

Finite Codimensionality Method in Infinite-dimensional Optimization Problems

Xu Liu* Qi Lü† Haisen Zhang‡ and Xu Zhang§

Abstract

This paper is devoted to establishing a first order necessary condition of Fritz John type for nonlinear infinite-dimensional optimization problems. Different from the known constraint qualifications in the optimization theory, a finite codimensionality condition is introduced. It is equivalent to suitable a priori estimates, which are much easier to be verified. As applications, the first order necessary conditions for optimal control problems of some deterministic/stochastic control systems are derived in a uniform way.

Key Words. Nonlinear optimization problem, finite codimensionality, Fritz John type condition, optimal control.

AMS subject classifications. 93B05, 49J20, 93B07, 49K20, 35Q93.

1 Introduction

Let V be a complete metric space, X be a Banach space with its dual space X' , and E be a nonempty closed convex subset of X . Given $f_0 : \mathcal{D}(f_0) \subseteq V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $f : \mathcal{D}(f) \subseteq V \rightarrow X$, where $\mathcal{D}(f_0)$ and $\mathcal{D}(f)$ denote the domains of f_0 and f , respectively. Assume that $\mathcal{D}(f_0) \cap \mathcal{D}(f)$ is closed in V . Consider the following nonlinear infinite-dimensional optimization problem:

$$(P) \quad \text{Minimize } f_0(u) \quad \text{subject to } f(u) \in E \text{ and } u \in \mathcal{D}(f_0) \cap \mathcal{D}(f).$$

When $V = \mathbb{R}^n$, $X = \mathbb{R}^m$ ($n, m \in \mathbb{N}$), $f = (g_1, g_2, \dots, g_{m_1}, h_{m_1+1}, \dots, h_m)^\top$, $\mathcal{D}(f_0) = \mathcal{D}(f) = V$ and

$$E = \left\{ (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{m_1}, 0, \dots, 0)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid x_i \leq 0, i = 1, 2, \dots, m_1 \right\}$$

*Key Laboratory of Applied Statistics of MOE, School of Mathematics and Statistics, Northeast Normal University, Changchun 130024, China. The research of this author is partially supported by NSF of China under grants 11871142 and 11971320. *E-mail:* liux216@nenu.edu.cn.

†School of Mathematics, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610064, Sichuan Province, China. The research of this author is partially supported by NSF of China under grants 12025105, 11971334 and 11931011, and the Chang Jiang Scholars Program from the Chinese Education Ministry. *E-mail:* lu@scu.edu.cn.

‡School of Mathematical Sciences, Sichuan Normal University, Chengdu 610068, China. The research of this author is partially supported by NSF of China under grants 11701470 and 11931011. *E-mail:* haisen.zhang@yeah.net.

§School of Mathematics, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610064, Sichuan Province, China. The research of this author is partially supported by the NSF of China under grants 11931011, the NSFC-CNRS Joint Research Project under grant 11711530142, the PCSIRT under grant IRT_16R53 and the Chang Jiang Scholars Program from the Chinese Education Ministry. *E-mail:* zhang_xu@scu.edu.cn.

with $1 \leq m_1 \leq m$, the problem **(P)** reduces to the classical finite-dimensional optimization problem:

$$(\mathbf{FP}) \quad \begin{cases} \text{Minimize } f_0(u) \\ \text{subject to } g_i(u) \leq 0, i = 1, 2, \dots, m_1; \text{ and} \\ h_j(u) = 0, j = m_1 + 1, m_1 + 2, \dots, m, \end{cases}$$

for suitable functions $g_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, m_1$) and $h_j : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ($j = m_1 + 1, m_1 + 2, \dots, m$).

Assume that the above functions f_0, g_i ($i = 1, 2, \dots, m_1$) and h_j ($j = m_1 + 1, m_1 + 2, \dots, m$) are sufficiently smooth. Then the first order necessary condition of the problem **(FP)** (e.g. [2, Page 199]) tells us that, if \bar{u} solves **(FP)**, then there exist $z_i \geq 0$ ($i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, m_1$) and $z_j \in \mathbb{R}$ ($j = m_1 + 1, m_1 + 2, \dots, m$), not vanish simultaneously, such that

$$z_0 \nabla f_0(\bar{u}) + \sum_{i=1}^{m_1} z_i \nabla g_i(\bar{u}) + \sum_{j=m_1+1}^m z_j \nabla h_j(\bar{u}) = \mathbf{0}. \quad (1.1)$$

The first order necessary condition (1.1) is usually called the *Fritz John condition*. It is first introduced by F. John in [8] (for $m_1 = m$). The nonzero vector $\mathbf{z} = (z_0, z_1, \dots, z_{m_1}, z_{m_1+1}, \dots, z_m)$ is called a *nontrivial Lagrange multiplier*. The requirement on nontrivial Lagrange multipliers is crucial. Otherwise the condition (1.1) become “ $\mathbf{0}=\mathbf{0}$ ”, which does not provide any information on \bar{u} .

If $z_0 = 0$, then \mathbf{z} is called a *singular Lagrange multiplier*. Otherwise, one may set $z_0 = 1$. In such case, \mathbf{z} is called a *normal Lagrange multiplier* and (1.1) is called the *KKT condition*. It is obtained separately by W. Karush in [9], and H. W. Kuhn and A. W. Tucker in [11].

Unlike the Fritz John condition, the KKT condition for **(FP)** may not hold (e.g. [2, Page 185]). Indeed, it is easy to show that the KKT condition for **(FP)** holds true if and only if

$$-\nabla f_0(\bar{u}) \subseteq (\nabla f(\bar{u}))^* E_1 \quad \text{with } E_1 = \left\{ (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid z_i \geq 0, i = 1, 2, \dots, m_1 \right\}. \quad (1.2)$$

Here and in what follows, for a bounded linear operator F , we write F^* for its adjoint operator and therefore, in (1.2), $(\nabla f(\bar{u}))^* = (\nabla g_1(\bar{u}), \dots, \nabla g_{m_1}(\bar{u}), \nabla h_1(\bar{u}), \dots, \nabla h_m(\bar{u}))$. In other words, to guarantee the KKT condition or equivalently, the existence of the normal Lagrange multiplier, some constraint qualifications for equality and inequality constraints, such as the Mangasarian-Fromovitz constraint qualification given in [17], are needed. On the other hand, for the Fritz John type necessary condition, since X is finite-dimensional, no extra condition is required for **(FP)**, even if V is an infinite-dimensional Banach space (see for instance [5]).

Generally speaking, there are two main approaches to derive the Fritz John necessary condition in optimization problems. The first one is using the separation theorem (in the range space X of f) to find the Lagrange multipliers (e.g. [3, 12, 20]). The second one is constructing a sequence of approximation optimization problems (without constraints), and then taking limit in the first order necessary conditions for solutions of these approximate problems to obtain the Lagrange multipliers (e.g. [5, 7, 21]). We would like to call the first method the *separation method* and the second one the *penalty functional method*. Both methods work well when X is finite dimensional.

Things will become quite different when the range space X of the constraint map f in the problem **(P)** is infinite dimensional. Indeed, recall that, by the separation theorem, for any nonempty convex set in a finite-dimensional space, there always exists a hyperplane, which supports the set on any of its boundary points. Meanwhile, in a finite-dimensional space, any sequence on the unit sphere may have a subsequence converging to a non-zero vector. These two facts ensure the existence of nontrivial Lagrange multipliers by the first and the second method, respectively, provided that X is a finite-dimensional space.

For the general infinite-dimensional optimization problem (\mathbf{P}) , the nontrivial Lagrange multiplier might not exist without some further assumptions (see [4]). This is caused by the following properties of infinite-dimensional spaces:

- In an infinite-dimensional space, the support hyperplane (crossing a boundary point) of a nonempty convex set may not exist, unless this set has a nonempty relative interior (see [10]).
- In an infinite-dimensional space, a sequence on the unit sphere may only have a weak or weak* convergent subsequence and the weak or weak* limit of this subsequence may be zero.

In order to overcome these difficulties, various constraint qualifications are proposed in infinite-dimensional optimization problems.

A typical condition for applying the separation method is that the set

$$\mathcal{Z}(\bar{u}) = f'(\bar{u})(\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}(f_0) \cap \mathcal{D}(f)}(\bar{u})) - \mathcal{R}_E(f(\bar{u})) \quad (1.3)$$

has a nonempty relative interior, where $f'(\bar{u})$ is the Fréchet derivative of f at \bar{u} , and $\mathcal{R}_K(v)$ is the radial cone (which will be defined in Definition 2.1) of a set K on $v \in K$ (e.g. [12]). Particularly, if

$$\mathcal{D}(f_0) = \mathcal{D}(f) = V \text{ and } E = \{0\},$$

it holds that

$$\mathcal{Z}(\bar{u}) = \text{Im}(f'(\bar{u})),$$

where $\text{Im}(f'(\bar{u}))$ is the range of the bounded linear operator $f'(\bar{u}) : V \rightarrow X$. Since $\text{Im}(f'(\bar{u}))$ is a subspace of X , the relative interior of $\text{Im}(f'(\bar{u}))$ is nonempty if and only if $\text{Im}(f'(\bar{u}))$ is closed. In [12], the Fritz John necessary condition is derived, provided that $\mathcal{Z}(\bar{u})$ is closed or $\overline{\mathcal{Z}(\bar{u})} \neq X$, for the above special case. More results can be found in [3, 12, 20, 23] and rich references therein.

On the other hand, by the penalty functional method, the existence of nontrivial Lagrange multiplier for a solution to the problem (\mathbf{P}) is proved in [7], under some constrained qualification described by the limit property of the variation sets on suitable approximate optimal solutions. Compared with the separation method, the above penalty functional method has its own advantage. Not only the existence of the Lagrange multiplier is obtained, but also it is regarded as the limit of a certain sequence. It provides more information about the Lagrange multiplier.

In this paper, we would like to present a new constraint qualification, which is easier to be verified than the ones mentioned before. To this aim, the finite codimensionality condition is introduced for (\mathbf{P}) . The concept of finite codimensionality originally comes from linear functional analysis, and it is used in [6, 13, 14, 15] to prove the Pontryagin maximum principle for infinite-dimensional optimal control problems. However, to our best knowledge, there are very few works using the finite codimensionality condition to establish the first order necessary conditions for infinite-dimensional optimization problems (or general nonlinear programming problems)(e.g. [7]). In some special cases, it is stronger than the condition that $\mathcal{Z}(\bar{u})$ (defined in (1.3)) has nonempty relative interior. The main advantage of this condition is that, it is equivalent to some estimates which are much easier to be verified for concrete problems. Details can be found in Sections 3 and 4.

For some optimal control problems of deterministic evolution equations with endpoint state constraint, the finite codimensionality of certain set was characterized by a new notion of controllability, i.e., finite codimensional controllability in [16]. In this paper, the method will be extended to study general nonlinear optimization problems, and therefore, it may be applied to optimal control problems with various state constraints associated to different types control systems. As examples, an elliptic control system with pointwise state constraint and a stochastic control system with endpoint constraint are considered, respectively. In addition, the finite codimensionality

condition of this paper also fits for the case that V is a complete metric space. Consequently, the abstract results in optimization problems can be applied to more general optimal control problems. Moreover, different from the condition in [7], the finite codimensionality condition is only related to the solution to the original optimization problem, rather than the sequence of solutions to the approximation problems.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, the finite codimensionality condition is presented to prove a first order necessary condition for the infinite-dimensional optimization problem defined in a complete metric space. Section 3 is devoted to some criterions for the finite codimensionality condition. As applications, some optimal control problems for elliptic equations and stochastic differential equations are studied in Section 4. Finally, in the Appendix, a characterization on the set of variations will be given.

2 First order necessary condition in optimization problems

In this section, a Fritz John type first order necessary condition for the problem **(P)** will be derived under suitable finite codimensionality condition. Also, this necessary condition will be applied to study some optimal control problems.

2.1 Some preliminaries

First, we introduce some notations. Denote by $|\cdot|_X$ the norm of the Banach space X , and by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{X', X}$ the dual product between X' and X . When X is a Hilbert space, we simply write $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_X$ for the inner product of X . For $x_0 \in X$ and $\rho > 0$, let

$$B_X(x_0, \rho) \triangleq \{x \in X \mid |x - x_0|_X \leq \rho\}.$$

Similarly, we can define $B_{X'}(x_0, \rho)$. The distance function $\text{dist}(\cdot, E) : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (to the set $E \subset X$) is defined by

$$\text{dist}(x, E) = \inf_{e \in E} |e - x|_X, \quad \forall x \in X.$$

Denote by $d_V(\cdot, \cdot)$ the metric of V . For a Banach space Z , write $\mathcal{L}(Z; X)$ for the set of all bounded linear operators from Z to X , and write $\mathcal{L}(X)$ for short when $Z = X$. Further, denote by $\text{span}D$ the closed subspace spanned by a subset D of Z ; by \overline{D} the closure of D ; by $\overline{\text{co}}D$ the convex closed hull of D ; and by $\text{Int}(D)$ the interior of D . For two subsets D_1 and D_2 of Z , put

$$D_1 \pm D_2 \triangleq \left\{ z \in Z \mid z = z_1 \pm z_2 \text{ for some } z_1 \in D_1 \text{ and } z_2 \in D_2 \right\},$$

and

$$D_1 \setminus D_2 \triangleq \left\{ z \in Z \mid z \in D_1 \text{ and } z \notin D_2 \right\}.$$

Next, we recall notions concerning cones (see, e.g., [3, 7]).

Definition 2.1 *Let E be a closed convex subset of a Banach space X . For any $e \in E$, the set*

$$\mathcal{R}_E(e) = \bigcup_{h \geq 0} h(E - e)$$

is called the radial cone of E on e . The closure of $\mathcal{R}_E(e)$, denoted by $I_E(e)$, is called the tangent cone of E on e .

