2 -domains have the strong Lipschitz property [1, pp.84] and are consequently Lipschitz domains [39, Section 1.1.9]. Therefore, Ω and $\Omega \cup \Gamma$ are regular in the sense of Gröger [25]. The latter is important since, for dimension two, the result of Proposition 2.3 is always fulfilled for only Gröger regular domains. On the other hand, the three-dimensional case is more involved. Having Gröger regular domains and a uniformly, continuous, and symmetric operator $k : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ is not enough. We refer to the appendix of [33] where arrangements such that $A : W_0^{1,\beta} \rightarrow W^{-1,\beta}$, $y \mapsto -\operatorname{div} k \nabla y$ satisfies maximal parabolic regularity for the 3-dimensional case, even for less regular domains, was studied in detail.

In the following sections, we will deal with linear and nonlinear state equations. In the study of these last ones, the analysis of linearized equations will be required. In that sense, we introduce a perturbation result (see e.g., [5, Prop. 1.3]).

Proposition 2.4. *Let $A : Y \rightarrow X$ satisfy maximal parabolic regularity, and $R \in \mathcal{L}(Y, X)$ be strongly measurable. If there exist positive constants c_1 and c_2 such that:*

$$\|Rz\|_X \leq c_1 \|z\|_Y + c_2 \|z\|_X, \quad \text{for all } z \in Y.$$

Then for all $\ell \in L^r(I; X)$ and $y_0 \in (X, Y)_{1-\frac{1}{r}, r}$, there exists a unique solution $y \in \mathbb{W}^r(Y, X)$ satisfying

$$\frac{\partial y}{\partial t} + Ay + Ry = \ell, \quad y(0) = y_0.$$

Likewise, since A satisfies maximal parabolic regularity, its adjoint operator also satisfies this property. We state this result in the following lemma and refer to [27, Lemma 36] for its proof.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $A \in \mathcal{L}(Y, X)$ be a closed densely defined operator, satisfying maximal parabolic $L^r(I; X)$ -regularity. Then its adjoint operator $A^* \in \mathcal{L}(X^*, Y^*)$ satisfies maximal parabolic $L^{r'}(I; Y^*)$ -regularity.*

Consequently, it follows that the equation

$$(2.6) \quad -\frac{\partial p}{\partial t} + A^*p = \nu, \quad p(T) = 0,$$

has a unique solution $p \in W^{1,r'}(I; Y^*) \cap L^{r'}(I; X^*) := \mathbb{W}^{r'}(X^*, Y^*)$ if $\nu \in L^{r'}(I; Y^*)$. Moreover, the following estimate holds:

$$(2.7) \quad \|p\|_{\mathbb{W}^{r'}(X^*, Y^*)} \leq c_p \|\nu\|_{L^{r'}(I; Y^*)}, \quad \text{for some constant } c_p > 0.$$

On the other hand, since $X^* \xrightarrow{d} Y^*$ (see e.g., [4, p.8]), we can formulate a Green's formula, utilizing the adjoint operator $A^* \in \mathcal{L}(X^*, Y^*)$. We formalize this result in the next proposition, its proof can be found in [4, Prop. 5.1].

Proposition 2.5. *If $y \in \mathbb{W}^r(Y, X)$ and $v \in \mathbb{W}^{r'}(X^*, Y^*)$, then the following Green's identity holds for $0 \leq s < t \leq T$:*

$$(2.8) \quad \int_s^t \langle v, (\partial_t + A)y \rangle_{X^*, X} dt + \langle v(s), y(s) \rangle_{(Y^*, X^*)_{\frac{1}{r}, r'}, (X, Y)_{\frac{1}{r'}, r}} = \\ \int_s^t \langle (-\partial_t + A^*)v, y \rangle_{Y^*, Y} dt + \langle v(t), y(t) \rangle_{(Y^*, X^*)_{\frac{1}{r}, r'}, (X, Y)_{\frac{1}{r'}, r}}.$$

Note that thanks to the perturbation result in Proposition 2.4, Green's formula for the linearized operator also holds.

For completeness of the article, we briefly comment on the notion of solutions. Let us consider again the linear equation (2.3), with $\ell \in L^r(I; X)$ and $y_0 \in (X, Y)_{1-\frac{1}{r}, r}$,

$$\frac{\partial y}{\partial t} + Ay = \ell, \quad y(0) = y_0.$$

By a solution of (2.3), we mean a function $y \in \mathbb{W}^r(Y, X)$ satisfying (2.3) in the pointwise sense a.e. Additionally, this solution satisfies

$$\int_0^T \langle (-\partial_t + A^*) \varphi, y(t) \rangle_{Y^*, Y} dt = \int_0^T \langle \varphi, \ell \rangle_{X^*, X} dt + \langle \varphi(0), y_0 \rangle_{(Y^*, X^*)_{\frac{1}{r}, r}, (X, Y)_{\frac{1}{r}, r}}$$

for $y \in L^r(I; Y)$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}([0, T[; X^*)$, see e.g., [4, Proposition 6.1].

Likewise, let us introduce the concept of mild solutions, which will be used later in the study of the nonlinear optimization problem, mainly in the well-posedness of its state equation. To do that, let us consider the following semilinear equation:

$$(2.9) \quad \frac{\partial y}{\partial t} + Ay = g(y), \quad y(0) = y_0.$$

By a **mild solution** of (2.9), we mean a function $y \in C(\bar{I}; Z)$ which satisfies the following integral equation:

$$(2.10) \quad y(t) = e^{-tA} y_0 + \int_0^t e^{-(t-\tau)A} g(y(\tau)) d\tau,$$

where $-A$ is the generator of the strongly continuous analytic semigroup $\{e^{-tA} : t \geq 0\}$, on X , and the nonlinear term maps from $Z \subset X$ to X , see e.g., [47, Chapter 6].

3. VARIATIONAL DATA ASSIMILATION PROBLEM: LINEAR CASE

In this section, we study the convex variational data assimilation problem. In this case, the 4D-VAR problem reads as follows:

$$(3.1) \quad \min_{u \in U_{ad}} J(y, u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \sum_k [y(x_k, t) - z_o(x_k, t)]^2 dt + \frac{1}{2} \|u - u_b\|_{B^{-1}}^2,$$

subject to the linear dynamical system:

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial y}{\partial t} + Ay &= \ell & \text{in } Q \\ y &= 0 & \text{on } \Sigma \\ y(x, 0) &= u & \text{in } \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

In (3.1), $z_o(x_k, \cdot)$ represents a state observation at the spatial point x_k . The terms u_b and $B^{-1} \in \mathcal{L}(L^2(\Omega), L^2(\Omega))$ are the background information and the inverse of the background error covariance operator, respectively. Since B is a covariance operator, its inverse B^{-1} is also a symmetric and continuous bilinear form. Further, we will assume that B^{-1} is coercive in $L^2(\Omega)$. Additionally, $\|u - u_b\|_{B^{-1}}^2 := \int_{\Omega} (u - u_b) B^{-1} (u - u_b) dx$. Furthermore, U_{ad} represents the admissible set whose precise definition will be given later in this section.

3.1. Analysis of the state equation. A first approach to analyze the well-posedness of the data assimilation problem constraint was set in [17]. There, an initial condition in a more regular space such as $H_0^1(\Omega)$ was considered, which leads to a state variable in $H^{2,1}(Q)$ (see, e.g., [34]). However, doing this requires modifying the 4D-VAR cost functional by adding a regularization term. In this paper, we consider an initial condition in the less regular space $L^\beta(\Omega)$ with $d < \beta$. Known results guarantee maximal parabolic regularity up to $\beta < \frac{2d}{d-2}$. Furthermore, due to the requirements of the problem, the solution space has to be embedded in a space with continuity in the spatial variable. This property is essential due to pointwise evaluations in the space variable appearing in the cost functional.

3.1.1. Well-posedness of the linear constraint. We have already seen that A satisfies maximal parabolic $L^r(I; W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega))$ -regularity, for every $1 < r < \infty$ and $d < \beta < \frac{2d}{d-2}$. Together with some embedding results, this yields continuity of the solution with respect to space similar to e.g., [29] and thus well-posedness of the data assimilation constraint. We formalize this result in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\beta \in \left]d, \frac{2d}{d-2}\right]$, $1 < r < 2$, $2 \leq q \leq \frac{2}{\frac{n-2}{2} + \gamma + \epsilon}$ for some $\gamma > 0$ and a sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, and $\ell \in L^r(I; W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega))$. Then, for each $u \in L^p(\Omega)$, with $p \geq \beta$, Problem (3.2) has a unique solution $y \in \mathbb{W}^r(W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega), W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)) \hookrightarrow L^q(I, C(\bar{\Omega}))$. Moreover, the solution satisfies the estimates:*

$$(3.3a) \quad \|y\|_{\mathbb{W}^r(W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega), W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega))} \leq c_1(\|\ell\|_{L^r(I; W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega))} + \|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}),$$

$$(3.3b) \quad \|y\|_{L^q(I, C(\bar{\Omega}))} \leq c_2(\|\ell\|_{L^r(I; W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega))} + \|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}),$$

for some constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ independent of y , u , and ℓ .

Proof. Since we know that the operator A satisfies maximal parabolic $L^r(I; W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega))$ -regularity for every $1 < r < \infty$ and for the given values of β , we first show that $L^\beta(\Omega)$ embeds into $(W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega), W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega))_{1-\frac{1}{r}, r}$ under the given conditions on β and r . This will guarantee the existence of a unique solution $y \in \mathbb{W}^r(W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega), W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega))$ for any $u \in L^p(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^\beta(\Omega)$ with $p \geq \beta$ and $\ell \in L^r(I; W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega))$. Theorem 1 of [53, Section 2.4.2] guarantees the following result on interpolation spaces:

$$W^{2\alpha-1,\beta}(\Omega) = [W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega), W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega)]_\alpha.$$

Furthermore, using (2.1) in Proposition 2.1 with $X = W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)$ and $Y = W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega)$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} W^{2\alpha-1,\beta}(\Omega) &= [W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega), W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega)]_\alpha \hookrightarrow (W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega), W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega))_{\alpha,\infty} \\ &\stackrel{d}{\hookrightarrow} (W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega), W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega))_{\frac{1}{r},1} \stackrel{d}{\hookrightarrow} (W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega), W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega))_{1-\frac{1}{r},r} \end{aligned}$$

with $0 < \frac{1}{r'} < \alpha < 1$, utilizing $1/r' = 1 - 1/r$. In particular, taking $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$, we obtain

$$(3.4) \quad L^\beta(\Omega) \hookrightarrow (W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega), W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega))_{1-\frac{1}{r},r}, \quad r < 2.$$

To show the continuity of the solution in the spatial variable, we use Proposition 2.2 with $X = W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)$ and $Y = W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega)$, and obtain

$$(3.5) \quad \mathbb{W}^r(W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega), W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)) \hookrightarrow L^q\left(I; (W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega), W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega))_{\theta,1}\right)$$

for all θ with $0 < \theta - \frac{1}{r'} < \frac{1}{q} \leq 1$, i.e.,

$$(3.6) \quad 1 - 1/r < \theta < 1 - 1/r + 1/q \leq 2 - 1/r.$$

With $1 < r < 2$ and $2 \leq q \leq \frac{2}{\frac{n-2}{2} + \gamma + \epsilon}$, it is clear that such a θ exists. Moreover, [53, Theorem 2.8.1] establishes that $[W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega), W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega)]_\theta \hookrightarrow C^\gamma(\bar{\Omega})$, as long as $2\theta - 1 = \frac{d}{\beta} + \gamma$ and $\gamma > 0$. Using this result jointly with (2.2) in Proposition 2.1, it follows that

$$(3.7) \quad (W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega), W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega))_{\theta,1} \xrightarrow{d} [W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega), W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega)]_\theta \hookrightarrow C^\gamma(\bar{\Omega}) \hookrightarrow C(\bar{\Omega}),$$

if such a $\gamma > 0$ with $\gamma = 2\theta - 1 - \frac{d}{\beta}$ exists. Choosing $\theta = \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon$ guarantees this along with (3.6) under our conditions on q, r , and β . Consequently, it holds that

$$(3.8) \quad \mathbb{W}^r(W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega), W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)) \hookrightarrow L^q(I; C(\bar{\Omega})).$$

Last, estimate (3.3a) is obtained from (2.4) and embedding (3.4). Likewise, estimate (3.3b) follows directly from (3.3a) and embedding (3.8). $\square$

About the continuity of the solution, we would like to mention that a similar calculation was done in [8, Proposition 3.3] for different values of q .

Assumption 3.1. For the rest of the paper, we will take the indices as in Theorem 3.1, i.e., $\beta \in \left] d, \frac{2d}{d-2} \right[$, $1 < r < 2$ and $2 \leq q \leq \frac{2}{\frac{n-2}{2} + \gamma + \epsilon}$ with $\gamma > 0$ and a small $\epsilon > 0$, where r and r' are conjugate exponents.

Based on the results of Theorem 3.1, we can introduce the control-to-state mapping $S: L^\beta(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{W}^r(W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega), W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega))$, $u \rightarrow S(u) = y$, as the solution of the state equation (3.2). Thanks to estimate (3.3a) and since $\ell \in L^r(I; W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega))$ is given, this linear operator is continuous as well. Using it, we can rewrite the cost functional (3.1), and thus the data assimilation problem, into its reduced form:

$$(3.9) \quad \min_{u \in U_{ad}} f(u) = \frac{1}{2} \iint_Q [Su - z_o]^2 \delta(x - x_k) dt dx + \frac{1}{2} \|u - u_b\|_{B^{-1}}^2,$$

where U_{ad} represents the admissible set given by

$$U_{ad} = \left\{ u \in L^\beta(\Omega) : \int_\Omega |u(x)|^\beta dx \leq b \right\}, \quad \text{for a given constant } b > 0.$$

Note that U_{ad} is a non-empty, closed, convex, and bounded subset of $L^\beta(\Omega)$. With the existence and regularity result of the state equation at hand, we can now discuss the control problem, guided by standard arguments available from e.g. distributed or boundary control, focussing on the structure of the control and control constraints in the initial condition.

3.2. Existence of a solution for the DA problem. Let us start with an existence result of optimal solutions. For ease of presentation, let us agree on the following notation:

Remark 3.1. Hereafter we use the simplified notation $\mathbb{W}_0^r := \mathbb{W}^r(W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega), W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega))$ and $\mathbb{W}_0^{r'} := \mathbb{W}^{r'}(W_0^{1,\beta'}(\Omega), W^{-1,\beta'}(\Omega))$.

