Analysis of the SQP Method for Hyperbolic PDE-Constrained Optimization in Acoustic Full Waveform Inversion*

Luis Ammann[†]

Irwin Yousept ^{†‡}

Abstract

In this paper, the SQP method applied to a hyperbolic PDE-constrained optimization problem is considered. The model arises from the acoustic full waveform inversion in the time domain. The analysis is mainly challenging due to the involved hyperbolicity and second-order bilinear structure. This notorious character leads to an undesired effect of loss of regularity in the SQP method, calling for a substantial extension of developed parabolic techniques. We propose and analyze a novel strategy for the well-posedness and convergence analysis based on the use of a smooth-in-time initial condition, a tailored self-mapping operator, and a two-step estimation process along with Stampacchia's method for hyperbolic equations. Our final theoretical result is the R-superlinear convergence of the SQP method.

Keywords: SQP methods, full waveform inversion, hyperbolic PDE constrained optimization, well-posedness, R-superlinear convergence MSC codes: 35L10,35Q93,49M15,49M37

1 Introduction

This paper analyzes the Sequential Quadratic Programming (SQP) method for a class of hyperbolic optimal control problems with applications in acoustic full waveform inversion. To describe the model problem, let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ $(N \ge 2)$ be a bounded domain with a Lipschitz boundary $\partial\Omega$ and I := [0, T] be a finite time interval. The boundary of Ω is separated into the (measurable) Neumann boundary part $\Gamma_N \subsetneq \partial\Omega$ satisfying $|\Gamma_N| \neq 0$ and the Dirichlet boundary part $\Gamma_D = \partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma_N$. Introducing the square slowness in Ω by $\nu \colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, the propagation of the acoustic pressure in Ω can be mathematically described by the solution $p \colon I \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ to the following damped acoustic wave equation:

$$\begin{cases}
\nu \partial_{tt} p - \Delta p + \eta \partial_t p = f & \text{in } I \times \Omega \\
\partial_n p = 0 & \text{in } I \times \Gamma_N \\
p = 0 & \text{in } I \times \Gamma_D \\
(p, \partial_t p)(0) = (0, 0) & \text{in } \Omega.
\end{cases}$$
(1)

Here, $\eta: \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is a given damping term, and $f: \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is a given source term. Full waveform inversion (FWI) is a famous method for reconstructing the square slowness ν . A suitable FWI formulation is given by the PDE-constrained

^{*}This work is supported by the DFG research grants YO159/2-2 and YO159/5-1.

[†]University of Duisburg-Essen, Fakultät für Mathematik, Thea-Leymann-Str. 9, D-45127 Essen, Germany.

Email: luis.ammann@uni-due.de, irwin.yousept@uni-due.de

[‡]Corresponding author

optimization problem

$$\begin{cases} \inf \mathcal{J}(\nu, p) \coloneqq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \int_{0}^{T} \int_{\Omega} a_{i}(p - p_{i}^{ob})^{2} dx dt + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\nu\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} \\ \text{s.t. (1) and } \nu \in \mathcal{V}_{ad} \coloneqq \{\nu \in L^{2}(\Omega) : \nu_{-}(x) \le \nu(x) \le \nu_{+}(x) \text{ for a.e. } x \in \Omega\} \end{cases}$$
(P)

for some given observation data $p_i^{ob}: I \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ recorded at receivers modeled through the weight functions $a_i: I \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, the constant $\lambda > 0$ denotes the Tikhonov regularization parameter, and $\nu_-: \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ (resp. $\nu_+: \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$) denotes the lower (resp. upper) bound for the square slowness ν . For a more detailed discussion on the appearing quantities, particularly their physical explanation, we refer to our previous work [4].

The SQP method is a celebrated technique in finite and infinite dimensional optimization, particularly in the context of optimal control problems. We refer to the earlier contributions by Alt [1, 2] and Alt, Sontag, and Tröltzsch [3] for SQP methods of optimization problems with ODE or integral equations constraints. From among many other related works in the context of PDE-constrained problems, we mention the contributions by Ito and Kunisch [15, 16], Tröltzsch et al. [6, 10, 19, 20, 22], Heinkenschloss [9], Hintermüller and Hinze [11, 12], Volkwein [23], Wachsmuth [24], Griesse et al. [7, 8], Hinze and Kunisch [13], and Hoppe and Neitzel [14]. Even though the investigations of SQP methods are highly problem-specified, they mainly follow the same methodology: Reformulation of the SQP method as a generalized Newton method and exploitation of Robinson's concept of *strong regularity* [18]. This unified ansatz leads to well-posedness and quadratic convergence of SQP iterations. Eventually, one verifies the strong regularity condition using suitable second-order sufficient optimality conditions.

Notice that the works mentioned above only focus on elliptic and parabolic PDEs. Our paper seems to be the first contribution toward analyzing SQP methods in hyperbolic PDE-constrained optimization. For our model problem (P), this results in a challenging task due to the underlying hyperbolicity and the second-order bilinear structure $\nu \partial_t^2 p$. This character leads to an undesired effect of *loss of regularity* in the SQP method (see Algorithm 1) causing two substantial difficulties (see Remark 4.1): (i) In general, Algorithm 1 is only executable for a limited number of iterations, i.e., the well-definedness of Algorithm 1 may fail. (ii) The ansatz through the notion of strong regularity as done in the parabolic case (cf. [19]) cannot be directly transferred to our case and requires a substantial extension.

This paper develops a novel strategy for analyzing Algorithm 1 and consists of three primary steps. First of all, we propose the use of a smooth-in-time initial guess for the state p_0 and the adjoint state q_0 satisfying $\partial_t^l p_0(0) = \partial_t^l q_0(T) = 0$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$ (Assumption 4.2). Under this regularity condition, we manage to prove the well-definedness of Algorithm 1 (see Proposition 3.1). As the second step, for every given SQP iteration (ν_k, p_k, q_k) , we construct a suitable self-mapping operator (52). Based on perturbation analysis (see Theorem 3.2) using Stampacchia's method (see Lemma 2.3), it turns out that the contraction principle can be applied to the operator (52) (see Proposition 4.9). The resulting fixed point ν_{k+1} is exactly the control component of the solution to the SQP iteration (\mathbb{P}_k) (see Proposition 4.10). The final step comprises a *two-step* estimation process: We estimate $\|\nu_{k+1} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ by the total error of the previous step $\|\nu_k - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$, $\|p_k - \overline{p}\|_{L^2(I,L^2(\Omega))}$, and $\|q_k - \overline{q}\|_{L^2(I,L^2(\Omega))}$. Then, the error in the state $\|p_k - \overline{p}\|_{L^2(I,L^2(\Omega))}$ and adjoint state $\|q_k - \overline{q}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \delta(\|\overline{\nu} - \nu_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\overline{\nu} - \nu_{k-1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)})^2$ which eventually allows us to prove our main result on the R-superlinear convergence of Algorithm 1 (see Theorem 4.12).

2 PDE-constrained optimization for FWI

We denote the space of all equivalence classes of measurable and Lebesgue square integrable \mathbb{R} -valued functions by $L^2(\Omega)$. Furthermore, let

$$\begin{split} H_D^1(\Omega) &\coloneqq \{ v \in H^1(\Omega) \colon \tau v = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_D \} \\ \boldsymbol{H}_N(\operatorname{div}, \Omega) &\coloneqq \{ \boldsymbol{u} \in \boldsymbol{H}(\operatorname{div}, \Omega) \colon (\operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{u}, \phi)_{L^2(\Omega)} = -(\boldsymbol{u}, \nabla \phi)_{\boldsymbol{L}^2(\Omega)} \, \forall \phi \in H_D^1 \}, \\ D(\Delta_{D,N}) &\coloneqq \{ v \in H_D^1(\Omega) : \nabla v \in \boldsymbol{H}_N(\operatorname{div}, \Omega) \} \end{split}$$

where the gradient and divergence are understood in the weak sense and $\tau: H^1(\Omega) \to L^2(\partial\Omega)$ denotes the trace operator.

Assumption 2.1. Let $f \in W^{1,1}(I, L^2(\Omega))$, and $p_i^{ob} \in L^2(I, L^2(\Omega))$ for all i = 1, ..., m and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. The coefficients $a_i \in L^{\infty}(I \times \Omega)$ and $\eta \in L^{\infty}(\Omega)$ are also given data and assumed to be nonnegative for all i = 1, ..., m. Furthermore, let $\nu_{\min} > 0$, $\nu_{\max} > 0$ and $\nu_{-}, \nu_{+} \in L^{\infty}(\Omega)$ satisfy $\nu_{\min} \le \nu_{-}(x) \le \nu_{+}(x) \le \nu_{\max}$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$.

The following lemma provides regularity conditions for the solutions of the second-order state equation. The result follows immediately from [4, Lemma 2.2] (cf. also [5, Theorem 5 on p. 410]).

Lemma 2.2. Let Assumption 2.1 hold and let $\nu \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}$. Further, let $g \in W^{k,1}(I, L^2(\Omega))$ for some $k \ge 1$ and $\partial_t^l g(0) = 0$ for $l = 0, \ldots, k - 1$. Then, the unique solution p to

$$\begin{cases} \nu \partial_t^2 p - \Delta p + \eta \partial_t p = g & \text{in } I \times \Omega \\ (p, \partial_t p)(0) = (0, 0) & \text{in } \Omega \end{cases}$$
(2)

satisfies $p \in C^{k+1}(I, L^2(\Omega)) \cap C^k(I, H^1_D(\Omega)) \cap C^{k-1}(I, D(\Delta_{D,N}))$ and it holds that

$$\begin{split} \|p(t)\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} &\leq c \|G\|_{L^{1}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\partial_{t}^{l}p(t)\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \leq c \|\partial_{t}^{l-1}g\|_{L^{1}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} \quad \forall t \in I \; \forall l = 1, \dots, k+1 \\ \text{with } c \coloneqq \nu_{\min}^{-1} \frac{\max\{\sqrt{\nu_{\max},1}\}}{\min\{\sqrt{\nu_{\min},1}\}} \; \text{and} \; G(t) \coloneqq \int_{0}^{t} g(s) ds \; \text{for all } t \in I. \end{split}$$

In our previous work [4], we have shown an existence result for (P) and derived its first-order necessary and secondorder sufficient optimality conditions. The analysis in [4] makes use of an elliptic inner regularity result to obtain an inner boundedness of the corresponding state (see [4, Lemma 4.3]). It turns out that the inner regularity ansatz can be improved by applying Stampacchia's method to the hyperbolic case that provides even the global $L^{\infty}(\Omega)$ -boundedness. This approach allows us to avoid the structural assumption on the admissible set \mathcal{V}_{ad} as in [4, Assumption 4.1].

Lemma 2.3 (Global boundedness). Let $N \leq 3$ and $g \in W^{k,1}(I, L^2(\Omega))$ for some $k \geq 1$ and $\partial_t^l g(0) = 0$ for $l = 0, \ldots k - 1$. Then, the unique solution of p to (2) satisfies $p \in C^{k-1}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))$ and

$$\|\partial_t^l p\|_{L^2(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \le \hat{c}(\|\partial_t^l g\|_{L^2(I,L^2(\Omega))} + \|\partial_t^{l+1} g\|_{L^2(I,L^2(\Omega))}) \quad \forall l = 0, \dots k-1$$
(3)

for a constant $\hat{c} > 0$ independent of p, g, and l.

Proof. Since $N \leq 3$, for any given $u \in L^2(\Omega)$, Stampacchia's method yields that the weak solution $y \in H^1_D(\Omega)$ to the elliptic problem

$$-\Delta y = u$$
 in Ω , $\partial_n y = 0$ on Γ_N , $au y = 0$ on Γ_D

satisfies $y \in L^{\infty}(\Omega)$ and

$$\|y\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \le \tilde{c} \|u\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \tag{4}$$

for a constant $\hat{c} > 0$, independent of u and y. This is obtained by classical arguments (cf. [21, Theorem 4.5]) along with the property $\max\{v, 0\} \in H_D^1(\Omega)$ for all $v \in H_D^1(\Omega)$. On the other, since $g \in W^{k,1}(I, L^2(\Omega))$, Lemma 2.2 implies that the unique solution p to (2) satisfies $p \in C^{k+1}(I, L^2(\Omega)) \cap C^k(I, H_D^1(\Omega)) \cap C^{k-1}(I, D(\Delta_{D,N}))$. Applying this regularity to (2), it follows for all $t \in I$ and $l = 0, \ldots, k-1$ that

$$-\Delta \partial_t^l p(t) = \partial_t^l g(t) - \nu \partial_t^{l+2} p(t) - \eta \partial_t^{l+1} p(t) \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \partial_n (\partial_t^l p(t)) = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_N, \quad \tau(\partial_t^l p(t)) = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_D.$$
(5)

Therefore, by the above argument, we obtain

$$\|\partial_{t}^{l} p(t)\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \leq \tilde{c} \|\partial_{t}^{l} g(t) - \nu \partial_{t}^{l+2} p(t) - \eta \partial_{t}^{l+1} p(t)\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \quad \forall t \in I \quad \forall l = 0, \dots, k-1.$$
(6)

Let us prove that $p \in C^{k-1}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))$. To this aim, let $l \in \{0, \ldots, k-1\}$ and $\{t_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \subset I$ with $\lim_{n \to \infty} t_n = t$. Applying the superposition principle to (5) yields that

$$\begin{split} &-\Delta\partial_t^l(p(t)-p(t_n))=\partial_t^l(g(t)-g(t_n))-\nu\partial_t^{l+2}(p(t)-p(t_n))-\eta\partial_t^{l+1}(p(t)-p(t_n))\quad\text{in }\Omega\\ &\partial_n(\partial_t^l(p(t)-p(t_n)))=0\quad\text{on }\Gamma_N,\quad \tau(\partial_t^l(p(t)-p(t_n)))=0\quad\text{on }\Gamma_D. \end{split}$$

Then, using again (4), it follows that

$$\|\partial_t^l(p(t) - p(t_n))\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \le \tilde{c}(\|\partial_t^l(g(t) - g(t_n))\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nu\partial_t^{l+2}(p(t) - p(t_n))\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\eta\partial_t^{l+1}(p(t) - p(t_n))\|_{L^2(\Omega)}).$$
(7)

Since $\partial_t^l g, \partial_t^l p, \partial_t^{l+1} p \in C(I, L^2(\Omega))$, the right hand side in (7) vanishes as $n \to \infty$. In conlusion, the regularity property $p \in C^{k-1}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))$ is valid. To prove (3), we integrate (6) and make use of Lemma 2.2 to deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t^l p\|_{L^2(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} &\leq \tilde{c} \|\partial_t^l g - \nu \partial_t^{l+2} p - \eta \partial_t^{l+1} p\|_{L^2(I,L^2(\Omega))} \\ &\leq \tilde{c} (\|\partial_t^l g\|_{L^2(I,L^2(\Omega))} + Tc\nu_{\max} \|\partial_t^{l+1} g\|_{L^2(I,L^2(\Omega))} + Tc\|\eta\|_{L^{\infty}} \|\partial_t^l g\|_{L^2(I,L^2(\Omega))}) \quad \forall l = 0, \dots, k-1 \end{aligned}$$

with $c = \nu_{\min}^{-1} \frac{\max\{\sqrt{\nu_{\max}}, 1\}}{\min\{\sqrt{\nu_{\min}}, 1\}}$. This leads to the desired estimate (3) with $\hat{c} \coloneqq \tilde{c} \max\{1 + Tc \|\eta\|_{L^{\infty}}, Tc\nu_{\max}\}$.

Assumption 2.4. Let Assumption 2.1 hold and let $f \in W^{6,1}(I, L^2(\Omega))$ with $\partial_t^l f(0) = 0$ for l = 0, ..., 5. Furthermore, let $(\overline{\nu}, \overline{p}, \overline{q}) \in \mathcal{V}_{ad} \times C^2(I, L^2(\Omega)) \cap C^1(I, H_D^1(\Omega)) \cap C(I, D(\Delta_{D,N})) \times C^2(I, L^2(\Omega)) \cap C^1(I, H_D^1(\Omega)) \cap C(I, D(\Delta_{D,N}))$ satisfy the first-order necessary optimality condition

$$\begin{cases} \overline{\nu}\partial_t^2 \overline{p} - \Delta \overline{p} + \eta \partial_t \overline{p} = f & \text{in } I \times \Omega \\ (\overline{p}, \partial_t \overline{p})(0) = (0, 0) & \text{in } \Omega \\ \overline{\nu}\partial_t^2 \overline{q} - \Delta \overline{q} - \eta \partial_t \overline{q} = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i (\overline{p} - p_i^{ob}) & \text{in } I \times \Omega \\ (\overline{q}, \partial_t \overline{q})(T) = (0, 0) & \text{in } \Omega \\ \left(-\int_0^T \partial_t^2 \overline{p}(t) \overline{q}(t) dt + \lambda \overline{\nu}, \nu - \overline{\nu} \right)_{L^2(\Omega)} \ge 0 \quad \forall \nu \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}. \end{cases}$$
(8)

Further, we assume that $\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i(\overline{p} - p_i^{ob}) \in W^{2,1}(I, L^2(\Omega))$, $a_i \in C^2(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))$, and $\partial_t^l a_i(T) = 0$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, m$ and l = 0, 1.