Definition 2.2 A set $N_E(e) \subseteq X'$ is called the normal cone to E at $e \in E$ if

$$N_E(e) = \left\{ w \in X' \mid \langle w, x \rangle_{X', X} \leq 0, \forall x \in I_E(e) \right\}.$$

Remark 2.1 It is easy to show that

$$N_E(e) = \left\{ w \in X' \mid \langle w, \tilde{e} - e \rangle_{X', X} \leq 0, \forall \tilde{e} \in E \right\}.$$

Definition 2.3 For the closed convex set E , the subdifferential of the distance function $\text{dist}(\cdot, E)$ is defined by

$$\partial \text{dist}(x, E) = \left\{ w \in X' \mid \text{dist}(\tilde{x}, E) - \text{dist}(x, E) \geq \langle w, \tilde{x} - x \rangle_{X', X}, \forall \tilde{x} \in X \right\}.$$

Remark 2.2 It is well known that, the set $\partial \text{dist}(x, E)$ is a nonempty convex weak*-compact subset of X' . In addition, when $x \notin E$ and $w \in \partial \text{dist}(x, E)$, we have that $|w|_{X'} = 1$, while when $x \in E$,

$$\partial \text{dist}(x, E) = N_E(e) \cap B_{X'}(0, 1) = \left\{ w \in B_{X'}(0, 1) \mid \langle w, \tilde{x} - x \rangle_{X', X} \leq 0, \forall \tilde{x} \in E \right\}.$$

Definition 2.4 A $\xi \in X$ is called a variation of $f : \mathcal{D}(f) \subseteq V \rightarrow X$ at $e \in \mathcal{D}(f)$ if there exists a sequence $\{h_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ with $h_k > 0$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} h_k = 0$, and a sequence $\{e_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{D}(f)$, such that

$$d_V(e_k, e) \leq h_k \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(e_k) - f(e)}{h_k} = \xi.$$

The set of all variations of f at e is denoted by $\text{Var } f(e)$.

Remark 2.3 If V is a reflexive Banach space and $f : \mathcal{D}(f) \subseteq V \rightarrow X$ is Fréchet differentiable at $e \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{D}(f))$, then it is easy to show that

$$\text{Var } f(e) = \left\{ \xi \in X \mid \xi = f'(e)v \text{ for some } v \in V \text{ with } |v|_V \leq 1 \right\}.$$

Further, if $\mathcal{D}(f)$ is a closed convex subset of V , and $f : \mathcal{D}(f) \subseteq V \rightarrow X$ is Fréchet differentiable on $\mathcal{D}(f)$, it holds that

$$\text{Var } f(e) = \left\{ f'(e)v \mid v \in I_{\mathcal{D}(f)}(e) \cap B_X(0, 1) \right\}. \quad (2.1)$$

The proof of (2.1) will be given in the Appendix.

Clearly, $\text{Var } f(\cdot)$ is in general a set-valued map. In order to study $\text{Var } f(\cdot)$, we recall the notion of lower semi-continuity of such a map.

Definition 2.5 A set-valued map $F : \mathcal{D}(F) \subseteq V \rightarrow X$ is called lower semi-continuous at $u_0 \in \mathcal{D}(F)$ if for any $\{u_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{D}(F)$ with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_V(u_k, u_0) = 0$ and any $x_0 \in F(u_0)$, there exists a sequence $\{x_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq X$, such that $x_k \in F(u_k)$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x_k = x_0$.

Remark 2.4 By [1, page 139, Theorem 4.2.2], when the set $\mathcal{D}(f_0) \cap \mathcal{D}(f)$ is convex and closed, the set-valued map $I_{\mathcal{D}(f_0) \cap \mathcal{D}(f)}(\cdot)$ is lower semi-continuous. Then, by Remark 2.3, if V is a reflexive Banach space, and f_0 and f are continuously differentiable at $\bar{u} \in \mathcal{D}(f_0) \cap \mathcal{D}(f)$, then $\text{Var}(f_0, f)(\cdot)$ is lower semi-continuous at \bar{u} .

Next, we recall the notion of finite codimensionality and some of its properties.

Definition 2.6 A linear subspace X_0 of X is called finite codimensional if there exist an $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and linearly independent $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m \in X \setminus X_0$, such that $\text{span}\{X_0, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\} = X$.

Lemma 2.1 [15, page 138, Proposition 3.2] Let X_0 be a subspace of X . Then the following are equivalent:

- (i) X_0 is finite codimensional in X .
- (ii) There exist finitely many bounded linear functionals $\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_m \in X'$, such that

$$X_0 = \bigcap_{i=1}^m \mathcal{N}(\Lambda_i), \quad \text{with } \mathcal{N}(\Lambda_i) = \left\{ x \in X \mid \Lambda_i(x) = 0 \right\}.$$

Definition 2.7 A subset D of X is called finite codimensional in X , if

- (i) There exists an $x_0 \in \overline{\text{co}} D$, such that $\text{span}\{D - x_0\}$ is a finite codimensional subspace of X ; and
- (ii) $\overline{\text{co}}(D - x_0)$ has at least one interior point in this subspace.

Lemma 2.2 [15, page 140, Proposition 3.3] Let $E \subset X$. If there exists a compact set $Q \subset X$ such that

$$\text{Int}(\overline{\text{co}}E + Q) \neq \emptyset,$$

then the subspace $\text{span}(E - e)$ is finite codimensional in X for any $e \in \overline{\text{co}}E$.

Lemma 2.3 [15, page 142, Lemma 3.6] Let Q be a finite codimensional subset in X . Let $\Lambda \in X'$ and $\{\Lambda_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset X'$ satisfying that

$$|\Lambda_k|_{X'} \geq \delta > 0, \quad \Lambda_k \rightarrow \Lambda \text{ weakly}^* \text{ in } X', \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty$$

and

$$\langle \Lambda_k, x \rangle \geq -\varepsilon_k, \quad \forall x \in Q, \quad k \geq 1,$$

where $\varepsilon_k \geq 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_k = 0$. Then, $\Lambda \neq 0$.

2.2 First order necessary condition for the problem (P)

Given two continuous maps $f : \mathcal{D}(f) \subseteq V \rightarrow X$ and $f_0 : \mathcal{D}(f_0) \subseteq V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We recall the nonlinear optimization problem **(P)**:

$$\text{Minimize } f_0(u), \quad \text{subject to } f(u) \in E \text{ and } u \in \mathcal{D}(f) \cap \mathcal{D}(f_0).$$

Assume that $\bar{u} \in \mathcal{D}(f) \cap \mathcal{D}(f_0)$ solves **(P)**, i.e.,

$$f_0(\bar{u}) = \min \left\{ f_0(u) \mid f(u) \in E \text{ and } u \in \mathcal{D}(f) \cap \mathcal{D}(f_0) \right\}.$$

The main result of this subsection is the following Fritz John type necessary condition.

Theorem 2.1 Let \bar{u} be a solution to the problem **(P)** and $\bar{e} = f(\bar{u})$. If there exists a set-valued map $\mathcal{V}(\cdot)$ satisfying $\mathcal{V}(u) \subseteq \text{Var}(f_0, f)(u)$, $\forall u \in \mathcal{D}(f) \cap \mathcal{D}(f_0)$, such that

(H₁) $\mathcal{V}(\cdot)$ is lower semi-continuous at \bar{u} ; and

(H₂) $\Pi_X(\mathcal{V}(\bar{u})) - E$ is finite codimensional in X ,

where

$$\Pi_X(\mathcal{V}(\bar{u})) = \left\{ \xi_2 \in X \mid (\xi_1, \xi_2)^\top \in \mathcal{V}(\bar{u}) \text{ for some } \xi_1 \in \mathbb{R} \right\},$$

then there is a non-zero pair $(z_0, z) \in \mathbb{R} \times X'$ with $z \in N_E(\bar{e})$, such that

$$z_0 \xi_1 + \langle z, \xi_2 \rangle_{X', X} \geq 0, \quad \forall (\xi_1, \xi_2)^\top \in \mathcal{V}(\bar{u}).$$

Proof. The proof is divided into three steps.

Step 1. For any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $u \in \mathcal{D}(f_0) \cap \mathcal{D}(f)$, set

$$\Phi_\varepsilon(u) = \left\{ [\mathrm{d}_E(f(u))]^2 + [(f_0(u) - f_0(\bar{u}) + \varepsilon)^+]^2 \right\}^{1/2}$$

and $\mathcal{F}(u) = (f_0(u), f(u))^\top$. Then we have that $\Phi_\varepsilon(\cdot)$ is continuous on $\mathcal{D}(f_0) \cap \mathcal{D}(f)$ and

$$\Phi_\varepsilon(\bar{u}) = \varepsilon \leq \inf_{u \in \mathcal{D}(f_0) \cap \mathcal{D}(f)} \Phi_\varepsilon(u) + \varepsilon.$$

Since $\mathcal{D}(f_0) \cap \mathcal{D}(f)$ is a complete metric space with the metric $\mathrm{d}_V(\cdot, \cdot)$, by the Ekeland variational principle, there exists a $u^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{D}(f_0) \cap \mathcal{D}(f)$, such that

$$\Phi_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon) \leq \Phi_\varepsilon(\bar{u}), \quad \mathrm{d}_V(u^\varepsilon, \bar{u}) \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon},$$

and

$$-\sqrt{\varepsilon} \mathrm{d}_V(u^\varepsilon, u) \leq \Phi_\varepsilon(u) - \Phi_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon), \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{D}(f_0) \cap \mathcal{D}(f). \quad (2.2)$$

Step 2. By Definition 2.4, for any $\xi^\varepsilon = (\xi_1^\varepsilon, \xi_2^\varepsilon)^\top \in \mathcal{V}(u^\varepsilon)$, there exists a sequence $\{h_k^\varepsilon\}_{k=1}^\infty$ with $h_k^\varepsilon > 0$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} h_k^\varepsilon = 0$, and a sequence $\{u_k^\varepsilon\}_{k=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{D}(f_0) \cap \mathcal{D}(f)$, such that

$$\mathrm{d}_V(u_k^\varepsilon, u^\varepsilon) \leq h_k^\varepsilon \quad (2.3)$$

and

$$\mathcal{F}(u_k^\varepsilon) = \mathcal{F}(u^\varepsilon) + h_k^\varepsilon \xi^\varepsilon + o(h_k^\varepsilon), \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty, \quad (2.4)$$

where $o(h_k^\varepsilon) = (o_1(h_k^\varepsilon), o_2(h_k^\varepsilon))^\top$ denotes the higher order infinitesimal of h_k^ε . It follows from (2.3) and (2.4) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi_\varepsilon(u_k^\varepsilon) - \Phi_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon) \\ &= \frac{[(f_0(u_k^\varepsilon) - f_0(\bar{u}) + \varepsilon)^+]^2 - [(f_0(u^\varepsilon) - f_0(\bar{u}) + \varepsilon)^+]^2 + [\mathrm{d}_E(f(u_k^\varepsilon))]^2 - [\mathrm{d}_E(f(u^\varepsilon))]^2}{\Phi_\varepsilon(u_k^\varepsilon) + \Phi_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon)} \\ &= \frac{[(f_0(u^\varepsilon) + h_k^\varepsilon \xi_1^\varepsilon + o_1(h_k^\varepsilon) - f_0(\bar{u}) + \varepsilon)^+]^2 - [(f_0(u^\varepsilon) - f_0(\bar{u}) + \varepsilon)^+]^2}{\Phi_\varepsilon(u_k^\varepsilon) + \Phi_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon)} \\ & \quad + \frac{[\mathrm{d}_E(f(u^\varepsilon) + h_k^\varepsilon \xi_2^\varepsilon + o_2(h_k^\varepsilon))]^2 - [\mathrm{d}_E(f(u^\varepsilon))]^2}{\Phi_\varepsilon(u_k^\varepsilon) + \Phi_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by (2.2),

$$\Phi_\varepsilon(u_k^\varepsilon) - \Phi_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon) \geq -\sqrt{\varepsilon} h_k^\varepsilon.$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Phi_\varepsilon(u_k^\varepsilon) - \Phi_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon)}{h_k^\varepsilon} = \frac{(f_0(u^\varepsilon) - f_0(\bar{u}) + \varepsilon)^+ \xi_1^\varepsilon + \mathrm{d}_E(f(u^\varepsilon)) \langle \psi_\varepsilon, \xi_2^\varepsilon \rangle_{X', X}}{\Phi_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon)} \geq -\sqrt{\varepsilon},$$

where $\psi_\varepsilon \in \partial \mathrm{dist}(f(u^\varepsilon), E)$ (the subdifferential of $\mathrm{dist}(\cdot, E)$ at $f(u^\varepsilon)$) with $|\psi_\varepsilon|_{X'} = 1$. Write

$$a_\varepsilon = \frac{(f_0(u^\varepsilon) - f_0(\bar{u}) + \varepsilon)^+}{\Phi_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon)} \quad \text{and} \quad b_\varepsilon = \frac{\mathrm{d}_E(f(u^\varepsilon)) \psi_\varepsilon}{\Phi_\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon)}.$$

Then, $a_\varepsilon^2 + |b_\varepsilon|_{X'}^2 = 1$ and

$$-\sqrt{\varepsilon} \leq a_\varepsilon \xi_1^\varepsilon + \langle b_\varepsilon, \xi_2^\varepsilon \rangle_{X', X}. \quad (2.5)$$

Noting that $\psi_\varepsilon \in \partial \text{dist}(f(u^\varepsilon), E)$, we have that

$$\langle b_\varepsilon, x - f(u^\varepsilon) \rangle_{X', X} \leq 0, \quad \forall x \in E. \quad (2.6)$$

Consequently, there exist a subsequence $\{(a_{\varepsilon_k}, b_{\varepsilon_k})\}_{k>0}$ of $\{(a_\varepsilon, b_\varepsilon)\}_{\varepsilon>0}$ and a pair $(z_0, z) \in \mathbb{R} \times X'$, such that $a_{\varepsilon_k} \rightarrow z_0$ in \mathbb{R} and $b_{\varepsilon_k} \rightarrow z$ weakly* in X' , as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Also, by **(H₁)**, for any $(\xi_1, \xi_2)^\top \in \mathcal{V}(\bar{u})$, there exists a pair $(\xi_1^{\varepsilon_k}, \xi_2^{\varepsilon_k})^\top \in \mathcal{V}(u^{\varepsilon_k})$, such that $\xi_1^{\varepsilon_k} \rightarrow \xi_1$ in \mathbb{R} and $\xi_2^{\varepsilon_k} \rightarrow \xi_2$ in X , as $k \rightarrow \infty$. By (2.5) and (2.6),

$$z_0 \xi_1 + \langle z, \xi_2 \rangle_{X', X} \geq 0, \quad \forall (\xi_1, \xi_2)^\top \in \mathcal{V}(\bar{u})$$

and

$$\langle z, x - \bar{e} \rangle_{X', X} \leq 0, \quad \forall x \in E.$$

By Remark 2.1 and Definition 2.2, we see that $z \in N_E(\bar{e})$.

