

A GRADIENT FLOW EQUATION FOR OPTIMAL CONTROL PROBLEMS WITH END-POINT COST

A. SCAGLIOTTI

ABSTRACT. In this paper we consider a control system of the form $\dot{x} = F(x)u$, linear in the control variable u . Given a fixed starting point, we study a finite-horizon optimal control problem that consists in minimizing a weighted sum of an end-point cost and the squared 2-norm of the control. We study the gradient flow induced by this functional on the Hilbert space of the admissible controls, and we prove a convergence result by means of the Simon-Lojasiewicz inequality. Finally, we prove that, if we let the weight of the end-point cost tend to infinity, a Γ -convergence result holds, and it turns out that the limiting problem consists in joining the starting point and a minimizer of the end-point cost with a horizontal length-minimizer path.

Keywords. Gradient flow, Optimal Control, End-point cost, Simon-Lojasiewicz inequality, Γ -convergence.

Acknowledgments. The Author wants to thank Prof. A. Agrachev and Prof. A. Sarychev for encouraging and for the helpful discussions.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we consider a control system of the form

$$\dot{x} = F(x)u, \tag{1}$$

where $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ is a real-analytic function, and $u \in \mathbb{R}^k$ is the control variable. If $k \leq n$, we may think the columns $\{F^i(x)\}_{i=1,\dots,k}$ of the matrix $F(x)$ as an ortho-normal frame of vector fields, defining a sub-Riemannian structure on \mathbb{R}^n . In our framework, $\mathcal{U} := L^2([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$ will be the space of admissible controls, equipped with the usual Hilbert space structure. For every $\beta > 0$ and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we define the the functional $\mathcal{F}^\beta : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{F}^\beta(u) := \frac{1}{2} \|u\|_{L^2}^2 + \beta a(x_u(1)), \tag{2}$$

where $a : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a non-negative real-analytic function, and $x_u : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is the solution of (1) that corresponds to the control $u \in \mathcal{U}$ and that satisfies the initial condition $x_u(0) = x_0$. In this paper we want to investigate the gradient flow induced by the functional \mathcal{F}^β on the Hilbert space \mathcal{U} , i.e., the evolution equation

$$\partial_t u = -d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u), \tag{3}$$

where $d\mathcal{F}^\beta : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ denotes the differential of the functional \mathcal{F}^β after the identification $\mathcal{U}^* = \mathcal{U}$ given by the scalar product of \mathcal{U} .

In Section 3 we prove that, for every initial datum $u_0 \in \mathcal{U}$, evolution equation (3) gives a well-defined Cauchy problem whose solutions exist for all positive times.

In Section 4 we prove that, if the Cauchy datum u_0 has Sobolev regularity (i.e., $u_0 \in W^{p,2}([0,1], \mathbb{R}^k) \subset \mathcal{U}$ for some positive integer p), then the curve that solves (3) starting from u_0 is pre-compact in \mathcal{U} . This fact, together with the Simon-Lojasiewicz inequality for the functional \mathcal{F}^β established in Section 5, allows us to prove a convergence result in Section 6. Namely, we prove that, if the Cauchy datum $u_0 \in W^{p,2}([0,1], \mathbb{R}^k) \subset \mathcal{U}$ with p positive integer, then there exists $u_\infty \in W^{p,2}([0,1], \mathbb{R}^k)$ such that the solution of (3) starting from u_0 converges to u_∞ with respect to the $W^{p,2}$ -weak topology, as the time goes to infinity. Moreover, using an approach similar to the one employed in [6] and [7] for the gradient flow in finite-dimension, we study the structure of the starting points for which the gradient flow converges to a strict saddle.

Finally, in Section 7 we establish a Γ -convergence result for the family $(\mathcal{F}^\beta)_\beta$ as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$. We prove that the limiting problem consists in minimizing the L^2 -norm of the controls that steer the initial point x_0 to a minimizer of the end-point cost $a : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

2. ASSUMPTIONS AND NOTATIONS

In this paper we consider control systems on \mathbb{R}^n with linear dependence in the control variable $u \in \mathbb{R}^k$, i.e., of the form

$$\dot{x} = F(x)u, \quad (4)$$

where $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ is a real-analytic function that satisfies the following sub-linear growth condition: there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$|F(x)|_\infty \leq (C + 1)|x|_2 \quad (5)$$

for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We use the notation F^j for $j = 1, \dots, k$ to denote the vector fields on \mathbb{R}^n obtained by taking the columns of F . We consider $u \in \mathcal{U} := L^2([0,1], \mathbb{R}^k)$, and we endow the space of controls \mathcal{U} with the usual Hilbert space structure. Given $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\beta > 0$, we are interested in solving the following optimal-control problem:

$$\mathcal{F}^\beta(u) := \frac{1}{2} \|u\|_{L^2}^2 + \beta a(x_u(1)) \rightarrow \min, \quad (6)$$

where $a : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a non-negative real-analytic function, and $x_u : [0,1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is the solution of (4) that corresponds to the control $u \in \mathcal{U}$ and that satisfies the initial condition $x_u(0) = x_0$. We recall that, under the condition (5), the existence and uniqueness of the curve $s \mapsto x_u(s)$ follows from standard results in Control Theory (see, e.g., [2]).

We remark that the hypothesis of real-analytic regularity for F and a is necessary for the results in Section 5 and Section 6. The results stated in the other sections hold true also if F and a are just C^∞ .

3. GRADIENT FLOW: WELL-POSEDNESS AND GLOBAL DEFINITION.

In this section we show the well-posedness in \mathcal{U} of the evolution equation

$$\partial_t u = -d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u), \quad (7)$$

and we prove that, for every initial datum $u_0 \in \mathcal{U}$, the corresponding solution of (7) is globally defined. We first show that $d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u)$ can be represented as an element of \mathcal{U} , for every $u \in \mathcal{U}$. We immediately observe that this problem reduces to study the differential of the functional $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defined as

$$\mathcal{M}(u) := a(x_u(1)), \quad (8)$$

where $s \mapsto x_u(s)$ solves

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_u(s) = F(x_u(s))u(s), \\ x_u(0) = x_0. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 3.1. *The operator $d\mathcal{M}(u) = (\frac{\partial}{\partial u^1}\mathcal{M}(u), \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial u^k}\mathcal{M}(u))$ is a linear continuous functional for every $u \in \mathcal{U}$, and it can be represented as an element of $\mathcal{U} = L^2([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$ as follows:*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial u^j}\mathcal{M}(u)(s) = \langle \lambda_u(s), F^j(x_u(s)) \rangle, \quad (9)$$

for every $j = 1, \dots, k$ and for a.e. $s \in [0, 1]$, where $s \mapsto \lambda_u(s)$ is an absolutely continuous curve in $(\mathbb{R}^n)^*$ that satisfies

$$\dot{\lambda}_u(s) = -\lambda_u(s) \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\partial F^i(x_u(s))}{\partial x} u^i(s) \right), \quad \lambda_u(1) = d_{x_u(1)}a. \quad (10)$$

Moreover, the operator $d\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ is locally Lipschitz-continuous.