Under the Assumption 2.4, the application of Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3 to (8) yields the higher regularity properties

$$\overline{p} \in C^7(I, L^2(\Omega)) \cap C^6(I, H^1_D(\Omega)) \cap C^5(I, D(\Delta_{D,N})) \cap C^5(I, L^\infty(\Omega))$$
(9)

and $\overline{q} \in C^3(I, L^2(\Omega)) \cap C^2(I, H^1_D(\Omega)) \cap C^1(I, D(\Delta_{D,N})) \cap C^1(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))$. For the derivation of the necessary optimality system (8), we refer the reader to [4, Theorem 3.5]. Further, note that the regularities of a_i are reasonable since, in the application, the product of characteristic functions in space with a smooth function in time is typically considered.

To prepare for the second-order sufficient optimality result, let us define the Lagrangian functional associated with (P) by

$$\mathcal{L}(\nu, p, q) \coloneqq \mathcal{J}(\nu, p) - (\nu \partial_t^2 p - \Delta p + \eta \partial_t p - f, q)_{L^2(I, L^2(\Omega))} - (p(0), q(0))_{L^2(\Omega)} - (\partial_t p(0), \partial_t q(0))_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$
(10)

For $h \in L^2(\Omega)$, we introduce the linearized state equation at $(\overline{\nu}, \overline{p})$ as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \overline{\nu}\partial_t^2 \tilde{p} - \Delta \tilde{p} + \eta \partial_t \tilde{p} = -h \partial_t^2 \overline{p} & \text{in } I \times \Omega \\ (\tilde{p}, \partial_t \tilde{p})(0) = (0, 0) & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$
(11)

Thanks to (9), the well-posedness of (11) follows immediately from Lemma 2.2. Furthermore, let the set of strongly active constraints be given by

$$\mathscr{A}_{0}(\overline{\nu}) \coloneqq \left\{ x \in \Omega \colon -\int_{0}^{T} \partial_{t}^{2} \overline{p}(t, x) \overline{q}(t, x) dt + \lambda \overline{\nu}(x) \neq 0 \right\}$$
(12)

and let the associated critical cone be given by

$$C^0_{\overline{\nu}} \coloneqq \{h \in L^2(\Omega): \text{ For a.e. } x \in \Omega: h(x) \ge 0 \text{ if } \overline{\nu}(x) = \nu_-(x); h(x) \le 0 \text{ if } \overline{\nu}(x) = \nu_+(x); h\Big|_{\mathscr{A}_0(\overline{\nu})} \equiv 0\}.$$

Theorem 2.5. Let Assumption 2.4 hold. Further, assume that

$$\begin{cases} D^{2}_{(\nu,p)}\mathcal{L}(\overline{\nu},\overline{p},\overline{q})(h,\widetilde{p})^{2} > 0 \quad \forall h \in C^{0}_{\overline{\nu}} \setminus \{0\} \\ \text{where } \widetilde{p} \in C^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega)) \cap C^{1}(I,H^{1}_{D}(\Omega)) \cap C(I,D(\Delta_{D,N})) \text{ denotes the solution to (11).} \end{cases}$$
(SSC)

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

$$\mathcal{J}(\nu, p) \ge \mathcal{J}(\overline{\nu}, \overline{p}) + \delta \|\nu - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2$$
(13)

holds true for every $\nu \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}$ with $\|\nu - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \sigma$ and the corresponding solution p to (1). In particular, $\overline{\nu}$ is a locally optimal solution to (P).

Proof. Under Assumption 2.4, for every $\nu, \hat{\nu} \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}$, by applying Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3 to the difference of the corresponding solutions p, \hat{p} to (1), we have that

$$\|p - \hat{p}\|_{C^4(I, L^2(\Omega))} + \|p - \hat{p}\|_{C^2(I, L^\infty(\Omega))} \le L \|\nu - \hat{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$$
(14)

for a constant L > 0, independent of $\nu, \hat{\nu}, p, \hat{p}$. Thus, the proof follows precisely the one of [4, Theorem 4.6] by replacing the inner regularity result [4, Lemma 4.3] with (14).

3 Perturbed optimality system

This section is devoted to the analysis of perturbed and linearized optimality systems associated with (P), which will play an essential role in the analysis of the SQP method (see section 4). In the following, let Assumption 2.4 hold. Given some perturbation term $(\rho^{VI}, \rho^{st}, \rho^{adj}) \in L^{\infty}(\Omega) \times H^1(I, L^2(\Omega)) \times H^1(I, L^2(\Omega))$ with $\rho^{st}(0) = \rho^{adj}(T) = 0$, we consider the system

$$\int \overline{\nu} \partial_t^2 p - \Delta p + \eta \partial_t p = f - (\nu - \overline{\nu}) \partial_t^2 \overline{p} + \rho^{st} \qquad \text{in } I \times \Omega$$

$$(p,\partial_t p)(0) = (0,0) \qquad \qquad \text{in } \Omega$$

$$\overline{\nu}\partial_t^2 q - \Delta q - \eta \partial_t q = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i (p - p_i^{ob}) - (\nu - \overline{\nu})\partial_t^2 \overline{q} + \rho^{adj} \qquad \text{in } I \times \Omega \tag{OS}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} (q, \partial_t q)(I) = (0, 0) & \text{in } \Omega \\ (-\int_0^T \partial_t^2 \overline{p}(t)q(t) + \partial_t^2(p(t) - \overline{p}(t))\overline{q}(t)dt + \lambda\nu, \tilde{\nu} - \nu)_{L^2(\Omega)} \ge (\rho^{VI}, \tilde{\nu} - \nu)_{L^2(\Omega)} & \text{for all } \tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}. \end{cases}$$

Sufficient second-order optimality conditions for (P) are the main ingredients for the analysis of (OS). Unfortunately, the originally proposed (SSC) in Theorem 2.5 is too weak for our purposes, as the involved critical cone $C_{\overline{\nu}}^0 \setminus \{0\}$ is too restrictive. Thus, for a fixed $\tau > 0$, we introduce the enlarged critical cone

$$C^{\tau}_{\overline{\nu}} \coloneqq \{ h \in L^2(\Omega) : h(x) = 0 \text{ for a.e. } x \in \mathscr{A}_{\tau}(\overline{\nu}) \},$$
(15)

where the set of τ -uniform strongly active constraints is given by

$$\mathscr{A}_{\tau}(\overline{\nu}) \coloneqq \left\{ x \in \Omega : \left| -\int_{0}^{T} \partial_{t}^{2} \overline{p}(t, x) \overline{q}(t, x) dt + \lambda \overline{\nu}(x) \right| > \tau \right\}.$$
(16)

Then, the strengthened sufficient second-order optimality condition reads as follows:

There exists
$$\alpha > 0$$
 such that $D^2_{(\nu,p)} \mathcal{L}(\overline{\nu}, \overline{p}, \overline{q})(h, \tilde{p})^2 > \alpha \|h\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}$ for every $h \in C^{\tau}_{\overline{\nu}}$
(SSC ^{τ}) where $\tilde{p} \in C^2(I, L^2(\Omega)) \cap C^1(I, H^1_D(\Omega)) \cap C(I, D(\Delta_{D,N}))$ denotes the solution to (11).

Note that $\mathscr{A}_{\tau}(\overline{\nu}) \subset \mathscr{A}_{0}(\overline{\nu})$ and therefore the new critical cone $C_{\overline{\nu}}^{\tau}$ is in fact enlarged, i.e. $C_{\overline{\nu}}^{0} \subset C_{\overline{\nu}}^{\tau}$. Therefore, the strengthened sufficient second-order condition (SSC^{τ}) particularly implies the original condition (SSC). As a consequence, it also guarantees the optimality of $\overline{\nu}$ along with the quadratic growth condition (13) under the same assumptions as in Theorem 2.5. Still, with the strengthened condition (SSC^{τ}) the following difficulty appears: Given two controls $\nu_{1}, \nu_{2} \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}$, the difference $h = \nu - \overline{\nu}$ for $\nu \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}$ does not belong to the enlarged critical cone $C_{\overline{\nu}}^{\tau}$. Therefore, it does not satisfy the assumptions of (SSC^{τ}). To circumvent this difficulty, we extend well-known techniques (see [14, 19, 23, 24]) to our hyperbolic case. We consider an auxiliary problem by replacing the admissible set \mathcal{V}_{ad} with

$$\mathcal{V}_{ad}^{\tau} \coloneqq \{ \nu \in \mathcal{V}_{ad} \mid \nu = \overline{\nu} \text{ a.e. in } \mathscr{A}_{\tau}(\overline{\nu}) \}.$$
(17)

Now, given two controls $\nu, \tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}^{\tau}$, the difference $h = \nu - \tilde{\nu}$ fullfils $h \in C_{\overline{\nu}}^{\tau}$. We define the following modification of the perturbed linearized optimality system (OS):

(OS) where
$$\mathcal{V}_{ad}$$
 is replaced with \mathcal{V}_{ad}^{τ} . (OS ^{au})

Proposition 3.1. Let Assumption 2.4 and (SSC^{τ}) be satisfied. Then, for all $(\rho^{st}, \rho^{adj}, \rho^{VI}) \in H^1(I, L^2(\Omega)) \times H^1(I, L^2(\Omega)) \times L^2(\Omega)$ with $\rho^{st}(0) = \rho^{adj}(T) = 0$, the system (OS^{τ}) admits a unique solution $(\nu, p, q) \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}^{\tau} \times (C^2(I, L^2(\Omega)) \cap C^1(I, H_D^1(\Omega)) \cap C(I, D(\Delta_{D,N})))^2$.

Proof. Let $(\rho^{st}, \rho^{adj}, \rho^{VI}) \in H^1(I, L^2(\Omega)) \times H^1(I, L^2(\Omega)) \times L^2(\Omega)$ with $\rho^{st}(0) = \rho^{adj}(T) = 0$ be given. Thanks to (9), Lemma 2.2 implies that

$$\begin{cases} \overline{\nu}\partial_t^2 p - \Delta p + \eta \partial_t p = f - (\nu - \overline{\nu})\partial_t^2 \overline{p} + \rho^{st} & \text{in } I \times \Omega\\ (p, \partial_t p)(0) = (0, 0) & \text{in } \Omega \end{cases}$$
(18)

admits for every $\nu \in L^2(\Omega)$ a unique solution $p \in C^2(I, L^2(\Omega)) \cap C^1(I, H^1_D(\Omega)) \cap C(I, D(\Delta_{D,N}))$. Denoting by $S_\rho \colon L^2(\Omega) \to C^2(I, L^2(\Omega)) \cap C^1(I, H^1_D(\Omega)), \nu \mapsto p$ the affine linear and continuous solution operator to (18), we consider the minimization problem

$$\min_{\nu \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}^{\tau}} J_{\rho}(\nu) \coloneqq \mathcal{J}(\nu, S_{\rho}(\nu)) + \left(-\int_{0}^{T} \partial_{t}^{2} (S_{\rho}(\nu) - \overline{p}) \overline{q} dt - \rho^{VI}, \nu - \overline{\nu} \right)_{L^{2}(\Omega)} + (\rho^{adj}, S_{\rho}(\nu))_{L^{2}(I, L^{2}(\Omega))}$$
(19)

where \mathcal{J} is defined as in (P). By the quadratic structure of J_{ρ} , we have that

$$J_{\rho}(\tilde{\nu}) = J_{\rho}(\nu) + J_{\rho}'(\nu)(\tilde{\nu} - \nu) + \frac{1}{2}J_{\rho}''(\nu)(\tilde{\nu} - \nu)^2 \quad \forall \nu, \tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}^{\tau}.$$
 (20)

Further, for any $\nu, \tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}^{\tau}$, it holds that $h \coloneqq \tilde{\nu} - \nu \in C_{\overline{\nu}}^{\tau}$ (see (15)) and $\tilde{p} \coloneqq S_{\rho}(\tilde{\nu}) - S_{\rho}(\nu)$ solves the linearized state equation (11) such that (SSC^{τ}) yields that

$$0 < D_{(\nu,p)}^{2} \mathcal{L}(\overline{\nu},\overline{p},\overline{q})(h,\tilde{p})^{2} \underbrace{=}_{(10)} \sum_{i=1}^{m} (a_{i}\tilde{p},\tilde{p})_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \lambda \|h\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} - 2(h\partial_{t}^{2}\tilde{p},\overline{q})_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} \underbrace{=}_{(19)} J_{\rho}''(\nu)h^{2}.$$

Therefore, along with (20), the strict convexity of J_{ρ} in \mathcal{V}_{ad}^{τ} is obtained, implying that (19) admits a unique solution $\nu \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}^{\tau}$. Moreover, the necessary and sufficient optimality condition for (19) is given by $J'_{\rho}(\nu)(\tilde{\nu}-\nu) \ge 0$ for every $\tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}^{\tau}$, which is equivalent to (OS^{τ}) due to standard arguments. Thus, the claim is valid.

The following Theorem 3.2 provides the crucial stability result for the solution to (OS^{τ}) regarding the perturbation terms. In the proof, we extend known ideas incorporating the first- and second-order optimality conditions (cf. [22,23]) to our given case.

Theorem 3.2. Let Assumption 2.4 and (SSC^{τ}) hold. Then, there exist constants $L, L_p, L_q > 0$ such that for all perturbation terms $(\rho^{st}, \rho^{adj}, \rho^{VI}), (\tilde{\rho}^{st}, \tilde{\rho}^{adj}, \tilde{\rho}^{VI}) \in H^1(I, L^2(\Omega)) \times H^1(I, L^2(\Omega)) \times L^2(\Omega)$ with $\rho^{st}(0) = \tilde{\rho}^{st}(0) = \rho^{adj}(T) = \tilde{\rho}^{adj}(T) = 0$, the corresponding solutions $(\nu_{\rho}, p_{\rho}, q_{\rho})$ and $(\nu_{\tilde{\rho}}, p_{\tilde{\rho}}, q_{\tilde{\rho}})$ to (OS^{τ}) satisfy

$$\|\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\tilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \leq L(\|\rho^{st} - \tilde{\rho}^{st}\|_{L^{2}(I, L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|\rho^{adj} - \tilde{\rho}^{adj}\|_{L^{2}(I, L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|\rho^{VI} - \tilde{\rho}^{VI}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)})$$
(21)

$$\|p_{\rho} - \overline{p}\|_{L^{2}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \leq L_{p}(\|\rho^{st}\|_{H^{1}(I, L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|\rho^{adj}\|_{L^{2}(I, L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|\rho^{VI}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)})$$
(22)

$$\|q_{\rho} - \overline{q}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \leq L_{q}(\|\rho^{st}\|_{H^{1}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|\rho^{adj}\|_{H^{1}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|\rho^{VI}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}).$$
(23)

Proof. Let $(\nu_{\rho}, p_{\rho}, q_{\rho}), (\nu_{\tilde{\rho}}, p_{\tilde{\rho}}, q_{\tilde{\rho}}) \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}^{\tau} \times (C^2(I, L^2(\Omega)) \cap C^1(I, H_D^1(\Omega)) \cap C(I, D(\Delta_{D,N})))^2$ denote the unique solutions to (OS^{τ}) with respect to $(\rho^{st}, \rho^{adj}, \rho^{VI})$ and $(\tilde{\rho}^{VI}, \tilde{\rho}^{st}, \tilde{\rho}^{adj})$ according to Proposition 3.1. Subtracting the corresponding PDE-systems (see (OS)), we obtain that

$$\begin{cases} \overline{\nu}\partial_t^2(p_\rho - p_{\widetilde{\rho}}) - \Delta(p_\rho - p_{\widetilde{\rho}}) + \eta\partial_t(p_\rho - p_{\widetilde{\rho}}) = -(\nu_\rho - \nu_{\widetilde{\rho}})\partial_t^2\overline{p} + \rho^{st} - \widetilde{\rho}^{st} & \text{in } I \times \Omega\\ (p_\rho - p_{\widetilde{\rho}}, \partial_t(p_\rho - p_{\widetilde{\rho}}))(0) = (0, 0) & \text{in } \Omega \end{cases}$$

$$\tag{24}$$

$$\begin{cases} \overline{\nu}\partial_t^2(q_\rho - q_{\widetilde{\rho}}) - \Delta(q_\rho - q_{\widetilde{\rho}}) - \eta\partial_t(q_\rho - q_{\widetilde{\rho}}) = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i(p_\rho - p_{\widetilde{\rho}}) - (\nu_\rho - \nu_{\widetilde{\rho}})\partial_t^2\overline{q} + \rho^{adj} - \widetilde{\rho}^{adj} & \text{in } I \times \Omega \\ (q_\rho - q_{\widetilde{\rho}}, \partial_t(q_\rho - q_{\widetilde{\rho}}))(T) = (0, 0) & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

$$(25)$$

We begin by elaborating on the control parameter. By the construction of \mathcal{V}_{ad}^{τ} (see (15)), the quantity $h \coloneqq \nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\tilde{\rho}}$ lies in the critical cone C_{ν}^{τ} , and $p_{\rho} - p_{\tilde{\rho}} - \hat{p}_{\rho,\tilde{\rho}}$ solves the associated linearized state equation (11) where $\hat{p}_{\rho,\tilde{\rho}}$ denotes the solution to

$$\begin{cases} \overline{\nu}\partial_t^2 \hat{p}_{\rho,\widetilde{\rho}} - \Delta \hat{p}_{\rho,\widetilde{\rho}} + \eta \partial_t \hat{p}_{\rho,\widetilde{\rho}} = \rho^{st} - \widetilde{\rho}^{st} & \text{in } I \times \Omega\\ (\hat{p}_{\rho,\widetilde{\rho}}, \partial_t \hat{p}_{\rho,\widetilde{\rho}})(0) = (0,0) & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$
(26)