Step 3. Now, we prove that the pair (z_0, z) is not zero by the assumption **(H₂)**. If $z_0 = 0$, by (2.5) and (2.6), for any $x \in E$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle b_{\varepsilon_k}, \xi_2 - (x - \bar{e}) \rangle_{X', X} \\ &= \langle b_{\varepsilon_k}, \xi_2 \rangle_{X', X} + \langle b_{\varepsilon_k}, f(u^{\varepsilon_k}) - x \rangle_{X', X} - \langle b_{\varepsilon_k}, f(u^{\varepsilon_k}) - f(\bar{u}) \rangle_{X', X} \\ &\geq \langle b_{\varepsilon_k}, \xi_2^{\varepsilon_k} \rangle_{X', X} + \langle b_{\varepsilon_k}, \xi_2 - \xi_2^{\varepsilon_k} \rangle_{X', X} - \langle b_{\varepsilon_k}, f(u^{\varepsilon_k}) - f(\bar{u}) \rangle_{X', X} \\ &\geq -\sqrt{\varepsilon_k} - a_{\varepsilon_k} \xi_1^{\varepsilon_k} + \langle b_{\varepsilon_k}, \xi_2 - \xi_2^{\varepsilon_k} \rangle_{X', X} - \langle b_{\varepsilon_k}, f(u^{\varepsilon_k}) - f(\bar{u}) \rangle_{X', X} \\ &\geq -\sqrt{\varepsilon_k} - |a_{\varepsilon_k} \xi_1^{\varepsilon_k}| - |\xi_2 - \xi_2^{\varepsilon_k}|_X - |f(u^{\varepsilon_k}) - f(\bar{u})|_X = -\delta_{\varepsilon_k}, \end{aligned}$$

with $\delta_{\varepsilon_k} > 0$ and $\lim_{\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0} \delta_{\varepsilon_k} = 0$. Then, by Lemma 2.3 and the finite codimensionality of $\Pi_X(\mathcal{V}(\bar{u})) - E$, we have $z \neq 0$. \square

Remark 2.5 If V is a reflexive Banach space, $\mathcal{D}(f_0) \cap \mathcal{D}(f)$ is a closed convex subset of V , and f_0 and f are continuously differentiable at \bar{u} , then, by Remark 2.4, the first order necessary condition in Theorem 2.1 can be represented as

$$\langle z_0 f'_0(\bar{u}) + f'(\bar{u})^* z, v \rangle_{V', V} \geq 0, \quad \forall v \in I_{\mathcal{D}(f_0) \cap \mathcal{D}(f)}(\bar{u}) \cap B_X(0, 1),$$

or equivalently,

$$-z_0 f'_0(\bar{u}) - f'(\bar{u})^* z \in N_{\mathcal{D}(f_0) \cap \mathcal{D}(f)}(\bar{u}).$$

In addition, when $\mathcal{D}(f_0) \cap \mathcal{D}(f) = V$, we have $z_0 f'_0(\bar{u}) + f'(\bar{u})^* z = 0$. Therefore, the first order necessary condition in Theorem 2.1 is a generalization of the usual Fritz John condition in Banach space (e.g. [3, page 153]).

Remark 2.6 Recall that in [7, Corollary 6.4.5], to guarantee the nontriviality of the multiplier (z_0, z) , the following condition is assumed:

$$\text{(H}_3\text{)} \quad \Delta = \bigcap_{k=k_0}^{\infty} (\Delta_k + Q_k) \text{ contains one interior point for a large enough } k_0 \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (2.7)$$

where $\Delta_k = \Pi_X(\text{Var}(f_0, f)(u_k)) - I_E(e_k) \cap B_X(0, \rho)$ with $\rho > 0$, $\{u_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \subseteq V$ and $\{e_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \subseteq E$ satisfy certain conditions, and $\{Q_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq X$ is a precompact sequence, i.e., any sequence $\{q_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq X$ with $q_k \in Q_k$ ($k \in \mathbb{N}$) has a convergent subsequence.

Now, consider a special case. Assume that V is a reflexive Banach space, $\mathcal{D}(f) \cap \mathcal{D}(f_0) = V$, $E = \{e_0\}$ for some $e_0 \in X$, the map f_0 is continuously Fréchet differentiable at $\bar{u} \in V$, and $f(\cdot) : V \rightarrow X$ is a bounded linear operator. Then, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$I_E(e_k) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_k = \text{Var}(f)(u_k) = \left\{ f(v) \in X \mid |v|_V \leq 1 \right\} = \mathcal{M}, \text{ for any } u_k \in V.$$

Choose a compact set $\tilde{Q} \subset X$ and let $Q_k = \tilde{Q}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then (2.7) becomes that $\mathcal{M} + \tilde{Q}$ contains a interior point. By Lemma 2.2, the condition (2.7) implies the finite codimensionality of the subspace $\text{span } \mathcal{M}$ in X and therefore, guarantees the finite codimensionality of the set \mathcal{M} .

On the other hand, in Theorem 2.1 of our paper, if one chooses $\mathcal{V}(\cdot) = \text{Var}(f_0, f)(\cdot)$, then $\Pi_X(\mathcal{V}(\bar{u})) = \text{Var}(f)(\bar{u}) = \mathcal{M}$. Hence, (\mathbf{H}_2) means the finite codimensionality of \mathcal{M} and it may be obtained by assuming (\mathbf{H}_3) for some special optimization problems. In general nonlinear cases, (\mathbf{H}_2) seems much easier to be verified.

The following result is a corollary of Theorem 2.1.

Corollary 2.1 *Let \bar{u} be a solution to the problem (P). If the set-valued map $\text{Var}(f_0, f)(\cdot)$ is lower semi-continuous at \bar{u} and*

$$0 \in \text{Int}\left(\Pi_X(\text{Var}(f_0, f)(\bar{u})) - [E - f(\bar{u})]\right), \quad (2.8)$$

then there exists a $z \in X'$ with $z \in N_E(\bar{e})$, such that

$$\xi_1 + \langle z, \xi_2 \rangle_{X', X} \geq 0, \quad \forall (\xi_1, \xi_2)^\top \in \text{Var}(f_0, f)(\bar{u}).$$

Proof. Let

$$\mathcal{V}(u) = \text{Var}(f_0, f)(u), \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{D}(f_0) \cap \mathcal{D}(f).$$

Then, the conditions (\mathbf{H}_1) and (\mathbf{H}_2) in Theorem 2.1 hold. By Theorem 2.1, there exists a non-zero pair $(z_0, z) \in \mathbb{R} \times X'$ with $z \in N_E(\bar{e})$ such that

$$z_0 \xi_1 + \langle z, \xi_2 \rangle_{X', X} \geq 0, \quad \forall (\xi_1, \xi_2)^\top \in \text{Var}(f_0, f)(\bar{u}).$$

Next, we prove that $z_0 \neq 0$ by contradiction. Assume that $z_0 = 0$. Then by Step 3 in the proof of Theorem 2.1,

$$\langle z, \xi_2 - (x - f(\bar{u})) \rangle_{X', X} \geq 0, \quad \forall \xi_2 \in \Pi_X(\text{Var}(f_0, f)(\bar{u})) \text{ and } x \in E.$$

From the condition (2.8), it follows that $z = 0$. This contradicts the conclusion that $(z_0, z) \neq (0, 0)$. Hence, it holds that $z_0 \neq 0$.

In addition, from the proof of Theorem 2.1, $z_0 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_{\varepsilon_k}$ with $a_{\varepsilon_k} \geq 0$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, we may choose $z_0 = 1$. \square

Remark 2.7 *If V is a reflexive Banach space, $\mathcal{D}(f_0) \cap \mathcal{D}(f) = V$, and f_0 and f are continuously differentiable at $\bar{u} \in V$, then the condition (2.8) becomes*

$$0 \in \text{Int}\left(\left\{ f'(\bar{u})v - [e - f(\bar{u})] \mid |v|_V \leq 1 \text{ and } e \in E \right\}\right). \quad (2.9)$$

We claim that the condition (2.9) is equivalent to Robinson's condition:

$$0 \in \text{Int}\left(\left\{ f'(\bar{u})v - [e - f(\bar{u})] \mid v \in V \text{ and } e \in E \right\}\right). \quad (2.10)$$

The proof for this claim is easy. First, it is obvious that (2.9) implies (2.10). On the other hand, let

$$\mathcal{V} \triangleq \left\{ f'(\bar{u})v - w \mid v \in V \text{ and } w \in \bigcup_{h \geq 0} h[E - f(\bar{u})] \right\}.$$

If (2.10) holds, we have $0 \in \text{Int}\mathcal{V}$. Since the set \mathcal{V} is a cone in Y , it holds that $\mathcal{V} = Y$. Similarly to the proof of Theorem 2.1 in [23], we obtain

$$0 \in \text{Int}\left(\left\{ f'(\bar{u})v - \tilde{w} \mid |v|_V \leq 1 \text{ and } \tilde{w} \in [E - f(\bar{u})] \cap B_Y(0, 1) \right\}\right).$$

This implies (2.9).

From the equivalence between (2.9) and (2.10), we see that Corollary 2.1 is a generalization of the classical KKT condition in the metric space.

At the end of this subsection, we give an example, in which the Fritz John condition holds true, but the KKT condition is untrue. The idea of constructing this example comes from [11].

Example 2.1 Let $V = X = \ell^2 = \left\{ u = (u_1, u_2, \dots)^\top \mid u_i \in \mathbb{R}, \forall i \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} u_i^2 < +\infty \right\}$. Define a map $f : X \rightarrow X$ as follows:

$$f(u) = \left(u_2 + (u_1 - 1)^3, -u_2 + (u_1 - 1)^3, 0, u_4, u_5, \dots \right)^\top, \quad \forall u \in \ell^2,$$

and consider the nonlinear optimization problem:

$$\text{Minimize } f_0(u) = u_1, \quad \text{subject to } f(u) = 0. \quad (2.11)$$

Clearly, for any $u_3 \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\bar{u} = (1, 0, u_3, 0, 0, \dots)^\top \quad (2.12)$$

is a solution to the optimization problem (2.11). On the other hand, we have that f_0 and f are continuously differentiable on ℓ^2 , and

$$f'_0(\bar{u})v = v_1, \quad f'(\bar{u})v = (v_2, -v_2, 0, v_4, v_5, \dots)^\top, \quad \forall v = (v_1, v_2, \dots) \in \ell^2.$$

Consequently, $\text{Var}f(\bar{u}) = \left\{ f'(\bar{u})v \in \ell^2 \mid v \in \ell^2 \text{ with } |v|_{\ell^2} \leq 1 \right\}$ is finite codimensional in ℓ^2 and

$$f'(\bar{u})^*(z) = (0, z_1 - z_2, 0, z_4, z_5, \dots)^\top, \quad \forall z = (z_1, z_2, \dots) \in \ell^2.$$

Then, by Theorem 2.1, it is easy to show that any solution \bar{u} defined by (2.12) satisfies the following Fritz John condition:

$$z_0 f'_0(\bar{u}) + f'(\bar{u})^*(z) = 0,$$

with $z_0 = 0$ and $z = (\alpha, \alpha, \beta, 0, 0, \dots)$ for any $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\alpha \neq 0$. However, since $f'_0(\bar{u}) \notin \text{Im}(f'(\bar{u})^*)$, the KKT condition for \bar{u} is untrue.

2.3 Examples on optimal control problems

In this subsection, by Theorem 2.1, we derive a first order necessary condition for optimal controls in infinite-dimensional spaces with end-point state constraints. Let $T > 0$, U be a separable complete metric space and \mathbb{X} be a Hilbert space. Assume that $A : \mathcal{D}(A) \subseteq \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$ generates a C_0 -semigroup on \mathbb{X} . Set

$$V = \left\{ u : (0, T) \rightarrow U \mid u(\cdot) \text{ satisfies suitable conditions, which will be specified later} \right\}.$$

Given functions $F : [0, T] \times \mathbb{X} \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$ and $g : [0, T] \times \mathbb{X} \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Consider the following controlled evolution equation:

$$\begin{cases} y_t(t) = Ay(t) + F(t, y(t), u(t)), & t \in (0, T], \\ y(0) = y_0, \end{cases} \quad (2.13)$$

with the cost functional

$$J(u(\cdot)) = \int_0^T g(t, y(t), u(t)) dt,$$

where F , g and V satisfy suitable conditions, such that for any $u(\cdot) \in V$ and $y_0 \in \mathbb{X}$, the equation (2.13) admits a unique mild solution. Also, for any $u(\cdot) \in V$ and the corresponding solution $y(\cdot; u)$, it holds that $g(\cdot, y(\cdot; u), u(\cdot)) \in L^1(0, T)$.

Let E be a closed convex subset of \mathbb{X} . Set

$$\mathcal{U}_{ad} = \left\{ u(\cdot) \in V \mid y(T; u(\cdot)) \in E \right\}$$

and consider the optimal control problem:

$$\text{Minimize } J(u(\cdot)), \quad \text{subject to } u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}. \quad (2.14)$$

This optimal control problem can be regarded as a special case the problem **(P)** by setting

$$V = \mathcal{D}(f_0) = \mathcal{D}(f), \quad X = \mathbb{X}, \quad f_0(u) = J(u), \quad f(u) = y(T; u).$$

The solution $\bar{u}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_{ad}$ to the problem **(P)** is the optimal control of (2.14) and the corresponding solution $\bar{y} = \bar{y}(\cdot; \bar{u})$ to (2.13) is the optimal trajectory. To obtain the first order necessary condition for the optimal control $\bar{u}(\cdot)$ by Theorem 2.1, the crucial point is to find the set-valued map $\mathcal{V}(\cdot)$ satisfying **(H₁)**–**(H₂)**. In the following, we study the optimal control problem (2.14) in two special cases according to the different choice of V .