Proof. From standard results in Control Theory it follows that, given $u \in \mathcal{U}$, for any possible variation $v \in \mathcal{U}$ we have that

$$x_{u+\varepsilon v}(1) = x_u(1) + \varepsilon \int_0^1 (P^{s,1}(u))_* F(x_u(s))v(s) ds + o(\varepsilon),$$

where the absolutely continuous family of linear operators $s_1 \mapsto (P^{s,s_1}(u))_*$ satisfies the linearized equation

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}(P^{s,\tau}(u))_* = \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\partial F^i(x_u(\tau))}{\partial x} u^i(\tau) \right) (P^{s,\tau}(u))_*, \quad (P^{s,s}(u))_* = \text{Id}. \quad (11)$$

Using this fact, we deduce that

$$a(x_{u+\varepsilon v}(1)) = a(x_u(1)) + \varepsilon \int_0^1 \langle \lambda_u(s), F(x_u(s))v(s) \rangle ds + o(\varepsilon),$$

where

$$\lambda_u(s) := (P^{s,1}(u))^*(d_{x_u(1)}a),$$

and $(P^{s,1}(u))^*$ is the adjoint of the linear operator $(P^{s,1}(u))_*$ defined above. This shows that $s \mapsto \lambda_u(s)$ satisfies (10). Recalling the definition of $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in (8), we deduce that for every $u \in \mathcal{U}$ the linear functional $d\mathcal{M}(u) : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has the form

$$d\mathcal{M}(u)(v) = \int_0^1 \sum_{j=1}^k \langle \lambda_u(s), F^j(x_u(s)) \rangle v^j(s) ds.$$

Hence, if we understand $\lambda_u(s)$ as a row vector, we obtain that (9) holds.

Finally, the local Lipschitz-continuity of the operator $d\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ can be deduced using repeatedly the Gronwall Lemma in (4) and in (10). \square

Remark 3.2. In Lemma 3.1 we have computed the Gâteaux differential $d\mathcal{M}(u)$ of the functional \mathcal{M} at $u \in \mathcal{U}$. The continuity of $d\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ implies that it does coincide with the Fréchet differential (see e.g. [4, Theorem 1.9]). Namely, using the continuity of $d\mathcal{M}$ at $u \in \mathcal{U}$, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\|d\mathcal{M}(u+h) - d\mathcal{M}(u)\|_{L^2} \leq \varepsilon$ for every $h \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $\|h\|_{L^2} \leq \delta$. Hence, if we define

$$R(h) := \frac{\mathcal{M}(u+h) - \mathcal{M}(u) - d\mathcal{M}(u)(h)}{\|h\|_{L^2}},$$

we have that

$$|R(h)| \leq \sup_{\theta \in [0,1]} \|dR(\theta h)\|_{L^2} \|h\|_{L^2} = \sup_{\theta \in [0,1]} \|d\mathcal{M}(u+\theta h) - d\mathcal{M}(u)\|_{L^2}.$$

If $\|h\|_{L^2} \leq \delta$, we obtain that $|R(h)| \leq \varepsilon$, and this in turn implies that

$$\mathcal{M}(u+h) - \mathcal{M}(u) - d\mathcal{M}(u)(h) = o(h), \text{ as } h \rightarrow 0.$$

Hence \mathcal{M} is Fréchet differentiable at u , and the Fréchet differential is $d\mathcal{M}(u)$.

We can now prove that the gradient flow equation (7) admits a unique and globally defined solution.

Proposition 3.3. *Let us consider the following Cauchy problem on \mathcal{U} :*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u(t, \cdot) = -u(t, \cdot) - \beta d\mathcal{M}(u(t, \cdot)), \\ u(0, \cdot) = u_0. \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

Hence (12) admits a unique and globally defined solution $u : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.1 we have that the right-hand side of differential equation (12) is locally Lipschitz in u . This fact guarantees that there exists a unique and locally defined solution of the Cauchy problem. Let $[0, \delta_{u_0}) \subseteq [0, +\infty)$ be its maximal interval of definition. To conclude we need to prove that $\delta_{u_0} = +\infty$. If we evaluate the functional \mathcal{F}^β along the absolutely continuous curve $t \mapsto u(t, \cdot)$, we obtain that

$$\partial_t \mathcal{F}^\beta(u(t, \cdot)) = \langle d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u(t, \cdot)), \partial_t u(t, \cdot) \rangle = -\|\partial_t u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq 0$$

for every $t \in [0, \delta_{u_0})$. Using this fact, we deduce that

$$\frac{1}{2}\|u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \mathcal{F}^\beta(u(t, \cdot)) \leq \mathcal{F}^\beta(u_0), \quad (13)$$

for every $t \in [0, \delta_{u_0})$. Using the sub-linear growth condition (5), we have that, if $\|u\|_{L^2} \leq c$, then there exists $\rho = \rho(c) > 0$ such that the corresponding trajectory $s \mapsto x_u(s)$ is entirely contained in $B_\rho(x_0) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, where x_0 is the starting point prescribed by the problem. Since ∇a , $\{F^j\}_{j=1, \dots, k}$ and $\{\frac{\partial F^j}{\partial x}\}_{j=1, \dots, k}$ are bounded on $B_\rho(x_0)$, we can use the Gronwall Lemma to show that $s \mapsto \lambda_u(s)$ is uniformly bounded (in the L^∞ -norm). Recalling (9), this implies that there exists $K : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that

$$\|u\|_{L^2} \leq c \implies \|d\mathcal{M}(u)\|_{L^2} \leq K(c). \quad (14)$$

Hence, if we define $c_{u_0, \beta} := \sqrt{2\mathcal{F}^\beta(u_0)}$, we have that

$$\|\partial_t u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} \leq c_{u_0, \beta} + \beta K(c_{u_0, \beta}).$$

This is sufficient to conclude that $\delta_{u_0} = +\infty$. \square

We conclude this section with some auxiliary results that will be useful later. The first one is an immediate byproduct of the previous proof.

Corollary 3.4. *For every $r > 0$ there exists $R > 0$ such that, if $\|u_0\|_{L^2} \leq r$, then the solution $t \mapsto u(t, \cdot)$ of Cauchy problem (12) with initial datum u_0 satisfies $\|u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} \leq R$ for every $t \geq 0$.*

Proof. Using (13), we deduce that

$$\frac{1}{2}\|u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \sup_{\|u_0\|_{L^2} \leq r} \mathcal{F}^\beta(u_0) \leq \frac{1}{2}r^2 + \sup_{\|u_0\|_{L^2} \leq r} a(x_{u_0}(1)).$$

On the other hand, using the sub-linear growth of the controlled vector fields $\{F^i\}_{i=1, \dots, k}$, we deduce that there exists $\rho = \rho(r)$ such that $x_{u_0}(1) \in B_\rho(x_0) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ for every u_0 such that $\|u_0\|_{L^2} \leq r$. Since the function $a : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is bounded on $B_\rho(x_0)$, we deduce the thesis. \square

The next result regards the possibility of defining the backward gradient flow for small times.

Lemma 3.5. *For every $R > r > 0$, we have that there exists $\delta = \delta(R, r) > 0$ such that, if $u_0 \in B_r(0) \subset \mathcal{U}$, then the solution $t \mapsto u(t, \cdot)$ of Cauchy problem (12) with initial datum u_0 is defined in the interval $[-\delta, +\infty)$, and $u(t, \cdot) \in B_R(0)$ for every $t \in [-\delta, 0]$.*

Proof. Using (14), we deduce that, as long as the curve $t \mapsto u(t, \cdot)$ stays in $B_R(0)$, the following estimate holds:

$$\|\partial_t u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} \leq R + K(R),$$

where $K : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ has been defined in the proof of Proposition 3.3. Hence, the time that the solution takes to reach the boundary of $B_R(0)$ starting from $B_r(0)$ can be bounded by the following expression:

$$\delta(R, r) := \frac{R - r}{R + K(R)}.$$

Since this estimate holds both for the forward and the backward Cauchy problem, it proves the thesis. \square

4. PRE-COMPACTNESS OF THE GRADIENT FLOW TRAJECTORY

In this section we investigate the pre-compactness in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{U} := L^2([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$ of the curve $t \mapsto u(t, \cdot)$ that solves Cauchy problem (12). We show that, for every $t \geq 0$, the solution $u(t, \cdot)$ has the same Sobolev regularity as the initial datum u_0 . Moreover we prove that, if $u_0 \in W^{p,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$ for a positive integer p , then the trajectory $t \mapsto u(t, \cdot)$ is pre-compact with respect to the strong topology of $W^{p-1,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$. In this section we use the notation $W^{0,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k) = \mathcal{U}$.