Thus, (SSC $^{\tau}$) yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \|\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\widetilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} &\leq D_{(\nu,p)}^{2} \mathcal{L}(\overline{\nu}, \overline{p}, \overline{q})(\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\widetilde{\rho}}, p_{\rho} - p_{\widetilde{\rho}} - \hat{p}_{\rho,\widetilde{\rho}})^{2} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{m} (a_{i}(p_{\rho} - p_{\widetilde{\rho}}), p_{\rho} - p_{\widetilde{\rho}})_{L^{2}(I, L^{2}(\Omega))} + \lambda \|\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\widetilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} - 2((\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\widetilde{\rho}})\partial_{t}^{2}(p_{\rho} - p_{\widetilde{\rho}}), \overline{q})_{L^{2}(I, L^{2}(\Omega))} \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^{m} (a_{i}\hat{p}_{\rho,\widetilde{\rho}}, \hat{p}_{\rho,\widetilde{\rho}})_{L^{2}(I, L^{2}(\Omega))} - 2\sum_{i=1}^{m} (a_{i}\hat{p}_{\rho,\widetilde{\rho}}, (p_{\rho} - p_{\widetilde{\rho}}))_{L^{2}(I, L^{2}(\Omega))} + 2((\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\widetilde{\rho}})\hat{p}_{\rho,\widetilde{\rho}}, \partial_{t}^{2}\overline{q})_{L^{2}(I, L^{2}(\Omega))}. \end{aligned}$$

$$(27)$$

For the first term on the right-hand side of (27), it holds that

$$\begin{split} &\sum_{i=1}^{m} (a_{i}(p_{\rho} - p_{\tilde{\rho}}), p_{\rho} - p_{\tilde{\rho}})_{L^{2}(I, L^{2}(\Omega))} \\ &= (\overline{\nu}\partial_{t}^{2}(q_{\rho} - q_{\tilde{\rho}}) - \Delta(q_{\rho} - q_{\tilde{\rho}}) - \eta\partial_{t}(q_{\rho} - q_{\tilde{\rho}}) + (\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\tilde{\rho}})\partial_{t}^{2}\overline{q} - \rho^{adj} + \tilde{\rho}^{adj}, p_{\rho} - p_{\tilde{\rho}})_{L^{2}(I, L^{2}(\Omega))} \\ &= (q_{\rho} - q_{\tilde{\rho}}, \overline{\nu}\partial_{t}^{2}(p_{\rho} - p_{\tilde{\rho}}) - \Delta(p_{\rho} - p_{\tilde{\rho}}) + \eta\partial_{t}(p_{\rho} - p_{\tilde{\rho}}))_{L^{2}(I, L^{2}(\Omega))} + (\overline{q}, (\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\tilde{\rho}})\partial_{t}^{2}(p_{\rho} - p_{\tilde{\rho}}))_{L^{2}(I, L^{2}(\Omega))} \\ &- (\rho^{adj} - \tilde{\rho}^{adj}, p_{\rho} - p_{\tilde{\rho}})_{L^{2}(I, L^{2}(\Omega))} \\ &= (q_{\rho} - q_{\tilde{\rho}}, -(\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\tilde{\rho}})\partial_{t}^{2}\overline{p} + \rho^{st} - \tilde{\rho}^{st}) + (\overline{q}, (\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\tilde{\rho}})\partial_{t}^{2}(p_{\rho} - p_{\tilde{\rho}}))_{L^{2}(I, L^{2}(\Omega))} - (\rho^{adj} - \tilde{\rho}^{adj}, p_{\rho} - p_{\tilde{\rho}})_{L^{2}(I, L^{2}(\Omega))} \end{split}$$

Applying this identity to (27), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha \|\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\tilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} \\ &\leq -((\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\tilde{\rho}})\partial_{t}^{2}\overline{p}, q_{\rho} - q_{\tilde{\rho}})_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + (q_{\rho} - q_{\tilde{\rho}}, \rho^{st} - \tilde{\rho}^{st})_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} - (\rho^{adj} - \tilde{\rho}^{adj}, p_{\rho} - p_{\tilde{\rho}})_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} \\ &+ \lambda \|\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\tilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} - ((\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\tilde{\rho}})\partial_{t}^{2}(p_{\rho} - p_{\tilde{\rho}}), \overline{q})_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} (a_{i}\hat{p}_{\rho,\tilde{\rho}}, \hat{p}_{\rho,\tilde{\rho}})_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} \\ &- 2\sum_{i=1}^{m} (a_{i}\hat{p}_{\rho,\tilde{\rho}}, (p_{\rho} - p_{\tilde{\rho}}))_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + 2((\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\tilde{\rho}})\hat{p}_{\rho,\tilde{\rho}}, \partial_{t}^{2}\overline{q})_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}.
\end{aligned}$$
(28)

Testing the variational inequality in (OS^{τ}) for $(\nu_{\rho}, p_{\rho}, q_{\rho})$ (resp. $(\nu_{\tilde{\rho}}, p_{\tilde{\rho}}, q_{\tilde{\rho}})$) with $\tilde{\nu} = \nu_{\tilde{\rho}}$ (resp. $\tilde{\nu} = \nu_{\rho}$) and adding the resulting two inequalites leads to

$$\left(-\int_0^T \partial_t^2 \overline{p}(t)(q_\rho(t) - q_{\widetilde{\rho}}(t)) + \partial_t^2(p_\rho(t) - p_{\widetilde{\rho}}(t))\overline{q}(t)dt + \lambda(\nu_\rho - \nu_{\widetilde{\rho}}), \nu_{\widetilde{\rho}} - \nu_\rho\right)_{L^2(\Omega)} \ge (\rho^{VI} - \widetilde{\rho}^{VI}, \nu_{\widetilde{\rho}} - \nu_\rho)_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Rearranging yields that

$$\lambda \|\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\tilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} - ((\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\tilde{\rho}})\partial_{t}^{2}\overline{p}, q_{\rho} - q_{\tilde{\rho}})_{L^{2}(I, L^{2}(\Omega))} - ((\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\tilde{\rho}})\partial_{t}^{2}(p_{\rho} - p_{\tilde{\rho}}), \overline{q})_{L^{2}(I, L^{2}(\Omega))} \leq (\rho^{VI} - \tilde{\rho}^{VI}, \nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\tilde{\rho}})_{L^{2}(\Omega)}.$$
(29)

Combining (28) and (29), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha \|\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\widetilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} \end{aligned}$$

$$& \leq (q_{\rho} - q_{\widetilde{\rho}}, \rho^{st} - \widetilde{\rho}^{st})_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} - (\rho^{adj} - \widetilde{\rho}^{adj}, p_{\rho} - p_{\widetilde{\rho}})_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + (\rho^{VI} - \widetilde{\rho}^{VI}, \nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\widetilde{\rho}})_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^{m} (a_{i}\hat{p}_{\rho,\widetilde{\rho}}, \hat{p}_{\rho,\widetilde{\rho}})_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} - 2\sum_{i=1}^{m} (a_{i}\hat{p}_{\rho,\widetilde{\rho}}, (p_{\rho} - p_{\widetilde{\rho}}))_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + 2((\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\widetilde{\rho}})\partial_{t}^{2}\hat{p}_{\rho,\widetilde{\rho}}, \overline{q})_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} \\ & \leq \|q_{\rho} - q_{\widetilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} \|\rho^{st} - \widetilde{\rho}^{st}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|\rho^{adj} - \widetilde{\rho}^{adj}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} \|p_{\rho} - p_{\widetilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} \\ & + \|\rho^{VI} - \widetilde{\rho}^{VI}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \|\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\widetilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \|a_{i}\|_{L^{\infty}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \|\hat{p}_{\rho,\widetilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}^{2} \\ & + 2\sum_{i=1}^{m} \|a_{i}\|_{L^{\infty}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \|\hat{p}_{\rho,\widetilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} \|p_{\rho} - p_{\widetilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} \\ & + 2\|\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\widetilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \|\hat{p}_{\rho,\widetilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} \|\partial_{t}^{2}\overline{q}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 2.2 to (26) yields for $G(t)\coloneqq \int_0^t \rho^{st}(s) - \widetilde{\rho}^{st}(s) ds$ that

$$\|\hat{p}_{\rho,\tilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} \leq \sqrt{T}c\|G\|_{L^{1}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} \leq T^{\frac{3}{2}}c\|\rho^{st} - \tilde{\rho}^{st}\|_{L^{1}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} \leq T^{2}c\|\rho^{st} - \tilde{\rho}^{st}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}$$
(31)

with $c \coloneqq \nu_{\min\{\sqrt{\nu_{\min},1}\}}^{-1}$. Analogously, applying Lemma 2.2 to (24) and (25), we obtain that

Therefore, applying (31)-(33) to (30) provides that

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha \|\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\widetilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} \\ &\leq T^{2}c \Biggl(\sum_{i=1}^{m} \|a_{i}\|_{L^{\infty}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} T^{2}c \left(\|\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\widetilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \|\partial_{t}^{2}\overline{p}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} + \|\rho^{st} - \widetilde{\rho}^{st}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}\right) \\ &\quad + \|\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\widetilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \|\partial_{t}^{2}\overline{q}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} + \|\rho^{adj} - \widetilde{\rho}^{adj}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}\Biggr) \|\rho^{st} - \widetilde{\rho}^{st}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} \\ &\quad + \|\rho^{adj} - \widetilde{\rho}^{adj}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} T^{2}c (\|\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\widetilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \|\partial_{t}^{2}\overline{p}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} + \|\rho^{st} - \widetilde{\rho}^{st}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{split} &+ \|\rho^{VI} - \tilde{\rho}^{VI}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \|\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\tilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} + T^{4}c^{2}\sum_{i=1}^{m} \|a_{i}\|_{L^{\infty}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \|\rho^{st} - \tilde{\rho}^{st}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}^{2} \\ &+ 2\sum_{i=1}^{m} \|a_{i}\|_{L^{\infty}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} T^{4}c^{2} \|\rho^{st} - \tilde{\rho}^{st}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} (\|\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\tilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \|\partial_{t}^{2}\overline{p}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} + \|\rho^{st} - \tilde{\rho}^{st}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}) \\ &+ 2\|\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\tilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} T^{2}c\|\rho^{st} - \tilde{\rho}^{st}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} \|\partial_{t}^{2}\overline{q}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \\ &\leq c_{1}\|\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\tilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \|\rho^{st} - \tilde{\rho}^{st}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + c_{2}\|\rho^{st} - \tilde{\rho}^{st}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} \\ &+ c_{3}\|\rho^{adj} - \tilde{\rho}^{adj}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} \|\rho^{st} - \tilde{\rho}^{st}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + c_{4}\|\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\tilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \|\rho^{adj} - \tilde{\rho}^{adj}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} \\ &+ \|\rho^{VI} - \tilde{\rho}^{VI}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \|\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\tilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \end{split}$$

with the constants

$$\begin{split} c_1 &\coloneqq 3T^4 c^2 \sum_{i=1}^m \|a_i\|_{L^{\infty}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \|\partial_t^2 \overline{p}\|_{L^2(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} + 3T^2 c \|\partial_t^2 \overline{q}\|_{L^2(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))}, \quad c_2 &\coloneqq 4T^4 c^2 \sum_{i=1}^m \|a_i\|_{L^{\infty}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))}, \\ c_3 &\coloneqq 2T^2 c, \qquad \qquad c_4 &\coloneqq T^2 c \|\partial_t^2 \overline{p}\|_{L^2(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))}. \end{split}$$

Using Young's inequality, we obtain that

$$\begin{split} &\alpha \|\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\widetilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha}{4} \|\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\widetilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} + \left(\frac{1}{\alpha}c_{1}^{2} + c_{2}\right) \|\rho^{st} - \widetilde{\rho}^{st}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}^{2} + \frac{c_{3}}{2} \|\rho^{adj} - \widetilde{\rho}^{adj}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}^{2} + \frac{c_{3}}{2} \|\rho^{st} - \widetilde{\rho}^{st}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}^{2} \\ &+ \frac{\alpha}{4} \|\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\widetilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} + \frac{1}{\alpha}c_{4}^{2} \|\rho^{adj} - \widetilde{\rho}^{adj}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}^{2} + \frac{1}{\alpha} \|\rho^{VI} - \widetilde{\rho}^{VI}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} + \frac{\alpha}{4} \|\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\widetilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}, \end{split}$$

leading to

$$\frac{\alpha}{4} \|\nu_{\rho} - \nu_{\widetilde{\rho}}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2} \\
\leq \left(\frac{1}{\alpha}c_{1}^{2} + c_{2} + \frac{c_{3}}{2}\right) \|\rho^{st} - \widetilde{\rho}^{st}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}^{2} + \left(\frac{c_{3}}{2} + \frac{1}{\alpha}c_{4}^{2}\right) \|\rho^{adj} - \widetilde{\rho}^{adj}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}^{2} + \frac{1}{\alpha} \|\rho^{VI} - \widetilde{\rho}^{VI}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}.$$
(34)

Therefore, (21) is valid. To prove (22), notice that $p_
ho-\overline{p}$ is the solution to

$$\begin{cases} \overline{\nu}\partial_t^2(p_\rho-\overline{p}) - \Delta(p_\rho-\overline{p}) + \eta\partial_t(p_\rho-\overline{p}) = -(\nu_\rho-\overline{\nu})\partial_t^2\overline{p} + \rho^{st} & \text{in } I \times \Omega \\ (p_\rho-\overline{p},\partial_t(p_\rho-\overline{p}))(0) = (0,0) & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Applying Lemma 2.3 to the above system yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \|p_{\rho} - \overline{p}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} & (35) \\ &\leq \hat{c}(\|(\nu_{\rho} - \overline{\nu})\partial_{t}^{2}\overline{p}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|\rho^{st}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|(\nu_{\rho} - \overline{\nu})\partial_{t}^{3}\overline{p}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|\partial_{t}\rho^{st}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}) \\ &\leq \hat{c}((\|\partial_{t}^{2}\overline{p}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} + \|\partial_{t}^{3}\overline{p}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))})\|\nu_{\rho} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} + \|\rho^{st}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|\partial_{t}\rho^{st}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $(\overline{\nu}, \overline{p}, \overline{q})$ solves (OS^{τ}) with $(\rho^{st}, \rho^{adj}, \rho^{vi}) = 0$, applying (21) to (35) leads to (22). Since $q_{\rho} - \overline{q}$ solves

$$\begin{cases} \overline{\nu}\partial_t^2(q_\rho - \overline{q}) - \Delta(q_\rho - \overline{q}) - \eta\partial_t(q_\rho - \overline{q}) = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i(p_\rho - \overline{p}) - (\nu_\rho - \overline{\nu})\partial_t^2\overline{q} + \rho^{adj} & \text{in } I \times \Omega\\ (q_\rho - \overline{q}, \partial_t(q_\rho - \overline{q}))(T) = (0, 0) & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

Lemma 2.3 yields that

$$\begin{split} \|q_{\rho} - \overline{q}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \\ &\leq \hat{c}(\sum_{i=1}^{m} \|a_{i}\|_{L^{\infty}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))}(\|p_{\rho} - \overline{p}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|\partial_{t}(p_{\rho} - \overline{p})\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \|\partial_{t}a_{i}\|_{L^{\infty}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))}\|p_{\rho} - \overline{p}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} \\ &+ (\|\partial_{t}^{2}\overline{q}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} + \|\partial_{t}^{3}\overline{q}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))})\|\nu_{\rho} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} + \|\rho^{adj}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|\partial_{t}\rho^{adj}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}). \end{split}$$

Applying (21) and (32) with $(\tilde{\rho}^{st}, \tilde{\rho}^{adj}, \tilde{\rho}^{vi}) = 0$, we obtain (23).

With the following lemma, we will abandon the modification \mathcal{V}_{ad}^{τ} of the admissible set \mathcal{V}_{ad} . The proof follows the argumentation from [24, Corollary 5.3] with a careful modification.