2.3.1 U is a complete separable metric space

In the following, we shall first discuss the case that U is a complete separable metric space. This problem comes from some engineering applications. A special case is $U = \{-1, 1\}$.

First, we give the following hypothesis on F and g :

(A₁) Let $F : [0, T] \times \mathbb{X} \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$ and $g : [0, T] \times \mathbb{X} \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be strongly measurable with respect to t in $(0, T)$, and continuously Fréchet differentiable with respect to y in \mathbb{X} . Furthermore, $F(t, \cdot, \cdot)$, $F_y(t, \cdot, \cdot)$, $g(t, \cdot, \cdot)$ and $g_y(t, \cdot, \cdot)$ are continuous. Moreover, there exists a positive constant L , such that for any $(t, y, u) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{X} \times U$,

$$|F_y(t, y, u)|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{X})} + |g_y(t, y, u)|_{\mathbb{X}'} + |F(t, 0, u)|_{\mathbb{X}} + |g(t, 0, u)| \leq L.$$

Choose

$$V = \mathcal{U}_1(0, T) \triangleq \left\{ u : (0, T) \rightarrow U \mid u(\cdot) \text{ is a measurable function} \right\}.$$

Then under the condition (\mathbf{A}_1) , (2.13) is well-posed for $u \in \mathcal{U}_1(0, T)$ and its solution is denoted by $y(\cdot; u)$. Also, $\mathcal{U}_1(0, T)$ is a complete separable metric space with the Ekeland metric (see [15]).

For any $u, v \in \mathcal{U}_1(0, T)$, consider the following system:

$$\begin{cases} \xi_t(t) = A\xi(t) + F_y(t, y(t; u), u(t))\xi(t) + F(t, y(t; u), v(t)) - F(t, y(t; u), u(t)), & t \in (0, T], \\ \xi(0) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (2.15)$$

and define the set-valued map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}(u) = & \left\{ \frac{1}{T}(\xi^0, \xi(T))^\top \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X} \mid \xi(\cdot) \text{ is the solution to (2.15) and} \right. \\ & \left. \xi^0 = \int_0^T \left[\langle g_y(t, y(t; u), u(t)), \xi(t) \rangle_{\mathbb{X}} + g(t, y(t; u), v(t)) - g(t, y(t; u), u(t)) \right] dt, \right. \\ & \left. \text{with some } v \in \mathcal{U}_1(0, T) \right\}, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{U}_1(0, T). \end{aligned}$$

By the spike variation technique, one can prove (see, for instance, [15, 16]) that,

$$\mathcal{V}(u) \subseteq \text{Var}(f_0, f)(u), \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{U}_1(0, T).$$

Particularly, for the optimal pair (\bar{u}, \bar{y}) , let $\hat{\xi} = \hat{\xi}(\cdot; v)$ be the solution to the equation

$$\begin{cases} \hat{\xi}_t(t) = A\hat{\xi}(t) + F_y(t, \bar{y}(t), \bar{u}(t))\hat{\xi}(t) + F(t, \bar{y}(t), v(t)) - F(t, \bar{y}(t), \bar{u}(t)), & t \in [0, T], \\ \hat{\xi}(0) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.16)$$

Then we have

$$\mathcal{M}_1 \triangleq \Pi_X(\mathcal{V}(\bar{u})) = \left\{ \frac{1}{T}\hat{\xi}(T; v) \in \mathbb{X} \mid v \in \mathcal{U}_1(0, T) \right\}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathcal{V}(\bar{u})) = & \left\{ \frac{1}{T}\xi^0 \in \mathbb{R} \mid \xi^0 = \int_0^T \left[\langle g_y(t, \bar{y}(t), \bar{u}(t)), \hat{\xi}(t) \rangle_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{X}} + g(t, \bar{y}(t), v(t)) - g(t, \bar{y}(t), \bar{u}(t)) \right] dt \right. \\ & \left. \text{with some } v \in \mathcal{U}_1(0, T) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Also, by the condition (\mathbf{A}_1) , $\mathcal{V}(\cdot)$ is lower semi-continuous at \bar{u} . Hence, one has the following necessary condition on \bar{u} by Theorem 2.1.

Corollary 2.2 *Assume that $\mathcal{M}_1 - E$ is finite codimensional in \mathbb{X} . Then there exists a non-zero pair $(z_0, z) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X}'$, such that*

$$z_0 \hat{\xi}^0 + \langle z, \hat{\xi}(T) \rangle_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{X}} \geq 0, \quad \forall (\hat{\xi}^0, \hat{\xi}(T))^\top \in \mathcal{V}(\bar{u}) \quad (2.17)$$

and

$$\langle z, x - \bar{y}(T) \rangle_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{X}} \leq 0, \quad \forall x \in E.$$

Note that, in the inequality (2.17), the solution $\hat{\xi}$ of (2.16) is involved, which makes (2.17) difficult to be verified. In the optimal control theory, it may be solved by introducing an adjoint equation for (2.16). Let (z_0, z) be the pair given in (2.17) and consider the following equation:

$$\begin{cases} \psi_t(t) = -A^*\psi(t) - F_y(t, \bar{y}(t), \bar{u}(t))^*\psi + z^0 g_y(t, \bar{y}(t), \bar{u}(t)), & t \in [0, T], \\ \psi(T) = -z. \end{cases} \quad (2.18)$$

By (2.16)–(2.18), it is easy to show that

$$H(t, \bar{y}(t), \bar{u}(t), z^0, \psi(t)) = \max_{u \in U} H(t, \bar{y}(t), u, z^0, \psi(t)), \quad \text{a.e. } t \in (0, T), \quad (2.19)$$

where

$$H(t, y, u, z^0, \psi) = \langle \psi, F(t, y, u) \rangle_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{X}} - z^0 g(t, y, u), \quad \forall (t, y, u, \psi) \in (0, T) \times \mathbb{X} \times U \times \mathbb{X}'.$$

This is a known result (see [15, Chapter 4, Theorem 1.6]), and as pointed out in [15, Chapter 4], if the finite codimensionality condition does not hold, there may not exist the non-zero pair (z^0, z) , such that (2.19) holds.

2.3.2 U is a closed convex subset of a Hilbert space

Let \mathbb{V} be a Hilbert space, and $U \subseteq \mathbb{V}$ be closed and convex. Choose

$$V = \mathcal{U}_2(0, T) \triangleq \left\{ u(\cdot) \in L^2(0, T; \mathbb{V}) \mid u(t) \in U, \text{ a.e. } t \in (0, T) \right\}.$$

Assume that $F : [0, T] \times \mathbb{X} \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$ and $g : [0, T] \times \mathbb{X} \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfy the following condition:

(A₂) F and g are strongly measurable with respect to t in $(0, T)$, and continuously Fréchet differentiable with respect to (y, u) in $\mathbb{X} \times U$. Also, for any $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_2(0, T)$ and $y_0 \in \mathbb{X}$, (2.13) admits a unique mild solution $y(\cdot; u) \in C([0, T]; \mathbb{X})$ and $g(\cdot, y(\cdot; u), u(\cdot)) \in L^1(0, T)$. Moreover, assume

$$\begin{aligned} u \in \mathcal{U}_2(0, T) &\rightarrow F_y(\cdot, y(\cdot; u), u(\cdot)) \in L^1(0, T; \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{X})), \\ u \in \mathcal{U}_2(0, T) &\rightarrow g_y(\cdot, y(\cdot; u), u(\cdot)) \in L^1(0, T; \mathbb{X}'), \\ u \in \mathcal{U}_2(0, T) &\rightarrow F_u(\cdot, y(\cdot; u), u(\cdot)) \in L^2(0, T; \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{V}; \mathbb{X})), \\ u \in \mathcal{U}_2(0, T) &\rightarrow g_u(\cdot, y(\cdot; u), u(\cdot)) \in L^2(0, T; \mathbb{V}'). \end{aligned}$$

For any $u, v \in \mathcal{U}_2(0, T)$, consider the following system:

$$\begin{cases} \xi_t(t) = A\xi(t) + F_y(t, y(t; u), u(t))\xi(t) + F_u(t, y(t; u), u(t))[v(t) - u(t)], & t \in [0, T], \\ \xi(0) = 0 \end{cases} \quad (2.20)$$

and define a set-valued map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}(u) = \left\{ (\xi^0, \xi(T))^\top \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X} \mid \xi(\cdot) \text{ is the solution to (2.20) and} \right. \\ \left. \xi^0 = \int_0^T \left[\langle g_y(t, y(t), u(t)), \xi(t) \rangle_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{X}} + \langle g_u(t, y(t), u(t)), v(t) - u(t) \rangle_{\mathbb{V}', \mathbb{V}} \right] dt, \right. \\ \left. \text{with some } v \in \mathcal{U}_2(0, T) \text{ and } |v - u|_{L^2(0, T; \mathbb{V})} \leq 1 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By Remark 2.3, $\mathcal{V}(u) \subseteq \text{Var}(f_0, f)(u)$ for any $u \in \mathcal{U}_2(0, T)$.

Particularly, for the optimal pair (\bar{u}, \bar{y}) , let $\hat{\xi} = \hat{\xi}(\cdot; v)$ be the solution to the equation

$$\begin{cases} \hat{\xi}_t(t) = A\hat{\xi}(t) + F_y(t, \bar{y}(t), \bar{u}(t))\hat{\xi}(t) + F_u(t, \bar{y}(t), \bar{u}(t))[v(t) - \bar{u}(t)], & t \in [0, T], \\ \hat{\xi}(0) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.21)$$

Then we have

$$\Pi_X(\mathcal{V}(\bar{u})) \triangleq \mathcal{M}_2 = \left\{ \hat{\xi}(T; v) \in \mathbb{X} \mid v \in \mathcal{U}_2(0, T) \text{ with } |v - \bar{u}|_{L^2(0, T; \mathbb{V})} \leq 1 \right\}. \quad (2.22)$$

Also, by the condition (\mathbf{A}_2) , $\mathcal{V}(\cdot)$ is lower semi-continuous at \bar{u} . Hence, one has the following necessary condition on \bar{u} by Theorem 2.1.

Corollary 2.3 *Assume that $\mathcal{M}_2 - E$ is finite codimensional in \mathbb{X} . Then there exists a non-zero pair $(z_0, z) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X}'$, such that*

$$z_0 \hat{\xi}^0 + \langle z, \hat{\xi}(T) \rangle_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{X}} \geq 0, \quad \forall (\hat{\xi}^0, \hat{\xi}(T))^\top \in \mathcal{V}(\bar{u}) \quad (2.23)$$

and

$$\langle z, x - \bar{y}(T) \rangle_{\mathbb{X}', \mathbb{X}} \leq 0, \quad \forall x \in E. \quad (2.24)$$

Similarly to the Subsection 2.3.1, by (2.23), (2.18) and (2.20), we obtain that

$$\int_0^T \langle F_u(t, \bar{y}(t), \bar{u}(t))^* \psi(t) + z^0 g_u(t, \bar{y}(t), \bar{u}(t)), v(t) - \bar{u}(t) \rangle_{\mathbb{V}', \mathbb{V}} dt \geq 0, \quad \forall v(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_2(0, T).$$

Clearly, this condition of integral type implies the following pointwise maximum condition:

$$\hat{H}(t, \bar{y}(t), z^0, \psi(t), \bar{u}(t)) = \max_{u \in U} \hat{H}(t, \bar{y}(t), z^0, \psi(t), u), \quad \text{a.e. } t \in (0, T), \quad (2.25)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}(t, y, z^0, \psi, u) &= \langle F_u(t, y, \bar{u}(t))^* \psi - z^0 g_u(t, y, \bar{u}(t)), u \rangle_{\mathbb{V}', \mathbb{V}}, \\ &\forall (t, y, z^0, \psi, u) \in (0, T) \times \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{X}' \times U. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, (2.23) implies the maximum condition and (2.24) is the transversality condition in the Pontryagin maximum principle.

3 Characterization of finite codimensionality

The finite codimensionality condition in Theorem 2.1 is crucial. However, it is usually difficult to be verified by Definition 2.7 directly. In this section, some equivalent characterization on the finite codimensionality is established, which will provide us with some more verifiable criterion of it.

In this section, we assume that V is a reflexive Banach space and $f : V \rightarrow X$ is Fréchet differentiable at $\bar{u} \in V$. Write

$$\mathbf{M} = \left\{ f'(\bar{u})v \mid |v|_V \leq 1 \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{N} = \left\{ f'(\bar{u})v \mid v \in V \right\}.$$

Then it is easy to check that

$$\text{span} \mathbf{M} = \overline{\mathbf{N}} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\text{co}} \mathbf{M} = \mathbf{M}. \quad (3.1)$$

The first result of this section is stated as follows.

Theorem 3.1 *The following two assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) *The subspace \mathbf{N} is a finite codimensional subspace in X .*
- (2) *The set \mathbf{M} is finite codimensional in X .*

Proof. First, we prove that (1) implies (2). For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, set $\mathbf{N}_k = \{ f'(\bar{u})v \mid |v|_V \leq k \}$. Then $\mathbf{N}_1 = \overline{\text{co}}\mathbf{M}$ and $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{N}_k = \mathbf{N}$. By (1) and (3.1), $\mathbf{N} = \overline{\mathbf{N}} = \text{span}\mathbf{M}$ is a finite codimensional subspace of X . By the Baire category theorem, there exists $\tilde{k} \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\mathbf{N}_{\tilde{k}} = \overline{\mathbf{N}_{\tilde{k}}}$ has at least one interior point x_0 in $\text{span}\mathbf{M}$. Then $\frac{x_0}{k}$ is an interior point of $\overline{\text{co}}\mathbf{M}$ in $\text{span}\mathbf{M}$. Hence, \mathbf{M} is finite codimensional in X .