In the following lemma, we study the regularity of the term $d\mathcal{M}(u)$ under the assumption that $u \in W^{p,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$ for p non-negative integer.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined as in (8) and, for every $u \in \mathcal{U}$, let $d\mathcal{M}(u) \in \mathcal{U}$ be the representation of the differential of \mathcal{M} at u induced by the scalar product on \mathcal{U} . Therefore, if $u \in W^{p,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k) \subset \mathcal{U}$ for a non-negative integer p , then $d\mathcal{M}(u) \in W^{p+1,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$. Moreover, for every p non-negative integer, there exists a non-decreasing function $C_p : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ such that*

$$\|d\mathcal{M}(u)\|_{W^{p+1,2}} \leq C_p(\|u\|_{W^{p,2}}). \quad (15)$$

for every $u \in W^{p,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$, and $d\mathcal{M} : W^{p,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k) \rightarrow W^{p,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$ is locally Lipschitz-continuous.

Proof. If $p = 0$, i.e. $u \in L^2([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$, using Lemma 3.1 we obtain that, for every $j = 1, \dots, k$, the j -th component of $d\mathcal{M}(u)$ can be represented as

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial u^j} \mathcal{M}(u)(s) = \langle \lambda_u(s), F^j(x_u(s)) \rangle.$$

Differentiating in s and using (10), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_s \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial u^j} \mathcal{M}(u) \right) (s) &= - \langle \lambda_u(s), \sum_{i=1}^k u^i(s) \frac{\partial F^i}{\partial x} |_{x_u(s)} F^j |_{x_u(s)} \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle \lambda_u(s), \sum_{i=1}^k u^i(s) \frac{\partial F^j}{\partial x} |_{x_u(s)} F^i |_{x_u(s)} \rangle \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k u^i(s) \langle \lambda_u(s), [F^i, F^j] |_{x_u(s)} \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where $[F^i, F^j]$ denotes the Lie bracket between the vector fields F^i and F^j . Observing that the function $s \mapsto \langle \lambda_u(s), [F^i, F^j] |_{x_u(s)} \rangle$ can be bounded in the L^∞ -norm with a quantity that depends on $\|u\|_{L^2}$ and on the data of the problem, we obtain that (15) holds for $p = 0$.

If $p = 1$, i.e. $u \in W^{1,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$, we introduce the auxiliary functions

$$h_u^{i_1; j}(s) : s \mapsto \langle \lambda_u(s), [F^{i_1}, F^j] |_{x_u(s)} \rangle$$

and

$$h_u^{i_1, i_2; j}(s) : s \mapsto \langle \lambda_u(s), [F^{i_2}, [F^{i_1}, F^j]] |_{x_u(s)} \rangle,$$

for every $i_1, i_2, j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. Then a similar computation yields the following identity:

$$\partial_s^2 \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial u^j} \mathcal{M}(u) \right) (s) = \sum_{i_1=1}^k \partial_s u^{i_1}(s) h_u^{i_1; j}(s) + \sum_{i_1, i_2=1}^k u^{i_1}(s) u^{i_2}(s) h_u^{i_1, i_2; j}(s).$$

With the same argument as before, we deduce that the first sum is in $L^2([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$, while the second is in $L^\infty([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$ (recall that $W^{1,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}) \subset L^\infty([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$).

The same strategy works for every $p > 1$.

As regards the local Lipschitz-continuity, if $p = 1$, then Lemma 3.1 guarantees that, for every $u \in \mathcal{U}$ and for every $r > 0$ small enough, the following inequality holds

$$\|d\mathcal{M}(u+v) - d\mathcal{M}(u)\|_{L^2} \leq C_{u,r} \|v\|_{L^2} \leq C_{u,r} \|v\|_{W^{1,2}}$$

for every $v \in W^{1,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$ such that $\|v\|_{W^{1,2}} \leq r$. Hence to complete the proof we have to prove local Lipschitz-continuity with respect to the $W^{1,2}$ semi-norm. Namely, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_s \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial u^j} \mathcal{M}(u+v) - \frac{\partial}{\partial u^j} \mathcal{M}(u) \right) (s) \\ = \sum_{i=1}^k \left(v^i(s) h_{u+v}^{i; j}(s) + u^i(s) (h_{u+v}^{i; j}(s) - h_u^{i; j}(s)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

If $\|v\|_{W^{1,2}} \leq r$, then there exists $C_{u,r}^1 > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{i,j=1,\dots,k} \|h_{u+v}^{i;j}\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_{u,r}^1.$$

On the other hand, the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 3.1 yields

$$\sup_{i,j=1,\dots,k} \|h_{u+v}^{i;j} - h_u^{i;j}\|_{L^2} \leq C_{u,r}^2 \|v\|_{L^2},$$

for some constant $C_{u,r}^2 > 0$. Using again the inclusion $W^{1,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k) \subset L^\infty([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$, we deduce that

$$\|\partial_s(d\mathcal{M}(u+v) - d\mathcal{M}(u))\|_{L^2} \leq k^2(C_{u,r}^1 + \|u\|_{L^\infty} C_{u,r}^2) \|v\|_{L^2},$$

which concludes the proof of the local Lipschitz-continuity for $p = 1$. The same strategy works for every $p > 1$. \square

In the next result we prove that the subspaces $W^{p,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k) \subset \mathcal{U}$ are invariant under the action of the gradient flow (12) for every positive integer p .

Proposition 4.2. *For every positive integer p , if $u_0 \in W^{p,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$, then the curve $t \mapsto u(t, \cdot)$ that solves Cauchy problem (12) keeps bounded in $W^{p,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$ for every $t \in [0, +\infty)$.*

Proof. Using Lemma 4.1, we have that the right-hand side of the differential equation

$$\partial_t u(t, \cdot) = -u(t, \cdot) - \beta d\mathcal{M}(u(t, \cdot)) \quad (16)$$

is locally Lipschitz with respect to the $W^{p,2}$ -norm, for every positive integer p . This fact guarantees that, if $u_0 \in W^{p,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$, then the curve $t \mapsto u(t, \cdot)$ that solves Cauchy problem (12) stays in $W^{p,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$ for small times. We prove the thesis using an inductive argument involving the positive integer p .

Let us assume that $p = 1$, i.e., $u_0 \in W^{1,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$. Let us consider $\delta > 0$ such that the curve $t \mapsto u(t, \cdot)$ that solves Cauchy problem (12) stays in $W^{1,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$ for every $t \in [0, \delta)$. Owing to (16), we have that

$$\partial_t(\partial_s u(t, \cdot)) = -\partial_s u(t, \cdot) - \beta \partial_s d\mathcal{M}(u(t, \cdot)),$$

that gives

$$\partial_t \|\partial_s u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^2 = -2\|\partial_s u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^2 - 2\beta \int_0^1 \partial_s d\mathcal{M}(u(t, s)) \cdot \partial_s u(t, s) ds. \quad (17)$$

We recall that, owing to (13), we have the uniform upper bound $\|u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} \leq c_{u_0, \beta}$ for every $t \in [0, \delta)$. Using Lemma 4.1, we deduce that, for every $t \in [0, \delta)$, the following inequality holds:

$$\|\partial_s d\mathcal{M}(u(t, \cdot))\|_{L^2} \leq \|d\mathcal{M}(u(t, \cdot))\|_{W^{1,2}} \leq C_0(c_{u_0, \beta}), \quad (18)$$

where the function $C_0 : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ is defined in Lemma 4.1. Combining (17) and (18), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \|\partial_s u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq -2\|\partial_s u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\beta \|\partial_s d\mathcal{M}(u(t, s))\|_{L^2} \|\partial_s u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq -\|\partial_s u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^2 + \beta^2 C_0^2(c_{u_0, \beta}), \end{aligned}$$

for every $t \in [0, \delta)$. Hence this implies that the semi-norm $\|\partial_s u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}$ is uniformly bounded in $[0, \delta)$. Using this fact, we deduce that $\|\partial_t u(t, \cdot)\|_{W^{1,2}}$ is uniformly bounded in $[0, \delta)$ as well, and this in turn implies that $\delta = +\infty$. As a byproduct, we also have that there exists $K_1^{u_0, \beta} > 0$ such that

$$\|u(t, \cdot)\|_{W^{1,2}} \leq K_1^{u_0, \beta} \quad (19)$$

for every $t \in [0, +\infty)$.