Lemma 3.3. Let Assumption 2.4 and (SSC^{τ}) hold. Let $(\rho^{st}, \rho^{adj}, \rho^{VI}) \in H^1(I, L^2(\Omega)) \times H^1(I, L^2(\Omega)) \times L^{\infty}(\Omega)$ such that $\rho^{st}(0) = \rho^{adj}(T) = 0$ and

$$\|\rho^{st}\|_{H^{1}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|\rho^{adj}\|_{H^{1}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|\rho^{VI}\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \leq \frac{\tau}{c_{L}}, \quad c_{L} \coloneqq \max\{L_{p}\|\partial_{t}^{2}\overline{q}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))}, L_{q}\|\partial_{t}^{2}\overline{p}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))}, 1\}.$$
(36)

Then, the unique solution to (OS^{τ}) satisfies (OS).

Proof. Let $(\nu_{\rho}, p_{\rho}, q_{\rho})$ denote the solution to (OS^{τ}) . Since the equations in (OS) and (OS^{τ}) coincide, it remains to show that the variational inequality in (OS) is valid. By (OS^{τ}) , it holds that

$$(-\int_{0}^{T} \partial_{t}^{2} \overline{p}(t) q_{\rho}(t) + \partial_{t}^{2} (p_{\rho}(t) - \overline{p}(t)) \overline{q}(t) dt + \lambda \nu_{\rho}, \widetilde{\nu} - \nu_{\rho})_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \geq (\rho^{VI}, \widetilde{\nu} - \nu_{\rho})_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \quad \forall \widetilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}^{\tau}.$$
(37)

By the definition of \mathcal{V}_{ad}^{τ} (see (17)) and since $\nu_{\rho} \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}^{\tau}$, it holds for every $\tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}^{\tau}$ that $\tilde{\nu} - \nu_{\rho} = 0$ a.e. in $\mathscr{A}_{\tau}(\bar{\nu})$. As a consequence, (37) implies that

$$(-\int_{0}^{T} \partial_{t}^{2} \overline{p}(t) q_{\rho}(t) + \partial_{t}^{2} (p_{\rho}(t) - \overline{p}(t)) \overline{q}(t) dt + \lambda \nu_{\rho}, \widetilde{\nu} - \nu_{\rho})_{L^{2}(\Omega \setminus \mathscr{A}_{\tau}(\overline{\nu}))} \geq (\rho^{VI}, \widetilde{\nu} - \nu_{\rho})_{L^{2}(\Omega \setminus \mathscr{A}_{\tau}(\overline{\nu}))} \quad \forall \widetilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}^{\tau}.$$
(38)

For every $\nu \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}$, we set $\widetilde{\nu} \coloneqq \chi_{\mathscr{A}_{\tau}(\overline{\nu})}\overline{\nu} + \chi_{(\Omega \setminus \mathscr{A}_{\tau}(\overline{\nu}))}\nu \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}^{\tau}$ in (38). Since $\widetilde{\nu}$ and ν coincide in $\Omega \setminus \mathscr{A}_{\tau}(\overline{\nu})$, it follows that (38) holds for every $\nu \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}$, i.e.,

$$(-\int_{0}^{T} \partial_{t}^{2} \overline{p}(t) q_{\rho}(t) + \partial_{t}^{2} (p_{\rho}(t) - \overline{p}(t)) \overline{q}(t) dt + \lambda \nu_{\rho}, \nu - \nu_{\rho})_{L^{2}(\Omega \setminus \mathscr{A}_{\tau}(\overline{\nu}))} \geq (\rho^{VI}, \nu - \nu_{\rho})_{L^{2}(\Omega \setminus \mathscr{A}_{\tau}(\overline{\nu}))} \quad \forall \nu \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}.$$
(39)

Let $\mathscr{A}_{\tau}^{+}(\overline{\nu}) \coloneqq \{x \in \Omega : -\int_{0}^{T} \partial_{t}^{2} \overline{p}(t, x) \overline{q}(t, x) dt + \lambda \overline{\nu}(x) > \tau \}$ and $\mathscr{A}_{\tau}^{-}(\overline{\nu}) \coloneqq \{x \in \Omega : -\int_{0}^{T} \partial_{t}^{2} \overline{p}(t, x) \overline{q}(t, x) dt + \lambda \overline{\nu}(x) < -\tau \}$. Then, by (16), it holds $\mathscr{A}_{\tau}(\overline{\nu}) = \mathscr{A}_{\tau}^{+}(\overline{\nu}) \cup \mathscr{A}_{\tau}^{-}(\overline{\nu})$ and it follows for a.e. $x \in \mathscr{A}_{\tau}^{+}(\overline{\nu})$ that

$$\tau < -\int_{0}^{T} \partial_{t}^{2} \overline{p}(t,x) \overline{q}(t,x) dt + \lambda \overline{\nu}(x)$$

$$= -\int_{0}^{T} \partial_{t}^{2} \overline{p}(t,x) q_{\rho}(t,x) + \partial_{t}^{2} (p_{\rho}(t,x) + \overline{p}(t,x)) \overline{q}(t,x) dt + \lambda \nu_{\rho}(x) - \rho^{VI}(x)$$

$$+ \int_{0}^{T} \partial_{t}^{2} \overline{p}(t,x) (q_{\rho}(t,x) - \overline{q}(t,x)) + \partial_{t}^{2} (p_{\rho}(t,x) - \overline{p}(t,x)) \overline{q}(t,x) dt + \rho^{VI}(x)$$

$$\leq -\int_{0}^{T} \partial_{t}^{2} \overline{p}(t,x) q_{\rho}(t,x) + \partial_{t}^{2} (p_{\rho}(t,x) + \overline{p}(t,x)) \overline{q}(t,x) dt + \lambda \nu_{\rho}(x) - \rho^{VI}(x)$$

$$(40)$$

$$+ \|\partial_{t}^{2}\overline{p}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))}\|q_{\rho} - \overline{q}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} + \|p_{\rho} - \overline{p}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))}\|\partial_{t}^{2}\overline{q}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} + \|\rho^{VI}\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)}$$

$$\leq \int_{0}^{T} \partial_{t}^{2}\overline{p}(t,x)q_{\rho}(t,x) + \partial_{t}^{2}(p_{\rho}(t,x) + \overline{p}(t,x))\overline{q}(t,x)dt + \lambda\nu_{\rho}(x) - \rho^{VI}(x)$$

$$+ c_{L}(\|\rho^{st}\|_{H^{1}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|\rho^{adj}\|_{H^{1}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|\rho^{VI}\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)})$$

where $c_L = \max\{L_p \| \partial_t^2 \overline{q} \|_{L^2(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))}, L_q \| \partial_t^2 \overline{p} \|_{L^2(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))}, 1\}$. Consequently, we obtain that

$$\begin{array}{l}
0 \leq & \tau - c_{L}(\|\rho^{st}\|_{H^{1}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|\rho^{adj}\|_{H^{1}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|\rho^{VI}\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)}) \\
\leq & (36) \\
\leq & (40) \\
\leq & (40) \\
\end{array} - \int_{0}^{T} \partial_{t}^{2} \overline{p}(t,x) q_{\rho}(t,x) + \partial_{t}^{2}(p_{\rho}(t,x) + \overline{p}(t,x)) \overline{q}(t,x) dt + \lambda \nu_{\rho}(x) - \rho^{VI}(x) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \mathscr{A}_{\tau}^{+}(\overline{\nu}).
\end{array}$$
(41)

Analogously,

$$0 \ge -\int_0^T \partial_t^2 \overline{p}(t,x) q_\rho(t,x) + \partial_t^2 (p_\rho(t,x) + \overline{p}(t,x)) \overline{q}(t,x) dt + \lambda \nu_\rho(x) - \rho^{VI}(x) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \mathscr{A}_\tau^-(\overline{\nu}).$$
(42)

On the other hand, by a standard argumentation, due to (8), the pointwise inequality

$$\left(-\int_0^T \partial_t^2 \overline{p}(t,x)\overline{q}(t,x)dt + \lambda\overline{\nu}(x)\right)(v-\overline{\nu}(x)) \ge 0 \quad \text{for all } v \in [\nu_-(x),\nu_+(x)] \text{ and a.e. } x \in \Omega$$

holds, implying that $\overline{\nu} = \nu_{-}$ in $\mathscr{A}_{\tau}^{+}(\overline{\nu})$ and $\overline{\nu} = \nu_{+}$ in $\mathscr{A}_{\tau}^{-}(\overline{\nu})$. Therefore, since $\nu_{\rho} = \overline{\nu}$ in $\mathscr{A}_{\tau}(\overline{\nu})$, along with (41) and (42), we obtain that

$$\begin{pmatrix} -\int_{0}^{T} \partial_{t}^{2} \overline{p}(t)q_{\rho}(t) + \partial_{t}^{2}(p_{\rho}(t) - \overline{p}(t))\overline{q}(t)dt + \lambda\nu_{\rho} - \rho^{VI}, \nu - \nu_{\rho} \end{pmatrix}_{L^{2}(\mathscr{A}_{\tau}(\overline{\nu}))}$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} -\int_{0}^{T} \partial_{t}^{2} \overline{p}(t)q_{\rho}(t) + \partial_{t}^{2}(p_{\rho}(t) - \overline{p}(t))\overline{q}(t)dt + \lambda\nu_{\rho} - \rho^{VI}, \underbrace{\nu - \nu_{-}}_{\geq 0 \text{ a.e.}} \end{pmatrix}_{L^{2}(\mathscr{A}_{\tau}^{+}(\overline{\nu}))}$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} -\int_{0}^{T} \partial_{t}^{2} \overline{p}(t)q_{\rho}(t) + \partial_{t}^{2}(p_{\rho}(t) - \overline{p}(t))\overline{q}(t)dt + \lambda\nu_{\rho} - \rho^{VI}, \underbrace{\nu - \nu_{+}}_{\leq 0 \text{ a.e.}} \end{pmatrix}_{L^{2}(\mathscr{A}_{\tau}^{-}(\overline{\nu}))}$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} -\int_{0}^{T} \partial_{t}^{2} \overline{p}(t)q_{\rho}(t) + \partial_{t}^{2}(p_{\rho}(t) - \overline{p}(t))\overline{q}(t)dt + \lambda\nu_{\rho} - \rho^{VI}, \underbrace{\nu - \nu_{+}}_{\leq 0 \text{ a.e.}} \end{pmatrix}_{L^{2}(\mathscr{A}_{\tau}^{-}(\overline{\nu}))}$$

$$= 0 \quad \forall \nu \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}.$$

$$= \underbrace{\langle 0 \text{ a.e. in } \mathscr{A}_{\tau}^{-}(\overline{\nu}) \text{ due to } (42)}$$

Combining (39) and (43) proves the assertion.

4 Sequential Quadratic Programming

The SQP method (cf. [21, Section 4.11]) approximates (P) by a sequence of coupled systems arising from a suitable linearization process of the optimality system (8). This leads to the following algorithm:

Algorithm 1 Sequential Quadratic Programming

- 1: Choose (ν_0, p_0, q_0) and set k = 0.
- 2: Compute the solution (
 u, p, q) to

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\nu}_k \partial_t^2 p - \Delta p + \eta \partial_t p &= f - (\nu - \nu_k) \partial_t^2 p_k & \text{in } I \times \Omega \\ (p, \partial_t p)(0) &= (0, 0) & \text{in } \Omega \\ \nu_k \partial_t^2 q - \Delta q - \eta \partial_t q &= \sum_{i=1}^m a_i (p - p_i^{ob}) - (\nu - \nu_k) \partial_t^2 q_k & \text{in } I \times \Omega \end{aligned}$$

$$(\mathbb{P}_k)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{i=1}{\begin{pmatrix} (q,\partial_t q)(T) = (0,0) \\ (-\int_0^T \partial_t^2 p_k(t)q(t) + \partial_t^2(p(t) - p_k(t))q_k(t)dt + \lambda\nu, \tilde{\nu} - \nu)_{L^2(\Omega)} \ge 0 & \text{for all } \tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}, \end{aligned}}$$

and set $(\nu_{k+1}, p_{k+1}, q_{k+1}) \coloneqq (\nu, p, q)$. 3: Stop or set k = k + 1 and go back to step 2.

Remark 4.1. The hyperbolicity and the second-order bilinear character of the PDEs in (\mathbb{P}_k) leads to an undesired effect of loss of regularity, causing two major challenges:

- (i) For a given iterate $(\nu_k, p_k, q_k) \in \mathcal{V}_{ad} \times C^l(I, L^2(\Omega)) \times C^l(I, L^2(\Omega))$ for some l > 2, the solutions p_{k+1}, q_{k+1} to (\mathbb{P}_k) are in general only l 1-times continuously differentiable. This can be inferred from Lemma 2.2 due to the regularity of the source terms $(\nu \nu_k)\partial_t^2 p_k, (\nu \nu_k)\partial_t^2 q_k \in C^{l-2}(I, L^2(\Omega))$ in the PDEs of (\mathbb{P}_k) . For this reason, Algorithm 1 is generally only executable for a limited number of iterations. To tackle this issue, we propose using a smooth-in-time regularity condition (see Assumption 4.2).
- (ii) In the parabolic case (cf. [12, 14, 19, 24]), the convergence analysis strongly relies on Robinson's notion of *strong* regularity (see [18]). Unfortunately, the regularity results and estimation for the hyperbolic case (see Lemma 2.2 or [5, p. 410]) are weaker than those for the parabolic one. Consequently, the developed strategies for parabolic scenarios cannot be directly transferred to our case and require a substantial extension.

Assumption 4.2. Let Assumption 2.4 hold. Furthermore, let $f \in C^{\infty}(I, L^{2}(\Omega))$ with $\partial_{t}^{l}f(0) = 0$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}_{0} := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, let $a_{i} \in C^{\infty}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))$ for all $i = 1, \ldots m$ with $\partial_{t}^{l}a_{i}(T) = 0$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}_{0}$, let $p_{i}^{ob} \in C^{\infty}(I, L^{2}(\Omega))$ for all $i = 1, \ldots m$, and let $(\nu_{0}, p_{0}, q_{0}) \in \mathcal{V}_{ad} \times C^{\infty}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega)) \times C^{\infty}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))$ with $\partial_{t}^{l}p_{0}(0) = \partial_{t}^{l}q_{0}(T) = 0$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}_{0}$.

Assumption 4.2 implies that $\overline{p}, \overline{q} \in C^{\infty}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))$ with $\partial_t^l \overline{p}(0) = \partial_t^l \overline{q}(T) = 0$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Further, in practice, observation data are typically available through measurements at various time points. Accordingly, their usual extrapolations are smooth in time. Therefore, Assumption 2.4 is reasonable since smoothness is only considered in time, whereas the data are allowed to be non-smooth with respect to the space variable.

Theorem 4.3. Let Assumption 4.2 hold. Then, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the system (\mathbb{P}_k) admits at least one solution $(\nu_{k+1}, p_{k+1}, q_{k+1}) \in \mathcal{V}_{ad} \times C^{\infty}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega)) \times C^{\infty}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))$ satisfying $\partial_t^l p_k(0) = \partial_t^l q_k(T) = 0$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$. In particular, Algorithm 1 is well-defined.

Proof. Let $(\nu_k, p_k, q_k) \in \mathcal{V}_{ad} \times C^{\infty}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega)) \times C^{\infty}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))$ with $\partial_t^l p_k(0) = \partial_t^l q_k(T) = 0$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$ be given for some $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. By $G_k \colon L^2(\Omega) \to C^3(I, H^1_D(\Omega))$ we denote the affine-linear and continuous solution operator that

maps every ν to the unique solution p to

$$\begin{cases} \nu_k \partial_t^2 p - \Delta p + \eta \partial_t p = f - (\nu - \nu_k) \partial_t^2 p_k & \text{in } I \times \Omega\\ (p, \partial_t p)(0) = (0, 0) & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Note that the well-definedness of G_k follows from Assumption 4.2 and Lemma 2.2. Making use of G_k , we consider the following minimization problem:

$$\inf_{\nu \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}} J_k(\nu) \coloneqq \mathcal{J}(\nu, G_k \nu) - ((\nu - \nu_k)\partial_t^2 (G_k \nu - p_k), q_k)_{L^2(I, L^2(\Omega))}$$
(44)

To prove the existence of a minimizer to (44), it remains to show that $J_k \colon L^2(\Omega) \to \mathbb{R}$ is lower sequentially semicontinuous. The lower sequential semicontinuity of the first term is obvious since it is convex and continuous. For the second term, we notice that the embedding $C^1(I, H_D^1(\Omega)) \hookrightarrow C(I, L^2(\Omega))$ is compact due to the Aubin-Lions lemma. Then, along with the continuity and affine-linearity of $\partial_t^2 G_k \colon L^2(\Omega) \to C^1(I, H_D^1(\Omega))$, we obtain the following implication:

$$\nu_n \rightharpoonup \nu \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(\Omega) \quad \Rightarrow \quad (\nu_n \partial_t^2 G_k \nu_n, q_k)_{L^2(I, L^2(\Omega))} \rightarrow (\nu \partial_t^2 G_k \nu, q_k)_{L^2(I, L^2(\Omega))}.$$

In conclusion, J_k is lower sequentially semicontinuous, and therefore (44) admits at least one minimizer $\nu_{k+1} \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}$. On the other hand, the iteration system (\mathbb{P}_k) is equivalent to the condition that $J'_k(\nu)(\tilde{\nu}-\nu) \ge 0$ for every $\tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}$ which is nothing but the necessary optimality condition to (44). Therefore, (\mathbb{P}_k) admits at least one solution ($\nu_{k+1}, p_{k+1}, q_{k+1}$). Applying Assumption 4.2 and Lemma 2.3 to the PDE systems in (\mathbb{P}_k) yields $p_{k+1}, q_{k+1} \in C^{\infty}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))$ and $\partial_t^l p_{k+1}(0) = \partial_t^l q_{k+1}(T) = 0$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$. In conclusion, the claim follows inductively.