Next, we prove that (2) implies (1). Notice that $\overline{\text{co}}\mathbf{M} \subseteq \mathbf{N}$. By (ii) in Definition 2.7, $\overline{\text{co}}\mathbf{M}$ has at least one interior point in the subspace $\text{span}\mathbf{M} = \overline{\mathbf{N}}$. Hence, \mathbf{N} also has an interior point in $\overline{\mathbf{N}}$. Since \mathbf{N} and $\overline{\mathbf{N}}$ are two linear subspaces of X , and \mathbf{N} is dense in $\overline{\mathbf{N}}$, we have that $\mathbf{N} = \overline{\mathbf{N}}$. By (i) in Definition 2.7, $\mathbf{N} = \text{span}\mathbf{M}$ is finite codimensional in X . Hence, (1) holds. \square

Remark 3.1 *In the optimization problem (P), if $\mathcal{D}(f_0) = \mathcal{D}(f) = V$, $E = \{0\}$, and both f_0 and f are continuously Fréchet differentiable, then the condition (\mathbf{H}_2) means that*

$$\mathbf{M} = \{ f'(\bar{u})v \mid |v|_V \leq 1 \} \text{ is finite codimensional in } X.$$

By Theorem 3.1, it is equivalent to the finite codimensionality of the set

$$\mathbf{N} = \{ f'(\bar{u})v \mid v \in V \}.$$

In [12, Theorem 4.2], the existence of a nontrivial Lagrange multiplier is proved to be equivalent to that \mathbf{N} is closed, provided that f is affine. In [3], for the above special optimization problem, it is required that \mathbf{N} has nonempty relative interior. Clearly, the finite codimensionality of \mathbf{N} implies that \mathbf{N} is a closed subspace of X . Furthermore, the subspace \mathbf{N} has nonempty relative interior, if and only if \mathbf{N} is closed. Therefore, this finite codimensionality condition of \mathbf{M} is stronger than the conditions used in [12] and [3] in some cases. However, in practice, the closedness of a subspace in an infinit-dimensional space seems difficult to be verified.

In the rest of this section, we give some verifiable conditions for the finite codimensionality of the set \mathbf{M} . More precisely, the finite codimensionality of \mathbf{M} is reduced to suitable a priori estimates by a duality technique. In what follows, the notation \mathcal{C} will be used to denote a generic positive constant, which may change from line to line.

Theorem 3.2 *The following two assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) *\mathbf{N} is a finite codimensional subspace in X .*
- (2) *There exists a finite codimensional subspace \tilde{X} of X' such that*

$$|\phi|_{X'} \leq \mathcal{C} |f'(\bar{u})^* \phi|_{V'}, \quad \forall \phi \in \tilde{X}. \quad (3.2)$$

Proof. We first prove that (2) implies (1). The proof is divided into four steps.

Step 1. In this step, we prove that

$$X_1 = \left\{ x \in X \mid \langle \phi, x \rangle_{X', X} = 0, \forall \phi \in \tilde{X} \right\} \text{ is finite dimensional,} \quad (3.3)$$

where \tilde{X} is the subspace given in (2).

Let the codimension of \tilde{X} be k_1 . If X_1 is an infinite-dimensional space, then there is a linear subspace X_1^0 of X_1 , whose dimension is $k_1 + 1$. Let $\{x_1, \dots, x_{k_1+1}\} \subseteq X$ be a basis of X_1^0 . By the Hahn-Banach theorem, one can find $\{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_{k_1+1}\} \subseteq X'$, such that for $1 \leq k, j \leq k_1 + 1$,

$$\langle \phi_k, x_j \rangle_{X', X} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } k = j, \\ 0 & \text{for } k \neq j. \end{cases}$$

It follows that $\{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_{k_1+1}\}$ are linearly independent in X' . Then $\text{span}\{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_{k_1+1}\}$ has dimension $k_1 + 1$. Since for any $j = 1, \dots, k_1 + 1$, $x_j \in X_1$ and $\langle \phi_j, x_j \rangle_{X', X} = 1$, by the definition of X_1 , we get that $\phi_j \notin \tilde{X}$ ($j = 1, \dots, k_1 + 1$). This contradicts the fact that the codimension of \tilde{X} is k_1 . Hence, the conclusion (3.3) holds.

Step 2. In this step, we prove that for any $x \in X$, there is a $u \in V$, such that

$$f'(\bar{u})u - x \in X_1. \quad (3.4)$$

Let $K \triangleq \{f'(\bar{u})^* \phi \in V' \mid \phi \in \tilde{X}\}$ and define a linear functional ℓ on K as

$$\ell(f'(\bar{u})^* \phi) = \langle \phi, x \rangle_{X', X}.$$

It follows from (3.2) that ℓ is a bounded linear functional on K and $|\ell|_{\mathcal{L}(K; \mathbb{R})} \leq \mathcal{C}|x|_X$. By the Hahn-Banach theorem, ℓ can be extended to be a bounded linear functional on V' . This implies that there is a $u \in V$, such that

$$\langle \phi, x \rangle_{X', X} = \langle f'(\bar{u})^* \phi, u \rangle_{V', V} = \langle \phi, f'(\bar{u})u \rangle_{X', X}, \quad \forall \phi \in \tilde{X} \quad (3.5)$$

and

$$|u|_V \leq \mathcal{C}|x|_X. \quad (3.6)$$

It follows from (3.5) that

$$\langle \phi, f'(\bar{u})u - x \rangle_{X', X} = 0, \quad \forall \phi \in \tilde{X}.$$

This deduces the conclusion (3.4).

Step 3. In this step, we prove that N is a closed subspace of X .

Let Π_{X_1} be the projection operator from X to the subspace X_1 . Since X_1 is finite dimensional, Π_{X_1} is well defined and a bounded linear operator on X . For the identity operator \mathbb{I}_X on X , we have that

$$\mathbf{N} = \Pi_{X_1} \mathbf{N} \oplus (\mathbb{I}_X - \Pi_{X_1}) \mathbf{N}.$$

Since $\Pi_{X_1} \mathbf{N}$ is finite dimensional, it is closed.

On the other hand, for any $\{x^j\}_{j=1}^\infty \subseteq (\mathbb{I}_X - \Pi_{X_1}) \mathbf{N}$ satisfying that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} x^j = \hat{x} \in X$, similar to (3.6) and (3.4), there exists a sequence $\{\hat{u}_j\}_{j=1}^\infty \subseteq V$, such that for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$|\hat{u}_j|_V \leq \mathcal{C}|x^j|_X, \quad (3.7)$$

and $f'(\bar{u})\hat{u}_j - x^j \in X_1$. Therefore,

$$(\mathbb{I}_X - \Pi_{X_1})f'(\bar{u})\hat{u}_j = x^j. \quad (3.8)$$

By (3.7), there exists a subsequence of $\{\widehat{u}_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ (still denoted by itself) and $\widehat{u} \in V$, such that

$$\widehat{u}_j \rightarrow \widehat{u} \text{ weakly in } V \text{ as } j \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence,

$$(\mathbb{I}_X - \Pi_{X_1})f'(\bar{u})\widehat{u}_j \text{ converges weakly to } (\mathbb{I}_X - \Pi_{X_1})f'(\bar{u})\widehat{u}, \text{ as } j \rightarrow \infty.$$

Noting that x^j converges strongly to \widehat{x} in X , as $j \rightarrow \infty$, from (3.8), we see

$$(\mathbb{I}_X - \Pi_{X_1})f'(\bar{u})\widehat{u} = \widehat{x}.$$

This implies that $\widehat{x} \in (\mathbb{I}_X - \Pi_{X_1})\mathbf{N}$. Therefore, $(\mathbb{I}_X - \Pi_{X_1})\mathbf{N}$ is a closed subspace of X and so is \mathbf{N} .

Step 4. Denote by k_2 the dimension of X_1 . In this step, we prove that the codimension of the closed subspace \mathbf{N} is not greater than the dimension k_2 of X_1 .

If it is untrue, there exist linearly independent vectors $x_1, \dots, x_{k_2+1} \in X$ such that for any $\tilde{x}_j \in \mathbf{N}$ ($j = 1, \dots, k_2 + 1$),

$$\tilde{x}_1 - x_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_{k_2+1} - x_{k_2+1} \text{ are linearly independent.} \quad (3.9)$$

By (3.4), there are $u_j \in V$ ($j = 1, \dots, k_2 + 1$), such that

$$f'(\bar{u})u_j - x_j \in X_1, \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, k_2 + 1.$$

Meanwhile, it follows from (3.9) that

$$f'(\bar{u})u_1 - x_1, \dots, f'(\bar{u})u_{k_2+1} - x_{k_2+1} \text{ are linearly independent.}$$

This contradicts that the dimension of X_1 is k_2 . Therefore, the codimension of \mathbf{N} is finite and (1) is proved.

Next, we prove that (1) implies (2). Assume that the codimension of \mathbf{N} is k_3 . Then there is a linear subspace X_2 of X , whose dimension is k_3 , such that $X = \text{span}\{X_2, \mathbf{N}\}$. Let $\{x_1, \dots, x_{k_3}\}$ be a basis of X_2 . For any x_j ($j = 1, \dots, k_3$), there exists an $x_j'' \in X''$, such that

$$\langle x_j'', \phi \rangle_{X'', X'} = \langle \phi, x_j \rangle_{X', X}, \quad \forall \phi \in X'.$$

Set $\tilde{X} = \bigcap_{j=1}^{k_3} \ker\{x_j''\}$. Then by Lemma 2.1, \tilde{X} is a finite codimensional subspace of X' . Also, for any $x_1 \in X_2$ and $\phi \in \tilde{X}$,

$$\langle \phi, x_1 \rangle_{X', X} = 0. \quad (3.10)$$

Now, we prove that (3.2) holds for the above subspace \tilde{X} of X' . If (3.2) fails, there exists a sequence $\{\phi_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ of \tilde{X} such that

$$|f'(\bar{u})^*\phi_j|_{V'} < \frac{1}{j}|\phi_j|_{X'}, \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let $\tilde{\phi}_j = \sqrt{j} \frac{\phi_j}{|\phi_j|_{X'}}$. Then we have

$$|\tilde{\phi}_j|_{X'} = \sqrt{j} \quad \text{and} \quad |f'(\bar{u})^*\tilde{\phi}_j|_{V'} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{j}}. \quad (3.11)$$

Also, for any $x_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, one can always find a $v \in V$ such that

$$\langle \tilde{\phi}_j, x_2 \rangle_{X', X} = \langle f'(\bar{u})^* \tilde{\phi}_j, v \rangle_{V', V}.$$

This, together with (3.10) and (3.11), implies that for any $x = x_1 + x_2 \in X$ with $x_1 \in X_2$ and $x_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, $\{\langle \tilde{\phi}_j, x \rangle_{X', X}\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is bounded. Hence, by the Banach-Steinhaus theorem, $\{\tilde{\phi}_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is bounded in X' .

This contradicts (3.11). Consequently, (3.2) holds for any $\phi \in \tilde{X}$. \square

In general, it is hard to find the finite codimensional subspace \tilde{X} of X' in the assertion **(2)** of Theorem 3.2. Hence, we give another equivalent criterion, where a priori estimate holds on the whole space X' .

Theorem 3.3 *The following two assertions are equivalent:*

(1) *There is a Banach space W and a compact operator $\mathcal{G} : X' \rightarrow W$, such that*

$$|\phi|_{X'} \leq \mathcal{C}(|f'(\bar{u})^* \phi|_{V'} + |\mathcal{G}\phi|_W), \quad \forall \phi \in X'. \quad (3.12)$$

(2) *There is a finite codimensional subspace \tilde{X} of X' , such that*

$$|\phi|_{X'} \leq \mathcal{C}|f'(\bar{u})^* \phi|_{V'}, \quad \forall \phi \in \tilde{X}. \quad (3.13)$$

Proof. First, we prove that **(1)** implies **(2)**. The proof is divided into two steps.

Step 1. In this step, we show that

$$\mathcal{E} \triangleq \{\phi \in X' \mid f'(\bar{u})^* \phi = 0\} \text{ is a finite-dimensional space.}$$

Indeed, let $\{\phi_j\}_{j=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ with $|\phi_j|_{X'} = 1$ for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there exist $\tilde{\phi} \in X'$ and a subsequence of $\{\phi_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ (still denoted by itself), such that

$$\phi_j \rightarrow \tilde{\phi} \text{ weakly}^* \text{ in } X', \text{ as } j \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence, $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{G}\phi_j = \mathcal{G}\tilde{\phi}$ in W . This, together with (3.12), implies that $\{\phi_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is strongly convergent in X' and therefore, \mathcal{E} is a finite-dimensional space.

Step 2. Denote $\Pi_{\mathcal{E}} : X' \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ the projection operator. Since \mathcal{E} is finite dimensional, $\Pi_{\mathcal{E}}$ is a bounded linear operator. We claim that

$$|\phi|_{X'} \leq \mathcal{C}|f'(\bar{u})^* \phi|_{V'}, \quad \text{for any } \phi \in (\mathbb{I}_{X'} - \Pi_{\mathcal{E}})X', \quad (3.14)$$

where $\mathbb{I}_{X'}$ denotes the identity operator on X' . Otherwise, there exists a sequence $\{\phi_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ of $(\mathbb{I}_{X'} - \Pi_{\mathcal{E}})X'$, such that

$$|\phi_j|_{X'} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |f'(\bar{u})^* \phi_j|_{V'} < \frac{1}{j}, \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3.15)$$

Then there exists $\hat{\phi} \in X'$ and a subsequence of $\{\phi_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ (still denoted by itself), such that

$$\phi_j \rightarrow \hat{\phi} \text{ weakly}^* \text{ in } X', \text{ as } j \rightarrow \infty.$$

By (3.15), one has that $f'(\bar{u})^* \hat{\phi} = 0$. This implies that $\hat{\phi} \in \mathcal{E}$. Also,

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{G}\phi_j = \mathcal{G}\hat{\phi} \quad \text{in } W. \quad (3.16)$$

It follows from (3.12) that

$$|\phi_j|_{X'} = 1 \leq \mathcal{C}(|f'(\bar{u})^* \phi_j|_{V'} + |\mathcal{G}\phi_j|_W).$$

Hence, by (3.15), for any $j > 2\mathcal{C}$, one has that $|\mathcal{G}\phi_j|_W \geq \frac{1}{2\mathcal{C}}$, which, together with (3.16), indicates that $\hat{\phi} \neq 0$.