Theorem 3.2. *The data assimilation problem (3.9) admits a unique optimal solution $\bar{u} \in L^\beta(\Omega)$.*

Proof. The continuity of the operator S and the norm implies the continuity of the reduced cost functional. Hence, f is convex and continuous; therefore, f is weakly lower semicontinuous. This allows us to deduce an existence result in a classical way. We refer to [54, Theorem 2.14] in a slightly different functional analytic framework for details about

this procedure. In fact, since $f \geq 0$, there exists the infimum $j := \inf_{u \in U_{ad}} f(u) \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Let $\{u_n\}_{n \geq 1} \subset U_{ad}$ be a minimizing sequence. Since U_{ad} is weakly sequentially compact [54, Theorem 2.11], there exists a subsequence, denoted the same, and a limit $\bar{u} \in U_{ad}$ such that $u_n \rightharpoonup \bar{u}$ in U_{ad} as $n \rightarrow \infty$. From the weakly lower semicontinuity of f , we find $f(\bar{u}) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(u_n) = j$. Consequently, $\bar{u} \in U_{ad}$ is an optimal control. Since the control-to-state mapping is linear and the cost functional is strictly convex, it follows that the solution to the minimization problem is unique. $\square$

3.3. First order optimality conditions. In this subsection, we state and prove the first-order necessary - and due to convexity also sufficient - optimality conditions satisfied by $\bar{u} \in U_{ad} \subset L^\beta(\Omega)$, solution of the convex variational data assimilation problem. We start by defining the functional:

$$\psi: L^\beta(\Omega) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad u \mapsto \psi(u) = b - \int_{\Omega} |u(x)|^\beta dx$$

as in [56]. Then, with help of ψ , we can rewrite problem (3.9), in the following way:

$$(3.10) \quad \min f(u), \quad u \in L^\beta(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \psi(u) \in K,$$

with $K = \{\kappa \in \mathbb{R} : \kappa \geq 0\}$ being a closed and convex set of $\mathbb{R}$. Problems of the type (3.10) were treated by Zowe and Kurcyusz (see, e.g., [56]) where after proving a regularity condition, they prove the existence of Lagrange multipliers. In our particular case, this multiplier belongs to $\mathbb{R}$. Moreover, for use in the optimality conditions, note $\psi'(u) = - \int_{\Omega} \beta |u(x)|^{\beta-2} u(x) dx$.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $\bar{u} \in L^\beta(\Omega)$ be the solution of (3.10), with $\bar{y} \in \mathbb{W}^r(W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega), W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega))$ its associated state. Then, there exists a unique adjoint state $\bar{p} \in \mathbb{W}'(W_0^{1,\beta'}(\Omega), W^{-1,\beta'}(\Omega))$ and a multiplier $\bar{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying:*

State equation :

$$(3.11a) \quad \begin{aligned} \bar{y}_t + A\bar{y} &= \ell && \text{in } Q \\ \bar{y} &= 0 && \text{on } \Sigma \\ \bar{y}(x, 0) &= \bar{u} && \text{in } \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Adjoint equation :

$$(3.11b) \quad \begin{aligned} -\bar{p}_t + A^*\bar{p} &= \sum_k [S\bar{u}(x, t) - z_o(x, t)] \otimes \delta(x - x_k) && \text{in } Q \\ \bar{p} &= 0 && \text{on } \Sigma \\ \bar{p}(x, T) &= 0 && \text{in } \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Gradient equation :

$$(3.11c) \quad \bar{p}(0) + B^{-1}(\bar{u} - u_b) - \bar{\lambda}\psi'(\bar{u}) = 0 \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Complementarity System :

$$(3.11d) \quad \bar{\lambda} \geq 0, \quad b - \int_{\Omega} |\bar{u}(x)|^\beta dx \geq 0, \quad \bar{\lambda} \left(b - \int_{\Omega} |\bar{u}(x)|^\beta dx \right) = 0.$$

Proof. First of all, notice that the operator S is differentiable since it is linear, hence the reduced cost functional is differentiable as well. Now, to prove the existence of a Lagrange multiplier $\bar{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}$, we follow Zowe and Kurcyusz in [56, pp.50]. Therefore, we have to verify the following regularity condition:

$$(3.12) \quad \psi'(\bar{u})L^\beta(\Omega)\mathcal{K}(\psi(\bar{u})) = \mathbb{R},$$

with $\mathcal{K}(\psi(\bar{u})) = \{\kappa - \vartheta\psi(\bar{u}) : \kappa \in K, \vartheta \geq 0\}$. For our problem setting, the left-hand side of (3.12) takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \psi'(\bar{u})L^\beta(\Omega) - \mathcal{K}(\psi(\bar{u})) = & \left\{ \beta \int_{\Omega} |\bar{u}(x)|^{\beta-2} \bar{u}(x) h(x) dx - \kappa + \vartheta b - \vartheta \int_{\Omega} |\bar{u}(x)|^\beta dx : \right. \\ & \left. h \in L^\beta(\Omega), \vartheta \geq 0, \kappa \geq 0 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

To verify the regularity condition, let us take $z \in \mathbb{R}$. If $z \leq 0$, it will belong to $\psi'(\bar{u})L^\beta(\Omega) - \mathcal{K}(\psi(\bar{u}))$ by setting: $\vartheta = 0$, $h = 0 \in L^\beta(\Omega)$, and $\kappa = -z \geq 0$. In the same way, if $z \geq 0$, it will belong to $\psi'(\bar{u})L^\beta(\Omega) - \mathcal{K}(\psi(\bar{u}))$ if $\vartheta = \frac{z+\kappa}{b} \geq 0$, $\kappa \geq 0$, and $h(x) = \frac{\vartheta}{\beta} \bar{u}(x) \in L^\beta(\Omega)$. From this, condition (3.12) follows.

Therefore, there exists a Lagrange multiplier $\bar{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}$, such that:

$$(3.13a) \quad \bar{\lambda} \geq 0,$$

$$(3.13b) \quad \bar{\lambda} \left(b - \int_{\Omega} |\bar{u}(x)|^\beta dx \right) = 0,$$

$$(3.13c) \quad \langle f'(\bar{u}) - \bar{\lambda}\psi'(\bar{u}), h \rangle_{L^{\beta'}, L^\beta} = 0, \quad \forall h \in L^\beta(\Omega),$$

where the derivative of $f(\bar{u})$ in some direction $h \in L^\beta(\Omega)$ has the following form:

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} f'(\bar{u})h = & \int_{\Omega} \int_0^T \sum_k [S\bar{u}(x, t) - \tilde{z}_o(x, t)] \delta(x - x_k) Sh \, dx dt \\ & + \int_{\Omega} (\bar{u}(x) - u_b(x)) B^{-1} h \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

The term $\tilde{y} = Sh$ appearing in (3.14) belongs to $\mathbb{W}_0^r$ since it is the solution of the auxiliary problem:

$$(3.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \tilde{y}}{\partial t} + A\tilde{y} &= 0 & \text{in } Q \\ \tilde{y} &= 0 & \text{on } \Sigma \\ \tilde{y}(x, 0) &= h & \text{in } \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Note that, since $\bar{u} \in L^\beta(\Omega)$ is the minimizer of problem (3.10), it satisfies the constraint, i.e., $\psi(\bar{u}) = b - \int_{\Omega} |\bar{u}(x)|^\beta dx \geq 0$. This fact jointly with (3.13a)-(3.13b), implies the complementarity system (3.11d).

On the other hand, due to the pointwise evaluations of the state present in the cost functional, the adjoint equation (3.11b) has measures on its right-hand side. In particular, we have $\sum_k [S\bar{u}(x, t) - z_o(x, t)] \otimes \delta(x - x_k) \in L^{r'}(I; W^{-1, \beta'}(\Omega))$ (see Lemma A.1). Hereafter and since A^* satisfies maximal parabolic $L^{r'}(I; W^{-1, \beta'}(\Omega))$ -regularity, it holds that the solution to the adjoint equation $p \in \mathbb{W}_0^{r'}(W_0^{1, \beta'}(\Omega), W^{-1, \beta'}(\Omega))$ (see Lemma 2.1). Then, following typical procedures and using the adjoint state, from (3.14) we then obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} f'(\bar{u})h &= \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} (-\bar{p}_t + A^* \bar{p}) Sh \, dx dt + \int_{\Omega} (\bar{u}(x) - u_b(x)) B^{-1} h \, dx \\ &= \int_0^T \langle (-\partial_t + A^*) \bar{p}, Sh \rangle_{W^{-1, \beta'}, W^{1, \beta}} \, dt + \int_{\Omega} (\bar{u}(x) - u_b(x)) B^{-1} h \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Green's identity (2.8), and, taking into account equations (3.11b) and (3.15), the following is verified:

$$\begin{aligned} f'(\bar{u})h &= \int_0^T \langle \bar{p}, (\partial_t + A)Sh \rangle_{W^{1,\beta'}, W^{-1,\beta}} dt + \langle \bar{p}(0), Sh(0) \rangle_{(W^{-1,\beta'}, W^{1,\beta'})_{\frac{1}{r}, r}, (W^{-1,\beta}, W^{1,\beta})_{\frac{1}{r'}, r}} \\ &\quad - \langle \bar{p}(T), Sh(T) \rangle_{(W^{-1,\beta'}, W^{1,\beta'})_{\frac{1}{r}, r}, (W^{-1,\beta}, W^{1,\beta})_{\frac{1}{r'}, r}} + \int_{\Omega} (\bar{u}(x) - u_b(x)) B^{-1} h \, dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} (\bar{p}(0) + (\bar{u} - u_b)B^{-1}) h \, dx, \quad \forall h \in L^{\beta}(\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

Replacing the above into equation (3.13c) yields

$$\int_{\Omega} (\bar{p}(0) + (\bar{u} - u_b)B^{-1}) h(x) \, dx + \bar{\lambda}\beta \int_{\Omega} |\bar{u}(x)|^{\beta-2} \bar{u}(x) h(x) \, dx = 0, \quad \forall h \in L^{\beta}(\Omega),$$

which corresponds to the weak formulation of (3.11c). $\square$

Remark 3.2. Since there is a unique optimal solution $\bar{u} \in L^{\beta}(\Omega)$ and the state and adjoint equations are well-posed, it holds that $\bar{p}(0)$ is also unique. Consequently, if $\psi'(\bar{u}) \neq 0$, from the gradient equation (3.11c), we can conclude the uniqueness of the Lagrange multiplier $\bar{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}$.

Remark 3.3. Since $r' > 2$, Proposition 2.1 jointly with [53, Theorem 2.4.2.1] yields

$$(W^{-1,\beta'}(\Omega), W_0^{1,\beta'}(\Omega))_{1-\frac{1}{r'}, r'} \hookrightarrow [W^{-1,\beta'}(\Omega), W_0^{1,\beta'}(\Omega)]_{\frac{1}{2}} = L^{\beta'}(\Omega).$$

Consequently, from Proposition 2.2-(ii), the following embedding is satisfied

$$\mathbb{W}^{r'}(W_0^{1,\beta'}(\Omega), W^{-1,\beta'}(\Omega)) \hookrightarrow C(\bar{I}; L^{\beta'}(\Omega)).$$

Therefore, continuity of the adjoint state in the time variable holds, and the term $p(T)$ in the adjoint equation makes sense.

4. VARIATIONAL DATA ASSIMILATION PROBLEM: SEMILINEAR CASE

In this section, we study the optimal control problem formed by the cost functional:

$$(4.1) \quad \min_{u \in U_{ad}} J(y, u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \sum_k [y(x_k, t) - z_o(x_k, t)]^2 \, dt + \frac{1}{2} \|u - u_b\|_{B^{-1}}^2,$$

subject to the following semilinear constraint

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial y}{\partial t} + Ay + g(y) &= 0 & \text{in } Q \\ y &= 0 & \text{on } \Sigma \\ y(x, 0) &= u & \text{in } \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Since the distributed term $\ell \in L^r(I; W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega))$ that was present in the linear problem is not a control variable, we will take $\ell = 0$, for the sake of a simpler exposition. Moreover, to prove well-posedness and differentiability, we must impose a set of assumptions over the non-linear term $g(y)$. For the existence and regularity discussion, we follow the lines of [46] and amend their assumptions by differentiability properties that did not come into play for non-smooth nonlinearities.

Assumption 4.1.

1. The nonlinearity $g: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, appearing in the semilinear state equation, is a measurable and bounded function, that is, $|g(\cdot)| \leq \mathcal{K}_1$, for some $\mathcal{K}_1 > 0$.

2. The function g is twice differentiable, and $|g_{yy}(\cdot)| \leq \mathcal{K}_2$, for some $\mathcal{K}_2 > 0$. Additionally, g_{yy} is globally Lipschitz continuous, i.e., there exists $\tilde{L} > 0$ such that

$$|g_{yy}(y_1) - g_{yy}(y_2)| \leq \tilde{L}|y_1 - y_2|, \quad \forall y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Note that the latter implies that the first derivative $g_y(\cdot)$ and the function itself are globally Lipschitz continuous.

4.1. Analysis of the semilinear state equation. This section discusses the well-posedness of (4.2) under Assumptions 4.1. We point out the setting in [46], where the authors deal with a control problem where the control variable is the right-hand-side of a non-smooth semilinear equation and with zero initial boundary conditions, can be adapted to our setting. The Nemytskii operator associated with g will be denoted by $\mathbf{g}$ and is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{g}: L^\beta(\Omega) &\rightarrow L^s(\Omega) \\ z &\mapsto \mathbf{g}(z) = g(z(\cdot)), \end{aligned}$$

where $s < \beta$ is such that $L^s(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)$. Note that since $\beta' < d$, from the Rellich-Kondrachov theorem, we get $W_0^{1,\beta'}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{s'}(\Omega)$ for all $s' \in [1, \beta^*[$ (see, e.g., [9, Theorem 9.16]), where $\frac{d}{2} < (\beta^*)' < 2 < \beta^* < \frac{d}{d-2}$. Consequently, the embedding $L^s(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)$ holds for all $2 \leq s < \beta$. Next, we state some properties satisfied by the superposition operator, such as Lipschitz continuity and differentiability.

Proposition 4.1. *The Nemytskii operator $\mathbf{g}$ is globally Lipschitz, i.e., there exists $\mathbf{L} > 0$ such that*

$$\|\mathbf{g}(z_1) - \mathbf{g}(z_2)\|_{L^s(\Omega)} \leq \mathbf{L}\|z_1 - z_2\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}, \quad \forall z_1, z_2 \in L^\beta(\Omega).$$

Moreover, for $2 \leq s < \beta$, $\mathbf{g}$ is also globally Lipschitz from $L^\beta(\Omega)$ to $W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)$.