For the inductive step, let us consider a general positive integer p , i.e., $u_0 \in W^{p,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$. With the same argument as before, we obtain that the solution $t \mapsto u(t, \cdot)$ is in $W^{p,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$ for $t \in [0, \delta)$, and moreover the following identity

$$\partial_t \|\partial_s^p u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^2 = -2\|\partial_s^p u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}^2 - 2\beta \int_0^1 \partial_s^p d\mathcal{M}(u(t, s)) \cdot \partial_s^p u(t, s) ds \quad (20)$$

holds for every $t \in [0, \delta)$. Using the inductive hypothesis, we have that there exists $K_{p-1}^{u_0, \beta} > 0$ such that

$$\|u(t, \cdot)\|_{W^{p-1,2}} \leq K_{p-1}^{u_0, \beta}$$

for every $t \in [0, +\infty)$. Using Lemma 4.1, we obtain that

$$\|\partial_s^p d\mathcal{M}(u(t, \cdot))\|_{L^2} \leq \|d\mathcal{M}(u(t, \cdot))\|_{W^{p,2}} \leq C_{p-1}(K_{p-1}^{u_0, \beta}), \quad (21)$$

where the function $C_{p-1} : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ is defined in Lemma 4.1. Repeating the same computations as before, we conclude that $t \mapsto u(t, \cdot)$ stays in $W^{p,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$ for $t \in [0, +\infty)$ and that there exists $K_p^{u_0, \beta} > 0$ such that

$$\|u(t, \cdot)\|_{W^{p,2}} \leq K_p^{u_0, \beta}$$

for every $t \in [0, +\infty)$. □

We are now in position to prove the following compactness result.

Corollary 4.3. *Let p be a positive integer and let us consider $u_0 \in W^{p,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$. Let $t \mapsto u(t, \cdot)$ be the solution of Cauchy problem (12) with initial condition $u(0, \cdot) = u_0$. Then the trajectory $\{u(t, \cdot) : t \geq 0\}$ is pre-compact in $W^{p-1,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$.*

Proof. Owing to Proposition 4.2, we have that there exists $K_p^{u_0, \beta} > 0$ such that

$$\|u(t, \cdot)\|_{W^{p,2}} \leq K_p^{u_0, \beta},$$

for every $t \in [0, +\infty)$. Since the inclusion $W^{p,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k) \hookrightarrow W^{p-1,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$ is compact for every integer $p \geq 1$, we deduce the thesis. □

5. LOJASIEWICZ-SIMON INEQUALITY VIA LYAPUNOV-SCHMIDT REDUCTION

In this section we establish the Lojasiewicz-Simon inequality for the functional $\mathcal{F}^\beta : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined in (6). We want to prove that for every $u \in \mathcal{U}$ there exist an open neighborhood $W_u \ni u$ and constants $C > 0$, $\gamma \in (1, 2)$ such that

$$|\mathcal{F}^\beta(v) - \mathcal{F}^\beta(u)| \leq C \|d\mathcal{F}^\beta(v)\|_{L^2}^\gamma, \quad (22)$$

for every $v \in W_u$. In the following proposition we establish inequality (22) for the non-degenerate cases.

Proposition 5.1. *Let us consider $u \in \mathcal{U}$ such that one of the following conditions is met:*

- (1) $d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u) \neq 0$;
- (2) $d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u) = 0$ and $\text{Hess}_u \mathcal{F}^\beta$ is invertible.

Hence, there exists a neighborhood $W_u \ni u$ such that, for every $\gamma \in (1, 2)$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that (22) is satisfied for every $v \in W_u$.

Proof. Let us consider the case when condition (1) is satisfied. In this case, we can find an open neighborhood $W_u \ni u$ such that $\|\mathcal{M}(v)\|_{L^2} \geq \delta$ for every $v \in W_u$. Then, taking as neighborhood $W_u \cup B_\rho(u)$ with $\rho > 0$ small enough, for every $v \in W_u \cup B_\rho(u)$ we have that

$$|\mathcal{F}^\beta(v) - \mathcal{F}^\beta(u)| \leq \frac{\rho}{2} \|d\mathcal{F}^\beta(v)\|_{L^2} \leq \frac{\rho}{2} \frac{1}{\delta^\alpha} \|d\mathcal{F}^\beta(v)\|_{L^2}^{1+\alpha},$$

and this proves (22) for every $\gamma \in (1, 2)$.

Let us assume that condition (2) holds. In this case there exists $\rho > 0$ and $M > \mu > 0$ such that the following inequalities holds

$$|\mathcal{F}^\beta(v) - \mathcal{F}^\beta(u)| \leq \frac{1}{2} M \|v - u\|_{L^2}^2, \quad \frac{1}{2} \mu \|v - u\|_{L^2} \leq \|d\mathcal{F}^\beta(v)\|_{L^2}$$

for every $v \in B_\rho(u)$. Hence, for every $v \in B_\rho(u)$ we have that

$$|\mathcal{F}^\beta(v) - \mathcal{F}^\beta(u)| \leq \frac{M}{\mu} \|v - u\|_{L^2} \|d\mathcal{F}^\beta(v)\|_{L^2} \leq \frac{M}{\mu} \rho^{1-\alpha} \frac{2^\alpha}{\mu^\alpha} \|d\mathcal{F}^\beta(v)\|_{L^2}^{1+\alpha},$$

and this proves that (22) holds for every $\gamma \in (1, 2)$. \square

The interesting case is when $u \in \mathcal{U}$ is a critical point for the functional \mathcal{F}^β in which the Hessian $\text{Hess}_u \mathcal{F}^\beta$ is degenerate. To manage this situation, we use the general strategy designed by Simon (see, e.g., [9]), i.e., we prove the inequality using the Lyapunov-Schmidt reduction.

Before proceeding in this direction, we need to investigate deeper the structure of $\text{Hess}_u \mathcal{F}^\beta$. As done for the differential, it is convenient to focus on the functional $u \mapsto \mathcal{M}(u) = a(x_u(1))$.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined by (8). Then, for every $u \in \mathcal{U}$ the Hessian of \mathcal{M} at u can be represented through the Riesz isomorphism as a compact linear operator $\text{Hess}_u : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$. Moreover, the application $u \mapsto \text{Hess}_u$ is locally Lipschitz.*

Proof. Using the chain-rule, for every $v, w \in \mathcal{U}$ we have that

$$\text{Hess}_u \mathcal{M}(v, w) = d_{x_u(1)}^2 a(D_u P_{x_0}^1(v), D_u P_{x_0}^1(w)) + d_{x_u(1)} a(D_u^2 P_{x_0}^1(v, w)), \quad (23)$$

where $P_{x_0}^1 : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is the end-point mapping based at $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, namely $P_{x_0}^1 : u \mapsto x_u(1)$. We recall that

$$D_u P_{x_0}^1(v) = \int_0^1 (P^{s,1}(u))_* F(x_u(s)) v(s) ds$$

is a bounded linear operator $D_u P_{x_0}^1 : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, and $(P^{s,1}(u))_*$ is defined as in (11). We observe that the linear operator $v \mapsto d_{x_u(1)}^2 a(D_u P_{x_0}^1(v), D_u P_{x_0}^1(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{U}^* \equiv \mathcal{U}$ has finite rank, since the mapping $v \mapsto D_u P_{x_0}^1(v)$ takes value in a finite-dimensional space. In order to manage the second term of (23), we need the tools of Chronological Calculus. Using the computations done in [2, Section 20.3] and recalling that our control system is linear in the control variable, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} D_u^2 P_{x_0}^1(v, w) &= x_0 \circ 2 \left(\iint_{0 \leq \tau_2 \leq \tau_1 \leq 1} \text{Ad}(P^{0,\tau_2}(u)) F v(\tau_2) \circ \text{Ad}(P^{0,\tau_1}(u)) F w(\tau_1) d\tau_1 d\tau_2 \right) \circ P^{0,1}(u) \\ &= x_0 \circ 2 \sum_{i,j=1}^k \left(\iint_{0 \leq \tau_2 \leq \tau_1 \leq 1} (\text{Ad}(P^{0,\tau_2}(u)) F^i \circ \text{Ad}(P^{0,\tau_1}(u)) F^j) v^i(\tau_2) w^j(\tau_1) d\tau_1 d\tau_2 \right) \\ &\quad \circ P^{0,1}(u). \end{aligned}$$