Assumption 4.4. Let Assumption 4.2 hold. Furthermore, let

$$C_{f} \coloneqq \sup_{l \in \mathbb{N}_{0}} \|\partial_{t}^{l}f\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}, \quad C_{a} \coloneqq \sup_{l \in \mathbb{N}_{0}} \sum_{j=0}^{l} {l \choose j} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \|\partial_{t}^{j}a_{i}\|_{L^{\infty}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))}, \quad C_{ob} \coloneqq \sup_{l \in \mathbb{N}_{0}} \sup_{i=1,...,m} \|\partial_{t}^{l}p_{i}^{ob}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}$$
$$C_{0} \coloneqq \max\left\{\sup_{l \in \mathbb{N}_{0}} \|\partial_{t}^{l}p_{0}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))}, \sup_{l \in \mathbb{N}_{0}} \|\partial_{t}^{l}q_{0}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))}\right\}$$

satisfy

$$C_f, C_a, C_{ob}, C_0 < \infty, \qquad \frac{C_f}{C_0} < \frac{1}{2\hat{c}}, \qquad \frac{C_a(C_0\sqrt{|\Omega|} + C_{ob})}{C_0} < \frac{1}{2\hat{c}}$$

with \hat{c} as in Lemma 2.3. Moreover, suppose that there exists a constant $\gamma \in (0,1)$ such that

$$\|\nu_{0} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \leq \kappa \coloneqq \min\left\{\frac{\gamma}{4\delta}, \frac{1}{\delta_{0}}, (4L(c_{1} + \kappa_{0} + |\Omega|\kappa_{0}c_{1}))^{-1}, (4L(3c_{1} + 2|\Omega|c_{1}^{2}))^{-1}, \frac{1}{4\hat{c}} - \frac{C_{f}}{2C_{0}}, \qquad (45)$$
$$\frac{1}{4\hat{c}} - \frac{C_{a}(C_{0}\sqrt{|\Omega|} + C_{ob})}{2C_{0}}, \frac{\tau}{(6(\sqrt{2} + c_{1})C_{0} + 2(\sqrt{2} + c_{1})\overline{C})c_{L}}\right\}$$

with L as in Theorem 3.2, c_L as in Lemma 3.3, and

$$\kappa_{0} \coloneqq \max\left\{\sup_{l \in \mathbb{N}_{0}} \frac{\|\partial_{t}^{l}(\overline{p} - p_{0})\|_{L^{2}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))}}{\|\nu_{0} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}}, \sup_{l \in \mathbb{N}_{0}} \frac{\|\partial_{t}^{l}(\overline{q} - q_{0})\|_{L^{2}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))}}{\|\nu_{0} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}}\right\}, \quad \delta_{0} \coloneqq 2L(2c_{0}(1 + |\Omega|\kappa_{0}) + |\Omega|\kappa_{0}^{2}),$$

$$\overline{C} \coloneqq \max\left\{\sup_{l \in \mathbb{N}_{0}} \|\partial_{t}^{l}\overline{p}\|_{L^{2}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))}, \sup_{l \in \mathbb{N}_{0}} \|\partial_{t}^{l}\overline{q}\|_{L^{2}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))}\right\}, \quad \delta \coloneqq 2L(2c_{1} + 3|\Omega|c_{1}^{2}),$$

$$c_{0} = (2\hat{c}(2C_{a}\sqrt{|\Omega|}\hat{c} + 1)(C_{0} + \overline{C}) + \kappa_{0}), \quad c_{1} \coloneqq 4\hat{c}(2C_{a}\sqrt{|\Omega|}\hat{c} + 1)(\overline{C} + C_{0}).$$

Remark 4.5. Applying Lemma 2.3 to (8) implies that $\overline{C} \leq \max\{2\hat{c}C_f, 2\hat{c}C_a(2\hat{c}C_f + C_{ob})\} < \infty$ and $\kappa_0 \leq \frac{\overline{C}+C_0}{\|\nu_0-\overline{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}} < \infty$. Furthermore, the definition of κ_0 provides that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t^l(\overline{p} - p_0)\|_{L^2(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))} &\leq \kappa_0 \|\nu_0 - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} & \forall l \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ \|\partial_t^l(\overline{q} - q_0)\|_{L^2(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))} &\leq \kappa_0 \|\nu_0 - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} & \forall l \in \mathbb{N}_0. \end{aligned}$$
(46)

In the following, we suppose that (SSC^{au}) holds. Associated with a given $(\nu_k, p_k, q_k) \in \mathcal{V}_{ad} \times C^{\infty}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega)) \times C^{\infty}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))$ satisfying $\partial_t^l p_k(0) = \partial_t^l q_k(T) = 0$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and some $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we introduce the mapping

$$S_k \colon L^2(\Omega) \times X_0 \times X_T \to L^2(\Omega) \times C^{\infty}(I, L^{\infty}) \times C^{\infty}(I, L^{\infty}), \quad (\hat{\nu}, \hat{p}, \hat{q}) \mapsto (\nu, p, q)$$

with $X_t := \{p \in C^{\infty}(I, L^{\infty}) : \partial_t^l p(t) = 0 \text{ for all } l \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ for $t \in \{0, T\}$, that assigns to every $(\hat{\nu}, \hat{p}, \hat{q}) \in L^2(\Omega) \times X_0 \times X_T$ the solution (ν, p, q) to

$$\begin{cases} \overline{\nu}\partial_t^2 p - \Delta p + \eta \partial_t p = f - (\nu_k - \overline{\nu})\partial_t^2 \hat{p} - (\hat{\nu} - \nu_k)\partial_t^2 p_k - (\nu - \hat{\nu})\partial_t^2 \overline{p} & \text{in } I \times \Omega\\ (p, \partial_t p)(0) = (0, 0) & \text{in } \Omega \end{cases}$$

$$(-\int_0^T \partial_t^2 \overline{p}(t)q(t) + \partial_t^2 (p_k(t) - \overline{p}(t))\hat{q}(t) + \partial_t^2 (\hat{p}(t) - p_k(t))q_k(t) + \partial_t^2 (p(t) - \hat{p}(t))\overline{q}(t)dt + \lambda\nu, \hat{\nu} - \nu)_{L^2(\Omega)} \ge 0 \qquad \forall \hat{\nu} \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}^{\tau}.$$

Remark 4.6. The system (47) is nothing but (OS^{τ}) with the perturbation terms

$$\rho^{st} = -(\nu_k - \overline{\nu})\partial_t^2 \hat{p} - (\hat{\nu} - \nu_k)\partial_t^2 p_k - (\overline{\nu} - \hat{\nu})\partial_t^2 \overline{p} \qquad \in H^1(I, L^2(\Omega))$$

$$\rho^{adj} = -(\nu_k - \overline{\nu})\partial_t^2 \hat{q} - (\hat{\nu} - \nu_k)\partial_t^2 q_k - (\overline{\nu} - \hat{\nu})\partial_t^2 \overline{q} \qquad \in H^1(I, L^2(\Omega))$$

$$\rho^{VI} = \int_0^T \partial_t^2 (p_k(t) - \overline{p}(t))\hat{q}(t) + \partial_t^2 (\hat{p}(t) - p_k(t))q_k(t) + \partial_t^2 (\overline{p}(t) - \hat{p}(t))\overline{q}(t)dt \qquad \in L^2(\Omega)$$
(48)

$$\rho^{st} = \int_0^{adj} (T) = 0$$
 such that the well-definedness of S_k follows by Proposition 3.1 and Lemma 2.3, which

satisfying $\rho^{st}(0) = \rho^{aaj}(T) = 0$ such that the well-definedness of S_k follows by Proposition 3.1 and Lemma 2.3, which also imply that the first component ν of $S_k(\hat{\nu}, \hat{p}, \hat{q})$ lies in \mathcal{V}_{ad}^{τ} .

We aim to show that S_k admits a unique fixed point. According to (\mathbb{P}_k) , every fixed point to S_k exactly solves the iteration in Algorithm 1 with \mathcal{V}_{ad}^{τ} instead of \mathcal{V}_{ad} . Unfortunately, due to the nature of the hyperbolic PDEs and the second-order time derivatives in the source terms, S_k cannot be defined as a self-map in an appropriate Banach space (see Lemma 2.2). As a consequence, the contraction principle is not applicable directly to S_k . As mentioned in the introduction, we establish a suitable self-map to overcome this issue. First, we define for every $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ the mapping

$$T_k \colon L^2(\Omega) \to L^2(\Omega) \times X_0 \times X_T, \quad \hat{\nu} \mapsto (\hat{\nu}, \hat{p}, \hat{q})$$
(49)

where \hat{p}, \hat{q} solve

$$\begin{cases} \nu_k \partial_t^2 \hat{p} - \Delta \hat{p} + \eta \partial_t \hat{p} = f - (\hat{\nu} - \nu_k) \partial_t^2 p_k & \text{in } I \times \Omega \\ (\hat{p}, \partial_t \hat{p})(0) = (0, 0) & \text{in } \Omega \end{cases}$$
(50)

$$\begin{cases} \nu_k \partial_t^2 \hat{q} - \Delta \hat{q} - \eta \partial_t \hat{q} = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i (\hat{p} - p_i^{ob}) - (\hat{\nu} - \nu_k) \partial_t^2 q_k & \text{in } I \times \Omega \\ (\hat{q}, \partial_t \hat{q})(T) = (0, 0) & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$
(51)

The well-definedness of T_k follows from Lemma 2.3. Then, the desired self-mapping operator reads

$$(I_{\nu} \circ S_k \circ T_k) \colon L^2(\Omega) \to L^2(\Omega) \quad \text{with} \quad I_{\nu} \colon (\nu, p, q) \mapsto \nu.$$
 (52)

As we will see later, the operator (52) is constructed suitably such that every fixed point ν_{k+1} of (52) is exactly the first (control) component of the solution to (\mathbb{P}_k) . Furthermore, the quantity $T_k(\nu_{k+1})$ is a fixed point of S_k and solves the iteration (\mathbb{P}_k) . To prove these results, let us start with the following two auxiliary lemmata:

Lemma 4.7. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, Assumption 4.4 hold, and ν_k and $(\nu_{k-1}, p_{k-1}, q_{k-1})$ be given such that

$$\begin{cases} \nu_{k}, \nu_{k-1} \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}, p_{k-1}, q_{k-1} \in C^{\infty}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega)), \partial_{t}^{l} p_{k-1}(0) = \partial_{t}^{l} q_{k-1}(T) = 0 \quad \forall l \in \mathbb{N}_{0} \\ \|\partial_{t}^{l} p_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \leq C_{0}, \quad \|\partial_{t}^{l} q_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \leq C_{0} \quad \forall l \in \mathbb{N}_{0} \\ \|\nu_{k} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \leq \kappa, \quad \|\nu_{k-1} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \leq \kappa \end{cases}$$
(A_k)

with $C_0, \kappa > 0$ as in Assumption 4.4. Then, the unique solutions p_k , q_k to

$$\begin{cases} \nu_{k-1}\partial_t^2 p_k - \Delta p_k + \eta \partial_t p_k = f - (\nu_k - \nu_{k-1})\partial_t^2 p_{k-1} & \text{in } I \times \Omega\\ (p_k, \partial_t p_k)(0) = (0, 0) & \text{in } \Omega \end{cases}$$
(53)

$$\begin{cases} \nu_{k-1}\partial_t^2 q_k - \Delta q_k - \eta \partial_t q_k = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i (p_k - p_i^{ob}) - (\nu_k - \nu_{k-1})\partial_t^2 q_{k-1} & \text{in } I \times \Omega\\ (q_k, \partial_t q_k)(T) = (0, 0) & \text{in } \Omega \end{cases}$$
(54)

satisfy $p_k, q_k \in C^{\infty}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))$, $\partial_t^l p_k(0) = \partial_t^l q_k(T) = 0$, $\|\partial_t^l p_k\|_{L^2(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \leq C_0$, and $\|\partial_t^l q_k\|_{L^2(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \leq C_0$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Proof. Due to Assumption 4.4 and (A_k), applying Lemma 2.3 to (53) yields that $p_k \in C^{\infty}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))$, $\partial_t^l p_k(0) = 0$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_{t}^{l}p_{k}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} &\leq \hat{c}(\|\partial_{t}^{l}f\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|(\nu_{k}-\nu_{k-1})\partial_{t}^{l+2}p_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|\partial_{t}^{l+1}f\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} \\ &+ \|(\nu_{k}-\nu_{k-1})\partial_{t}^{l+3}p_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}) \\ &\leq 2\hat{c}C_{f} + 2\hat{c}C_{0}\|\nu_{k}-\nu_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \leq 2\hat{c}C_{f} + 2\hat{c}C_{0}(\|\nu_{k}-\overline{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} + \|\nu_{k-1}-\overline{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}) \\ &\stackrel{\leq}{\underset{(\mathsf{A}_{k})}{\leq}} 2\hat{c}C_{f} + 4\hat{c}C_{0}\kappa\underset{(\mathsf{45})}{\leq} 2\hat{c}C_{f} + 4\hat{c}C_{0}\left(\frac{1}{4\hat{c}} - \frac{C_{f}}{2C_{0}}\right) = C_{0} \quad \forall l \in \mathbb{N}_{0}. \end{aligned}$$

Analogously, applying Lemma 2.3 to (54), it follow that $q_k \in C^{\infty}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))$, $\partial_t^l q_k(T) = 0$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t^l q_k\|_{L^2(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \\ &\leq \hat{c}(\sum_{j=0}^l \binom{l}{j} \sum_{i=1}^m \|\partial_t^j a_i\|_{L^{\infty}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \|\partial_t^{l-j}(p_k - p_i^{ob})\|_{L^2(I,L^2(\Omega))} + \|\nu_k - \nu_{k-1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\partial_t^{l+3} q_{k-1}\|_{L^2(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \end{aligned}$$
(56)

$$+ \sum_{j=0}^{l+1} \binom{l+1}{j} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \|\partial_t^j a_i\|_{L^{\infty}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \|\partial_t^{l+1-j}(p_k - p_i^{ob})\|_{L^2(I,L^2(\Omega))} + \|\nu_k - \nu_{k-1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\partial_t^{l+3}q_{k-1}\|_{L^2(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))})$$

$$\leq 2\hat{c}C_a(\sqrt{|\Omega|}C_0 + C_{ob}) + 2\hat{c}C_0(\|\nu_k - \nu_{k-1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}) \leq 2\hat{c}C_a(\sqrt{|\Omega|}C_0 + C_{ob}) + 4\hat{c}C_0\kappa$$

$$\leq 2\hat{c}C_a(\sqrt{|\Omega|}C_0 + C_{ob}) + 2\hat{c}C_0(\|\nu_k - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nu_{k-1} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}) \leq 2\hat{c}C_a(\sqrt{|\Omega|}C_0 + C_{ob}) + 4\hat{c}C_0\kappa$$

$$\leq 2\hat{c}C_a(\sqrt{|\Omega|}C_0 + C_{ob}) + 4\hat{c}C_0\left(\frac{1}{4\hat{c}} - \frac{C_a(\sqrt{|\Omega|}C_0 + C_{ob})}{2C_0}\right) = C_0 \quad \forall l \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Lemma 4.8. Let Assumption 4.4 hold. Then, for $\nu, \tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}$, $(\overline{\nu}, \check{p}, \check{q}) \coloneqq T_0(\overline{\nu})$, $(\nu, p, q) \coloneqq T_0(\nu)$, and $(\tilde{\nu}, \tilde{p}, \tilde{q}) \coloneqq T_0(\tilde{\nu})$, it holds for all $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$ that

$$\|\partial_t^l(\check{p} - p_0)\|_{L^2(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \le c_0 \|\overline{\nu} - \nu_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \qquad \qquad \|\partial_t^l(\check{q} - q_0)\|_{L^2(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \le c_0 \|\overline{\nu} - \nu_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \tag{57}$$

$$\|\partial_t^l(p-\tilde{p})\|_{L^2(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \le c_1 \|\nu - \tilde{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \qquad \qquad \|\partial_t^l(q-\tilde{q})\|_{L^2(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \le c_1 \|\nu - \tilde{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \tag{58}$$

with $c_0, c_1 > 0$ as in Assumption 4.4. Let additionally ν_k and $(\nu_{k-1}, p_{k-1}, q_{k-1})$ satisfy (A_k) for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, for $\nu, \tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}$, $(\nu, p, q) \coloneqq T_k(\nu)$, $(\tilde{\nu}, \tilde{p}, \tilde{q}) \coloneqq T_k(\tilde{\nu})$, and p_k, q_k being the unique solutions to (53) and (54), respectively, it holds for all $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$ that

$$\|\partial_t^l(p-\tilde{p})\|_{L^2(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \le c_1 \|\nu - \tilde{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \qquad \qquad \|\partial_t^l(q-\tilde{q})\|_{L^2(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \le c_1 \|\nu - \tilde{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \tag{59}$$

$$\|\partial_t^l(\overline{p} - p_k)\|_{L^2(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \le c_1(\|\overline{\nu} - \nu_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\overline{\nu} - \nu_{k-1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)})$$
(60)

$$\|\partial_t^l(\overline{q} - q_k)\|_{L^2(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \le c_1(\|\overline{\nu} - \nu_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\overline{\nu} - \nu_{k-1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)})$$
(61)

$$\|\partial_t^l(p - p_k)\|_{L^2(I, L^\infty(\Omega))} \le c_1(\|\nu - \nu_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nu - \nu_{k-1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)})$$
(62)

$$\|\partial_t^l(q-q_k)\|_{L^2(I,L^\infty(\Omega))} \le c_1(\|\nu-\nu_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nu-\nu_{k-1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}).$$
(63)

Proof. Considering the corresponding PDEs for the quantities $p, \tilde{p}, \overline{p}, p_k, q, \tilde{q}, \overline{q}$, and q_k (see (8), (50), (51), (53) and (54)), the estimates follow from Lemma 2.3 along with the estimates from Assumption 4.4 and Lemma 4.7. We refer to the appendix A.1 for the detailed proof.