Proof. The proof is rather standard, see for instance [54, Chapter 4], where since g is bounded and globally Lipschitz, it holds that there is some $L > 0$ such that $\|\mathbf{g}(z_1) - \mathbf{g}(z_2)\|_{L^s(\Omega)} \leq L\|z_1 - z_2\|_{L^s(\Omega)}$. Moreover, since $s < \beta$, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $\|z_1 - z_2\|_{L^s(\Omega)} \leq c\|z_1 - z_2\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}$. Therefore, the result holds, taking $\mathbf{L} = cL > 0$. To prove the second assertion, it is only necessary to note that $L^s(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)$ where $2 \leq s < \beta$. $\square$

Due to the differentiability properties of $g: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ settled in Assumptions 4.1.2, the superposition operator $\mathbf{g}$ is Fréchet differentiable from $L^\beta(\Omega)$ to $L^s(\Omega)$, with $2 \leq s < \beta$. Additionally, if $2s < \beta$, we can obtain a second-order differentiability result for $\mathbf{g}$ (see, e.g., [24]). In our case, due to the restrictions on β that must be imposed to prove the state equation well-posedness, we can get first- and second-order differentiability for specific values of β . For instance, $\beta > 4$ (for the first order differentiability), and $\beta > 6$ (for the second-order differentiability if $d = 2$). Next, we formalize this result.

Proposition 4.2. *Setting $s = 2$ and $\beta > 4$, the superposition operator $\mathbf{g}: L^\beta(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)$ is Fréchet differentiable, with $(\mathbf{g}'(y)h)(x) = g_y(y(x))h(x)$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and all $h \in L^\beta(\Omega)$. Additionally, for $d = 2$ and taking $\beta > 6$, $\mathbf{g}$ is twice Fréchet differentiable from $L^\beta(\Omega)$ to $L^2(\Omega)$, where $(\mathbf{g}''(y)[h, k])(x) = g_{yy}(y(x))h(x)k(x)$ a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and all $h, k \in L^\beta(\Omega)$.*

Proof. The proof of this result uses standard technicalities. To look at them in a slightly different functional analytic framework, we refer to [54, Lemma 4.12] and [54, Theorem 4.22], where the author shows the first- and second-order differentiability of the superposition operator, respectively. $\square$

4.1.1. Well-posedness. We now prove the well-posedness of the semilinear state equation. We first rely on results in [47, Chapter 6] and consider the properties of the strongly continuous semigroup generated by $-A$, and the regularity properties of the operator $\mathbf{g}$ to first obtain a mild solution to the equation, cf. also [23]. Then, to improve the regularity, as in [46], use a standard bootstrapping argument, where the improved regularity of the solution is obtained by using the maximal parabolic regularity of the operator A , jointly with the studied embedding results. We state the existence result of the semilinear equation in the following theorem. Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning that the additional assumptions on β required to prove the differentiability of $\mathbf{g}$ are not applied in the existence result and estimates that follow.

Theorem 4.1. *Let β , r , and q be as in Assumption 3.1. The semilinear equation (4.2) is well-posed in the following sense: For each $u \in L^p(\Omega)$, $p \geq \beta$, equation (4.2) has a unique solution $y \in \mathbb{W}^r(W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega), W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)) \hookrightarrow L^q(I; C(\bar{\Omega}))$. Moreover, the solution satisfies:*

$$(4.3a) \quad \|y\|_{C(\bar{I}; L^\beta(\Omega))} \leq C_1(1 + \|u\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}), \quad \text{for some } C_1 > 0,$$

$$(4.3b) \quad \|y\|_{\mathbb{W}_0^r} \leq C_2(1 + \|u\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}), \quad \text{for some } C_2 > 0.$$

Proof. Under Assumption 4.1, equation (4.2) has a unique mild solution $y \in C(\bar{I}; L^\beta(\Omega))$ (see e.g., [23, 47]), which satisfies the following integral equation

$$(4.4) \quad y(t) = e^{-tA}u + \int_0^t e^{-(t-\tau)A} \mathbf{g}(y(\tau)) \, d\tau.$$

To improve the regularity of the solution, we apply boot-strapping and observe that y fulfills the auxiliary linear problem

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + A\phi &= -\mathbf{g}(y(\cdot)) && \text{in } Q \\ \phi &= 0 && \text{on } \Sigma \\ \phi(x, 0) &= u && \text{in } \Omega, \end{aligned}$$

where $y \in C(\bar{I}; L^\beta(\Omega))$ stands for the solution of (4.2). To apply the maximal parabolic regularity of A and get the desired regularity for the solution of the auxiliary problem (4.5), it remains to prove that $\mathbf{g}(y(\cdot))$ belongs to $L^r(I; W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega))$. Let us show first that $\mathbf{g}(y(\cdot)) \in L^2(I; W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega))$. In fact, using the Lipschitz continuity of $\mathbf{g}$, the embedding $L^\beta(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)$, the boundedness of the nonlinearity at the origin with constant $\mathcal{K}_1$ (see Assumption 4.1.1), and the triangle inequality, it follows that

$$\|\mathbf{g}(y(t))\|_{W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)} \leq \mathbf{L}\|y(t)\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{g}(0)\|_{W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)} \leq \mathbf{L}\|y\|_{C(\bar{I}; L^\beta(\Omega))} + \|\mathbf{g}(0)\|_{W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)},$$

where $\|\mathbf{g}(0)\|_{W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)} \leq c\|\mathbf{g}(0)\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)} \leq c\mathcal{K}_1|\Omega| =: k$. Therefore,

$$\|\mathbf{g}(y(\cdot))\|_{L^2(I; W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega))}^2 \leq \int_0^T (\mathbf{L}\|y\|_{C(\bar{I}; L^\beta(\Omega))} + k)^2 \, dt < \infty.$$

Moreover, since $r < 2$, $L^2(I; W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)) \hookrightarrow L^r(I; W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega))$ holds, and consequently $\mathbf{g}(y(\cdot)) \in L^r(I; W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega))$. Therefore, $y \in \mathbb{W}^r(W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega), W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega))$ is the unique solution of (4.5), i.e., $y \in L^r(I; W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega))$ satisfies

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_0^T \langle (-\partial_t + A^*) \varphi, y(t) \rangle_{W^{-1,\beta'}, W_0^{1,\beta}} \, dt &= \int_0^T \langle \varphi, \mathbf{g}(y(t)) \rangle_{W_0^{1,\beta'}, W^{-1,\beta}} \, dt \\ &+ \langle \varphi(0), u \rangle_{(W^{-1,\beta'}, W_0^{1,\beta'})_{\frac{1}{r}, r}, (W^{-1,\beta}, W_0^{1,\beta})_{\frac{1}{r}, r}}, \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{D}([0, T]; W_0^{1,\beta'}(\Omega)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by definition, y is the unique solution of (4.2), and consequently, y belongs to $\mathbb{W}^r(W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega), W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega))$. The result holds applying the results of Theorem 3.1 to the auxiliary linear equation.

On the other hand, to prove the estimates, note that (4.3a) follows from (4.4) jointly with the boundedness of the semigroup by $\mathcal{M} > 0$, and the Lipschitz continuity of $\mathbf{g}(y(t))$. Then, by using the embedding $L^\beta(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)$, the boundedness of $\|\mathbf{g}(0)\|_{W^{-1,\beta}}$ and the triangle inequality, it holds that

$$\|y(t)\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)} \leq (c\mathcal{M}\|u\|_{L^\beta} + \mathcal{M}kT) + \int_0^t \mathcal{M}\mathbf{L}\|y(\tau)\|_{L^\beta} d\tau.$$

From here, by using Gronwall's lemma and setting $k_1 = \mathcal{M}kT$, it follows

$$\|y(t)\|_{L^\beta} \leq (c\mathcal{M}\|u\|_{L^\beta} + k_1) \exp\left(\int_0^t \mathcal{M}\mathbf{L} d\tau\right) \leq C_1(1 + \|u\|_{L^\beta}),$$

where $C_1 = \max\{c\mathcal{M} \exp(\mathcal{M}\mathbf{L}T), k_1 \exp(\mathcal{M}\mathbf{L}T)\} > 0$. Consequently, estimate (4.3a) holds. Estimate (4.3b) follows directly from (4.3a), the Lipschitz continuity of $\mathbf{g}(y(\cdot))$, and the boundedness of the nonlinearity at the origin. $\square$

Based on Theorem 4.1, we introduce the control-to-state mapping

$$S: L^\beta(\Omega) \longrightarrow \mathbb{W}_0^r, \quad u \mapsto S(u) = y,$$

as the solution operator associated with the semilinear parabolic problem (4.2). Even though we are using the same notation we used in the linear case, in this section, the operator S refers to the solution operator related to the semilinear PDE.

4.2. Continuity of the control-to-state mapping. This subsection is devoted to studying some continuity properties of S . They will later be used to prove the existence of solutions to the semilinear data assimilation problem. Their proofs follow standard arguments and can be found in a slightly different framework, for instance, in [46].

Lemma 4.1. *The solution operator S is Lipschitz continuous, i.e., there exists $\mathbf{L}_s > 0$ such that*

$$\|S(u_1) - S(u_2)\|_{\mathbb{W}_0^r} \leq \mathbf{L}_s \|u_1 - u_2\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}, \quad \forall u_1, u_2 \in L^\beta(\Omega).$$

Proof. Let us take $y_i = S(u_i)$, $i = 1, 2$. Subtracting the corresponding integral equations, and proceeding as in the proof of the estimates in Theorem 4.1, it follows that

$$\|y_1(t) - y_2(t)\|_{L^\beta} \leq \mathcal{M}\|u_1 - u_2\|_{L^\beta} + \mathcal{M} \int_0^t \mathbf{L}\|y_1(\tau) - y_2(\tau)\|_{L^\beta} d\tau.$$

Using Gronwall's lemma in the latter, the following inequality holds

$$(4.7) \quad \|y_1(t) - y_2(t)\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)} \leq L_1 \|u_1 - u_2\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)},$$

with $L_1 = \mathcal{M} \exp(\mathcal{M}\mathbf{L}T) > 0$. Further, let us consider the auxiliary equation:

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \hat{y}}{\partial t} + A\hat{y} &= \mathbf{g}(y_2(\cdot)) - \mathbf{g}(y_1(\cdot)) && \text{in } Q \\ \hat{y} &= 0 && \text{on } \Sigma \\ \hat{y}(x, 0) &= u_1 - u_2 && \text{in } \Omega, \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{y} = y_1 - y_2$. Thanks to the Lipschitz continuity of $\mathbf{g}(y(t))$, there exists a unique mild solution $\hat{y} \in C(\bar{I}; L^\beta(\Omega))$ of (4.8). Furthermore, noticing that $u_1 - u_2 \in L^\beta(\Omega)$ and its right-hand side belongs to $L^r(I; W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega))$, a boot-strapping argument yields higher

regularity of $\hat{y}$, that is $\hat{y} \in \mathbb{W}_0^r$. The maximal parabolic regularity of A implies that $(\partial_t + A) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{W}_0^r, L^r(I, W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)))$ [4, Proposition 2.1], and, consequently,

$$\|\hat{y}\|_{\mathbb{W}_0^r} \leq \|(\partial_t + A)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^r(I; W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)), \mathbb{W}_0^r)} \|\mathbf{g}(y_1(\cdot)) - \mathbf{g}(y_2(\cdot))\|_{L^r(I; W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega))}.$$

The boundedness of $(\partial_t + A)^{-1}$ by a positive constant K [2, Theorem 2.2.5] and the Lipschitz continuity of $\mathbf{g}(y(t))$ imply that

$$\|y_1 - y_2\|_{\mathbb{W}_0^r} \leq K\mathbf{L} \left(\int_0^T \|y_1(t) - y_2(t)\|_{L^\beta}^r dt \right)^{\frac{1}{r}}.$$

Using inequality (4.7), we can conclude the existence of a positive constant $\mathbf{L}_s := K\mathbf{L}L_1T$ such that the result holds. $\square$

Before showing a weak continuity result for the control-to-state mapping, we state a useful embedding. Similar results, with different restrictions on the indices, are presented, for instance, in [46, 8, 29].

Proposition 4.3. *The following compact embedding is satisfied*

$$(4.9) \quad \mathbb{W}^r(W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega), W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)) \hookrightarrow L^r(I; L^\beta(\Omega)).$$

Proof. Since $W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)$ (see, e.g., [8, pp.7]), from Proposition 2.2 the embedding

$$(4.10) \quad \mathbb{W}_0^r \hookrightarrow L^q(I; (W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega), W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega))_{\frac{1}{2},1}),$$

is compact as well with $q \geq 2$. Further, using Proposition 2.1 jointly with [53, Theorem 2.4.2.1], we get that $(W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega), W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega))_{\frac{1}{2},1} \hookrightarrow [W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega), W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega)]_{\frac{1}{2}} = L^\beta(\Omega)$, and, consequently $L^q(I; (W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega), W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega))_{\frac{1}{2},1}) \hookrightarrow L^q(I; L^\beta(\Omega))$. Moreover, since $r < 2 \leq q$, it follows

$$(4.11) \quad L^q(I; (W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega), W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega))_{\frac{1}{2},1}) \hookrightarrow L^q(I; L^\beta(\Omega)) \hookrightarrow L^r(I; L^\beta(\Omega)).$$

Finally, using embeddings (4.10), (4.11), and [1, Remark 6.4.2], we obtain that

$$(4.12) \quad \mathbb{W}^r(W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega), W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)) \hookrightarrow L^q(I; L^\beta(\Omega)) \hookrightarrow L^r(I; L^\beta(\Omega)).$$

$\square$

Lemma 4.2. *The control-to-state mapping S is weakly continuous from $L^\beta(\Omega)$ to $\mathbb{W}_0^r$.*