Since the bilinear operator $D_u^2 P_{x_0}^1 : \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ can be verified to be continuous, then, using the Riesz representation induced by the Hilbert structure of \mathcal{U} , we define the linear endomorphism $\mathcal{L}_u : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}^* \equiv \mathcal{U}$ as $\mathcal{L}_u(v) \cdot = d_{x_u(1)} a(D_u^2 P_{x_0}^1(v, \cdot))$. Using Tonelli's theorem, we obtain the following representation for each component of the operator $\mathcal{L}_u(v)$:

$$\mathcal{L}_u(v)^j(s) = x_0 \circ 2 \left(\int_0^s \text{Ad}(P^{0,\tau_2}(u)) F v(\tau_2) d\tau_2 \right) \circ \text{Ad}(P^{0,s}(u)) F^j \circ P^{0,1}(u) \circ a,$$

for every $j = 1, \dots, k$ and for a.e. $s \in [0, 1]$. Moreover, we have that \mathcal{L}_u maps weakly convergent sequences into strongly convergent sequences. Indeed, first of all we observe that $\mathcal{L}_u(v) \in L^\infty([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$, and in particular $\|\mathcal{L}_u(v)\|_\infty \leq C_u \|v\|_{L^2}$. Moreover, given $v_n \rightharpoonup_{L^2} v$, we have that $\mathcal{L}_u(v_n)(s) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_u(v)(s)$ for almost every $s \in [0, 1]$, and finally, by dominated convergence, $\mathcal{L}_u(v_n) \rightarrow_{L^2} \mathcal{L}_u(v)$. This proves that \mathcal{L}_u is a compact linear operator for every $u \in \mathcal{U}$. Hence we obtain that $\text{Hess}_u \mathcal{M}$ is compact for every $u \in \mathcal{U}$. The local Lipschitz continuity of the Hessian with respect to u can be checked using Variation Formulas for Chronological Calculus operators (see [1, Section 3]). \square

An immediate consequence of the previous result concerns the dimension of the kernel of the Hessian of \mathcal{F}^β . As done before for $\text{Hess}_u\mathcal{M}$, we can represent $\text{Hess}_u\mathcal{F}^\beta$ as a linear endomorphism of \mathcal{U} .

Corollary 5.3. *For every $u \in \mathcal{U}$ the linear operator $\text{Hess}_u\mathcal{F}^\beta : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ has finite-dimensional kernel.*

Proof. Recalling the definition of \mathcal{F}^β given in (6), we have that

$$\text{Hess}_u\mathcal{F}^\beta(v) = v + \beta\text{Hess}_u\mathcal{M}(v).$$

Using Lemma 5.2, we have that $\text{Hess}_u\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ is compact, hence by standard results in Functional Analysis we deduce that it has a finite-dimensional kernel. \square

Using Corollary 5.3 and the fact that the functional \mathcal{F}^β is real-analytic (see [1, Proposition 2.1]), we can apply the Lyapunov-Schmidt reduction to establish the Simon-Lojasiewicz inequality.

Proposition 5.4. *Let $u \in \mathcal{U}$ be a degenerate critical point for the functional $\mathcal{F}^\beta : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Hence there exist an open neighborhood $W_u \ni u$ and constants $C > 0$ and $\gamma \in (1, 2)$ such that*

$$|\mathcal{F}^\beta(v) - \mathcal{F}^\beta(u)| \leq C\|d\mathcal{F}^\beta(v)\|_{L^2}^\gamma$$

for every $v \in W_u$.

The proof of Proposition 5.4 follows the lines of the argument presented in [9, Section 3.12-13], and it is postponed to the Appendix.

Combining the statements of Proposition 5.1 and Proposition 5.4, we obtain the result for the general case.

Theorem 5.5. *For every $u \in \mathcal{U}$ there exist an open neighborhood $W_u \ni u$ and constants $C > 0$ and $\gamma \in (1, 2)$ such that*

$$|\mathcal{F}^\beta(v) - \mathcal{F}^\beta(u)| \leq C\|d\mathcal{F}^\beta(v)\|_{L^2}^\gamma$$

for every $v \in W_u$.

6. CONVERGENCE OF THE GRADIENT FLOW

In this section we show that the gradient flow trajectory $t \mapsto u(t, \cdot)$ that solves

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u(t, \cdot) = -d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u(t, \cdot)), \\ u(0, \cdot) = u_0, \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

has finite length in \mathcal{U} , provided that $u_0 \in W^{1,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k) \subset \mathcal{U}$.

In the following proposition we show that the length of the portion of trajectory that lies in a neighborhood of any of its limiting points is finite.

Proposition 6.1. *Let $t \mapsto u(t, \cdot)$ be the solution of (24) with initial datum $u_0 \in \mathcal{U}$, and let $u_\infty \in \mathcal{U}$ be in the ω -limit of $t \mapsto u(t, \cdot)$. Then there exists $\rho > 0$ such that the portion of the curve that lies in $B_\rho(u_\infty)$ has finite length, i.e.,*

$$\int_{\mathcal{T}} \|\partial_t u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} dt < \infty,$$

where $\mathcal{T} := \{t \geq 0 : u(t, \cdot) \in B_\rho(u_\infty)\}$.

Proof. Let $u_\infty \in \mathcal{U}$ be in the ω -limit of $t \mapsto u(t, \cdot)$. Owing to Theorem 5.5, we deduce that there exist $C > 0$, $\gamma \in (1, 2)$ and $\rho > 0$ such that

$$|\mathcal{F}^\beta(v) - \mathcal{F}^\beta(u_\infty)| \leq \frac{1}{C} \|d\mathcal{F}^\beta(v)\|_{L^2}^\gamma \quad (25)$$

for every $v \in B_\rho(u_\infty)$. Using the fact that the functional \mathcal{F}^β is decreasing along $t \mapsto u(t, \cdot)$, and recalling that $u(t_k, \cdot) \rightarrow u_\infty$ as $t_k \nearrow \infty$ implies that $\mathcal{F}^\beta(u(t_k, \cdot)) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}^\beta(u_\infty)$, we have that

$$\mathcal{F}^\beta(u(t, \cdot)) - \mathcal{F}^\beta(u_\infty) \geq 0$$

for every $t \geq 0$. Moreover, by (25) we have that

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\mathcal{F}^\beta(u(t, \cdot)) - \mathcal{F}^\beta(u_\infty)) = -\|d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u(t, \cdot))\|_{L^2}^2 \leq -C(\mathcal{F}^\beta(u(t, \cdot)) - \mathcal{F}^\beta(u_\infty))^{\frac{2}{\gamma}}, \quad (26)$$