Under Assumption 4.2, we know that Algorithm 1 is well-defined, but the iteration step (\mathbb{P}_k) may have multiple possible solutions. In the following, we prove that under Assumption 4.4, the solution to the iteration step (\mathbb{P}_k) is unique. More importantly, under a two-step estimation process (65), we establish the R-superlinear convergence of the unique sequence of iterations towards the solution to (P).

Proposition 4.9. Let Assumption 4.4 and (SSC^{τ}) be satisfied. Then, the mapping $(I_{\nu} \circ S_0 \circ T_0) \colon L^2(\Omega) \to L^2(\Omega)$ associated with (ν_0, p_0, q_0) is a contraction and admits a unique fixed point $\nu_1 \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}$ satisfying

$$\|\nu_1 - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \delta_0 \|\overline{\nu} - \nu_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.$$
(64)

Let additionally ν_k and $(\nu_{k-1}, p_{k-1}, q_{k-1})$ satisfy (A_k) for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, the mapping $(I_{\nu} \circ S_k \circ T_k) \colon L^2(\Omega) \to L^2(\Omega)$ associated with (ν_k, p_k, q_k) , with p_k and q_k being the unique solutions to (53) and (54), is a contraction and admits a unique fixed point $\nu_{k+1} \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}$ satisfying

$$\|\nu_{k+1} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \le \delta(\|\overline{\nu} - \nu_{k}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} + \|\overline{\nu} - \nu_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)})^{2}.$$
(65)

Proof. Let $\nu, \tilde{\nu} \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Further, if $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we suppose that ν_k and $(\nu_{k-1}, p_{k-1}, q_{k-1})$ satisfy (A_k) and p_k , q_k denote the unique solutions to (53) and (54), respectively. According to (49), we may write $(\nu, p, q) \coloneqq T_k(\nu)$ and $(\tilde{\nu}, \tilde{p}, \tilde{q}) \coloneqq T_k(\tilde{\nu})$. As pointed out in Remark 4.6, $(S_k \circ T_k)(\nu)$ and $(S_k \circ T_k)(\tilde{\nu})$ solve (OS^{τ}) with the perturbation terms (48) for $(\hat{\nu}, \hat{p}, \hat{q}) = (\nu, p, q)$ and $(\hat{\nu}, \hat{p}, \hat{q}) = (\tilde{\nu}, \tilde{p}, \tilde{q})$, respectively. Then, by Theorem 3.2, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \| (I_{\nu} \circ S_{k} \circ T_{k})(\nu) - (I_{\nu} \circ S_{k} \circ T_{k})(\tilde{\nu}) \|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \tag{66} \\ &\leq L(\| (\nu_{k} - \overline{\nu}) \partial_{t}^{2}(p - \tilde{p}) + (\nu - \tilde{\nu}) \partial_{t}^{2}(p_{k} - \overline{p}) \|_{L^{2}(I, L^{2}(\Omega))} + \| (\nu_{k} - \overline{\nu}) \partial_{t}^{2}(q - \tilde{q}) + (\nu - \tilde{\nu}) \partial_{t}^{2}(q_{k} - \overline{q}) \|_{L^{2}(I, L^{2}(\Omega))} \\ &+ \| \int_{0}^{T} \partial_{t}^{2}(p_{k}(t) - \overline{p}(t))(q(t) - \tilde{q}(t)) + \partial_{t}^{2}(p(t) - \tilde{p}(t))(q_{k}(t) - \overline{q}(t)) dt \|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}) \\ &\leq L(\| \nu_{k} - \overline{\nu} \|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \| \partial_{t}^{2}(p - \tilde{p}) \|_{L^{2}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))} + \| \nu - \tilde{\nu} \|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \| \partial_{t}^{2}(p_{k} - \overline{p}) \|_{L^{2}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \\ &+ \| \nu_{k} - \overline{\nu} \|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \| \partial_{t}^{2}(q - \tilde{q}) \|_{L^{2}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))} + \| \nu - \tilde{\nu} \|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \| \partial_{t}^{2}(q_{k} - \overline{q}) \|_{L^{2}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \\ &+ \| \partial_{t}^{2}(p_{k} - \overline{p}) \|_{L^{2}(I, L^{2}(\Omega))} \| q - \tilde{q} \|_{L^{2}(I, L^{2}(\Omega))} + \| \partial_{t}^{2}(p - \tilde{p}) \|_{L^{2}(I, L^{2}(\Omega))} \| q_{k} - \overline{q} \|_{L^{2}(I, L^{2}(\Omega))}). \end{aligned}$$

According to (46) and (58), the above inequality implies for k = 0 that

 $\|(I_{\nu} \circ S_{0} \circ T_{0})(\nu) - (I_{\nu} \circ S_{0} \circ T_{0})(\tilde{\nu})\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \leq 2L(c_{1} + \kappa_{0} + |\Omega|\kappa_{0}c_{1})\|\nu_{0} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}\|\nu - \tilde{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \underbrace{\leq}_{(45)} \frac{1}{2}\|\nu - \tilde{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}.$

For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, by (66), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \| (I_{\nu} \circ S_{k} \circ T_{k})(\nu) - (I_{\nu} \circ S_{k} \circ T_{k})(\tilde{\nu}) \|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} &\leq 2L(c_{1} \|\nu_{k} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} + c_{1}(\|\overline{\nu} - \nu_{k}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} + \|\overline{\nu} - \nu_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}) \\ &+ |\Omega|c_{1}^{2}(\|\overline{\nu} - \nu_{k}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} + \|\overline{\nu} - \nu_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)})) \|\nu - \tilde{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq 2L(3c_{1} + 2|\Omega|c_{1}^{2})\kappa \|\nu - \tilde{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\nu - \tilde{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the mapping $(I_{\nu} \circ S_k \circ T_k)$: $L^2(\Omega) \to L^2(\Omega)$ is a contraction and consequently admits a unique fixed point $\nu_{k+1} \in L^2(\Omega)$ due to Banach's fixed point theorem. Also, according to Remark 4.6, $I_{\nu} \circ S_k$ maps into \mathcal{V}_{ad}^{τ} such that $\nu_{k+1} \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}^{\tau}$. Now, let us prove (64) and (65). From the above contraction property, it holds that

$$\frac{1}{2} \|\nu_{k+1} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|(I_{\nu} \circ S_k \circ T_k)(\nu_{k+1}) - (I_{\nu} \circ S_k \circ T_k)(\overline{\nu})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \|\nu_{k+1} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Thus, since $\nu_{k+1} = (I_{\nu} \circ S_k \circ T_k)\nu_{k+1}$, it follows that

$$\frac{1}{2} \|\nu_{k+1} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \|\nu_{k+1} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} - \|(I_{\nu} \circ S_k \circ T_k)(\nu_{k+1}) - (I_{\nu} \circ S_k \circ T_k)(\overline{\nu})\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \|(I_{\nu} \circ S_k \circ T_k)(\overline{\nu}) - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$
 (67)

Furthermore, we set $(\overline{\nu}, \check{p}, \check{q}) \coloneqq T_k(\overline{\nu})$. As above, according to Remark 4.6, $S_k(T_k(\overline{\nu}))$ solves (OS^{τ}) with the perturbation terms (48) with $(\hat{\nu}, \hat{p}, \hat{q}) = (\overline{\nu}, \check{p}, \check{q})$, and $(\overline{\nu}, \overline{p}, \overline{q})$ solves (OS^{τ}) with the perturbation $(\rho^{st}, \rho^{adj}, \rho^{VI}) = (0, 0, 0)$. Thus, Theorem 3.2 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(I_{\nu} \circ S_{k} \circ T_{k})(\overline{\nu}) - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq L(\|(\nu_{k} - \overline{\nu})\partial_{t}^{2}(\check{p} - p_{k})\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|(\nu_{k} - \overline{\nu})\partial_{t}^{2}(\check{q} - q_{k})\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} \\ &+ \left\|\int_{0}^{T} \partial_{t}^{2}(p_{k}(t) - \overline{p}(t))\check{q}(t) + \partial_{t}^{2}(\check{p}(t) - p_{k}(t))q_{k}(t) + \partial_{t}^{2}(\overline{p}(t) - \check{p}(t))\overline{q}(t)dt\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \end{aligned}$$
(68)

$$\leq L(\|\nu_{k}-\overline{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}\|\partial_{t}^{2}(\check{p}-p_{k})\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} + \|\nu_{k}-\overline{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}\|\partial_{t}^{2}(\check{q}-q_{k})\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} + \|\partial_{t}^{2}(p_{k}-\overline{p})\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}\|\check{q}-\overline{q}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|\partial_{t}^{2}(\check{p}-p_{k})\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}\|q_{k}-\overline{q}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}) \leq L(\|\nu_{k}-\overline{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}\|\partial_{t}^{2}(\check{p}-p_{k})\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} + \|\nu_{k}-\overline{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}\|\partial_{t}^{2}(\check{q}-q_{k})\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} + \|\partial_{t}^{2}(p_{k}-\overline{p})\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}\|\check{q}-q_{k}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|\partial_{t}^{2}(p_{k}-\overline{p})\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}\|q_{k}-\overline{q}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|\partial_{t}^{2}(\check{p}-p_{k})\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}\|q_{k}-\overline{q}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}).$$

For k = 0, applying (68) to (67) and making use of Lemma 4.8 and Assumption 4.4 yield that

$$\|\nu_{1} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \underbrace{\leq}_{(46),(57)} 2L(2c_{0}(1 + |\Omega|\kappa_{0}) + |\Omega|\kappa_{0}^{2})\|\nu_{0} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}.$$

For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, Lemma 4.8 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nu_{k+1} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} &\leq \\ \underbrace{2L(2c_{1} \|\nu_{k} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}(\|\overline{\nu} - \nu_{k}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} + \|\overline{\nu} - \nu_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}) + 3|\Omega|c_{1}^{2}(\|\overline{\nu} - \nu_{k}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} + \|\overline{\nu} - \nu_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)})^{2})} \\ &\leq 2L(2c_{1} + 3|\Omega|c_{1}^{2})(\|\overline{\nu} - \nu_{k}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} + \|\overline{\nu} - \nu_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)})^{2}. \end{aligned}$$

In conclusion, (64) and (65) are valid. This completes the proof.

Proposition 4.10. Let Assumption 4.4 and (SSC^{τ}) be satisfied and $\nu_1 \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}$ denote the unique fixed point of $(I_{\nu} \circ S_0 \circ T_0)$ associated with (ν_0, p_0, q_0) . Then, $(\nu_1, p_1, q_1) \coloneqq T_0(\nu_1)$ is the unique solution to the iteration (\mathbb{P}_k) for k = 0. Let additionally ν_k and $(\nu_{k-1}, p_{k-1}, q_{k-1})$ satisfy (A_k) for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\nu_{k+1} \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}$ denote the unique fixed point of $(I_{\nu} \circ S_k \circ T_k)$ associated with (ν_k, p_k, q_k) , with p_k and q_k being the unique solutions to (53) and (54). Then, $(\nu_{k+1}, p_{k+1}, q_{k+1}) \coloneqq T_k(\nu_{k+1})$ is the unique solution to (\mathbb{P}_k) .

Proof. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Since ν_{k+1} is a fixed-point of $(I_{\nu} \circ S_k \circ T_k)$, it holds by the definition of S_k (see (47) for $(\hat{\nu}, \hat{p}, \hat{q}) = (\nu_{k+1}, p_{k+1}, q_{k+1})$) that $S_k(\nu_{k+1}, p_{k+1}, q_{k+1}) = (\nu_{k+1}, p, q)$ where p, q are the unique solutions to

$$\begin{cases} \overline{\nu}\partial_t^2 p - \Delta p + \eta \partial_t p = f - (\nu_k - \overline{\nu})\partial_t^2 p_{k+1} - (\nu_{k+1} - \nu_k)\partial_t^2 p_k & \text{in } I \times \Omega \\ (p, \partial_t p)(0) = (0, 0) & \text{in } \Omega \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \overline{\nu}\partial_t^2 q - \Delta q - \eta \partial_t q = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i(p - p_i^{ob}) - (\nu_k - \overline{\nu})\partial_t^2 q_{k+1} - (\nu_{k+1} - \nu_k)\partial_t^2 q_k & \text{in } I \times \Omega \\ (q, \partial_t q)(T) = (0, 0) & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

$$(69)$$

On the other hand, according to the definition of T_k (see (49) for $(\hat{\nu}, \hat{p}, \hat{q}) = (\nu_{k+1}, p_{k+1}, q_{k+1})$), p_{k+1} and q_{k+1} , respectively, solve the same systems (69) and (70). Therefore, we obtain $p = p_{k+1}$ and $q = q_{k+1}$, and consequently $T_k(\nu_{k+1})$ is a fixed point of S_k and satisfies the PDEs in (\mathbb{P}_k) . Let us prove that $T_k(\nu_{k+1})$ satisfies the variational inequality in (\mathbb{P}_k) . Note that the assumptions of Lemma 4.7 and Lemma 4.8 are fulfilled for k + 1 since

$$\|\nu_1 - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \delta_0 \|\nu_0 - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq \delta_0 \kappa^2 \leq \kappa$$

$$(71)$$

$$\|\nu_{k+1} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \underbrace{\leq}_{(65)} \delta(\|\overline{\nu} - \nu_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\overline{\nu} - \nu_{k-1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)})^2 \underbrace{\leq}_{(\mathsf{A}_k)} 4\delta\kappa^2 \underbrace{\leq}_{(45)} \kappa \quad \text{if } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

$$(72)$$

On the other hand, in view of Remark 4.6, the fixed point $(\nu_{k+1}, p_{k+1}, q_{k+1})$ of S_k solves (OS^{τ}) with the perturbation terms

$$\rho^{st} = -(\nu_k - \overline{\nu})\partial_t^2 p_{k+1} - (\nu_{k+1} - \nu_k)\partial_t^2 p_k - (\overline{\nu} - \nu_{k+1})\partial_t^2 \overline{p} \quad \in H^1(I, L^2(\Omega))$$

$$\rho^{adj} = -(\nu_k - \overline{\nu})\partial_t^2 q_{k+1} - (\nu_{k+1} - \nu_k)\partial_t^2 q_k - (\overline{\nu} - \nu_{k+1})\partial_t^2 \overline{q} \quad \in H^1(I, L^2(\Omega))$$

$$\rho^{VI} = \int_0^T \partial_t^2 (p_k(t) - \overline{p}(t))q_{k+1}(t) + \partial_t^2 (p_{k+1}(t) - p_k(t))q_k(t) + \partial_t^2 (\overline{p}(t) - p_{k+1}(t))\overline{q}(t)dt \quad \in L^\infty(\Omega)$$
(73)

satisfying $\rho^{st}(0) = \rho^{adj}(T) = 0$. Making use of Assumption 4.4, Lemma 4.7, and Lemma 4.8 for k and k + 1 we obtain that

$$\begin{split} \|\rho^{st}\|_{H^{1}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} &+ \|\rho^{adj}\|_{H^{1}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|\rho^{VI}\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq \|\nu_{k} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \|\partial_{t}^{2} p_{k+1}\|_{H^{1}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} + \|\nu_{k+1} - \nu_{k}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \|\partial_{t}^{2} p_{k}\|_{H^{1}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} + \|\overline{\nu} - \nu_{k+1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \|\partial_{t}^{2} \overline{p}\|_{H^{1}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \\ &+ \|\nu_{k} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \|\partial_{t}^{2} q_{k+1}\|_{H^{1}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} + \|\nu_{k+1} - \nu_{k}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \|\partial_{t}^{2} q_{k}\|_{H^{1}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} + \|\overline{\nu} - \nu_{k+1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \|\partial_{t}^{2} \overline{q}\|_{H^{1}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \\ &+ \|\partial_{t}^{2} (p_{k} - \overline{p})\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \|q_{k+1}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} + \|\partial_{t}^{2} (p_{k+1} - p_{k})\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \|q_{k}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \\ &+ \|\partial_{t}^{2} (\overline{p} - p_{k+1})\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \|\overline{q}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \\ &\leq 4\sqrt{2}C_{0}\|\nu_{k} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} + 2\sqrt{2}(C_{0} + \overline{C})\|\nu_{k+1} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} + 2c_{1}C_{0}(\|\nu_{k} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} + \|\nu_{k-1} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}) \\ &+ c_{1}(C_{0} + \overline{C})(\|\nu_{k+1} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} + \|\nu_{k} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}) \\ &\leq (6(\sqrt{2} + c_{1})C_{0} + 2(\sqrt{2} + c_{1})\overline{C})\kappa \leq \frac{\tau}{(45)}} \frac{\tau}{c_{L}}. \end{split}$$