Proof. Let $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ in $L^\beta(\Omega)$ and set $y_n = S(u_n)$ and $y = S(u)$. Thanks to estimate (4.3b) and the boundedness of $\{u_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ in $L^\beta(\Omega)$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $\|y_n\|_{\mathbb{W}_0^r} \leq C$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Consequently, due to the reflexivity of $\mathbb{W}_0^r$, there exists a weakly convergent subsequence, denoted the same, and a limit point $\tilde{y} \in \mathbb{W}_0^r$, such that $y_n \rightharpoonup \tilde{y}$ in $\mathbb{W}_0^r$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Using the compact embedding (4.9), we get that $y_n \rightarrow \tilde{y}$ strongly in $L^r(I; L^\beta(\Omega))$. Further, thanks to the Lipschitz continuity of $\mathbf{g}(y(\cdot))$, $\mathbf{g}(y_n(\cdot)) \rightarrow \mathbf{g}(\tilde{y}(\cdot))$ strongly in $L^r(I; W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega))$. On the other hand, since $y_n \in \mathbb{W}_0^r$ is the unique solution of the following equation,

$$(4.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial y_n}{\partial t} + Ay_n + g(y_n(t)) &= 0 \\ y_n(0) &= u_n, \end{aligned}$$

then, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, y_n satisfies the following weak formulation:

$$\int_0^T \langle (-\partial_t + A^*) \varphi, y_n(t) \rangle_{W^{-1,\beta'}, W_0^{1,\beta}} dt = \int_0^T \langle \varphi, \mathbf{g}(y_n(t)) \rangle_{W_0^{1,\beta'}, W^{-1,\beta}} dt$$

$$+ \langle \varphi(0), u_n \rangle_{(W^{-1,\beta'}, W_0^{1,\beta'})_{\frac{1}{r}, r}, (W^{-1,\beta}, W_0^{1,\beta})_{\frac{1}{r}, r}} \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{D}([0, T[; W_0^{1,\beta'}(\Omega)).$$

Passing to the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and using the convergence of $y_n \rightharpoonup \tilde{y}$ in $\mathbb{W}_0^r$, $\mathbf{g}(y_n(\cdot)) \rightarrow \mathbf{g}(\tilde{y}(\cdot))$ in $L^r(I; W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega))$, and $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ in $L^\beta(\Omega)$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \langle (-\partial_t + A^*) \varphi, \tilde{y}(t) \rangle_{W^{-1,\beta'}, W_0^{1,\beta}} dt &= \int_0^T \langle \varphi, \mathbf{g}(\tilde{y}(t)) \rangle_{W_0^{1,\beta'}, W^{-1,\beta}} dt \\ &+ \langle \varphi(0), u \rangle_{(W^{-1,\beta'}, W_0^{1,\beta'})_{\frac{1}{r}, r}, (W^{-1,\beta}, W_0^{1,\beta})_{\frac{1}{r}, r}} \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{D}([0, T[; W_0^{1,\beta'}(\Omega)), \end{aligned}$$

and consequently, $\tilde{y} \in \mathbb{W}_0^r$ is the unique solution corresponding to the initial condition $u \in L^\beta(\Omega)$, i.e., $\tilde{y} = S(u)$. Moreover, due to the uniqueness of the solution, it follows that $\tilde{y} = y$, and the assertion holds. $\square$

4.3. Differentiability of the control-to-state mapping. This subsection deals with the differentiability properties of the semilinear solution operator S , which will be used later to derive first- and second-order optimality conditions.

Lemma 4.3. *Setting $4 < \beta \leq q$ and let $y \in C(\bar{I}; L^\beta(\Omega))$ be the mild solution of (4.2) and $h \in L^\beta(\Omega)$. There is a unique solution $\eta \in \mathbb{W}_0^r$ of the linearized equation*

$$(4.14) \quad \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial t} + A\eta + \mathbf{g}'(y(\cdot))\eta = 0, \quad \eta(x, 0) = h, \quad \eta = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma,$$

and there is a unique solution $\omega \in \mathbb{W}_0^r$ of the second-order linearized equation

$$(4.15) \quad \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial t} + A\omega + \mathbf{g}'(y(\cdot))\omega = -\mathbf{g}''(y(\cdot))\eta^2, \quad \omega(x, 0) = 0, \quad \omega = 0 \text{ on } \Sigma.$$

Moreover, η and ω satisfy the following estimates:

$$(4.16a) \quad \|\eta\|_{C(\bar{I}; L^\beta(\Omega))} \leq K_1 \|h\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}, \quad \text{for some } K_1 > 0,$$

$$(4.16b) \quad \|\eta\|_{\mathbb{W}_0^r} \leq K_2 \|h\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}, \quad \text{for some } K_2 > 0,$$

$$(4.17a) \quad \|\omega\|_{C(\bar{I}; L^\beta(\Omega))} \leq C_1 \|h\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}^2, \quad \text{for some } C_1 > 0,$$

$$(4.17b) \quad \|\omega\|_{\mathbb{W}_0^r} \leq C_2 \|h\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}^2, \quad \text{for some } C_2 > 0.$$

Proof. Since $\mathbf{g}'(y(t)): L^\beta(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)$ is linear and continuous, then for each $z \in W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega)$, it holds that

$$\|\mathbf{g}'(y(t))z\|_{W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)} \leq c \|\mathbf{g}'(y(t))z\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c \|\mathbf{g}'(y(t))\|_{L^{\frac{2\beta}{\beta-2}}(\Omega)} \|z\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)} \leq cL|\Omega|c_1 \|z\|_{W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega)}.$$

Moreover, since $z \in W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega) \subset W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)$, it yields

$$(4.18) \quad \|\mathbf{g}'(y(t))z\|_{W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)} \leq C_1 \|z\|_{W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega)} + C_2 \|z\|_{W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)}, \quad \text{for some } C_1, C_2 > 0.$$

On the other hand, since g_y comes from the limit of measurable functions, $\mathbf{g}'(y(t)) = g_y(y(\cdot, t))$ will be also (strongly) measurable (see [54, pp.202]). Therefore, from the perturbation result stated in Proposition 2.4, it follows that the linear operator $A + \mathbf{g}'(y(t))$ satisfies maximal parabolic $L^r(I; W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega))$ -regularity, and consequently, there exists a unique $\eta \in \mathbb{W}_0^r$ solution of the first-order linearized equation (4.14). The result for the second-order linearized equation (4.15) follows directly if $\mathbf{g}''(y(\cdot))\eta(\cdot)^2 \in L^r(I; W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega))$. In fact, taking into account the boundedness of $g_{yy}(\cdot)$ by $\mathcal{K}_2$, it follows that,

$$\|\mathbf{g}''(y(\cdot))\eta(\cdot)^2\|_{L^r(I; W^{-1,\beta})} \leq c \left(\int_0^T \|\mathbf{g}''(y(t))\eta^2(t)\|_{L^2}^r dt \right)^{\frac{1}{r}}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq c \left(\int_0^T \|\mathbf{g}''(y(t))\|_{L^{\tilde{v}}(\Omega)}^r \|\eta(t)\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}^{2r} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \leq C_1 \left(\int_0^T \left(\|\eta(t)\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}^2 \right)^r dt \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \\
&\leq C_1 \left(\int_0^T \|\eta(t)\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}^v dt \right)^{\frac{1}{v}} \left(\int_0^T \|\eta(t)\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}^{\frac{rv}{v-r}} dt \right)^{\frac{v-r}{rv}} = C_1 \|\eta\|_{L^v(I; L^\beta(\Omega))} \|\eta\|_{L^{\frac{rv}{v-r}}(I; L^\beta(\Omega))},
\end{aligned}$$

where $C_1 = c\mathcal{K}_2|\Omega|$. Moreover, since $v < \beta \leq q$ and $\frac{rv}{v-r} < \beta \leq q$, there exists $C_2 > 0$ such that $\|\mathbf{g}''(y(\cdot))\eta(\cdot)^2\|_{L^r(I; W^{-1, \beta})} \leq C_2 \|\eta\|_{L^q(I; L^\beta(\Omega))}^2$. Finally, by using embedding (4.12), we deduce that

$$(4.19) \quad \|\mathbf{g}''(y(\cdot))\eta(\cdot)^2\|_{L^r(I; W^{-1, \beta})} \leq C_2 \|\eta\|_{\mathbb{W}_0^r}^2,$$

which is finite since $\eta \in \mathbb{W}_0^r$. Therefore, $\omega \in \mathbb{W}_0^r$ is the unique solution of (4.15).

On the other hand, estimate (4.16b) follows directly by using (2.4) and embedding result (3.4). Likewise, estimate (4.17b) follows by using (2.4), (4.19), and (4.16b). Moreover, since $A + \mathbf{g}'(y(t))$ is the infinitesimal generator of a bounded analytic semigroup $T(t)$ [47, Theorem 2.1, Section 3.2], using the integral representation of the first-order linearized equation (see, e.g., [47, Section 4.2]) yields

$$(4.20) \quad \|\eta(t)\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)} = \|T(t)h\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)} \leq \|T(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(W^{-1, \beta}, L^\beta)} \|h\|_{W^{-1, \beta}(\Omega)} \leq \mathcal{M}_1 \|h\|_{W^{-1, \beta}(\Omega)},$$

where $\mathcal{M}_1 > 0$ represents the bound for $T(t)$. Then, since $L^\beta(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W^{-1, \beta}(\Omega)$, there exists $c > 0$ such that $\|\eta(t)\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)} \leq c\mathcal{M}_1 \|h\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}$, from where (4.16a) holds. Likewise, using the latter, Hölder's inequality, and the boundedness of $\|\mathbf{g}''(y(t))\|_{L^{\frac{2\beta}{\beta-4}}(\Omega)} \leq c_1$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\omega(t)\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)} &\leq \int_0^t \|T(\tau-t)\mathbf{g}''(y(\tau))\eta^2(\tau)\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)} d\tau \leq \mathcal{M}_1 \int_0^t \|\mathbf{g}''(y(\tau))\eta^2(\tau)\|_{W^{-1, \beta}(\Omega)} d\tau \\
&\leq c\mathcal{M}_1 \int_0^t \|\mathbf{g}''(y(\tau))\eta^2(\tau)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} d\tau \leq c\mathcal{M}_1 \int_0^t \|\mathbf{g}''(y(\tau))\|_{L^{\frac{2\beta}{\beta-4}}(\Omega)} \|\eta(\tau)\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}^2 d\tau \leq C_1 \|h\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C_1 > 0$, and consequently, estimate (4.17a) holds. $\square$

Remark 4.1. Since $L^2(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W^{-1, \beta}(\Omega)$, from (4.20), the following estimate holds

$$(4.21) \quad \|\eta(t)\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)} \leq C \|h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \text{ for some } C > 0.$$

Estimate (4.21) will be useful in proving the Lipschitz continuity of the second-order derivative of the cost functional.

Theorem 4.2. *The control-to-state mapping S is Fréchet-differentiable from $L^\beta(\Omega)$ to $\mathbb{W}_0^r$ with $\beta > 4$. Moreover, for $d = 2$ and $\beta > 6$, S is twice Fréchet-differentiable from $L^\beta(\Omega)$ to $\mathbb{W}_0^r$, where $y = S(u)$, $h \in L^\beta(\Omega)$, $\eta = S'(u)h$ and $\omega = S''(u)h^2$ correspond to the unique solutions of the linearized equation (4.14) and the second-order linearized equation (4.15), respectively.*

Proof. Let us consider the increment $y_h = S(u+h)$, with $h \in L^\beta(\Omega)$, and $y = S(u)$. Since $(\partial_t + A)^{-1} \in \mathcal{L}(L^r(I; W^{-1, \beta}(\Omega)), \mathbb{W}_0^r)$ is bounded by a positive constant K [2, Theorem 2.5.5] and $L^2(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W^{-1, \beta}(\Omega)$, there exists a positive constant c , such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|y_h - y - \eta\|_{\mathbb{W}_0^r} &\leq \|(\partial_t + A)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^r(I; W^{-1, \beta}), \mathbb{W}_0^r)} \|\mathbf{g}(y_h(\cdot)) - \mathbf{g}(y(\cdot)) - \mathbf{g}'(y(\cdot))\eta(\cdot)\|_{L^r(I; W^{-1, \beta})} \\
(4.22) \quad &\leq cK \left(\int_0^T \|\mathbf{g}(y_h(t)) - \mathbf{g}(y(t)) - \mathbf{g}'(y(t))\eta(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^r dt \right)^{\frac{1}{r}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, from the differentiability properties of $\mathbf{g}(y(t))$, stated in Proposition 4.2, there exist positive constants c_1 and c_2 such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{g}(y_h(t)) - \mathbf{g}(y(t)) - \mathbf{g}'(y(t))\eta(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\leq \|\mathbf{g}(y_h(t)) - \mathbf{g}(y(t)) - \mathbf{g}'(y(t))(y_h(t) - y(t))\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &+ \|\mathbf{g}'(y(t))(y_h(t) - y(t) - \eta(t))\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c_1\|y_h(t) - y(t)\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}^2 + c_2\|y_h(t) - y(t) - \eta(t)\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

From the Lipschitz property (4.7), there exists $L_1 > 0$ such that the first term in the sum above is bounded by $L_1^2\|h\|_{L^\beta}^2$. To get a bound for the second term, we analyze its integral equation. In fact,

$$\begin{aligned} \|y_h(t) - y(t) - \eta(t)\|_{L^\beta} &\leq c\mathcal{M} \int_0^t \|\mathbf{g}(y_h(\tau)) - \mathbf{g}(y(\tau)) - \mathbf{g}'(y(\tau))\eta(\tau)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} d\tau \\ &\leq C_1\|h\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}^2 + C_2 \int_0^t \|y_h(\tau) - y(\tau) - \eta(\tau)\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)} d\tau, \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constants C_1 and C_2 . Then, Gronwall's inequality yields

$$\|y_h(t) - y(t) - \eta(t)\|_{L^\beta} \leq C_1\|h\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}^2 \exp\left(\int_0^t C_2 d\tau\right) \leq C_1\|h\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}^2 \exp(C_2 T).$$

Therefore, $\|\mathbf{g}(y_h(t)) - \mathbf{g}(y(t)) - \mathbf{g}'(y(t))\eta(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^r \leq C_3\|h\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}^{2r}$, for some $C_3 > 0$. Replacing this in (4.22) yields

$$\|y_h - y - \eta\|_{\mathbb{W}_0^r} \leq cKC_3 \left(\int_0^T \|h\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}^{2r} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \leq C_4\|h\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}^2, \text{ for some } C_4 > 0.$$

Consequently,

$$\frac{\|y_h - y - \eta\|_{\mathbb{W}_0^r}}{\|h\|_{L^\beta}} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \|h\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0.$$