whenever $u(t, \cdot) \in B_\rho(u_\infty)$. Let $t_1 \geq 0$ be an instant such that $u(t, \cdot) \in B_\rho(u_\infty)$ for every $t \in (t_1, t'_1)$ (we take the largest $t'_1 > t_1$ such that the previous condition is satisfied). If $t'_1 < \infty$, we take the smallest $t_2 > t'_1$ and the largest $t'_2 > t_2$ such that $u(t, \cdot) \in B_\rho(u_\infty)$ for every $t \in (t_2, t'_2)$. We repeat this procedure (which terminates in a finite number of steps if and only if $u(t, \cdot)$ stays in $B_\rho(u_\infty)$ definitely), and we obtain a family of intervals $\{(t_i, t'_i)\}_{i=1, \dots, N}$ where $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$. We observe that it is not restrictive to assume that $\bigcup_{i=1}^N (t_i, t'_i) \subset \mathbb{R}$ is a set of infinite Lebesgue measure. Indeed, if this is not the case, we would have the thesis:

$$\int_{\bigcup_{i=1}^N (t_i, t'_i)} \|\partial_t u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} dt = \int_{\bigcup_{i=1}^N (t_i, t'_i)} \|d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u(t, \cdot))\|_{L^2} dt < \infty,$$

since $\|d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u)\|_{L^2}$ is bounded on $B_\rho(u_\infty)$. Let us introduce the following sequence:

$$\tau_0 = t_1, \quad \tau_1 = t'_1, \quad \tau_2 = \tau_1 + (t'_2 - t_2), \quad \dots, \quad \tau_n = \tau_{n-1} + (t'_n - t_n), \quad \dots$$

Let us define the function $g : [t_1, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$g(t) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{F}^\beta(u_t) - \mathcal{F}^\beta(u_\infty) & \text{if } \tau_0 \leq t < \tau_1, \\ \mathcal{F}^\beta(u_{(t-\tau_1)+t_2}) - \mathcal{F}^\beta(u_\infty) & \text{if } \tau_1 \leq t < \tau_2, \\ \mathcal{F}^\beta(u_{(t-\tau_2)+t_3}) - \mathcal{F}^\beta(u_\infty) & \text{if } \tau_2 \leq t < \tau_3, \\ \dots & \dots \end{cases}$$

Let $h : [\tau_0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the solution of the Cauchy problem

$$\dot{h} = -Ch^{\frac{2}{\gamma}}, \quad h(\tau_0) = \mathcal{F}^\beta(u_{\tau_0}) - \mathcal{F}^\beta(u_\infty).$$

We obtain that

$$h(t) = \left(h(\tau_0)^{1-\frac{2}{\gamma}} + \frac{(2-\gamma)C}{\gamma}(t-\tau_0) \right)^{-1-\frac{2\gamma-2}{2-\gamma}}.$$

We observe that $\frac{2\gamma-2}{2-\gamma} > 0$ since $\gamma \in (1, 2)$. In view of (26), we have that

$$g(t) \leq h(t),$$

for every $t \in [\tau_0, \tau_1)$. Moreover, again by (26), we have that

$$\dot{g}(t) \leq -Cg^{\frac{2}{\gamma}}(t)$$

for $t \in (\tau_1, \tau_2)$, and using that $g(\tau_1) \leq \lim_{t \rightarrow \tau_1^-} g(t) \leq h(\tau_1)$, we deduce that

$$g(t) \leq h(t),$$

for every $t \in [\tau_1, \tau_2)$. Using an inductive argument, we deduce that

$$g(t) \leq h(t) = \left(h(\tau_0)^{1-\frac{2}{\gamma}} + \frac{(2-\gamma)C}{\gamma}(t-\tau_0) \right)^{-1-\frac{2\gamma-2}{2-\gamma}} \quad (27)$$

for every $t \in [\tau_0, \infty)$. We can now prove that the portion of the trajectory that lies in $B_\rho(u_\infty)$ is finite. Indeed, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\bigcup_{i=1}^N (t_i, t'_i)} \|\partial_t u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} dt &= \int_{\bigcup_{i=1}^N (t_i, t'_i)} \|d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u(t, \cdot))\|_{L^2} dt = \int_{\tau_0}^{\infty} \sqrt{-\dot{g}(t)} dt \\ &\leq \left(\int_{\tau_0}^{\infty} -\dot{g}(t)t^{1+\delta} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\tau_0}^{\infty} t^{-1-\delta} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

for every $\delta > 0$. On the other hand, using the integration by parts, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau_n} -\dot{g}(t)t^{1+\delta} dt &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\tau_{i-1}^{1+\delta} g(\tau_{i-1}) - \tau_i^{1+\delta} g(\tau_i^-) + (1+\delta) \int_{\tau_{i-1}}^{\tau_i} g(t)t^\delta dt \right) \\ &\leq \tau_0^{1+\delta} g(\tau_0) - \tau_n^{1+\delta} g(\tau_n^-) + (1+\delta) \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau_n} h(t)t^\delta dt, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $g(\tau_i^-) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \tau_i^-} g(t) \geq g(\tau_i)$. Hence, if we choose δ such that $0 < \delta < \frac{2\gamma-2}{2-\gamma}$, we deduce that

$$\int_{\tau_0}^{\infty} -\dot{g}(t)t^{1+\delta} dt < \infty,$$

and hence

$$\int_{\bigcup_{i=1}^N (t_i, t'_i)} \|\partial_t u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} dt < \infty,$$

which is the thesis. \square

In the following corollary we state an immediate (but important) consequence of Proposition 6.1.

Corollary 6.2. *Let $t \mapsto u(t, \cdot)$ be a solution of (24) with initial datum $u_0 \in \mathcal{U}$. If $u_\infty \in \mathcal{U}$ belongs to the ω -limit of the solution, then the whole solution converges to u_∞ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, i.e.,*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|u(t, \cdot) - u_\infty\|_{L^2} = 0.$$

Moreover, the length of the whole solution is finite.

Proof. We prove the statement by contradiction. Let us assume that $t \mapsto u(t, \cdot)$ is not converging to u_∞ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Let $B_\rho(u_\infty)$ be the neighborhood of u_∞ given by Proposition 6.1. Diminishing $\rho > 0$ if necessary, we can define two sequences $\{t_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ and $\{t'_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ such that for every $k \geq 0$ the following conditions hold:

$$t_k < t'_k < t_{k+1}, \quad \|u(t_k, \cdot) - u_\infty\|_{L^2} \leq \frac{\rho}{4}, \quad \|u(t'_k, \cdot) - u_\infty\|_{L^2} \geq \frac{\rho}{2}.$$

However, this contradicts the finiteness of the length of the trajectory lying in $B_\rho(u_\infty)$ established by Proposition 6.1. This means that $\|u(t, \cdot) - u_\infty\|_{L^2} \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, we deduce that there exists $\bar{t} \geq 0$ such that $u(t, \cdot) \in B_\rho(u_\infty)$ for every $t \geq \bar{t}$. This in turn implies that the whole trajectory has finite length. \square

We observe that in the convergence result in Corollary 6.2 we need to assume *a priori* that the solution of the Cauchy problem (24) has a non-empty ω -limit. However, for a general initial datum $u_0 \in \mathcal{U}$ we cannot prove that this is actually the case. On the other hand, if we assume more regularity on the Cauchy datum u_0 , we can use the compactness results proved in the previous section.

Theorem 6.3. *Let $t \mapsto u(t, \cdot)$ be the solution of Cauchy problem (24), and let us assume that the initial datum $u_0 \in W^{p,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$ for an integer $p \geq 1$. Then there exists $u_\infty \in W^{p,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$ such that*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|u(t, \cdot) - u_\infty\|_{W^{p-1,2}} = 0.$$

Proof. Using Corollary 4.3, we deduce that the trajectory $t \mapsto u(t, \cdot)$ is pre-compact with respect to the strong topology of $W^{p-1,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$. Hence the ω -limit of the solution with respect to the strong topology of \mathcal{U} is non-empty, and, in virtue of Corollary 6.2, it is reduced to a single point $u_\infty \in \mathcal{U}$. Finally, owing to Proposition 4.2, we deduce that the solution is pre-compact with respect to the weak topology of $W^{p,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$. Hence we obtain that $u_\infty \in W^{p,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$ and that $u(t, \cdot) \rightharpoonup_{W^{p,2}} u_\infty$. The thesis follows by the compact inclusion $W^{p,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k) \hookrightarrow W^{p-1,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$. \square

In the next result we study the regularity of the limiting points of the gradient flow trajectories.