Since $(\mathbb{I}_{X'} - \Pi_{\mathcal{E}})X'$ is closed and convex, $\{\phi_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \subseteq (\mathbb{I}_{X'} - \Pi_{\mathcal{E}})X'$, and $\phi_j \rightarrow \hat{\phi}$ weakly* in X' , as $j \rightarrow \infty$, by the Mazur lemma, $\hat{\phi} \in (\mathbb{I}_{X'} - \Pi_{\mathcal{E}})X'$, which contradicts that $\hat{\phi} \in \mathcal{E}$ and $\hat{\phi} \neq 0$. This proves (3.14) and hence (3.13) holds, provided that ϕ belongs to the finite codimensional subspace $\tilde{X} = (\mathbb{I}_{X'} - \Pi_{\mathcal{E}})X'$.

Next, we prove that **(2)** implies **(1)**. Assume that there is a finite dimensional subspace X_3 of X' , such that $X' = \text{span}\{\tilde{X}, X_3\}$. Denote by Π_{X_3} and $\Pi_{\tilde{X}}$ the projections from X' to X_3 and \tilde{X} , respectively. Then by (3.13), for any $\phi \in X'$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi|_{X'} &\leq |\Pi_{X_3}\phi|_{X'} + |\Pi_{\tilde{X}}\phi|_{X'} \leq |\Pi_{X_3}\phi|_{X'} + \mathcal{C}|f'(\bar{u})^* \Pi_{\tilde{X}}\phi|_{V'} \\ &\leq \mathcal{C}(|\Pi_{X_3}\phi|_{X'} + |f'(\bar{u})^* \Pi_{X_3}\phi|_{V'}) + \mathcal{C}|f'(\bar{u})^* \phi|_{V'}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

Define a linear operator $\mathcal{G} : X' \rightarrow X' \times V'$ by

$$\mathcal{G}(\phi) = (\Pi_{X_3}\phi, f'(\bar{u})^* \Pi_{X_3}\phi), \quad \forall \phi \in X'.$$

Since Π_{X_3} is compact, \mathcal{G} is also compact from X' to the Banach space $W = X' \times V'$ and therefore, (3.12) follows from (3.17). \square

4 Optimal control problems with state constraints

In this section, we will discuss the optimal control problems with state constraints in infinite-dimensional spaces. Different control systems, such as deterministic evolution equations, elliptic equations and stochastic ordinary differential equations, are studied, respectively. Particularly, we shall show how to verify the finite codimensionality conditions in those control systems.

4.1 An evolution equation with endpoint state constraint

Consider the optimal control problem in the Subsection 2.3.2 with $U = \mathbb{V}$ and $E = \{y_1\}$ for a given $y_1 \in \mathbb{X}$.

Let

$$\mathcal{M}_3 = \left\{ \xi(T; v) \in \mathbb{X} \mid v \in L^2(0, T; \mathbb{V}) \text{ with } |v|_{L^2(0, T; \mathbb{V})} \leq 1 \right\}, \quad (4.1)$$

where $\xi(\cdot; v)$ solves

$$\begin{cases} \xi_t(t) = A\xi(t) + F_y(t, \bar{y}(t), \bar{u}(t))\xi(t) + F_u(t, \bar{y}(t), \bar{u}(t))v(t), & t \in [0, T], \\ \xi(0) = 0. \end{cases}$$

By Corollary 2.3, if the set $\mathcal{M}_3 - E$ is finite codimensional in \mathbb{X} , then

$$F_u(t, \bar{y}(t), \bar{u}(t))^* \psi(t) + z^0 g_u(t, \bar{y}(t), \bar{u}(t)) = 0, \quad \text{a.e. in } (0, T).$$

Hence, in order to derive the Fritz John type condition, it suffices to prove the finite codimensionality of the set $\mathcal{M}_3 \subset \mathbb{X}$. It will be reduced to suitable a priori estimates by the results in Section 3.

First, when the optimal control problem (2.14) is regarded as the optimization problem (\mathbf{P}) , we have $f(u) = y(T; u)$, where $y(\cdot; u)$ is the solution to (2.13) corresponding to the control u , and

$$\left\{ f'(\bar{u})v \mid |v|_V \leq 1 \right\} = \text{Var}f(\bar{u}) = \mathcal{M}_3.$$

Also, $f'(\bar{u})v = \xi(T; v)$ for any $v \in L^2(0, T; \mathbb{V})$, where ξ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \xi_t(t) = A\xi(t) + F_y(t, \bar{y}(t), \bar{u}(t))\xi(t) + F_u(t, \bar{y}(t), \bar{u}(t))v(t), & t \in [0, T], \\ \xi(0) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then it follows that

$$f'(\bar{u})^* \phi_T = F_u(t, \bar{y}(t), \bar{u}(t))^* \phi, \quad \forall \phi_T \in \mathbb{X}',$$

where ϕ solves

$$\begin{cases} \phi_t(t) = -A^* \phi(t) - F_y(t, \bar{y}(t), \bar{u}(t))^* \phi(t), & t \in [0, T], \\ \phi(T) = \phi_T. \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

By Theorems 3.1–3.3, we have the following results on the finite codimensionality.

Corollary 4.1 *The following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) *The set \mathcal{M}_3 is finite codimensional in \mathbb{X} .*
- (2) *There is a finite codimensional subspace $\tilde{\mathbb{X}} \subseteq \mathbb{X}'$, such that for any $\phi_T \in \tilde{\mathbb{X}}$, the solution ϕ to (4.2) satisfies that*

$$|\phi_T|_{\mathbb{X}'} \leq \mathcal{C} |F_u(\cdot, \bar{y}(\cdot), \bar{u}(\cdot))^* \phi|_{L^2(0, T; \mathbb{V})}.$$

- (3) *There is a Banach space W and a compact operator \mathcal{G} from \mathbb{X}' to W , such that for any $\phi_T \in \tilde{\mathbb{X}}$, the solution ϕ to (4.2) satisfies that*

$$|\phi_T|_{\mathbb{X}'} \leq \mathcal{C} (|F_u(\cdot, \bar{y}(\cdot), \bar{u}(\cdot))^* \phi|_{L^2(0, T; \mathbb{V})} + |\mathcal{G}\phi_T|_W).$$

This corollary has been used to study the finite codimensionality in the optimal control problems for some wave and heat equations in [16]. The associated a priori estimates have been verified to be true or not easily.

4.2 A controlled elliptic equation with pointwise state constraint

In this subsection, an elliptic optimal control problem with pointwise state constraint is studied. We show that different control and state spaces may lead to different results on the finite codimensionality in optimal control problems.

First, assume that $G \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a nonempty bounded domain with a smooth boundary Γ . \hat{X} and \hat{V} are two Hilbert spaces. In what follows, we will discuss two different cases as examples:

- (I) $\hat{X} = \hat{V} = L^2(G)$;
- (II) $\hat{X} = H_0^1(G)$ and $\hat{V} = H^{-1}(G)$.

Assume that $(a^{ij}(\cdot))_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \in W^{1, \infty}(G; \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$ is uniformly positive definite in G . Consider the following elliptic equation:

$$\begin{cases} - \sum_{i, j=1}^n (a^{ij}(x) y_{x_i})_{x_j} = F(x, y(x)) + u(x) & \text{in } G, \\ y = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma, \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

where $u(\cdot) \in \hat{U}$ is the control variable and $y(\cdot) \in \hat{X}$ is the state variable. Set

$$J(u(\cdot)) = \int_G g(x, y(x), u(x)) dx$$

and

$$E = \left\{ y(\cdot) \in \hat{X} \mid y(x) \geq 0 \text{ a.e. in } G \right\}.$$

Here $F : G \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $g : G \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfy the following conditions:

(**A₃**) $F(\cdot, y)$ is measurable on G and $F(x, \cdot) \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$. Moreover, $F_y(\cdot, \cdot) \in L^\infty(G \times \mathbb{R})$.

(**A₄**) $g(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot) \in L^1(G \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$ and $g(x, \cdot, \cdot) \in C^1(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$.

By (**A₃**) and (**A₄**), we know that (4.3) is well-posed and $J(u(\cdot)) < +\infty$ for any $u(\cdot) \in \hat{U}$. The optimal control problem considered in this subsection is

$$\text{Minimize } J(u(\cdot)) \quad \text{subject to } y(\cdot; u(\cdot)) \in E \text{ and } u(\cdot) \in \hat{U}. \quad (4.4)$$

Assume that $\bar{u}(\cdot)$ is an optimal control of the problem (4.4) and denote by $\bar{y}(\cdot)$ the corresponding solution of (4.3).

This optimal control problem (with pointwise state constraint) is a special case of the optimization problem (**P**). Indeed, choose $V = \hat{V}$, $X = \hat{X}$, $f_0(u(\cdot)) = J(u(\cdot))$ and $f(u(\cdot)) = y(\cdot; u)$, where $y(\cdot)$ is the solution to (4.3) corresponding to $u(\cdot) \in \hat{V}$. Consider the elliptic equation:

$$\begin{cases} - \sum_{i,j=1}^n (a^{ij}(x) \xi_{x_i})_{x_j} = F_y(x, \bar{y}(x)) \xi + u & \text{in } G, \\ \xi = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma. \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

It is easy to show that

$$\text{Var} f(\bar{u}) = \left\{ \xi(\cdot) \in \hat{X} \mid \xi \text{ is the solution to (4.5) for some } u \in \hat{U} \text{ with } |u|_{\hat{U}} \leq 1 \right\},$$

and for any $u(\cdot) \in \hat{V}$, $f'(\bar{u})u = \xi(\cdot; u)$, where $\xi(\cdot)$ is the solution to (4.5) corresponding to u . Hence, for any $h \in \hat{X}'$, $f'(\bar{u})^*(h) = \varphi \in \hat{U}'$ satisfies the following elliptic equation:

$$\begin{cases} - \sum_{i,j=1}^n (a^{ij}(x) \varphi_{x_i})_{x_j} = F_y(x, \bar{y}(x)) \varphi + h(x), & x \in G, \\ \varphi(x) = 0, & x \in \Gamma. \end{cases} \quad (4.6)$$

In Theorem 2.1, choose $\mathcal{V}(\cdot) = \text{Var}(f^0, f)(\cdot)$ and therefore, $\Pi_X(\mathcal{V}(\cdot)) = \text{Var} f(\cdot)$. Consider the following elliptic equation:

$$\begin{cases} - \sum_{i,j=1}^n (a^{ij}(x) \psi_{x_i})_{x_j} = F_y(x, \bar{y}(x)) \psi + z + z^0 g_y(x, \bar{y}(x), \bar{u}(x)), & x \in G, \\ \psi(x) = 0, & x \in \Gamma. \end{cases}$$

As a corollary of Theorem 2.1, it is easy to see that if $\text{Var} f(\bar{u})$ is finite codimensional in \hat{X} , then there exists a non-zero pair $(z^0, z) \in \mathbb{R} \times \hat{X}'$, such that

$$\psi(x) + z^0 g_u(x, \bar{y}(x), \bar{u}(x)) = 0, \quad \text{a.e. } x \in G.$$

Furthermore, by Theorems 3.1–3.3, the finite codimensionality condition of the set $\text{Var}f(\bar{u})$ in \hat{X} is reduced to the following estimate:

$$|h|_{\hat{X}'} \leq \mathcal{C}(|\varphi|_{\hat{U}'} + |\mathcal{G}h|_W), \quad \forall h \in \hat{X}', \quad (4.7)$$

where \mathcal{G} is a compact operator from \hat{X}' to a Banach space W and $\varphi(\cdot)$ is the solution to the equation (4.6).

In the following, we choose different spaces \hat{X} and \hat{U} to study the finite codimensionality of $\text{Var}f(\bar{u})$, based on the a priori estimate (4.7).

1) Choose $\hat{X} = \hat{U} = L^2(G)$. We claim that $\text{Var}f(\bar{u})$ is not finite codimensional in \hat{X} .

Otherwise, by (4.7),

$$|h|_{L^2(G)} \leq \mathcal{C}(|\varphi|_{L^2(G)} + |\mathcal{G}h|_W), \quad \forall h \in L^2(G). \quad (4.8)$$

Write

$$S = \left\{ \varphi \in H^2(G) \cap H_0^1(G) \mid \varphi \text{ is the solution to (4.6) for some } h \in L^2(G) \right\}.$$

By the classical L^2 theory for elliptic equations and (4.8), S is an infinite-dimensional subspace of $H^2(G) \cap H_0^1(G)$ and

$$|\varphi|_{H^2(G)} \leq \mathcal{C}|h|_{L^2(G)} \leq \mathcal{C}(|\varphi|_{L^2(G)} + |\mathcal{G}h|_W), \quad \forall h \in L^2(G). \quad (4.9)$$

Let $\{\varphi_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \subseteq S$ with $|\varphi_k|_{H^2(G)} = 1$. Then there is a subsequence of $\{\varphi_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$, which is still denoted by $\{\varphi_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ and, is a Cauchy sequence in $L^2(G)$. Set $h_k = - \sum_{i,j=1}^n (a^{ij}(x)\varphi_{k,x_i})_{x_j} - F_y(x, \bar{y}(x))\varphi_k$. It follows that

$$|h_k|_{L^2(G)} \leq \mathcal{C}|\varphi_k|_{H^2(G)} + |F_y(\cdot, \bar{y}(\cdot))|_{L^\infty(G)}|\varphi_k|_{L^2(G)} \leq \mathcal{C}.$$

This implies that $\{h_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ has a weakly convergent subsequence $\{h_{k_j}\}_{j=1}^\infty$ in $L^2(G)$. Since \mathcal{G} is a compact operator,

$$\{\mathcal{G}h_{k_j}\}_{j=1}^\infty \text{ is a Cauchy sequence in } W. \quad (4.10)$$

From (4.9)-(4.10), $\{\varphi_{k_j}\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is a Cauchy sequence in $H^2(G) \cap H_0^1(G)$. This contradicts that S is an infinite-dimensional subspace of $H^2(G) \cap H_0^1(G)$. Therefore, $\text{Var}f(\bar{u})$ is not finite codimensional in $L^2(G)$.