We will prove the second-order differentiability of S in the 2-dimensional case and with $\beta > 6$. Let us denote $\rho = y_h - y - \eta - \omega$. Using the boundedness of $(\partial_t + A)^{-1} \in \mathcal{L}(L^r(I; W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)), \mathbb{W}_0^r)$ by $K > 0$ and $L^2(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)$, there exists $c > 0$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho\|_{\mathbb{W}_0^r} &\leq K \left\| \mathbf{g}(y_h(\cdot)) - \mathbf{g}(y(\cdot)) - \mathbf{g}'(y(\cdot))\eta(\cdot) - \mathbf{g}'(y(\cdot))\omega(\cdot) - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{g}''(y(\cdot))(\eta(\cdot))^2 \right\|_{L^r(I; W^{-1,\beta})} \\ &\leq cK \left(\int_0^T \|\mathbf{g}(y_h(t)) - \mathbf{g}(y(t)) - \mathbf{g}'(y(t))\eta(t) - \mathbf{g}'(y(t))\omega(t) - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{g}''(y(t))\eta^2(t)\|_{L^2}^r dt \right)^{\frac{1}{r}}. \end{aligned}$$

From the differentiability properties of $\mathbf{g}(y(t))$, it can be proved that

$$\|\mathbf{g}(y_h(t)) - \mathbf{g}(y(t)) - \mathbf{g}'(y(t))\eta(t) - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{g}''(y(t))(\eta(t))^2\|_{L^2} \leq C_1\|h\|_{L^\beta}^3, \text{ for some } C_1 > 0,$$

and consequently, $\|\rho\|_{\mathbb{W}_0^r} \leq cK \int_0^T C_1^r \|h\|_{L^\beta}^{3r} dt \leq cKC_1 T \|h\|_{L^\beta}^3$, from where it holds

$$\frac{\|y_h - y - \eta - \omega\|_{\mathbb{W}_0^r}}{\|h\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}^2} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \|h\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0.$$

□

We state a Lipschitz continuity result for the solution to the first-order linearized equation η . This result will be helpful later in deriving the second-order optimality conditions.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $y = S(u)$, $\tilde{y} = S(\tilde{u})$ and $\eta = S'(u)h$, $\tilde{\eta} = S'(\tilde{u})h$ with $u, \tilde{u} \in U_{ad}$ and $h \in L^\beta(\Omega)$, there exists a positive constant C such that*

$$(4.23) \quad \|\eta(t) - \tilde{\eta}(t)\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)} \leq C\|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}\|h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Proof. Let η and $\tilde{\eta}$ be solutions of the linearized equations associated with $S(u)$ and $S(\tilde{u})$, respectively. Subtracting the corresponding PDEs, the study of the resulting integral equation yields the following

$$\|\eta(t) - \tilde{\eta}(t)\|_{L^\beta} \leq \mathcal{M} \int_0^t \|(\mathbf{g}'(y(\tau)) - \mathbf{g}'(\tilde{y}(\tau))) \eta(\tau)\|_{W^{-1,\beta}} + \|\mathbf{g}'(\tilde{y}(\tau))(\tilde{\eta}(\tau) - \eta(\tau))\|_{W^{-1,\beta}} d\tau,$$

the embedding $L^2(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)$, the differentiability properties of $\mathbf{g}$, the Lipschitz continuity of S , and estimate (4.21) yields

$$\|\eta(t) - \tilde{\eta}(t)\|_{L^\beta} \leq \mathcal{M} L_1 L T \|\tilde{u} - u\|_{L^\beta} \|h\|_{L^2} + \int_0^t \mathcal{M} L \|\tilde{\eta}(\tau) - \eta(\tau)\|_{L^\beta} d\tau.$$

Therefore, applying Gronwall's inequality in the later, estimate (4.23) is satisfied. $\square$

4.4. Existence. Making use of the solution operator S , we rewrite the cost functional, and thus the minimization problem, in the following way:

$$(4.24) \quad \min_{u \in U_{ad}} J(S(u), u) = \frac{1}{2} \iint_Q \sum_k [S(u) - z_o]^2 \delta(x - x_k) dt dx + \frac{1}{2} \|u - u_b\|_{B^{-1}}^2,$$

where $U_{ad} = \{u \in L^\beta(\Omega) : \int_\Omega |u(x)|^\beta dx \leq b\}$, for a given constant $b > 0$.

Theorem 4.3. *The data assimilation problem (4.24) has at least one optimal solution $\bar{u} \in U_{ad} \subset L^\beta(\Omega)$ with $\bar{y} = S(\bar{u}) \in \mathbb{W}_0^r$ being its associated optimal state.*

Proof. Since the functional $J(S(u), u)$ is nonnegative, it is bounded from below. Then, the infimum $j = \inf_{u \in U_{ad}} J(S(u), u) \in \mathbb{R}$ exists. Let $\{(y_n, u_n)\}_{n \geq 1}$ be a minimizing sequence, that is, let $u_n \in U_{ad}$ and $y_n = S(u_n)$, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be such that $J(y_n, u_n) \rightarrow j$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Since U_{ad} is weakly sequentially compact [54, Theorem 2.11], there exists a subsequence, denoted the same, and a limit $\bar{u} \in U_{ad}$ such that $u_n \rightharpoonup \bar{u}$ in U_{ad} as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, $\bar{u} \in U_{ad}$ is a candidate to be the optimal control. Now, using the weakly continuity of the solution operator (see Lemma 4.2), and the compact embedding $\mathbb{W}_0^r \hookrightarrow L^r(I; L^\beta(\Omega))$ (see Proposition 4.3), we obtain $y_n \rightarrow \bar{y}$ strongly in $L^r(I; L^\beta(\Omega))$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $\bar{y} = S(\bar{u})$. To show the optimality of $\bar{u} \in U_{ad}$, we will use the continuity of operator S in the first term of (4.24) and the weakly lower semicontinuity of the second one, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} j &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} J(y_n, u_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} \iint_Q \sum_k [S(u_n) - z_o]^2 \delta(x - x_k) dt dx + \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} \|u_n - u_b\|_{B^{-1}}^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \iint_Q \sum_k [S(\bar{u}) - z_o]^2 \delta(x - x_k) dt dx + \frac{1}{2} \|\bar{u} - u_b\|_{B^{-1}}^2 = J(\bar{y}, \bar{u}). \end{aligned}$$

By definition of the infimum, it must hold that $J(\bar{y}, \bar{u}) = j$, which proves the optimality. $\square$

4.5. First order optimality conditions. In this subsection, we derive a first-order optimality system of the data assimilation problem subject to a semilinear constraint. Let us start by studying the adjoint equation. We consider the following adjoint problem:

$$(4.25) \quad \begin{aligned} -p_t + A^* p + [\mathbf{g}'(y(\cdot))]^* p &= \nu & \text{in } Q \\ p &= 0 & \text{on } \Sigma \\ p(x, T) &= 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{aligned}$$

where $\nu \in L^{r'}(I; W^{-1,\beta'}(\Omega))$. The existence and regularity of solutions follow using results on the linearized equation (4.14), as well as the maximal parabolic regularity of the second-order operator. We formalize this result in the next lemma and carry out the details of the

proof for convenience. Note that due to the presence of $\mathbf{g}'(y)$, the result will hold under additional restriction on either or both β and d .

Lemma 4.5. *Let $\nu \in L^{r'}(I; W^{-1, \beta'}(\Omega))$. The adjoint equation (4.25) has a unique solution $p \in \mathbb{W}^{r'}(W_0^{1, \beta'}(\Omega), W^{-1, \beta'}(\Omega))$. Moreover, there exists a constant $c_p > 0$ such that*

$$\|p\|_{\mathbb{W}_0^{r'}} \leq c_p \|\nu\|_{L^{r'}(I; W^{-1, \beta'}(\Omega))}.$$

Proof. From the perturbation result, we can prove that $A + \mathbf{g}'(y(\cdot))$ satisfies maximal parabolic $L^r(I; W^{-1, \beta}(\Omega))$ -regularity. From here and using Lemma 2.1, it follows that $A^* + [\mathbf{g}'(y(\cdot))]^*$ satisfies maximal parabolic $L^{r'}(I; W^{-1, \beta'}(\Omega))$ -regularity, and consequently, $p \in \mathbb{W}_0^{r'}$ is the unique solution of (4.25) and the estimate holds. $\square$

As in the linear case, we rewrite the admissible set using the function

$$\psi: L^\beta(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad u \mapsto \psi(u) = b - \int_{\Omega} |u(x)|^\beta dx,$$

and, consequently, problem (4.24) can be expressed, analogous to (3.10), as:

$$(4.26) \quad \min f(u) = J(S(u), u), \quad u \in L^\beta(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \psi(u) \in K,$$

with $K = \{\kappa \in \mathbb{R} : \kappa \geq 0\}$ being a closed and convex set of $\mathbb{R}$.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $\bar{u} \in L^\beta(\Omega)$ be a local solution of (4.26) in the sense of L^β with $\bar{y} \in \mathbb{W}_0^r$ its associated optimal state. There exists a unique adjoint state $\bar{p} \in \mathbb{W}_0^{r'}$ and a multiplier $\bar{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying:*

State equation :

$$(4.27a) \quad \begin{aligned} \bar{y}_t + A\bar{y} + \mathbf{g}(\bar{y}(\cdot)) &= 0 & \text{in } Q \\ \bar{y} &= 0 & \text{on } \Sigma \\ \bar{y}(x, 0) &= \bar{u} & \text{in } \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Adjoint equation :

$$(4.27b) \quad \begin{aligned} -\bar{p}_t + A^*\bar{p} + [\mathbf{g}'(\bar{y}(\cdot))]^*\bar{p} &= \sum_k [S\bar{u} - z_o] \otimes \delta(x - x_k) & \text{in } Q \\ \bar{p} &= 0 & \text{on } \Sigma \\ \bar{p}(x, T) &= 0 & \text{in } \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Gradient equation :

$$(4.27c) \quad \bar{p}(0) + B^{-1}(\bar{u} - u_b) - \bar{\lambda}\psi'(\bar{u}) = 0 \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Complementarity System :

$$(4.27d) \quad \bar{\lambda} \geq 0, \quad b - \int_{\Omega} |\bar{u}(x)|^\beta dx \geq 0, \quad \bar{\lambda} \left(b - \int_{\Omega} |\bar{u}(x)|^\beta dx \right) = 0.$$

Proof. Proceeding as in the linear case and using the result of Zowe and Kurcyusz [56, pp.50], we obtain the existence of a Lagrange multiplier $\bar{\lambda} \geq 0$ that satisfies the complementarity system (4.27d) as well as the equation:

$$(4.28) \quad \langle f'(\bar{u}) - \bar{\lambda}\psi'(\bar{u}), h \rangle_{L^{\beta'}, L^\beta} = 0, \quad \forall h \in L^\beta(\Omega).$$

For any direction $h \in L^\beta(\Omega)$, we see

$$f'(\bar{u})h = \iint_Q \sum_k [S\bar{u}(x, t) - z_o(x, t)] \delta(x - x_k) S'(\bar{u})h \, dx dt + \int_{\Omega} (\bar{u}(x) - u_b(x)) B^{-1}h \, dx,$$

by the chain rule. Further, using the adjoint equation (4.27b) and relying on $\eta = S'(\bar{u})h \in \mathbb{W}_0^r \subset L^r(I; W^{1,\beta}(\Omega))$ being the solution of the linearized equation (4.14), it follows that

$$f'(\bar{u})h = \int_0^T \langle (-\partial_t + A^* + [\mathbf{g}'(\bar{y}(t))]^*)\bar{p}, \eta \rangle_{W^{-1,\beta'}, W^{1,\beta}} dt + \int_{\Omega} (\bar{u}(x) - u_b(x)) B^{-1}h \, dx.$$

Applying Green's identity to the latter and considering the linearized equation (4.14), it holds

$$\begin{aligned} f'(\bar{u})h &= \int_0^T \langle \bar{p}, (\partial_t + A + [\mathbf{g}'(\bar{y}(t))])\eta \rangle_{W^{1,\beta'}, W^{-1,\beta}} dt + \langle \bar{p}(0), \eta(0) \rangle_{(W^{-1,\beta'}, W^{1,\beta'})_{\frac{1}{r}, r}, (W^{-1,\beta}, W^{1,\beta})_{\frac{1}{r}, r}} \\ &\quad - \langle \bar{p}(T), \eta(T) \rangle_{(W^{-1,\beta'}, W^{1,\beta'})_{\frac{1}{r}, r}, (W^{-1,\beta}, W^{1,\beta})_{\frac{1}{r}, r}} + \int_{\Omega} (\bar{u}(x) - u_b(x)) B^{-1}h \, dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} (\bar{p}(0) + (\bar{u} - u_b)B^{-1}) h \, dx, \quad \forall h \in L^{\beta}(\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

Replacing the above result into equation (4.28), we finally get

$$\int_{\Omega} (\bar{p}(0) + (\bar{u} - u_b)B^{-1}) h(x) \, dx + \bar{\lambda}\beta \int_{\Omega} |\bar{u}(x)|^{\beta-2} \bar{u}(x) h(x) \, dx = 0, \forall h \in L^{\beta}(\Omega),$$

which corresponds to the weak formulation of (4.27c). $\square$

Remark 4.2. Likewise to the linear case, we can verify the uniqueness of the Lagrange multiplier $\bar{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}$ for each fixed control.

Next, we estate two useful estimates on the adjoint state. They will be used later in proving the Lipschitz continuity of f'' .