Theorem 6.4. *Let $u_\infty \in \mathcal{U}$ be a limiting point of the curve $t \mapsto u(t, \cdot)$ that solves Cauchy problem (24) with $u_0 \in \mathcal{U}$. Then u_∞ is a critical point for the functional \mathcal{F}^β , i.e., $d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u_\infty) = 0$. Moreover, $u_\infty \in W^{p,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$ for every integer $p \geq 0$.*

Proof. By Corollary 6.2, we have that the solution $t \mapsto u(t, \cdot)$ is converging with respect to the L^2 strong topology to u_∞ . Let us consider $\rho > 0$ given by Proposition 6.1. If $d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u_\infty) \neq 0$, taking a smaller $\rho > 0$ if necessary, we have that there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\|d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u)\|_{L^2} \geq \varepsilon$ for every $u \in B_\rho(u_\infty)$. Since $u(t, \cdot) \in B_\rho(u_\infty)$ definitely, we have that $\|\partial_t u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2} \geq \varepsilon$ definitely, but this contradicts the fact that the length of the trajectory is finite. As regards the regularity of u_∞ , we observe that $d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u_\infty) = 0$ implies that

$$u_\infty = -\beta d\mathcal{M}(u_\infty).$$

Owing to Lemma 4.1, we deduce that the right-hand side has regularity $W^{p+1,2}$, whenever $u_\infty \in W^{p,2}$, for every non-negative integer p . Using a bootstrapping argument, this implies that $u_\infty \in W^{p,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^k)$, for every integer $p \geq 0$. \square

Remark 6.5. We can give a further characterization of critical points of the functional \mathcal{F}^β . Let u_∞ be such that $d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u_\infty) = 0$. Then, using the computations done in Lemma 3.1, for every component $j = 1, \dots, k$ the following identity holds:

$$u_\infty^j(s) = -\beta d\mathcal{M}^j(u_\infty) = \langle -\beta d_{x_{u_\infty}(1)} a, (P^{s,1}(u_\infty))^* F^j(x_{u_\infty}(s)) \rangle. \quad (28)$$

Hence, if we set

$$\lambda(s) := (P^{s,1}(u_\infty))^* (-\beta d_{x_{u_\infty}(1)} a),$$

we can rewrite (28) as follows:

$$u_\infty^j(s) = \langle \lambda(s), F^j(x_{u_\infty}(s)) \rangle.$$

This means that the curve $s \mapsto x_{u_\infty}(s)$ is a normal Pontryagin extremal for the optimal control problem (6).

6.1. Convergence to strict saddles. We conclude this section with a result on the possibility that a solution of Cauchy problem (12) converges to a strict saddle point of the functional \mathcal{F}^β . Our approach follows the same general ideas as in [6, 7], where the framework was the discrete gradient method in the finite-dimensional case. First of all, we give the definition of strict saddle point for our problem.

Definition 6.6. A point $u \in \mathcal{U}$ of the functional $\mathcal{F}^\beta : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a strict saddle point when the following are satisfied:

- $d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u) = 0$,
- $\text{Hess}_u \mathcal{F}^\beta : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ has at least one negative eigenvalue.

We recall a result on the structure of the center stable manifold near a critical point of a dynamical system in a Banach space. For a complete discussion on the topic we refer the reader to [8, Chapter 5].

Theorem 6.7 (p.67, [8]). *Let $U \subset E$ be an open set of the Banach space E , let $\Phi : U \rightarrow E$ be a C^1 local diffeomorphism, and let $e \in U$ be a fixed point of Φ . Suppose that E has a $D_e\Phi$ -invariant decomposition $E^s \oplus E^c \oplus E^u$, and that there are positive numbers $0 < \lambda_0 < \lambda_1 < 1 < \mu_1 < \mu_0$ such that:*

$$\|D_e\Phi(v)\| \leq \lambda_0\|v\|, \quad \forall v \in E^s;$$

$$\lambda_1\|v\| \leq \|D_e\Phi(v)\| \leq \mu_1\|v\|, \quad \forall v \in E^c;$$

$$\mu_0\|v\| \leq \|D_e\Phi(v)\|, \quad \forall v \in E^u.$$

Let $B_r^s(e)$, $B_r^c(e)$ and $B_r^u(e)$ be the balls centered at the fixed point e with radius r (measured with the norm of E) in E^s , E^c and E^u , respectively. Let $\hat{B}_r(e)$ be the product of $B_r^s(e)$, $B_r^c(e)$ and $B_r^u(e)$. Then there exists $W_{loc}^{sc}(e) \subset \hat{B}_r(e)$ such that:

- $\Phi(W_{loc}^{sc}(e)) \cap \hat{B}_r(e) \subset W_{loc}^{sc}(e)$;
- $\{x \in \hat{B}_r(e) : \Phi^m(x) \in \hat{B}_r(e), \forall m \geq 0\} \subset W_{loc}^{sc}(e)$;
- $W_{loc}^{sc}(e)$ is the graph of a Lipschitz function $g^{sc} : B_r^s(e) \times B_r^c(e) \rightarrow B_r^u(e)$.

The general idea of our discussion is that the role of the local diffeomorphism Φ in Theorem 6.7 will be played by the gradient flow mapping, i.e., given $\bar{t} > 0$, we define

$$\Phi^{\bar{t}} : u_0 \mapsto u(\bar{t}, \cdot), \quad (29)$$

where the curve $t \mapsto u(t, \cdot)$ solves Cauchy problem (12). We have the following result, whose proof coincides with the finite-dimensional case.

Lemma 6.8. *Let $e \in \mathcal{U}$ be a fixed point for the mapping $\Phi^{\bar{t}}$ defined in (29). Then the eigenvalues of $D_e\Phi^{\bar{t}}$ satisfy the following relation:*

$$\text{eig}(D_e\Phi^{\bar{t}}) = \{e^{-\lambda\bar{t}} : \lambda \in \text{eig}(\text{Hess}_e\mathcal{F}^\beta)\}.$$

In the next result we show that, for a generic choice of the initial datum, the gradient flow does not converge to a strict saddle point.

Theorem 6.9. *The set of the initial data for Cauchy problem (12) such that the solution converges to a strict saddle point is a countable union of nowhere dense sets in \mathcal{U} .*

Proof. Given $\rho > 0$, we first prove the thesis assuming that the initial datum u_0 satisfies $u_0 \in B_\rho(0)$. Using Corollary 3.4, we have that there exists $R > 0$ such that any solution $t \mapsto u(t, \cdot)$ of (12) with Cauchy datum in $B_\rho(0)$ stays in $B_R(0)$ for every $t \geq 0$. If we use Lemma 3.5 with $2R$ and R , we obtain $\delta = \delta(2R, R)$ such that the inverse flow $(\Phi^\delta)^{-1} = \Phi^{-\delta}$ is well-defined on $B_R(0)$ and $\Phi^{-\delta}(B_R(0)) \subset B_{2R}(0)$. We are going to apply Theorem 6.7 to the flow $\Phi^\delta : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$. Let $\{v_i\}_{i \in I} \subset B_R(0)$ be the set of the strict saddle points contained in $B_R(0)$. We recall that, by definition of R , the elements of $\{v_i\}_{i \in I}$ are the only strict saddle points reachable from $B_\rho(0)$. For every $i \in I$, let $\hat{B}_{r_i}(v_i)$ be the open neighborhood prescribed by Theorem 6.7. We recall that the condition of being a strict saddle point guarantees that, for

every $i \in I$, we can choose μ_0 such that the unstable invariant subspace E^u has positive dimension. Reducing r_i if necessary, we may assume that $\hat{B}_{r_i}(v_i) \subset B_R(0)$ for every $i \in I$. Using the fact that the Hilbert space \mathcal{U} is second countable, we have that there exists $\{v_\ell\}_{\ell \geq 1} \subset \{v_i\}_{i \in I}$ such that

$$\bigcup_{i \in I} \hat{B}_{r_i}(v_i) = \bigcup_{\ell \geq 1} \hat{B}_{r_\ell}(v_\ell).$$