Thus, by the Lemma 3.3, $(\nu_{k+1}, p_{k+1}, q_{k+1})$ solves (OS) with the perturbation terms (73). As a consequence, $(\nu_{k+1}, p_{k+1}, q_{k+1})$ satisfies (\mathbb{P}_k) . Assume that $(\tilde{\nu}_{k+1}, \tilde{p}_{k+1}, \tilde{q}_{k+1})$ is another solution to (\mathbb{P}_k) . Then, $(\tilde{\nu}_{k+1}, \tilde{p}_{k+1}, \tilde{q}_{k+1})$ is also a fixed point of S_k , and consequently $\tilde{\nu}_{k+1}$ is a fixed point of $(I_{\nu} \circ S_k \circ T_k)$. By the uniqueness of the fixed point of $(I_{\nu} \circ S_k \circ T_k)$ (see Proposition 4.9), it follows that $\tilde{\nu}_{k+1} = \nu_{k+1}$. Furthermore, by the uniqueness of the solutions to the PDEs in (\mathbb{P}_k) , we obtain $\tilde{p}_{k+1} = p_{k+1}$ and $\tilde{q}_{k+1} = q_{k+1}$. Therefore, $(\nu_{k+1}, p_{k+1}, q_{k+1})$ is the unique solution to (\mathbb{P}_k) .

Differently from the parabolic case, we cannot prove the quadratic (Q-)convergence of Algorithm 1. As a remedy, the proposed two-step estimation process (65) eventually enables us to prove R-superlinear convergence, i.e., the error is dominated by some scalar-valued sequence converging superlinearly to zero [17, page 620]. This final result is proven in Theorem 4.12 by making use of the previous propositions and the following auxiliary lemma:

Lemma 4.11. Let $\{x_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ and let there exist some constants $\delta, \delta_0 > 0$ and $\gamma \in (0,1)$ such that $x_0 \leq \min\left\{\frac{\gamma}{4\delta}, \frac{1}{\delta_0}\right\}$, $x_1 \leq \delta_0 x_0^2$, and $x_{k+1} \leq \delta(x_k + x_{k-1})^2$ for all $k \geq 1$. Then, $\{x_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ converges *R*-superlinearly to 0 and satisfies

$$x_k \le \frac{1}{4\delta} (\gamma^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}})^{\sqrt{2}^k} \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}$$

Proof. By induction, one shows that $\max\{x_k, x_{k+1}\} \le 2^{\binom{2^k}{2}-2} \delta^{\binom{2^k}{2}-1} (\delta_0 x_0^2 + x_0)^{2^{\binom{k}{2}}}$ for every even $k \ge 2$, from which the claim immediately follows. The detailed proof can be found in the appendix A.2.

Theorem 4.12. Let Assumption 4.4 and (SSC^{τ}) be satisfied. Then, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the iteration step (\mathbb{P}_k) of Algorithm 1 admits a unique solution $(\nu_{k+1}, p_{k+1}, q_{k+1}) \in \mathcal{V}_{ad} \times C^{\infty}(I, L^{\infty}) \times C^{\infty}(I, L^{\infty})$ satisfying

$$\|\nu_1 - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \delta_0 \|\nu_0 - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2$$

$$\|\nu_{k+1} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \delta(\|\nu_k - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nu_{k-1} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)})^2 \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Furthermore, Algorithm 1 converges R-superlinearly towards the solution $\overline{\nu}$ to (P) with

$$\|\nu_k - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \frac{1}{4\delta} (\gamma^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}})^{\sqrt{2}^k} \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$
(74)

Proof. For every $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, let $(\nu_{k+1}, p_{k+1}, q_{k+1}) \in \mathcal{V}_{ad} \times C^{\infty}(I, L^{\infty}) \times C^{\infty}(I, L^{\infty})$ denote a solution to (\mathbb{P}_k) according to Theorem 4.3. We combine Proposition 4.9, Proposition 4.10, and Lemma 4.7 to prove by induction that

$$\begin{cases} (\nu_{k+1}, p_{k+1}, q_{k+1}) \in \mathcal{V}_{ad} \times C^{\infty}(I, L^{\infty}) \times C^{\infty}(I, L^{\infty}) \text{ is the unique solution to } (\mathbb{P}_{k}) \\ \|\nu_{k+1} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \leq \delta(\|\overline{\nu} - \nu_{k}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} + \|\overline{\nu} - \nu_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)})^{2} \\ \|\overline{\nu} - \nu_{k}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \leq \kappa, \quad \|\overline{\nu} - \nu_{k+1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \leq \kappa \\ p_{k}, q_{k} \in C^{\infty}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega)) \text{ with } \partial_{t}^{l}p_{k}(0) = \partial_{t}^{l}q_{k}(T) = 0 \quad \forall l \in \mathbb{N}_{0} \\ \|\partial_{t}^{l}p_{k}\|_{L^{2}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \leq C_{0}, \quad \|\partial_{t}^{l}q_{k}\|_{L^{2}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \leq C_{0} \quad \forall l \in \mathbb{N}_{0} \end{cases}$$

$$(75)$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Due to Proposition 4.9 and Proposition 4.10, the solution (ν_1, p_1, q_1) to (\mathbb{P}_k) for k = 0 is unique and satisfies

$$\|\overline{\nu} - \nu_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \delta_0 \|\overline{\nu} - \nu_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \underbrace{\le}_{(45)} \delta_0 \kappa^2 \underbrace{\le}_{(45)} \kappa.$$
(76)

Furthermore, ν_1 and (ν_0, p_0, q_0) satisfy (A_k) for k = 1 such that Proposition 4.9 and Proposition 4.10 imply that the solution (ν_2, p_2, q_2) to (\mathbb{P}_k) for k = 1 is unique and satisfies

$$\|\overline{\nu}-\nu_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \delta(\|\overline{\nu}-\nu_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)}+\|\overline{\nu}-\nu_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)})^2 \underbrace{\le}_{(45),(76)} \delta 4\kappa^2 \underbrace{\le}_{(45)} \kappa.$$

Moreover, Lemma 4.7 implies $p_1, q_1 \in C^{\infty}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))$ with $\partial_t^l p_1(0) = \partial_t^l q_1(T) = 0$, $\|\partial_t^l p_1\|_{L^2(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \leq C_0$ and $\|\partial_t^l q_1\|_{L^2(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \leq C_0$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$. In conclusion, (75) is fulfilled for k = 1. Now, let $k \geq 2$ be fixed, and assume that (75) is satisfied for k - 1. Then, ν_k and $(\nu_{k-1}, p_{k-1}, q_{k-1})$ satisfy (A_k) such that Proposition 4.9 and Proposition 4.10 imply that the solution $(\nu_{k+1}, p_{k+1}, q_{k+1})$ to (\mathbb{P}_k) is unique and it holds that

$$\|\overline{\nu} - \nu_{k+1}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \delta(\|\nu_{k-1} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nu_{k-2} - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)})^2 \le \delta 4\kappa^2 \underbrace{\le}_{(45)} \kappa.$$

Again, Lemma 4.7 implies that $p_k, q_k \in C^{\infty}(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))$ with $\partial_t^l p_k(0) = \partial_t^l q_k(T) = 0$, $\|\partial_t^l p_k\|_{L^2(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \leq C_0$, and $\|\partial_t^l q_k\|_{L^2(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \leq C_0$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$. This completes the induction proof. Finally, the convergence property (74) follows by the previous Lemma 4.11.

A Appendix

A.1 Proof of Lemma 4.8

Proof. Let $\nu, \tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{V}_{ad}$, $(\overline{\nu}, \check{p}, \check{q}) \coloneqq T_0(\overline{\nu})$, $(\nu, p, q) \coloneqq T_0(\nu)$, and $(\tilde{\nu}, \tilde{p}, \tilde{q}) \coloneqq T_0(\tilde{\nu})$. Furthermore, let $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$. To prove (57), we first notice from (50) that $\check{p} - \overline{p}$ solves

$$\begin{cases} \nu_0 \partial_t^2 (\check{p} - \overline{p}) - \Delta (\check{p} - \overline{p}) + \eta \partial_t (\check{p} - \overline{p}) = -(\overline{\nu} - \nu_0) \partial_t^2 (p_0 - \overline{p}) & \text{in } I \times \Omega \\ (\check{p} - \overline{p}, \partial_t (\check{p} - \overline{p}))(0) = (0, 0) & \text{in } \Omega \end{cases}$$

such that Lemma 2.3 and Assumption 4.4 yield that

$$\|\partial_{t}^{l}(\check{p}-\overline{p})\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \leq \hat{c}(\|\overline{\nu}-\nu_{0}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}\|\partial_{t}^{l+2}(p_{0}-\overline{p})\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} + \|\overline{\nu}-\nu_{0}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}\|\partial_{t}^{l+3}(p_{k}-\overline{p})\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))})$$
(77)

 $\leq 2\hat{c}(C_0 + \overline{C}) \|\nu_0 - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$

Consequently, along with the triangular inequality and (46), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t^l(\check{p} - p_0)\|_{L^2(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))} &\leq \|\partial_t^l(\check{p} - \overline{p})\|_{L^2(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))} + \|\partial_t^l(\overline{p} - p_0)\|_{L^2(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \\ &\leq (2\hat{c}(C_0 + \overline{C}) + \kappa_0)\|\nu_0 - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c_0\|\nu_0 - \overline{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \end{aligned}$$

leading to the first inequality in (57). Analogously, due to (8) and (51), $\check{q} - \bar{q}$ solves

$$\begin{cases} \nu_0 \partial_t^2 (\check{q} - \overline{q}) - \Delta (\check{q} - \overline{q}) - \eta \partial_t (\check{q} - \overline{q}) = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i (\check{p} - \overline{p}) - (\overline{\nu} - \nu_0) \partial_t^2 (q_0 - \overline{q}) & \text{in } I \times \Omega \\ (\check{q} - \overline{q}, \partial_t (\check{q} - \overline{q}))(T) = (0, 0) & \text{in } \Omega \end{cases}$$

such that Lemma 2.3 yields that

$$\begin{split} \|\partial_{t}^{l}(\check{q}-\overline{q})\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \\ &\leq \hat{c}(\sum_{j=0}^{l} \binom{l}{j} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \|\partial_{t}^{j}a_{i}\|_{L^{\infty}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \|\partial_{t}^{l-j}(\check{p}-\overline{p})\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|(\overline{\nu}-\nu_{0})\partial_{t}^{l+2}(q_{0}-\overline{q})\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=0}^{l+1} \binom{l+1}{j} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \|\partial_{t}^{j}a_{i}\|_{L^{\infty}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \|\partial_{t}^{l+1-j}(\check{p}-\overline{p})\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|(\overline{\nu}-\nu_{0})\partial_{t}^{l+3}(q_{0}-\overline{q})\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{l} 2\hat{c}(2C_{a}\sqrt{|\Omega|}\hat{c}+1)(C_{0}+\overline{C})\|\overline{\nu}-\nu_{0}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}. \end{split}$$

Again, with the triangular inequality and (46), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t^l(\check{q} - q_0)\|_{L^2(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))} &\leq \|\partial_t^l(\check{q} - \overline{q})\|_{L^2(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))} + \|\partial_t^l(\overline{q} - q_0)\|_{L^2(I, L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \\ &\leq (2\hat{c}(2C_a\sqrt{|\Omega|}\hat{c} + 1)(C_0 + \overline{C}) + \kappa_0)\|\overline{\nu} - \nu_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \end{aligned}$$

leading to the second inequality in (57). By (50), $p-\tilde{p}$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \nu_0 \partial_t^2 (p - \tilde{p}) - \Delta (p - \tilde{p}) + \eta \partial_t (p - \tilde{p}) = -(\nu - \tilde{\nu}) \partial_t^2 p_0 & \text{in } I \times \Omega \\ (p - \tilde{p}, \partial_t (p - \tilde{p}))(0) = (0, 0) & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Applying Lemma 2.3 and Assumption 4.4 gives that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_t^l(p-\tilde{p})\|_{L^2(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} &\leq \hat{c}(\|\nu-\tilde{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\partial_t^{l+2}p_0\|_{L^2(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} + \|\nu-\tilde{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\partial_t^{l+3}p_0\|_{L^2(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))}) \\ &\leq 2\hat{c}C_0\|\nu-\tilde{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c_1\|\nu-\tilde{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \end{aligned}$$

that is the first inequality in (58). By (51), the difference $(q - \tilde{q})$ solves

$$\begin{cases} \nu_0 \partial_t^2 (q - \tilde{q}) - \Delta (q - \tilde{q}) - \eta \partial_t (q - \tilde{q}) = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i (p - \tilde{p}) - (\nu - \tilde{\nu}) \partial_t^2 q_0 & \text{in } I \times \Omega \\ (q - \tilde{q}, \partial_t (q - \tilde{q}))(T) = (0, 0) & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

such that Lemma 2.3 along with the previous estimates provide that

$$\begin{split} \|\partial_t^l(q-\tilde{q})\|_{L^2(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \\ &\leq \hat{c}(\sum_{j=0}^l \binom{l}{j} \sum_{i=1}^m \|\partial_t^j a_i\|_{L^{\infty}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \|\partial_t^{l-j}(p-\tilde{p})\|_{L^2(I,L^2(\Omega))} + \|\nu-\tilde{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\partial_t^{l+2}q_0\|_{L^2(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=0}^{l+1} \binom{l+1}{j} \sum_{i=1}^m \|\partial_t^j a_i\|_{L^{\infty}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \|\partial_t^{l+1-j}(p-\tilde{p})\|_{L^2(I,L^2(\Omega))} + \|\nu-\tilde{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\partial_t^{l+3}q_0\|_{L^2(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))}) \\ &\leq \hat{2}c(2C_a\sqrt{|\Omega|}\hat{c}+1)C_0\|\nu-\tilde{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq c_1\|\nu-\tilde{\nu}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \end{split}$$

that is the second inequality in (58). Now, let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and we redefine $(\nu, p, q) \coloneqq T_k(\nu)$ and $(\tilde{\nu}, \tilde{p}, \tilde{q}) \coloneqq T_k(\tilde{\nu})$. Furthermore, let ν_k and $(\nu_{k-1}, p_{k-1}, q_{k-1})$ satisfy (A_k) and p_k, q_k being the unique solutions to (53) and (54). Then, the estimates in (59) follow by the same argumentation as above along with (A_k) . Let us now prove (60). From (53), we obtain that

$$\begin{cases} \nu_{k-1}\partial_t^2(\overline{p}-p_k) - \Delta(\overline{p}-p_k) + \eta\partial_t(\overline{p}-p_k) = -(\overline{\nu}-\nu_{k-1})\partial_t^2\overline{p} + (\nu_k-\nu_{k-1})\partial_t^2p_{k-1} & \text{in } I \times \Omega\\ (\overline{p}-p_k,\partial_t(\overline{p}-p_k))(0) = (0,0) & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$
(78)