Lemma 4.6. *Let $u, \tilde{u} \in U_{ad}$ and $p, \tilde{p}$ be adjoint states associated with $y = S(u)$ and $\tilde{y} = S(\tilde{u})$, respectively. Then the following estimates hold:*

$$(4.29a) \quad \|p\|_{\mathbb{W}_0^{r'}} \leq C_1, \text{ for some } C_1 > 0,$$

$$(4.29b) \quad \|p - \tilde{p}\|_{\mathbb{W}_0^{r'}} \leq C_2 \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^{\beta}(\Omega)}, \text{ for some } C_2 > 0.$$

Proof. To prove estimate (4.29a), we apply the result of Lemma 4.5, then, proceeding as in the proof of Lemma A.1, we know that there exists a positive constant c_1 such that

$$\|p\|_{\mathbb{W}_0^{r'}} \leq c_1 \left(\sum_k \|Su\|_{\mathbb{W}_0^r} + 1 \right) \leq c_2 (\|u\|_{L^{\beta}} + 1), \quad \text{for some } c_2 > 0.$$

Finally, since $u \in U_{ad} \subset L^{\beta}(\Omega)$, taking $C_1 := c_2(b + 1)$, the first assertion holds. For proving (4.29b), let us subtract adjoint equations corresponding to p and $\tilde{p}$, that is:

$$\begin{aligned} -(p - \tilde{p})_t + A^*(p - \tilde{p}) + [\mathbf{g}'(y(\cdot))]^*(p - \tilde{p}) &= \sum_k [y - \tilde{y}] \otimes \delta(x - x_k) \\ &\quad - (\mathbf{g}'(\tilde{y}(\cdot)) - \mathbf{g}'(y(\cdot))) \tilde{p} \quad \text{in } Q \\ (p - \tilde{p}) &= 0 \quad \text{on } \Sigma \\ (p - \tilde{p})(x, T) &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

The right-hand side of the above equation belongs to $L^{r'}(I; W^{-1,\beta'}(\Omega))$. In fact, proceeding as in the proof of Lemma A.1 and using the embedding $L^2(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{\beta'}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W^{-1,\beta'}(\Omega)$, there exist positive constants c_1 and c_2 such that

$$I = \left\| \sum_k [Su - S\tilde{u}] \otimes \delta(x - x_k) - (\mathbf{g}'(\tilde{y}(\cdot)) - \mathbf{g}'(y(\cdot))) \tilde{p} \right\|_{L^{r'}(I; W^{-1,\beta'}(\Omega))}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq c_1 \sum_k \|Su - S\tilde{u}\|_{L^r(I; W^{1,\beta}(\Omega))} + c_2 \left(\int_0^T \|(\mathbf{g}'(\tilde{y}(t)) - \mathbf{g}'(y(t)))\tilde{p}(t)\|_{L^{\beta'}(\Omega)}^{r'} dt \right)^{1/r'} \\
&\leq c_1 L \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)} + c_2 \left(\int_0^T \|(\mathbf{g}'(\tilde{y}(t)) - \mathbf{g}'(y(t)))\|_{L^2}^{r'} \|\tilde{p}(t)\|_{L^s}^{r'} dt \right)^{1/r'},
\end{aligned}$$

where the latter holds since $\mathbb{W}^r(W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega), W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)) \subset L^r(I; W^{1,\beta}(\Omega))$ and using the Lipschitz continuity of S jointly with Hölder's inequality with $\frac{1}{\beta'} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{s}$. Additionally, from the Lipschitz continuity $\mathbf{g}'(\cdot)$, jointly with the embedding $W^{1,\beta'}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^s(\Omega)$ [9, Corollary 9.14], it follows that

$$I \leq c_1 L \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)} + c_4 \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)} \|\tilde{p}\|_{\mathbb{W}_0^{r'}}, \quad \text{for some } c_4 > 0.$$

The result holds by using estimate (4.29a) in the latter. $\square$

Before proving the Lipschitz property for the second derivative of the cost function, let us see its form. We remark that the Lipschitz result will be crucial in proving second-order optimality conditions.

Proposition 4.4. *Setting $d = 2$, $\beta > 6$ satisfying Assumption 3.1 and $u \in L^\beta(\Omega)$. Then, for each $h \in L^\beta(\Omega)$*

(4.30)

$$f''(u)h^2 = \iint_Q \sum_k \eta^2(x, t) \delta(x - x_k) dt dx + \int_\Omega h B^{-1} h \, dx - \int_0^T \left(\int_\Omega p(t) \mathbf{g}''(y(t)) \eta^2(t) dx \right) dt$$

where $\eta = S'(u)h$ and p denotes the adjoint state.

Proof. Due to the results of Theorem 4.2, we are allowed to compute the second-order derivative of the cost functional in the two-dimensional case, which yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
f''(u)h^2 &= \iint_Q \sum_k \eta^2(x, t) \delta(x - x_k) \, dx dt + \int_\Omega h B^{-1} h \, dx \\
&\quad + \iint_Q \sum_k [Su(x, t) - z_o] \delta(x - x_k) S''(u)[h]^2 \, dx dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the adjoint equation (4.27b) in the latter, $f''(u)h^2$ takes the form

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.31) \quad f''(u)h^2 &= \iint_Q \sum_k \eta^2(x, t) \delta(x - x_k) \, dx dt + \int_\Omega h B^{-1} h \, dx \\
&\quad + \int_0^T \left(\int_\Omega S''(u)[h]^2(t) (\partial_t + A + \mathbf{g}'(y(t)))^* p(t) \, dx \right) dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $S''(u)[h]^2 \in C(\bar{I}; L^\beta(\Omega))$ and $L^\beta(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^2(\Omega)$, it holds that $\omega(t) = S''(u)[h]^2(t) \in L^2(\Omega)$. Additionally, since $(\partial_t + A + \mathbf{g}'(y(\cdot))) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{W}_0^r, L^r(I; W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)))$, its adjoint operator map from $L^{r'}(I; W^{1,\beta'}(\Omega))$ to $\mathbb{W}_0^{r'}$. Consequently, $(\partial_t + A + \mathbf{g}'(y(t)))^* p(t) \in W_0^{1,\beta'}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^2(\Omega)$ [9, Theorem 9.16], and we can write (4.31) as

$$(4.32) \quad f''(u)h^2 = \iint_Q \sum_k \eta^2(x, t) \delta(x - x_k) \, dx dt + \int_\Omega h B^{-1} h \, dx \\ + \int_0^T (\omega(t), (\partial_t + A + \mathbf{g}'(y(t)))^* p(t))_{L^2(\Omega), L^2(\Omega)} \, dt.$$

Proceeding as in the proof Lemma 4.3 and using the form of the second-order linearized equation (4.15), it follows that $(\partial_t + A + \mathbf{g}'(y(t)))\omega(t) = -\mathbf{g}''(y(t))(\eta(t))^2 \in L^2(\Omega)$. Moreover, since $p(t) \in W_0^{1, \beta'}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^2(\Omega)$, and $\mathbf{g}''(\cdot)$ is bounded, we can prove that $p(t)\mathbf{g}''(y(t)) \in L^2(\Omega)$. In fact,

$$\|p(t)\mathbf{g}''(y(t))\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|p(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{g}''(y(t))\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} < \infty.$$

Additionally, note that $\eta^2(t) \in L^2(\Omega)$. In fact, since $\eta(t) \in L^\beta(\Omega)$ and $\beta > \frac{2\beta}{\beta-2}$, then $\eta(t) \in L^{\frac{2\beta}{\beta-2}}(\Omega)$, and the generalized Hölder's inequality yields

$$\|\eta(t)^2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|\eta(t)\|_{L^\beta} \|\eta(t)\|_{L^{\frac{2\beta}{\beta-2}}(\Omega)} < \infty.$$

Consequently, we are allowed to use integration by parts in Bochner spaces (see, e.g., [52, Lemma 7.3]) in equation (4.32), to get:

$$f''(u)h^2 = \iint_Q \sum_k \eta^2(x, t) \delta(x - x_k) \, dx dt + \int_\Omega h B^{-1} h \, dx \\ - \int_0^T (\mathbf{g}''(y(t))(\eta(t))^2, p(t))_{L^2(\Omega), L^2(\Omega)} \, dt,$$

taking into account that $p(T) = \omega(0) = 0$, which concludes the proof. $\square$

Proposition 4.5. *Setting $d = 2$ and $\beta > 6$, the second-order derivative of the cost functional f is Lipschitz continuous in the following sense: for $u, \tilde{u} \in U_{ad} \subset L^\beta(\Omega)$,*

$$(4.33) \quad |f''(u)h^2 - f''(\tilde{u})h^2| \leq L \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)} \|h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2,$$

where $L > 0$ and $h \in L^\beta(\Omega)$.

Proof. From the form of $f''(\cdot)$, it follows that

$$|f''(u)h^2 - f''(\tilde{u})h^2| \leq \overbrace{\iint_Q \sum_k |[\eta^2(x, t) - \tilde{\eta}^2(x, t)] \delta(x - x_k)| \, dt dx}^{I_1} \\ + \underbrace{\int_0^T \left| \int_\Omega \tilde{p}(t) \mathbf{g}''(\tilde{y}(t)) \tilde{\eta}^2(t) dx - \int_\Omega p(t) \mathbf{g}''(y(t)) \eta^2(t) dx \right| dt}_{I_2}.$$

Let us study I_1 , first by using Hölder inequality and then estimate (4.23), it holds

$$I_1 \leq \sum_k \int_0^T \|(\eta - \tilde{\eta})(\eta + \tilde{\eta}) \delta(x - x_k)\|_{L^1} dt \leq \sum_k \int_0^T \|(\eta - \tilde{\eta})(\eta + \tilde{\eta})\|_{L^{\beta/2}} \|\delta(x - x_k)\|_{L^{\beta/\beta-2}} dt$$

$$\leq \sum_k \int_0^T \|\eta - \tilde{\eta}\|_{L^\beta} \|\eta + \tilde{\eta}\|_{L^\beta} dt \leq c_1 \|h\|_{L^2} \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^\beta} \sum_k \int_0^T 2c_2 \|h\|_{L^2} dt,$$

where the last inequality holds by using inequality (4.21). Consequently, there exists some $C_1 > 0$ such that $I_1 \leq C_1 \|h\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}^2 \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}$. To study expression I_2 , let us add and subtract the term $p(t)\mathbf{g}''(\tilde{y}(t))\tilde{\eta}^2(t)$. Then, by rearranging terms, using Hölder's inequality, and the embedding $L^2(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)$, there exists a positive constant c such that

$$I_2 \leq c \int_0^T (\|p(t) - \tilde{p}(t)\|_{W^{1,\beta'}} \|\mathbf{g}''(\tilde{y}(t))\tilde{\eta}^2(t)\|_{L^2} + \|p(t)\|_{W^{1,\beta'}} \|\mathbf{g}''(\tilde{y}(t))\tilde{\eta}^2(t) - \mathbf{g}''(y(t))\eta^2(t)\|_{L^2}) dt.$$

From here and using the boundedness of $\mathbf{g}''(\cdot)$, by $K > 0$, and estimate (4.21), we get

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\leq cK \|h\|_{L^2}^2 \|p - \tilde{p}\|_{L^1(I; W^{1,\beta'})} + c \int_0^T \|p(t)\|_{W^{1,\beta'}} (\|\mathbf{g}''(\tilde{y}(t)) - \mathbf{g}''(y(t))\| \tilde{\eta}^2(t)\|_{L^2}) dt \\ &\quad + cK \int_0^T \|p(t)\|_{W^{1,\beta'}} \|\eta(t) - \tilde{\eta}(t)\|_{L^\beta} \|\eta(t) + \tilde{\eta}(t)\|_{L^\beta} dt \\ &\leq cK \|h\|_{L^2}^2 \|p - \tilde{p}\|_{L^{r'}(I; W^{1,\beta'})} + \|p\|_{L^{r'}(I; W^{1,\beta'})} (K_1 \|\tilde{u} - u\|_{L^\beta} \|h\|_{L^2}^2 + K_2 \|h\|_{L^2}^2 \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^\beta}), \end{aligned}$$

with, $K_1, K_2 > 0$, and where the last inequality holds from estimates (4.23) and (4.21). Grouping terms and using (4.29a) and (4.29b) yields $I_2 \leq C \|h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}$, which proves the result. $\square$

4.6. Second order optimality conditions. Second-order conditions are required in the nonlinear case since the first-order ones are not sufficient for optimality due to the non-convexity of the control-to-state mapping. In this subsection, we follow some of the ideas given in [38], where a general abstract problem defined in real Banach spaces is considered.

We start the analysis by building the so-called cone of critical directions. In the cases when the feasible set takes the form of a box constraint in $L^\infty(\Omega)$, the construction of the cone of critical directions is rather well-known, see for instance [11, 13, 14, 54]; where the cone is built by exploiting the structure of the L^∞ -norm. In our case, due to the problem's nature, the admissible set U_{ad} is a subset of $L^\beta(\Omega)$ (for the given values of β). Consequently, we follow the more general approach given in [38] and characterize the cone of feasible directions directly through the approximation of its sequential tangent cone. For that, we exploit the structure of the reformulated problem (4.26) and rewrite the set of admissible controls as $U_{ad} = \{u \in L^\beta(\Omega) : \psi(u) \geq 0\}$. Since the regularity condition (3.12) is satisfied, the linearized cone of U_{ad} at $\bar{u}$, $L(U_{ad}, \bar{u})$, approximates the feasible set at $\bar{u}$ [38, Theorem. 4.2]. Moreover, since the set $\mathcal{K}(\psi(\bar{u}))$ is closed in $\mathbb{R}$, the sequential tangent cone of U_{ad} at $\bar{u}$ and the linearizing one are the same, i.e., $T(U_{ad}, \bar{u}) = L(U_{ad}, \bar{u})$ (see e.g. [38, Lemma 2.1], [56, Lemma 3.1]), where

$$\begin{aligned} T(U_{ad}, \bar{u}) &= \{h \in L^\beta(\Omega) : h = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{u_n - \bar{u}}{t_n}, u_n \in U_{ad}, t_n > 0, t_n \rightarrow 0\}, \\ L(U_{ad}, \bar{u}) &= \{h \in L^\beta(\Omega) : \psi'(\bar{u})h \in \mathcal{K}(\psi(\bar{u}))\} = \{h : \psi'(\bar{u})h = \kappa - \vartheta\psi(\bar{u}), \kappa \geq 0, \vartheta \geq 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Additionally, taking the Lagrange multiplier of the problem, $\lambda \geq 0$, we define the approximating sequential tangent and linearized cones as follows:

$$T(U_{ad}^\lambda, \bar{u}) = \{h \in L^\beta(\Omega) : h = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{u_n - \bar{u}}{t_n}, u_n \in U_{ad}, t_n > 0, t_n \rightarrow 0, \lambda \psi(u_n) = 0\},$$

$$L(U_{ad}^\lambda, \bar{u}) = \{h \in L^\beta(\Omega) : \psi'(\bar{u})h = \kappa - \vartheta \psi(\bar{u}), \kappa \geq 0, \vartheta \geq 0, \lambda \psi'(\bar{u})h = 0, \lambda \geq 0\}.$$

Analyzing the approximating linearized cone when the multiplier is strictly greater than zero in one case, and when it is equal to zero in another, $L(U_{ad}^\lambda, \bar{u})$ takes the form:

$$(4.34) \quad L(U_{ad}^\lambda, \bar{u}) = \{h \in L^\beta(\Omega) : \psi'(\bar{u})h \geq 0 \text{ if } \psi(\bar{u}) = 0 \text{ and } \lambda = 0, \\ \psi'(\bar{u})h = 0 \text{ if } \psi(\bar{u}) = 0 \text{ and } \lambda > 0\},$$

see, e.g., [38, pp.102]. Let us introduce the Lagrangian for the problem (4.26):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(u, \lambda) &= \frac{1}{2} \iint_Q \sum_k [Su(x, t) - z_o(x, k)]^2 \delta(x - x_k) dt dx \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega (u - u_b) B^{-1} (u - u_b) dx - \lambda \left(b - \int_\Omega |u(x)|^\beta dx \right). \end{aligned}$$

We give the form of the second-order derivative of the Lagrangian, which follows directly from Proposition 4.4, where $\eta = S'(u)h$ and p denotes the adjoint state,

$$(4.35) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{uu}(u, \lambda)[h]^2 &= \iint_Q \sum_k \eta^2(x, t) \delta(x - x_k) dt dx + \int_\Omega h B^{-1} h dx \\ &\quad - \int_0^T \left(\int_\Omega p(t) \mathbf{g}''(y(t)) \eta^2(t) dx \right) dt + \lambda \beta (\beta - 1) \int_\Omega |u(x)|^{\beta-2} h^2(x) dx, \quad \forall h \in L^\beta(\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

Given the form of $\mathcal{L}_{uu}(u, \lambda)[h]^2$, it will be helpful to first prove a coercivity result of the second-order derivative of the Lagrangian and an estimate derived from the Lipschitz continuity of $f''(\cdot)$. We provide both results in the following propositions.