2) Choose $\hat{X} = H_0^1(G)$ and $\hat{U} = H^{-1}(G)$. Then, the set $\text{Var}f(\bar{u})$ is finite codimensional in \hat{X} .

In this case, (4.7) implies that

$$|h|_{H^{-1}(G)} \leq \mathcal{C}\left(|\varphi|_{H_0^1(G)} + |\mathcal{G}h|_W\right), \quad \forall h \in H^{-1}(G).$$

By the classical L^2 theory for elliptic equations, the above estimate holds for $\mathcal{G} = 0$ and therefore, $\text{Var}f(\bar{u})$ is finite codimensional in $H_0^1(G)$.

Remark 4.1 *This example on the elliptic optimal control problem presents us a method of choosing suitable control function space and state function space to guarantee the finite codimensionality. In fact, by this method, it is also easy to show that if $\hat{X} = H^2(G) \cap H_0^1(G)$ and $\hat{U} = L^2(G)$, then the set $\text{Var}f(\bar{u})$ is finite dimensional in \hat{X} . But if $\hat{X} = H_0^1(G)$ and $\hat{U} = L^2(G)$, the set $\text{Var}f(\bar{u})$ is not finite dimensional in \hat{X} .*

4.3 A controlled stochastic differential equation with a endpoint state constraint

4.3.1 Formulation of the problem and a necessary condition for optimal controls

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$ be a complete filtered probability space, on which a one-dimensional standard Brownian motion $\{B(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is defined, such that $\mathbf{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is the natural filtration generated by $B(\cdot)$, augmented by all the \mathbb{P} -null sets in \mathcal{F} . Denote by \mathbb{F} the progressive σ -field (in $[0, T] \times \Omega$) with respect to \mathbf{F} . For any $\alpha, \beta \geq 1$ and $t \in [0, T]$, denote by $L_{\mathcal{F}_t}^\beta(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$ the set of all \mathbb{R}^n -valued, \mathcal{F}_t -measurable random variables ξ with $\mathbb{E}|\xi|^\beta < \infty$; and by $L_{\mathbb{F}}^\beta(\Omega; L^\alpha(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n))$ the set of all \mathbb{R}^n -valued, $\mathcal{B}([0, T]) \otimes \mathcal{F}$ -measurable, \mathbb{F} -adapted stochastic processes φ with $\mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^T |\varphi(t, \omega)|^\alpha dt \right)^{\frac{\beta}{\alpha}} < \infty$. When $\alpha = \beta$, it is simply denoted by $L_{\mathbb{F}}^\beta(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n)$.

Consider the following controlled stochastic differential equation:

$$\begin{cases} dy(t) = a(t, y(t), u(t))dt + b(t, y(t), u(t))dB(t), & t \in [0, T], \\ y(0) = y_0, \end{cases} \quad (4.11)$$

where $u(\cdot)$ is the control variable and $y(\cdot)$ is the state variable. Set

$$J(u(\cdot)) = \mathbb{E} \int_0^T g(t, y(t), u(t))dt, \quad \forall u(\cdot) \in L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^m).$$

Assume that $a, b : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and $g : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfy the following conditions:

(A₅) For any $(y, u) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$, $a(\cdot, y, u, \cdot), b(\cdot, y, u, \cdot) : [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and $g(\cdot, y, u, \cdot) : [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are $\mathcal{B}([0, T]) \otimes \mathcal{F}$ -measurable and \mathbb{F} -adapted. Also, a, b and g are continuously Fréchet differentiable with respect to (y, u) in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$. Moreover, for any $u(\cdot) \in L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^m)$, (4.11) admits a unique solution $y(\cdot; u)$, $g(\cdot, y(\cdot; u), u(\cdot)) \in L_{\mathbb{F}}^1(0, T)$, and the following maps are continuous:

$$\begin{aligned} u \in L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^m) &\rightarrow a_y(\cdot, y(\cdot; u), u(\cdot)) \in L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(\Omega; L^1(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})), \\ u \in L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^m) &\rightarrow b_y(\cdot, y(\cdot; u), u(\cdot)) \in L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}), \\ u \in L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^m) &\rightarrow g_y(\cdot, y(\cdot; u), u(\cdot)) \in L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(\Omega; L^1(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n)), \\ u \in L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^m) &\rightarrow a_u(\cdot, y(\cdot; u), u(\cdot)) \in L_{\mathbb{F}}^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}), \\ u \in L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^m) &\rightarrow b_u(\cdot, y(\cdot; u), u(\cdot)) \in L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(\Omega; L^\infty(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n)), \\ u \in L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^m) &\rightarrow g_u(\cdot, y(\cdot; u), u(\cdot)) \in L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^m). \end{aligned}$$

For any given $y_T \in L_{\mathcal{F}_T}^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$, consider the following stochastic optimal control problem:

$$\text{Minimize } J(u(\cdot)) \quad \text{subject to } y(T; u(\cdot)) = y_T \text{ and } u(\cdot) \in L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^m). \quad (4.12)$$

Suppose that $\bar{u}(\cdot)$ is an optimal control of the optimal control problem (4.12) and $\bar{y}(\cdot)$ is the corresponding solution of (4.11).

Let us give a necessary condition of \bar{u} by the optimization result in Theorem 2.1. In the optimization problem **(P)**, choose

$$V = L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^m), \quad X = L_{\mathcal{F}_T}^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n), \quad E = \{y_T\}, \quad f_0(u(\cdot)) = J(u(\cdot)), \quad f(u(\cdot)) = y(T; u),$$

where y is the solution of (4.11) corresponding to $u \in V$. For simplicity of notations, we let

$$\begin{aligned} A_1(t) &\triangleq a_y(t, \bar{y}(t), \bar{u}(t)), & C_1(t) &\triangleq a_u(t, \bar{y}(t), \bar{u}(t)), \\ A_2(t) &\triangleq b_y(t, \bar{y}(t), \bar{u}(t)), & C_2(t) &\triangleq b_u(t, \bar{y}(t), \bar{u}(t)), \\ A_3(t) &\triangleq g_y(t, \bar{y}(t), \bar{u}(t)), & C_3(t) &\triangleq g_u(t, \bar{y}(t), \bar{u}(t)), \end{aligned}$$

and consider the stochastic differential equation:

$$\begin{cases} d\xi = [A_1(t)\xi + C_1(t)u(t)]dt + [A_2(t)\xi + C_2(t)u(t)]dB(t), & t \in [0, T], \\ \xi(0) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (4.13)$$

By the well-posedness result for stochastic differential equations (e.g. [22, Chapter 1, Section 6]), under the condition (\mathbf{A}_5) , the equation (4.13) is well-posed. Also, it is easy to show that

$$\text{Var}f(\bar{u}) = \left\{ \xi(T; u) \in L^2_{\mathcal{F}_T}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n) \mid \xi \text{ is the solution to (4.13) for some } u \in V \text{ with } |u|_V \leq 1 \right\},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(f_0, f)(\bar{u}) &= \left\{ (\xi^0, \xi(T; u))^\top \in \mathbb{R} \times L^2_{\mathcal{F}_T}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n) \mid \xi(\cdot; u) \text{ is the solution to (4.13) and} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \xi^0 = \mathbb{E} \int_0^T [A_3(t)^\top \xi(t) + C_3(t)^\top u(t)] dt \text{ for some } u \in V \text{ with } |u|_V \leq 1 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and $f'(\bar{u})u = \xi(T; u)$ for any $u \in V$.

In Theorem 2.1, choose $\mathcal{V}(\cdot) = \text{Var}(f^0, f)(\cdot)$ and therefore, $\Pi_X(\mathcal{V}(\cdot)) = \text{Var}f(\cdot)$. As a corollary of Theorem 2.1, one gets the following necessary condition of the optimal control \bar{u} .

Corollary 4.2 *Assume that $\text{Var}f(\bar{u})$ is finite codimensional in $L^2_{\mathcal{F}_T}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$. Then there exists a non-zero pair $(z_0, z) \in \mathbb{R} \times L^2_{\mathcal{F}_T}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$, such that*

$$z_0 \hat{\xi}^0 + \mathbb{E}(z^\top \hat{\xi}) \geq 0, \quad \forall (\hat{\xi}^0, \hat{\xi})^\top \in \text{Var}(f, f_0)(\bar{u}). \quad (4.14)$$

Furthermore, consider the following backward stochastic differential equation:

$$\begin{cases} d\psi(t) = -[z_0 A_3(t) + A_1(t)^\top \psi(t) + A_2(t)^\top \Psi(t)]dt + \Psi(t)dB(t), & t \in [0, T], \\ \psi(T) = z. \end{cases} \quad (4.15)$$

By the classical well-posedness result for backward stochastic differential equations (e.g. [22, Chapter 7, Section 2]), (4.15) admits a unique solution

$$(\psi, \Psi) \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(\Omega; C([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^n)) \times L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n).$$

Also, by the duality relationship between (4.13) and (4.15), it is easy to show that (4.14) implies the necessary condition:

$$C_1(t)^\top \psi(t) + C_2(t)^\top \Psi(t) + z_0 C_3(t) = 0, \quad \text{a.e. } t \in (0, T), \quad \text{a.s.}$$

4.3.2 The finite codimensionality of the set $\text{Var}f(\bar{u})$

To begin with, we introduce the following backward stochastic differential equation:

$$\begin{cases} d\phi = -[A_1(t)^\top \phi + A_2(t)^\top \Phi]dt + \Phi dB(t), & t \in [0, T], \\ \phi(T) = \phi_T. \end{cases} \quad (4.16)$$

By the definition of $f'(\bar{u})$, it is easy to show that

$$f'(\bar{u})^*(\phi_T) = C_1(\cdot)^\top \phi(\cdot) + C_2(\cdot)^\top \Phi(\cdot), \quad \forall \phi_T \in L^2_{\mathcal{F}_T}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n),$$

where (ϕ, Φ) is the solution to (4.16) with the final datum ϕ_T . Then by Theorems 3.1–3.3, one has the following result on finite codimensionality.

Corollary 4.3 *The following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) *The set $\text{Var}f(\bar{u})$ is finite codimensional in $L^2_{\mathcal{F}_T}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$.*
- (2) *There is a finite codimensional subspace $\tilde{\mathbb{X}} \subseteq L^2_{\mathcal{F}_T}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$, such that for any $\phi_T \in \tilde{\mathbb{X}}$, the solution ϕ to (4.16) satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}|\phi_T|_{\mathbb{R}^n}^2 \leq C\mathbb{E} \int_0^T |C_1(t)^\top \phi(t) + C_2(t)^\top \Phi(t)|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 dt.$$

- (3) *There is a Banach space W and a compact operator \mathcal{G} from $L^2_{\mathcal{F}_T}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$ to W , such that for any $\phi_T \in L^2_{\mathcal{F}_T}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$, the solution ϕ to (4.16) satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}|\phi_T|_{\mathbb{R}^n}^2 \leq C \left(\mathbb{E} \int_0^T |C_1(t)^\top \phi(t) + C_2(t)^\top \Phi(t)|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 dt + |\mathcal{G}\phi_T|_W^2 \right). \quad (4.17)$$

Next, we consider a special case, i.e., $C_2(\cdot) = C_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$. This holds when the function $b(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ in (4.11) has the form of $b(t, y, u) = b_1(t, y) + C_2 u$. Define a linear operator $\mathcal{G} : L^2_{\mathcal{F}_T}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ by

$$\mathcal{G}\phi_T = \phi(0), \quad \forall \phi_T \in L^2_{\mathcal{F}_T}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n), \quad (4.18)$$

where the process $\phi(\cdot)$ is the solution to (4.16) with the final datum ϕ_T . By the well-posedness of (4.16) (e.g. [22, Chapter 7, Section 2]), the operator \mathcal{G} is well-defined on $L^2_{\mathcal{F}_T}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$. Then we have the following result.

Theorem 4.1 *The assertion (3) in Corollary 4.3 holds for the operator \mathcal{G} defined by (4.18) if and only if $\text{rank}(C_2) = n$.*

Proof. The “if” part. Assume that $\text{rank}(C_2) = n$. Let $\mathcal{M} \subseteq L^2_{\mathcal{F}_T}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$ be a bounded set. By the well-posedness of (4.16), there is a positive constant C , such that for any $\phi_T \in L^2_{\mathcal{F}_T}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$|\phi(0)|_{\mathbb{R}^n} \leq C|\phi_T|_{L^2_{\mathcal{F}_T}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

This implies that $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{M})$ is a bounded set in \mathbb{R}^n and therefore, \mathcal{G} is compact.

Set

$$h(t) = C_1(t)^\top \phi(t) + C_2^\top \Phi(t), \quad \text{a.e. } t \in (0, T), \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (4.19)$$

Since $\text{rank}(C_2) = n$, there is a matrix $\tilde{C}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, such that $\tilde{C}_2 C_2^\top \Phi(t) = \Phi(t)$. Then we have

$$\Phi(t) = \tilde{C}_2 h(t) - \tilde{C}_2 C_1^\top(t) \phi(t), \quad \text{a.e. } t \in (0, T), \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (4.20)$$

If a pair (ϕ, Φ) solves (4.16), by (4.20), we obtain

$$\begin{cases} d\phi = -(A_1^\top \phi + A_2^\top \tilde{C}_2 h - A_2^\top \tilde{C}_2 C_1^\top \phi) dt + (\tilde{C}_2 h - \tilde{C}_2 C_1^\top \phi) dB(t), & t \in [0, T], \\ \phi(0) = \phi(0). \end{cases} \quad (4.21)$$

By the well-posedness result for stochastic differential equations (e.g. [22, Chapter 1, Section 6]), there is a positive constant \mathcal{C} , such that

$$\mathbb{E}|\phi(T)|_{\mathbb{R}^n}^2 \leq \mathcal{C} \left(\mathbb{E} \int_0^T |h(t)|_{\mathbb{R}^n}^2 dt + |\phi(0)|_{\mathbb{R}^n}^2 \right). \quad (4.22)$$

This, together with (4.19), implies (4.17).