Thus, Lemma 2.3 and (A_k) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_{t}^{l}(\overline{p}-p_{k})\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} &\leq \hat{c}(\|(\overline{\nu}-\nu_{k-1})\partial_{t}^{l+2}\overline{p}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|(\overline{\nu}-\nu_{k-1})\partial_{t}^{l+3}\overline{p}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} & + \|(\nu_{k}-\nu_{k-1})\partial_{t}^{l+3}p_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} \\ &+ \|(\nu_{k}-\nu_{k-1})\partial_{t}^{l+2}p_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|(\nu_{k}-\nu_{k-1})\partial_{t}^{l+3}p_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}) \\ &\leq 2\hat{c}\overline{C}\|\overline{\nu}-\nu_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} + 2\hat{c}C_{0}\|\nu_{k}-\nu_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq 2\hat{c}(\overline{C}+C_{0})(\|\overline{\nu}-\nu_{k}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} + \|\overline{\nu}-\nu_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}) \\ &\leq c_{1}(\|\overline{\nu}-\nu_{k}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} + \|\overline{\nu}-\nu_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}) \end{aligned}$$
(79)

leading to (60). Similarly, by (8) and (54), we obtain that

$$\begin{cases} \nu_{k-1}\partial_t^2(\overline{q}-q_k) - \Delta(\overline{q}-q_k) - \eta\partial_t(\overline{q}-q_k) = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i(\overline{p}-p_k) - (\overline{\nu}-\nu_{k-1})\partial_t^2\overline{q} + (\nu_k-\nu_{k-1})\partial_t^2q_{k-1} & \text{in } I \times \Omega \\ (\overline{q}-q_k,\partial_t(\overline{q}-q_k))(T) = (0,0) & \text{in } \Omega \end{cases}$$

such that Lemma 2.3, Assumption 4.4, (A_k) , and (79) provide

$$\|\partial_t^l(\overline{q}-q_k)\|_{L^2(I,L^\infty(\Omega))}$$

$$\begin{split} &\leq \hat{c}(\sum_{j=0}^{l} \binom{l}{j} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \|\partial_{t}^{j} a_{i}\|_{L^{\infty}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \|\partial_{t}^{l-j}(\overline{p}-p_{k})\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|(\overline{\nu}-\nu_{k-1})\partial_{t}^{l+2}\overline{q}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} \\ &\quad + \|(\nu_{k}-\nu_{k-1})\partial_{t}^{l+2}q_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \sum_{j=0}^{l+1} \binom{l+1}{j} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \|\partial_{t}^{j} a_{i}\|_{L^{\infty}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \|\partial_{t}^{l+1-j}(\overline{p}-p_{k})\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} \\ &\quad + \|(\overline{\nu}-\nu_{k-1})\partial_{t}^{l+3}\overline{q}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|(\nu_{k}-\nu_{k-1})\partial_{t}^{l+3}q_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))}) \\ &\leq \hat{c}(2C_{a}\sqrt{|\Omega|}2\hat{c}(\overline{C}+C_{0})(\|\overline{\nu}-\nu_{k}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} + \|\overline{\nu}-\nu_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}) + 2\overline{C}\|\overline{\nu}-\nu_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} + 2C_{0}\|\nu_{k}-\nu_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}) \\ &\leq \hat{c}c(2C_{a}\sqrt{|\Omega|}\hat{c}+1)(\overline{C}+C_{0})(\|\overline{\nu}-\nu_{k}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} + \|\overline{\nu}-\nu_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}) \\ &\leq c_{1}(\|\overline{\nu}-\nu_{k}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} + \|\overline{\nu}-\nu_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}), \end{split}$$

that is (61). To prove (62), notice that $p-p_k$ solves

$$\begin{cases} \nu_k \partial_t^2 (p - p_k) - \Delta (p - p_k) + \eta \partial_t (p - p_k) = -(\nu - \nu_{k-1}) \partial_t^2 p_k + (\nu_k - \nu_{k-1}) \partial_t^2 p_{k-1} & \text{in } I \times \Omega \\ (p - p_k, \partial_t (p - p_k))(0) = (0, 0) & \text{in } \Omega \end{cases}$$
(80)

such that from Lemma 2.3, Assumption 4.4, and Lemma 4.7 it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_{t}^{l}(p-p_{k})\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} &\leq \hat{c}(\|\nu-\nu_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}\|\partial_{t}^{l+2}p_{k}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} + \|\nu_{k}-\nu_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}\|\partial_{t}^{l+2}p_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} & (81) \\ &+ \|\nu-\nu_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}\|\partial_{t}^{l+3}p_{k}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} + \|\nu_{k}-\nu_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}\|\partial_{t}^{l+3}p_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))}) \\ &\leq 2\hat{c}C_{0}(\|\nu-\nu_{k}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} + \|\nu_{k}-\nu_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}) \leq 4\hat{c}C_{0}(\|\nu-\nu_{k}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} + \|\nu-\nu_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}) \\ &\leq c_{1}(\|\nu-\nu_{k}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} + \|\nu-\nu_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, since

$$\begin{cases} \nu_k \partial_t^2 (q - q_k) - \Delta (q - q_k) - \eta \partial_t (q - q_k) = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i (p - p_k) - (\nu - \nu_{k-1}) \partial_t^2 q_k + (\nu_k - \nu_{k-1}) \partial_t^2 q_{k-1} & \text{in } I \times \Omega \\ (q - q_k, \partial_t (q - q_k))(T) = (0, 0) & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 2.3, Assumption 4.4, Lemma 4.7, (81) yield that

$$\begin{split} \|\partial_{t}^{l}(q-q_{k})\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \\ &\leq \hat{c}(\sum_{j=0}^{l} \binom{l}{j} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \|\partial_{t}^{j}a_{i}\|_{L^{\infty}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \|\partial_{t}^{l-j}(p-p_{k})\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} + \|\nu-\nu_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \|\partial_{t}^{l+2}q_{k}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \\ &+ \|\nu_{k}-\nu_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \|\partial_{t}^{l+2}q_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} + \sum_{j=0}^{l+1} \binom{l+1}{j} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \|\partial_{t}^{j}a_{i}\|_{L^{\infty}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} \|\partial_{t}^{l+1-j}(p-p_{k})\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{2}(\Omega))} \\ &+ \|\nu-\nu_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \|\partial_{t}^{l+3}q_{k}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))} + \|\nu_{k}-\nu_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \|\partial_{t}^{l+3}q_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(I,L^{\infty}(\Omega))}) \\ &\leq 4\hat{c}(2C_{a}\sqrt{|\Omega|}\hat{c}+1)C_{0}(\|\nu-\nu_{k}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} + \|\nu-\nu_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}) \\ &\leq c_{1}(\|\nu-\nu_{k}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} + \|\nu-\nu_{k-1}\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}), \end{split}$$

that is (63).

A.2 Proof of Lemma 4.11

Proof. We remember the following assumptions:

$$x_0 \le \frac{\gamma}{4\delta} \tag{82}$$

$$x_0 \le \frac{1}{\delta_0} \tag{83}$$

$$x_1 \le \delta_0 x_0^2 \tag{84}$$

$$x_{k+1} \le \delta(x_k + x_{k-1})^2 \quad \forall k \ge 1.$$
 (85)

First, we show by induction that

$$\max\{x_k, x_{k+1}\} \le 2^{\left(2^{\frac{k}{2}} - 2\right)} \delta^{\left(2^{\frac{k}{2}} - 1\right)} (\delta_0 x_0^2 + x_0)^{2^{\left(\frac{k}{2}\right)}} \quad \forall k \ge 2 \text{ even.}$$
(86)

For k = 2, it holds that

$$x_{2} \underbrace{\leq}_{(85)} \delta(x_{1} + x_{0})^{2} \underbrace{\leq}_{(84)} \delta(\delta_{0}x_{0}^{2} + x_{0})^{2}$$
(87)

and

$$x_{3} \underbrace{\leq}_{(85)} \delta(x_{2} + x_{1})^{2} \underbrace{\leq}_{(84),(87)} \delta\left(\delta(\delta_{0}x_{0}^{2} + x_{0})^{2} + \delta_{0}x_{0}^{2}\right)^{2} \underbrace{\leq}_{(83)} \delta\left(4\delta x_{0}^{2} + \delta_{0}x_{0}^{2}\right)^{2} \underbrace{\leq}_{(82)} \delta(x_{0} + \delta_{0}x_{0}^{2})^{2}$$

leading to (86) for k = 2. Now, let (86) be satisfied for k - 2 for an arbitrarily fixed even $k \ge 4$. Then, it holds that

$$x_{k} \leq \delta(x_{k-1} + x_{k-2})^{2} \leq \delta \left(2^{\left(2^{\frac{k-2}{2}} - 2\right)} \delta^{\left(2^{\frac{k-2}{2}} - 1\right)} (\delta_{0} x_{0}^{2} + x_{0})^{2^{\left(\frac{k-2}{2}\right)}} + 2^{\left(2^{\frac{k-2}{2}} - 2\right)} \delta^{\left(2^{\frac{k-2}{2}} - 1\right)} (\delta_{0} x_{0}^{2} + x_{0})^{2^{\left(\frac{k-2}{2}\right)}} \right)^{2}$$

$$(88)$$

$$=2^{\left(2^{\frac{k}{2}}-2\right)}\delta^{\left(2^{\frac{k}{2}}-1\right)}(\delta_0 x_0^2+x_0)^{2^{\left(\frac{k}{2}\right)}}$$

and

$$x_{k+1} \underbrace{\leq}_{(85)} \delta(x_k + x_{k-1})^2 \underbrace{\leq}_{(88)} \delta\left(2^{\left(2^{\frac{k}{2}} - 2\right)} \delta^{\left(2^{\frac{k}{2}} - 1\right)} (\delta_0 x_0^2 + x_0)^{2^{\left(\frac{k}{2}\right)}} + 2^{\left(2^{\frac{k-2}{2}} - 2\right)} \delta^{\left(2^{\frac{k-2}{2}} - 1\right)} (\delta_0 x_0^2 + x_0)^{2^{\left(\frac{k-2}{2}\right)}}\right)^2.$$

Since

$$(\delta_0 x_0^2 + x_0)^{2\binom{k}{2}} = (\delta_0 x_0^2 + x_0)^{2\binom{k-2}{2}} (\delta_0 x_0^2 + x_0)^{2\binom{k-2}{2}} \underbrace{\leq}_{(83)} (2x_0)^{2\binom{k-2}{2}} (\delta_0 x_0^2 + x_0)^{2\binom{k-2}{2}} \underbrace{\leq}_{(83)} (2x_0)^{2\binom{k-2}{2}} (\delta_0 x_0^2 + x_0)^{2\binom{k-2}{2}} \underbrace{\leq}_{(83)} (\delta_0 x_0^2 + x_0)^{2\binom{k-2}{2}} (\delta_0 x_0^2 + x_0)^{2\binom{k-2}{2}},$$

we obtain that

$$x_{k+1} \le \delta \left(2^{\left(2^{\frac{k-2}{2}}-2\right)} \delta^{\left(2^{\frac{k-2}{2}}-1\right)} (\delta_0 x_0^2 + x_0)^{2^{\left(\frac{k-2}{2}\right)}} + 2^{\left(2^{\frac{k-2}{2}}-2\right)} \delta^{\left(2^{\frac{k-2}{2}}-1\right)} (\delta_0 x_0^2 + x_0)^{2^{\left(\frac{k-2}{2}\right)}} \right)^2$$

$$=2^{\left(2^{\frac{k}{2}}-2\right)}\delta^{\left(2^{\frac{k}{2}}-1\right)}\left(\delta_0 x_0^2+x_0\right)^{2^{\left(\frac{k}{2}\right)}}.$$

This finalizes the induction proof. In conclusion, it holds that

$$\max\{x_k, x_{k+1}\} \le 2^{\binom{2^{\frac{k}{2}}-2}{\delta}} \delta^{\binom{2^{\frac{k}{2}}-1}{\delta}} (\delta_0 x_0^2 + x_0)^{2^{\binom{k}{2}}} = \frac{1}{4\delta} (2\delta(\delta_0 x_0^2 + x_0))^{2^{\binom{k}{2}}} \underbrace{\le}_{(82), (83)} \frac{1}{4\delta} \gamma^{2^{\binom{k}{2}}} \quad \forall k \ge 2 \text{ even}$$

and thus

$$x_k \le \frac{1}{4\delta} \gamma^2^{\left(\frac{k-1}{2}\right)} = \frac{1}{4\delta} (\gamma^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}})^{\sqrt{2}^k} \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

References

- W. Alt. The Lagrange-Newton method for infinite-dimensional optimization problems. Numer. Funct. Anal. Optim., 11(3-4):201-224, 1990. doi:10.1080/01630569008816371.
- [2] W. Alt. Discretization and mesh-independence of Newton's method for generalized equations. In Mathematical programming with data perturbations, volume 195 of Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math., pages 1–30. Dekker, New York, 1998.
- W. Alt, R. Sontag, and F. Tröltzsch. An SQP method for optimal control of weakly singular Hammerstein integral equations. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 33(3):227-252, 1996. doi:10.1007/s002459900012.
- [4] L. Ammann and I. Yousept. Acoustic Full Waveform Inversion via Optimal Control: First- and Second-Order Analysis. SIAM J. Control Optim., 61(4):2468–2496, 2023. doi:10.1137/22M1480045.
- [5] L. C. Evans. Partial differential equations, volume 19 of Graduate Studies in Mathematics. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1998. doi:10.1090/gsm/019.
- [6] H. Goldberg and F. Tröltzsch. On a Lagrange-Newton method for a nonlinear parabolic boundary control problem. Optim. Methods Softw., 8(3-4):225-247, 1998. doi:10.1080/10556789808805678.
- [7] R. Griesse, N. Metla, and A. Rösch. Convergence analysis of the SQP method for nonlinear mixed-constrained elliptic optimal control problems. ZAMM Z. Angew. Math. Mech., 88(10):776–792, 2008. doi:10.1002/zamm.200800036.
- [8] R. Griesse, N. Metla, and A. Rösch. Local quadratic convergence of SQP for elliptic optimal control problems with mixed control-state constraints. *Control Cybernet.*, 39(3):717–738, 2010.
- [9] M. Heinkenschloss. Formulation and analysis of a sequential quadratic programming method for the optimal Dirichlet boundary control of Navier-Stokes flow. In Optimal control (Gainesville, FL, 1997), volume 15 of Appl. Optim., pages 178–203. Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1998. doi:10.1007/978-1-4757-6095-8_9.
- [10] M. Heinkenschloss and F. Tröltzsch. Analysis of the Lagrange-SQP-Newton method for the control of a phase field equation. Control Cybernet., 28(2):177–211, 1999.
- [11] M. Hintermüller and M. Hinze. Globalization of SQP-methods in control of the instationary Navier-Stokes equations. M2AN Math. Model. Numer. Anal., 36(4):725-746, 2002. doi:10.1051/m2an:2002032.
- [12] M. Hintermüller and M. Hinze. A SQP-semismooth Newton-type algorithm applied to control of the instationary Navier-Stokes system subject to control constraints. SIAM J. Optim., 16(4):1177–1200, 2006. doi:10.1137/030601259.
- [13] M. Hinze and K. Kunisch. Second order methods for optimal control of time-dependent fluid flow. SIAM J. Control Optim., 40(3):925-946, 2001. doi:10.1137/S0363012999361810.
- [14] F. Hoppe and I. Neitzel. Convergence of the SQP method for quasilinear parabolic optimal control problems. Optim. Eng., 22(4):2039–2085, 2021. doi:10.1007/s11081-020-09547-2.
- [15] K. Ito and K. Kunisch. Augmented Lagrangian-SQP methods for nonlinear optimal control problems of tracking type. SIAM J. Control Optim., 34(3):874–891, 1996. doi:10.1137/S0363012994261707.
- [16] K. Ito and K. Kunisch. Augmented Lagrangian-SQP-methods in Hilbert spaces and application to control in the coefficients problems. SIAM J. Optim., 6(1):96–125, 1996. doi:10.1137/0806007.

- [17] J. Nocedal and S. J. Wright. Numerical optimization. Springer Series in Operations Research. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999. doi:10.1007/b98874.
- [18] S. M. Robinson. Strongly regular generalized equations. Math. Oper. Res., 5(1):43-62, 1980. doi:10.1287/moor.5.1.43.
- [19] F. Tröltzsch. On the Lagrange-Newton-SQP method for the optimal control of semilinear parabolic equations. SIAM J. Control Optim., 38(1):294-312, 1999. doi:10.1137/S0363012998341423.
- [20] F. Tröltzsch. Lipschitz stability of solutions of linear-quadratic parabolic control problems with respect to perturbations. Dynam. Contin. Discrete Impuls. Systems, 7(2):289–306, 2000.
- [21] F. Tröltzsch. Optimal control of partial differential equations, volume 112 of Graduate Studies in Mathematics. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010. Theory, methods and applications, Translated from the 2005 German original by Jürgen Sprekels. doi:10.1090/gsm/112.
- [22] F. Tröltzsch and S. Volkwein. The SQP method for control constrained optimal control of the Burgers equation. ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var., 6:649-674, 2001. doi:10.1051/cocv:2001127.
- [23] S. Volkwein. Lagrange-SQP techniques for the control constrained optimal boundary control for the Burgers equation. Comput. Optim. Appl., 26(3):253-284, 2003. doi:10.1023/A:1026047622744.
- [24] D. Wachsmuth. Analysis of the SQP-method for optimal control problems governed by the nonstationary Navier-Stokes equations based on L^p-theory. SIAM J. Control Optim., 46(3):1133–1153, 2007. doi:10.1137/S0363012904443506.