Proposition 4.6. *Let $d = 2$, $\beta > 6$, $u \in L^\beta(\Omega)$ and $y = S(u)$. If*

$$(4.36) \quad \sum_k \delta(x - x_k) - p(t) \mathbf{g}''(y(t)) \geq 0,$$

then there exists a constant $\kappa > 0$ such that $\mathcal{L}_{uu}(u, \lambda)[h]^2 \geq \kappa \|h\|_{L^2}^2$, $\forall h \in L^\beta(\Omega)$.

Proof. Using (4.35) and grouping terms, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{uu}(u, \lambda)[h]^2 &= \iint_Q \left(\sum_k \delta(x - x_k) - p(t) \mathbf{g}''(y(t)) \right) \eta^2(x, t) dx dt + \int_\Omega h B^{-1} h dx \\ &\quad + \lambda \beta (\beta - 1) \int_\Omega |u(x)|^{\beta-2} h^2(x) dx, \quad \forall h \in L^\beta(\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to (4.36) and due to the positivity of the terms involved, it holds that

$$\mathcal{L}_{uu}(u, \lambda)[h]^2 \geq \int_\Omega h(x) B^{-1} h(x) dx \geq \kappa \|h\|_{L^2}^2, \text{ for some } \kappa > 0,$$

where the last inequality holds since $B^{-1} \in \mathcal{L}(L^2(\Omega), L^2(\Omega))$ is a coercive mapping. Therefore, the coercivity of $\mathcal{L}_{uu}(\bar{u}, \bar{\lambda})$, in the L^2 -norm is guaranteed. $\square$

Remark 4.3. Observe that there exist non-linearities satisfying Assumptions 4.1 and Proposition 4.2, which also satisfy condition (4.36). In fact, let us take $g: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $y \mapsto g(y) = \epsilon \sin(y)$, with $\epsilon > 0$ a small value. Since $g_y(y) = \epsilon \cos(y)$ is bounded, by the mean value theorem, we can prove the global Lipschitz continuity of this function. Its second-order derivative is given by $g_{yy}(y) = -\epsilon \sin(y)$, which is also bounded. Therefore Assumptions 4.1 hold. On the other hand, fixing $d = 2$ and $\beta > 6$, $\mathbf{g}: L^\beta(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)$, with $y(t) \mapsto \mathbf{g}(y(t)) = \epsilon \sin(y(t))$ defines the superposition operator. The global Lipschitz continuity of $\mathbf{g}$, i.e.,

$$\|\epsilon \sin(y(t)) - \epsilon \sin(z(t))\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq L \|y(t) - z(t)\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}, \forall y(t), z(t) \in L^\beta(\Omega)$$

follows directly from the Lipschitz continuity of g and the embedding $L^\beta(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^2(\Omega)$. Moreover, the first- and second-order Fréchet differentiability of $\mathbf{g}$ from $L^\beta(\Omega)$ to $L^2(\Omega)$ hold (see, e.g., [54, Lemma 4.12] and [54, Theorem 4.22]).

Additionally, from the boundedness of the $\sin(\cdot)$ function and for sufficiently small values of ϵ , it holds that

$$\sum_k \delta(x - x_k) - p(t) \mathbf{g}''(y(t)) \geq 1 + \epsilon p(t) \sin(y(t)) \geq 0,$$

that is, the positivity assumption (4.36) holds.

Proposition 4.7. *Setting $d = 2$ and $\beta > 6$, let $\bar{u} \in U_{ad}$ be a local solution of problem (4.26) and $u, \tilde{u} \in U_{ad}$, then there exists $L > 0$ such that*

$$(4.37) \quad \mathcal{L}_{uu}(\tilde{u}, \bar{\lambda})[u - \bar{u}]^2 - \mathcal{L}_{uu}(\bar{u}, \bar{\lambda})[u - \bar{u}]^2 \geq -L \|\tilde{u} - \bar{u}\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)} \|u - \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$

Proof. Note that $\mathcal{L}(\bar{u}, \bar{\lambda}) = f(\bar{u}) - \bar{\lambda} \psi(\bar{u})$, where $\bar{u} \in U_{ad}$ is a local solution of (4.26). Therefore, from the complementarity system (4.27d), $\bar{\lambda} \psi(\bar{u}) = 0$ and consequently $\mathcal{L}(\bar{u}, \bar{\lambda}) = f(\bar{u})$. Then, from the Lipschitz continuity of $f''(\cdot)$ and the form of $\psi''(\cdot)$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{L}_{uu}(\tilde{u}, \bar{\lambda}) - \mathcal{L}_{uu}(\bar{u}, \bar{\lambda}))[u - \bar{u}, u - \bar{u}] &= (f''(\tilde{u}) - f''(\bar{u}))[u - \bar{u}, u - \bar{u}] - \bar{\lambda} \psi''(\tilde{u})(u - \bar{u})^2 \\ &\geq -L \|\tilde{u} - \bar{u}\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)} \|u - \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \bar{\lambda} \beta (\beta - 1) \int_{\Omega} |\tilde{u}(x)|^{\beta-2} (u(x) - \bar{u}(x))^2 dx \geq -L \|\tilde{u} - \bar{u}\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)} \|u - \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds since $\bar{\lambda} \beta (\beta - 1) \int_{\Omega} |\tilde{u}(x)|^{\beta-2} (u(x) - \bar{u}(x))^2 dx \geq 0$. $\square$

Theorem 4.5. *Let $d = 2$, $\beta > 6$, and $\bar{u} \in U_{ad}$ such that the regularity condition (3.12) holds. If $\bar{u}$ satisfies the first-order optimality conditions, and there exists $\kappa > 0$ such that*

$$(4.38) \quad \mathcal{L}_{uu}(u, \lambda)[h, h] \geq \kappa \|h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2, \quad \forall h \in L(U_{ad}^\lambda, \bar{u}).$$

Then there exist $\gamma > 0$ and $\sigma > 0$ such that the quadratic growth condition

$$(4.39) \quad f(u) \geq f(\bar{u}) + \sigma \|u - \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \quad \forall u \in U_{ad} \text{ s.t. } \|u - \bar{u}\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)} \leq \gamma$$

is satisfied.

Proof. Taking $\bar{u} \in U_{ad}$, there are two possible cases: $\psi(\bar{u}) > 0$ and $\psi(\bar{u}) = 0$.

Case 1: $\psi(\bar{u}) > 0$.

Since $\bar{u}$ belongs to the inactive set $\{u \in L^\beta(\Omega) : \int_{\Omega} |u(x)|^\beta < b\}$, the direction where condition (4.38) is satisfied, can be chosen freely. Let $u \in L^\beta(\Omega)$ be admissible for the problem. Then, by using a Taylor expansion, it holds that

$$\mathcal{L}(u, \bar{\lambda}) = \mathcal{L}(\bar{u}, \bar{\lambda}) + \mathcal{L}_u(\bar{u}, \bar{\lambda})(u - \bar{u}) + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_{uu}(u_\epsilon, \bar{\lambda})[u - \bar{u}, u - \bar{u}],$$

where $u_\epsilon = \bar{u} - \epsilon(u - \bar{u})$, with $0 < \epsilon < 1$. Taking into account the definition of $\mathcal{L}(\bar{u}, \bar{\lambda})$, and using (4.28) jointly with the complementarity condition (4.27d), from where $\bar{\lambda} = 0$, it follows

$$f(u) = f(\bar{u}) + \frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{L}_{uu}(u_\epsilon, \bar{\lambda}) - \mathcal{L}_{uu}(\bar{u}, \bar{\lambda}))[u - \bar{u}, u - \bar{u}] + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}_{uu}(\bar{u}, \bar{\lambda})[u - \bar{u}, u - \bar{u}].$$

Applying the coercivity condition (4.38) in the direction $u - \bar{u} \in L^\beta(\Omega)$, possible since in *Case 1* directions are freely chosen, and estimate (4.37), we get

$$f(u) \geq f(\bar{u}) - \frac{L}{2}\|u_\epsilon - \bar{u}\|_{L^\beta}\|u - \bar{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\kappa}{2}\|u - \bar{u}\|_{L^2}^2 \geq f(\bar{u}) - \frac{L}{2}\|u - \bar{u}\|_{L^\beta}\|u - \bar{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\kappa}{2}\|u - \bar{u}\|_{L^2}^2,$$

where the last inequality follows since $\|u_\epsilon - \bar{u}\|_{L^\beta} = \epsilon\|u - \bar{u}\|_{L^\beta}$, with $\epsilon < 1$. Now, taking $0 < \gamma < \frac{\kappa}{L}$, if $\|u - \bar{u}\|_{L^\beta} \leq \gamma$, it holds that

$$f(u) \geq f(\bar{u}) - \frac{L\gamma}{2}\|u - \bar{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\kappa}{2}\|u - \bar{u}\|_{L^2}^2 = f(\bar{u}) + \frac{\kappa - L\gamma}{2}\|u - \bar{u}\|_{L^2}^2,$$

the result follows taking $\sigma = \frac{\kappa - L\gamma}{2} > 0$ and $0 < \gamma < \frac{\kappa}{L}$.

Case 2: $\psi(\bar{u}) = 0$.

Taking $u \in U_{ad}$, let us prove first that $u - \bar{u} \in L(U_{ad}^\lambda, \bar{u})$. From the approximating linearized cone structure (4.34), we need to verify the following assertions:

$$(4.40) \quad \bar{\lambda} \geq 0, \quad \psi'(\bar{u})(u - \bar{u}) \geq 0, \quad \bar{\lambda}\psi'(\bar{u})(u - \bar{u}) = 0.$$

The non-negativity of the Lagrange multiplier $\bar{\lambda}$ is guaranteed by (4.27d). To get the second assertion, we compute $\psi'(\bar{u})(u - \bar{u}) = \beta b - \beta \int_\Omega |\bar{u}(x)|^{\beta-2} \bar{u}(x)u(x) dx$. From here and using an extension of Hölder's inequality [9, pp.93] in the second term, we get:

$$\int_\Omega |\bar{u}(x)|^{\beta-2} \bar{u}(x)u(x) dx \leq \|\bar{u}^{\beta-1}\|_{L^{\beta'}}\|u\|_{L^\beta} \leq \|\bar{u}\|_{L^\beta}^{\beta-1}\|u\|_{L^\beta} \leq b^{\frac{\beta-1}{\beta}}b^{\frac{1}{\beta}} = b,$$

and, replacing the above computation in the derivative, we get that

$$(4.41) \quad \psi'(\bar{u})(u - \bar{u}) \geq 0.$$

To get the third one, note that if (4.41) is satisfied with equality, then $\bar{\lambda}\psi'(\bar{u})(u - \bar{u}) = 0$ trivially holds for any value of $\bar{\lambda}$, and particularly for $\bar{\lambda} > 0$. Otherwise, if $\psi'(\bar{u})(u - \bar{u}) > 0$, we can only get the assertion by taking $\bar{\lambda} = 0$. Therefore, assertions (4.40) are satisfied, i.e., we have proved that $u - \bar{u} \in L(U_{ad}^\lambda, \bar{u})$. Consequently, the coercivity condition (4.38) holds for $u - \bar{u} \in L(U_{ad}^\lambda, \bar{u})$. Using estimate (4.37) and proceeding as in *Case 1*, we get:

$$f(u) \geq f(\bar{u}) + \frac{\kappa}{2}\|u - \bar{u}\|_{L^2}^2 - \frac{L\gamma}{2}\|u - \bar{u}\|_{L^2}^2 = f(\bar{u}) + \frac{\kappa - L\gamma}{2}\|u - \bar{u}\|_{L^2}^2.$$

The result follows taking $\sigma = \frac{\kappa - L\gamma}{2} > 0$ and $0 < \gamma < \frac{\kappa}{L}$. $\square$

To conclude, we state the second-order necessary condition result. Its proof is classical and can be found in, e.g., [38, Theorem 3.3].

Theorem 4.6. *If $d = 2$ and $\bar{u} \in U_{ad}$ is a locally optimal solution of (4.26), with respect to $L^\beta(\Omega)$, then*

$$(4.42) \quad \mathcal{L}_{uu}(\bar{u}, \bar{\lambda})[h, h] \geq 0, \quad \forall h \in L(U_{ad}^\lambda, \bar{u}).$$

Proof. Due to the regularity of $\bar{u}$, $L(U_{ad}^\lambda, \bar{u}) = T(U_{ad}^\lambda, \bar{u})$. Therefore, for any direction $h \in T(U_{ad}^\lambda, \bar{u})$, there exists a sequence $\{u_n\}_{n \geq 1} \subset U_{ad}$, $t_n > 0$ with $t_n \rightarrow 0$ such that $h = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{u_n - \bar{u}}{t_n}$, and $\bar{\lambda}\psi(u_n) = 0$. Then, by using a Taylor expansion, it holds that

$$\mathcal{L}(u_n, \bar{\lambda}) = \mathcal{L}(\bar{u}, \bar{\lambda}) + \mathcal{L}_u(\bar{u}, \bar{\lambda})(u_n - \bar{u}) + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}_{uu}(\bar{u}, \bar{\lambda})[u_n - \bar{u}, u_n - \bar{u}] + o(\|u_n - \bar{u}\|_{L^\beta}^2).$$

Using above the first-order optimality conditions, the optimality of $\bar{u}$, and replacing $\mathcal{L}(u_n, \bar{\lambda}) = f(u_n) - \bar{\lambda}\psi(u_n) = f(u_n)$, it follows that

$$0 \leq f(u_n) - f(\bar{u}) = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_{uu}(\bar{u}, \bar{\lambda})[u_n - \bar{u}, u_n - \bar{u}] + o(\|u_n - \bar{u}\|_{L^\beta}^2).$$

Dividing by $t_n^2 = \frac{\|u_n - \bar{u}\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}^2}{\|h\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)}^2} > 0$ in the expression above and taking $n \rightarrow \infty$, it follows that $0 \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}_{uu}(\bar{u}, \bar{\lambda})[h, h]$ and the assertion holds. $\square$

APPENDIX A. REGULARITY OF THE DATA ASSIMILATION ADJOINT STATE

Let us prove that the solution of the adjoint equation (3.11b) belongs to the space $\mathbb{W}^{r'}(W_0^{1,\beta'}(\Omega), W^{-1,\beta'}(\Omega))$ with r' and β' the conjugate exponents of r and β , which are taken as in Theorem 3.1. This result comes directly from Lemma 2.1 as long as the right-hand side of this equation belongs to a suitable space. We formalize this result in the following lemma.