The ‘‘only if’’ part. Consider the following stochastic differential equation:

$$\begin{cases} d\psi = -[A_1(t)^\top \psi + A_2(t)^\top g] dt + g dB(t), & t \in [0, T], \\ \psi(0) = \psi_0, \end{cases} \quad (4.23)$$

where $\psi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $g \in L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n)$. If (ϕ, Φ) is a solution to (4.16), $\psi = \phi$ is a solution to (4.23) with $g = \Phi$ and $\psi(0) = \phi(0)$. Meanwhile, if ψ is a solution to (4.23), $(\phi, \Phi) = (\psi, g)$ is a solution to (4.16) with the final datum $\phi(T) = \psi(T)$. Hence, (4.17) is equivalent to the following inequality for solutions to (4.23):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\psi(T)|_{\mathbb{R}^n}^2 &\leq \mathcal{C} \left[\mathbb{E} \int_0^T |C_1(t)^\top \psi(t) + C_2^\top g(t)|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 dt + |\mathcal{G}\psi(T)|_{\mathbb{R}^n}^2 \right], \\ &\quad \forall \psi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ and } g \in L_{\mathbb{F}}^2(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n). \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

If $\text{rank}(C_2) < n$, then we can find a $\hat{g} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, such that $C_2^\top \hat{g} = 0$. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $g_k = \sqrt{k} \chi_{[T-1/k, T]} \hat{g}$, and ψ_k be the solution to (4.23) with $g = g_k$ and $\psi_0 = 0$. It follows from (4.24) that

$$\mathbb{E}|\psi_k(T)|_{\mathbb{R}^n}^2 \leq \mathcal{C} \mathbb{E} \int_{T-1/k}^T |C_1(t)^\top \psi_k(t)|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 dt. \quad (4.25)$$

By the well-posedness of (4.23), we have that

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\psi_k(t)|_{\mathbb{R}^n}^2 \leq \mathcal{C} \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |g_k(t)|_{\mathbb{R}^n}^2 dt = \mathcal{C} |\hat{g}|_{\mathbb{R}^n}^2. \quad (4.26)$$

It follows from (4.25) and (4.26) that

$$\mathbb{E}|\psi_k(T)|_{\mathbb{R}^n}^2 \leq \frac{\mathcal{C}}{k}, \quad (4.27)$$

with a constant \mathcal{C} independent of $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Meanwhile, (ψ_k, g_k) may be regarded as a solution to (4.16). Then by the well-posedness of (4.16), there is a positive constant \mathcal{C} , such that

$$|\hat{g}|_{\mathbb{R}^n}^2 = \mathbb{E} \int_{T-1/k}^T |g_k(t)|_{\mathbb{R}^n}^2 dt \leq \mathcal{C} \mathbb{E}|\psi_k(T)|_{\mathbb{R}^n}^2. \quad (4.28)$$

This contradicts (4.27), for a sufficiently large $k \in \mathbb{N}$. □

Remark 4.2 *It is well known that when C_2 is an invertible matrix, the following controlled system is not exactly controllable:*

$$\begin{cases} d\xi = A_1(t)\xi dt + [A_2(t)\xi + C_2u(t)]dB(t), & t \in [0, T], \\ \xi(0) = \xi_0, \end{cases}$$

where u is the control variable and ξ is the state variable. It implies that in this case,

$$\mathcal{R}_T \triangleq \left\{ \xi(T; u) \in L^2_{\mathcal{F}_T}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n) \mid \xi \text{ is the solution to (4.13) for some } u \in L^2_{\mathbb{F}}(0, T; \mathbb{R}^m) \right\}$$

is not $L^2_{\mathcal{F}_T}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$. Hence, the Robinson constraint qualification does not hold and the following estimate fails for solutions to (4.16):

$$\mathbb{E}|\phi_T|_{\mathbb{R}^n}^2 \leq C\mathbb{E} \int_0^T |C_2(t)^\top \Phi(t)|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 dt, \quad \forall \phi_T \in L^2_{\mathcal{F}_T}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n).$$

But Theorem 4.1 implies that the above inequality holds, if one extra term with a compact operator \mathcal{G} is added. This weaker estimate is enough to obtain a Fritz John type necessary condition for optimal controls of the problem (4.12).

Next, we consider the following controlled stochastic differential equation:

$$\begin{cases} dy(t) = [A(t)y(t) + B(t)u(t)]dt + [C(t)y(t) + Du(t)]dB(t) & t \in [0, T], \\ y(0) = y_0, \end{cases} \quad (4.29)$$

where $A(\cdot), C(\cdot) \in L^\infty_{\mathbb{F}}(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{n \times n})$, $B(\cdot) \in L^\infty_{\mathbb{F}}(0, T; \mathbb{R}^{n \times m})$ and $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$. The system (4.29) is indeed a special case of (4.11). It is a model of investment in a financial market (e.g. [18]). Here, the constant matrix D means that volatilities of the stocks are constant. This is reasonable, if T is not very large (e.g.[19]). By Theorem 4.1, to guarantee the existence of a non-zero pair $(z_0, z) \in \mathbb{R} \times L^2_{\mathcal{F}_T}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$, a sufficient condition is $\text{rank}(D) = n$. This condition means that there are enough numbers of stocks in the market. It holds for a modern financial market.

5 Appendix

In this section, the characterization (2.1) on the set of variations in Remark 2.3 is proved as follows.

Proof of (2.1). First, for any $e \in \mathcal{D}(f)$ and $\xi \in \text{Var}f(e)$, there exists a sequence $\{h_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ with $h_k > 0$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} h_k = 0$, and a sequence $\{e_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{D}(f)$, such that

$$|e_k - e|_V \leq h_k \quad \text{and} \quad \xi = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(e_k) - f(e)}{h_k}.$$

Notice that $\left| \frac{e_k - e}{h_k} \right|_V \leq 1$. Then there are subsequences of $\{h_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ and $\{e_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ (denoted still by themselves), and a $v \in B_X(0, 1)$, such that

$$\frac{e_k - e}{h_k} \text{ converges weakly to } v \text{ in } V, \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Since $I_{\mathcal{D}(f)}(e) = \overline{\bigcup_{\alpha>0} \alpha(\mathcal{D}(f) - e)}$, we have $\frac{e_k - e}{h_k} \in I_{\mathcal{D}(f)}(e)$. Then, by the fact that $I_{\mathcal{D}(f)}(e)$ is closed and convex, we have $v \in I_{\mathcal{D}(f)}(e)$. Moreover,

$$\xi = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(e_k) - f(e)}{h_k} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f'(e)(e_k - e) + o(|e_k - e|_V)}{h_k} = f'(e)v, \quad \forall v \in I_{\mathcal{D}(f)}(e) \cap B_X(0, 1).$$

This implies that

$$\text{Var} f(e) \subseteq \left\{ f'(e)v \mid v \in I_{\mathcal{D}(f)}(e) \cap B_X(0, 1) \right\}.$$

Now we only need to prove that

$$\left\{ f'(e)v \mid v \in I_{\mathcal{D}(f)}(e) \cap B_X(0, 1) \right\} \subseteq \text{Var} f(e). \quad (5.1)$$

For any $v \in R_{\mathcal{D}(f)}(e) \cap B_X(0, 1)$, there exists a $\alpha > 0$ and $y \in \mathcal{D}(f)$, such that $v = \alpha(y - e)$. Choose an $\ell > 0$, such that $\alpha\ell < 1$. Then

$$e + \ell v = e + \ell\alpha(y - e) = \ell\alpha y + (1 - \ell\alpha)e \in \mathcal{D}(f).$$

Take $h_k \in (0, \ell)$ with $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} h_k = 0$ and $e_k = e + h_k v$. Then $e_k \in \mathcal{D}(f)$ and $|e_k - e|_V = h_k |v|_V \leq h_k$. Also,

$$f'(e)v = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(e + h_k v) - f(e)}{h_k} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(e_k) - f(e)}{h_k} \in \text{Var} f(e).$$

Consequently, we have

$$\left\{ f'(e)v \mid v \in R_{\mathcal{D}(f)}(e) \cap B_X(0, 1) \right\} \subseteq \text{Var} f(e). \quad (5.2)$$

For any $v \in I_{\mathcal{D}(f)}(e) \cap B_X(0, 1)$, there exists a sequence $\{v_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \subseteq R_{\mathcal{D}(f)}(e)$, such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} v_n = v$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $|v_n|_V \leq 1$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Indeed, if $|v|_V < 1$, $|v_n|_V < 1$ for sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$. On the other hand, if $|v|_V = 1$, set $\tilde{v}_n = \frac{v_n}{|v_n|_V}$. Then it is easy to show that $\tilde{v}_n \in R_{\mathcal{D}(f)}(e) \cap B_X(0, 1)$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{v}_n = v$. Furthermore, for the above sequence $\{v_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f'(e)v_n = f'(e)v.$$

Since $f'(e)v_n \in \text{Var} f(e)$, there exists a sequence $\{h_k^n\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ with $h_k^n > 0$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} h_k^n = 0$, and a sequence $\{e_k^n\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathcal{D}(f)$, such that

$$|e_k^n - e|_V \leq h_k^n \quad \text{and} \quad f'(e)v_n = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(e_k^n) - f(e)}{h_k^n}.$$

According to this, we may construct a sequence $\{h_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ with $h_k > 0$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} h_k = 0$, and a sequence $\{e_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathcal{D}(f)$, such that

$$|e_k - e|_V \leq h_k \quad \text{and} \quad f'(e)v = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(e_k) - f(e)}{h_k}.$$

This implies that

$$f'(e)v \in \text{Var} f(e).$$

□

References

- [1] J.-P. Aubin and H. Frankowska, *Set-valued Analysis*, Systems & Control: Foundations & Applications, 2. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1990.
- [2] M. S. Bazaraa, H. D. Sherali and C. M. Shetty, *Nonlinear programming: Theory and Algorithms*, Third edition, Wiley-Interscience, Hoboken, NJ, 2006.
- [3] J. F. Bonnans and A. Shapiro, *Perturbation Analysis of Optimization Problems*, Springer Series in Operations Research, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000.
- [4] M. Brokate, *A regularity condition for optimization in Banach spaces: counterexamples*, Appl. Math. Optim., 6 (1980), no. 2, 189-192.
- [5] F. H. Clarke, *A new approach to Lagrange multipliers*, Math. Oper. Res., 1 (1976), no. 2, 165-174.
- [6] H. O. Fattorini, *The maximum principle for nonlinear nonconvex systems in infinite-dimensional spaces*, Distributed Parameter Systems, Lect. Notes Control Inf. Sci., vol. 75, Springer, Berlin, 1985, 162-178.
- [7] H. O. Fattorini, *Infinite-dimensional Optimization and Control Theory*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, 62, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.
- [8] F. John, *Extremum problems with inequalities as subsidiary conditions*, Studies and Essays Presented to R. Courant on his 60th Birthday, 1948, 187-204, Interscience Publishers, Inc., New York, N. Y., 1948.
- [9] W. Karush, *Minima of functions of several variables with inequalities as side conditions*, Thesis (SM)-The University of Chicago, 1939.
- [10] V. Klee, *Separation and support properties of convex sets-a survey*, in "Control Theory and the Calculus of Variations", 235-303, Edited by A.V. Balakrishnan, Acad. Press, New York, 1969.
- [11] H. W. Kuhn and A. W. Tucker, *Nonlinear Programming*, Proceedings of the Second Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, 1950, 481-492, University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1951.
- [12] S. Kurcyusz, *On the existence and non-existence Lagrange multipliers in Banach spaces*, J. Optim. Theory Appl., 20 (1976), no. 1, 81-110.
- [13] X. Li and Y. Yao, *Maximum principle of distributed parameter systems with time lags*, Distributed parameter systems (Vorau, 1984), 410-427, Lect. Notes Control Inf. Sci., 75, Springer, Berlin, 1985.
- [14] X. Li and J. Yong, *Necessary conditions for optimal control of distributed parameter systems*, SIAM J. Control Optim., 29 (1991), no. 4, 895-908.
- [15] X. Li and J. Yong, *Optimal Control Theory for Infinite-dimensional Systems*, Systems & Control: Foundations & Applications, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1995.
- [16] X. Liu, Q. Lü and X. Zhang, *Finite codimensional controllability and optimal control problems with endpoint state constraints*, J. Math. Pures Appl., 138 (2020), 164-203.
- [17] O. L. Mangasarian and S. Fromovitz, *The Fritz John necessary optimality conditions in the presence of equality and inequality constraints*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 17 (1967), 37-47.
- [18] R. C. Merton, *Optimum consumption and portfolio rules in a continuous-time model*, J. Econom. Theory, 3 (1971), no. 4, 373-413.
- [19] R. C. Merton, *An intertemporal capital asset pricing model*, Econometrica, 41 (1973), 867-887.
- [20] S. M. Robinson, *First order conditions for general nonlinear optimization*, SIAM J. Appl. Math., 30 (1976), no. 4, 597-607.
- [21] X. Yang and Z. Meng, *Lagrange multipliers and calmness conditions of order p* , Math. Oper. Res., 32 (2007), no. 1, 95-101.
- [22] J. Yong and X. Zhou, *Stochastic Controls: Hamiltonian Systems and HJB Equations*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999.
- [23] J. Zowe and S. Kurcyusz, *Regularity and stability for the mathematical programming problem in Banach spaces*, Appl. Math. Optim., 5 (1979), 49-62.