Lemma A.1. *Take β and r as in Theorem 3.1, with β' and r' their conjugate exponents and setting $\beta > r' > d$. Then, the right-hand side of equation (3.11b) belongs to $L^{r'}(I; W^{-1,\beta'}(\Omega))$.*

Proof. Since z_o is given, fixed data, and the sum involved is finite, to verify the assertion it is only necessary to show that $S\bar{u} \otimes \delta(x - x_k) \in L^{r'}(I; W^{-1,\beta'}(\Omega))$. Since $\beta > d$, using the Rellich-Kondrachov compact embeddings, it follows that $W^{1,\beta}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow C(\bar{\Omega})$ (see e.g. [19, 1]), and, therefore $\mathcal{M}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W^{-1,\beta'}(\Omega)$. Consequently, $L^{r'}(I; \mathcal{M}(\Omega)) \hookrightarrow L^{r'}(I; W^{-1,\beta'}(\Omega))$. From the last embedding and using the norm definition in the weakly measurable space, there exists a constant $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|S\bar{u} \otimes \delta(x - x_k)\|_{L^{r'}(I; W^{-1,\beta'}(\Omega))} &\leq c_1 \|S\bar{u} \otimes \delta(x - x_k)\|_{L^{r'}(I; \mathcal{M}(\Omega))} \\ &= c_1 \left(\int_0^T \left(\sup_{\substack{\|\varphi\|_\infty \leq 1 \\ \varphi \in C_0(\Omega)}} \left\{ \int_\Omega \varphi(x) S\bar{u}(x) \delta(x - x_k) dx \right\} \right)^{r'} dt \right)^{1/r'} \\ &\leq c_1 \left(\int_0^T \left(\sup_{\substack{\|\varphi\|_\infty \leq 1 \\ \varphi \in C_0(\Omega)}} \{ |\varphi(x_k) S\bar{u}(x_k)| \} \right)^{r'} dt \right)^{1/r'} \leq c_1 \left(\int_0^T \left| \int_\Omega S\bar{u}(x) \delta(x - x_k) dx \right|^{r'} dt \right)^{1/r'} \\ &\leq c_1 \int_0^T \left(\int_\Omega |S\bar{u}(x) \delta(x - x_k)|^{r'} dx \right)^{1/r'} dt = c_1 \int_0^T \|S\bar{u}(x) \delta(x - x_k)\|_{L^{r'}(\Omega)} dt, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds due to Minkowski's inequality for integrals [1, Theorem 2.9]. Now, taking $s > 0$ such that $\frac{1}{\beta} + \frac{1}{s} = \frac{1}{r'}$, the following is guaranteed, see [1, Corollary 2.5]:

$$\|S\bar{u}(x) \delta(x - x_k)\|_{L^{r'}(\Omega)} \leq \|S\bar{u}\|_{L^\beta(\Omega)} \|\delta(x - x_k)\|_{L^s(\Omega)}.$$

Furthermore, since $\|\delta(x - x_k)\|_{L^s(\Omega)} \leq 1$ and $W^{1,\beta}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^\beta(\Omega)$, it follows that there exists a constant $c_2 > 0$ such that $\|S\bar{u}(x)\delta(x - x_k)\|_{L^{r'}(\Omega)} \leq c_2\|S\bar{u}\|_{W^{1,\beta}(\Omega)}$. Thus,

$$(A.1) \quad \int_0^T \|S\bar{u}(x)\delta(x - x_k)\|_{L^{r'}(\Omega)} dt \leq c_2 \int_0^T \|S\bar{u}\|_{W^{1,\beta}(\Omega)} dt.$$

Additionally, we know that $S\bar{u} \in \mathbb{W}^r(W_0^{1,\beta}(\Omega), W^{-1,\beta}(\Omega)) \subset L^r(I; W^{1,\beta}(\Omega))$, and, therefore $\|S\bar{u}\|_{L^r(I; W^{1,\beta}(\Omega))}$ is finite. Moreover $L^r(I; W^{1,\beta}(\Omega)) \hookrightarrow L^1(I; W^{1,\beta}(\Omega))$, from where $\|S\bar{u}\|_{L^1(I; W^{1,\beta}(\Omega))}$ is also finite. Then, thanks to (A.1), the assertion holds. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Adams and J. Fournier. *Sobolev Spaces*, volume 140. Pure and Applied Mathematics series, Elsevier, 2003.
- [2] H. Amann. *Linear and Quasilinear Parabolic Problems: Volume I: Abstract Linear Theory*, volume 11. Birkhäuser, Basel, 1995.
- [3] H. Amann. Linear parabolic problems involving measures. *Rev. R. Acad. Cien. Serie A. Mat. (RACSAM)*, 95:85–119, 2001.
- [4] H. Amann. Nonautonomous parabolic equations involving measures. *Journal of Mathematical Sciences*, 130(4):4780–4802, 2005.
- [5] Wolfgang Arendt, Ralph Chill, Simona Fornaro, and César Poupaud. Lp-maximal regularity for non-autonomous evolution equations. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 237(1):1–26, 2007.
- [6] M. Asch, M. Bocquet, and M. Nodet. *Data Assimilation: Methods, Algorithms, and Applications*, volume 11. SIAM, 2016.
- [7] J. Bergh and J. Löfström. *Interpolation Spaces: An Introduction*, volume 223. Springer, 1976.
- [8] L. Bonifacius and I. Neitzel. Second order optimality conditions for optimal control of quasilinear parabolic equations. *Mathematical Control & Related Fields*, 8(1):1–34, 2018.
- [9] H. Brezis. *Functional Analysis, Sobolev Spaces and Partial Differential Equations*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2010.
- [10] E. Casas. Control of an elliptic problem with pointwise state constraints. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 24(6):1309–1318, 1986.
- [11] E. Casas, J.C De Los Reyes, and F. Tröltzsch. Sufficient second-order optimality conditions for semilinear control problems with pointwise state constraints. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 19(2):616–643, 2008.
- [12] E. Casas, M. Mateos, and B. Vexler. New regularity results and improved error estimates for optimal control problems with state constraints. *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations*, 20(3):803–822, 2014.
- [13] E. Casas and F. Tröltzsch. Second order analysis for optimal control problems: Improving results expected from abstract theory. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 22(1):261–279, 2012.
- [14] E. Casas and F. Tröltzsch. Second order optimality conditions and their role in pde control. *Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung*, 117(1):3–44, 2015.
- [15] E. Casas, B. Vexler, and E. Zuazua. Sparse initial data identification for parabolic pde and its finite element approximations. 2015.
- [16] Eduardo Casas and Konstantinos Chrysafinos. Analysis and optimal control of some quasilinear parabolic equations. *Math. Control Relat. Fields*, 8(3-4):607–623, 2018.
- [17] P. Castro and J.C. De Los Reyes. A bilevel learning approach for optimal observation placement in variational data assimilation. *Inverse Problems*, 2019.
- [18] C. Christof and B. Vexler. New regularity results and finite element error estimates for a class of parabolic optimal control problems with pointwise state constraints. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var*, 27(4), 2021.
- [19] P. Ciarlet. *Linear and Nonlinear Functional Analysis with Applications*, volume 130. Siam, 2013.
- [20] J.C. De Los Reyes, P. Merino, J. Rehberg, and F. Tröltzsch. Optimality conditions for state-constrained pde control problems with time-dependent controls. 2008.
- [21] K. Disser, M. Meyries, and J. Rehberg. A unified framework for parabolic equations with mixed boundary conditions and diffusion on interfaces. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 430(2):1102–1123, 2015.

- [22] K. Disser, AFM Ter Elst, and J. Rehberg. Hölder estimates for parabolic operators on domains with rough boundary. *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. Classe di scienze*, 17(1):65–79, 2017.
- [23] C. Fabre, J.P. Puel, and E. Zuazua. On the density of the range of the semigroup for semilinear heat equations. In *Control and optimal design of distributed parameter systems*, pages 73–91. Springer, 1995.
- [24] H. Goldberg, W. Kampowsky, and F. Tröltzsch. On nemytskij operators in lp-spaces of abstract functions. *Mathematische Nachrichten*, 155(1):127–140, 1992.
- [25] K. Gröger. A $w^{1,p}$ -estimate for solutions to mixed boundary value problems for second order elliptic differential equations. *Mathematische Annalen*, 283(4):679–687, 1989.
- [26] R. Haller-Dintelmann and J. Rehberg. Maximal parabolic regularity for divergence operators including mixed boundary conditions. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 247(5):1354–1396, 2009.
- [27] R. Herzog, C. Meyer, and A. Stötzner. Existence of solutions of a thermoviscoplastic model and associated optimal control problems. *Nonlinear Analysis: Real World Applications*, 35:75–101, 2017.
- [28] F. Hoppe and I. Neitzel. Convergence of the sqp method for quasilinear parabolic optimal control problems. *Optimization and Engineering*, pages 1–47, 2020.
- [29] Fabian Hoppe and Ira Neitzel. Optimal control of quasilinear parabolic PDEs with state-constraints. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 60(1):330–354, 2022.
- [30] A. D. Ioffe. Necessary and sufficient conditions for a local minimum. III. Second order conditions and augmented duality. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 17(2):266–288, 1979.
- [31] E. Kalnay. *Atmospheric Modeling, Data Assimilation and Predictability*. Cambridge university press, 2003.
- [32] P. Korn. Strong solvability of a variational data assimilation problem for the primitive equations of large-scale atmosphere and ocean dynamics. *Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 31(3):1–53, 2021.
- [33] K. Krumbiegel and J. Rehberg. Second order sufficient optimality conditions for parabolic optimal control problems with pointwise state constraints. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 51(1):304–331, 2013.
- [34] O. Ladyzhenskaia and N. Solonnikov, V. and Ural’ceva. *Linear and Quasi-linear Equations of Parabolic Type*, volume 23. American Mathematical Soc., 1968.
- [35] F. Le Dimet and O. Talagrand. Variational algorithms for analysis and assimilation of meteorological observations: theoretical aspects. *Tellus A: Dynamic Meteorology and Oceanography*, 38(2):97–110, 1986.
- [36] F.X. Le Dimet, I.M. Navon, and R. Ștefănescu. Variational data assimilation: Optimization and optimal control. In *Data Assimilation for Atmospheric, Oceanic and Hydrologic Applications (Vol. III)*, pages 1–53. Springer, 2017.
- [37] D. Leykekhman, B. Vexler, and D. Walter. Numerical analysis of sparse initial data identification for parabolic problems. *ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis*, 54(4):1139–1180, 2020.
- [38] H. Maurer and J. Zowe. First and second-order necessary and sufficient optimality conditions for infinite-dimensional programming problems. *Mathematical Programming*, 16:98–110, 1979.
- [39] Vladimir Maz’ya. *Sobolev Spaces*. Springer, 2013.
- [40] D. Meidner, R. Rannacher, and B. Vexler. A priori error estimates for finite element discretizations of parabolic optimization problems with pointwise state constraints in time. *SIAM journal on control and optimization*, 49(5):1961–1997, 2011.
- [41] H. Meinlschmidt, C. Meyer, and J. Rehberg. Optimal control of the thermistor problem in three spatial dimensions, part 1: Existence of optimal solutions. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 55(5):2876–2904, 2017.
- [42] H. Meinlschmidt, C. Meyer, and J. Rehberg. Optimal control of the thermistor problem in three spatial dimensions, part 2: Optimality conditions. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 55(4):2368–2392, 2017.
- [43] H. Meinlschmidt and J. Rehberg. Hölder-estimates for non-autonomous parabolic problems with rough data. *Evolution Equations & Control Theory*, 5(1):147, 2016.
- [44] P. Merino, I. Neitzel, and F. Tröltzsch. An adaptive numerical method for semi-infinite elliptic control problems based on error estimates. *Optimization Methods and Software*, 30(3):492–515, 2015.
- [45] P. Merino, F. Tröltzsch, and B. Vexler. Error estimates for the finite element approximation of a semilinear elliptic control problem with state constraints and finite dimensional control space. *ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis*, 44(1):167–188, 2010.
- [46] C. Meyer and L. Susu. Optimal control of nonsmooth, semilinear parabolic equations. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 55(4):2206–2234, 2017.

- [47] A. Pazy. *Semigroups of Linear Operators and Applications to Partial Differential Equations*, volume 44. Springer, 1983.
- [48] K. Pieper and B. Vexler. A priori error analysis for discretization of sparse elliptic optimal control problems in measure space. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 51(4):2788–2808, 2013.
- [49] J.P. Raymond and F. Tröltzsch. Second order sufficient optimality conditions for nonlinear parabolic control problems with state constraints. *Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems-A*, 6(2):431, 2000.
- [50] J.P. Raymond and H. Zidani. Pontryagin’s principle for state-constrained control problems governed by parabolic equations with unbounded controls. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 36(6):1853–1879, 1998.
- [51] J.P. Raymond and H. Zidani. Hamiltonian pontryagin’s principles for control problems governed by semilinear parabolic equations. *Applied Mathematics and Optimization*, 39(2):143–177, 1999.
- [52] T. Roubíček. *Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations with Applications*, volume 153. Birkhäuser, 2013.
- [53] H. Triebel. *Interpolation Theory, Function Spaces, Differential Operators*, volume 18. North Holland, Amsterdam, 1978.
- [54] F. Tröltzsch. *Optimal Control of Partial Differential Equations*, volume 112. 2010.
- [55] T. Warner. *Numerical Weather and Climate Prediction*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [56] J. Zowe and S. Kurcyusz. Regularity and stability for the mathematical programming problem in banach spaces. *Applied Mathematics and Optimization*, 5(1):49–62, 1979.

[†] RESEARCH CENTER FOR MATHEMATICAL MODELING (MODEMAT), ESCUELA POLITÉCNICA NACIONAL, QUITO, ECUADOR.

[‡] INSTITUT FÜR NUMERISCHE SIMULATION, RHEINISCHE FRIEDRICH-WILHELMS-UNIVERSITÄT BONN, BONN, GERMANY.