Moreover, if the curve $t \mapsto u(t, \cdot)$ that solves (12) with initial datum $u_0 \in B_\rho(0)$ converges to some strict saddle $v_i, i \in I$, then there exist $\ell \geq 1$ and $\bar{t} > 0$ such that $u(t, \cdot) \in B_{r_\ell}(v_\ell)$ for every $t \geq \bar{t}$. It is not restrictive to assume that $\bar{t} = \bar{m}\delta$, for some $\bar{m} \geq 1$. This implies that for every $m \geq 0$

$$(\Phi^\delta)^m(u(\bar{t}, \cdot)) \in \hat{B}_{r_\ell}(v_\ell).$$

In view of Theorem 6.7, this means that $u(\bar{t}, \cdot) \in W_{loc}^{sc}(v_\ell)$, or equivalently that $u_0 = (\Phi^\delta)^{-\bar{m}}(u(\bar{t}, \cdot)) \in (\Phi^\delta)^{-\bar{m}}(W_{loc}^{sc}(v_\ell))$. The fact that $\{v_\ell\}_{\ell \geq 1}$ are strict saddle points guarantees that the center stable manifolds $\{W_{loc}^{sc}(v_\ell)\}_{\ell \geq 1}$ have positive codimension. Moreover, being the graph of a Lipschitz function, the closure of $W_{loc}^{sc}(v_\ell) \subset \hat{B}_{r_\ell}(v_\ell)$ in \mathcal{U} has empty interior. Let $S_\ell^0 := W_{loc}^{sc}(v_\ell)$ and, for every $m \geq 1$, let us define recursively

$$S_\ell^m := (\Phi^\delta)^{-1}(S_\ell^{m-1}) \cap B_R(0).$$

We recall that we have chosen $\delta > 0$ such that $(\Phi^\delta)^{-1}(B_R(0)) \subset B_{2R}(0)$, then the family $\{S_\ell^m\}_{\ell, m \geq 1}$ is well-defined. Finally, let S be the set of the initial data in $B_\rho(0)$ such that the corresponding gradient flow trajectory converges to a strict saddle. Then, we have that

$$S \subset \bigcup_{\ell, m \geq 1} S_\ell^m \cap B_\rho(0),$$

i.e., S is contained in a countable union of nowhere dense sets. To complete the proof it is sufficient to consider an increasing sequence of radii $(\rho_j)_{j \geq 1}$ such that $\rho_j \rightarrow +\infty$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, and to repeat the argument for every ball $B_{\rho_j}(0)$. \square

7. Γ -CONVERGENCE

In this section we study the behavior of the functionals \mathcal{F}^β as $\beta \rightarrow +\infty$, and we establish a Γ -convergence result. The expression $u_\beta \rightharpoonup u$ as $\beta \rightarrow +\infty$ denotes the weak convergence in \mathcal{U} . The standard theory of Γ -convergence requires the domain of the functionals to be metric spaces (see [5]). Since the weak topology of \mathcal{U} is only locally metrizable, we shall restrict the functionals $(\mathcal{F}^\beta)_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ to the set

$$U_\rho := \{u \in \mathcal{U} : \|u\|_{L^2} \leq \rho\},$$

where $\rho > 0$. We set $\mathcal{F}_\rho^\beta := \mathcal{F}^\beta|_{U_\rho}$.

We recall the definition of Γ -convergence.

Definition 7.1. The family of functionals $(\mathcal{F}_\rho^\beta)_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ is said to Γ -converge to a functional $\mathcal{F}_\rho : \mathcal{U}_\rho \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ with respect to the weak topology of \mathcal{U} as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ if the following conditions hold:

- for every $(u_\beta)_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}_+} \subset \mathcal{U}_\rho$ such that $u_\beta \rightharpoonup u$ as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ we have

$$\liminf_{\beta \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{F}_\rho^\beta(u_\beta) \geq \mathcal{F}_\rho(u); \quad (30)$$

- for every $u \in \mathcal{U}$ there exists a sequence $(u_\beta)_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}_+} \subset \mathcal{U}_\rho$ such that $u_\beta \rightharpoonup u$ as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ and such that

$$\limsup_{\beta \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{F}_\rho^\beta(u_\beta) \leq \mathcal{F}_\rho(u). \quad (31)$$

If (30) and (31) are satisfied, then we write $\mathcal{F}_\rho^\beta \rightarrow_\Gamma \mathcal{F}_\rho$ as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$.

For simplicity, we will assume that the non-negative function $a : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that defines the end-point cost has a unique global minimizer $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $a(x_1) = 0$. Let us define the functional $\mathcal{F}_\rho : \mathcal{U}_\rho \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{F}_\rho(u) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \|u\|_{L^2}^2 & \text{if } x_u(1) = x_1, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

We now prove the Γ -convergence result, i.e., we show that $\mathcal{F}_\rho^\beta \rightarrow_\Gamma \mathcal{F}_\rho$ as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ with respect to the weak topology of \mathcal{U} .

Theorem 7.2. *Given $\rho > 0$, let us consider $\mathcal{F}_\rho^\beta : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $\beta > 0$. Let $\mathcal{F}_\rho : \mathcal{U}_\rho \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be defined as in (32). Then the functionals \mathcal{F}_ρ^β Γ -converge to \mathcal{F}_ρ as $\beta \rightarrow +\infty$ with respect to the weak topology of \mathcal{U} .*

Remark 7.3. If $\rho > 0$ is not large enough, it may happen that no control in \mathcal{U}_ρ steers x_0 to x_1 , i.e., $x_u(1) \neq x_1$ for every $u \in \mathcal{U}_\rho$. In this case the Γ -convergence result is still valid, and the Γ -limit satisfies $\mathcal{F}_\rho \equiv +\infty$. We can easily avoid this uninteresting situation when system (4) is controllable. Indeed, using the controllability assumption, we deduce that there exists a control $\tilde{u} \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $x_{\tilde{u}}(1) = x_1$. On the other hand, we have that

$$\inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \mathcal{F}^\beta(u) \leq \mathcal{F}^\beta(\tilde{u})$$

for every $\beta > 0$. Moreover, using the fact that $x_{\tilde{u}}(1) = x_1$, we have that

$$\mathcal{F}^\beta(\tilde{u}) = \frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{u}\|_{L^2}^2,$$

for every $\beta > 0$. This means that $\mathcal{F}^\beta(u) > \mathcal{F}^\beta(\tilde{u})$ if $\|u\|_{L^2} > \|\tilde{u}\|_{L^2}$. Setting $\rho = \|\tilde{u}\|_{L^2}$, we deduce that

$$\inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \mathcal{F}^\beta(u) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}_\rho} \mathcal{F}_\rho^\beta(u).$$

Moreover, this choice of ρ guarantees that the Γ -limit $\mathcal{F}_\rho \neq +\infty$, since we have that $\mathcal{F}_\rho(\tilde{u}) < +\infty$.

Proof of Theorem 7.2. We begin with the lim sup condition (31). If $\mathcal{F}_\rho(u) = +\infty$, the inequality is trivially satisfied. Let us assume that $\mathcal{F}_\rho(u) < +\infty$. Then setting $u_\beta = u$ for every $\beta > 0$, we deduce that $x_u(1) = x_{u_\beta}(1) = x_1$, and, recalling that $a(x_1) = 0$, we have that

$$\mathcal{F}_\rho^\beta(u_\beta) = \frac{1}{2} \|u\|_{L^2}^2 = \mathcal{F}_\rho(u). \quad (33)$$

This proves the lim sup condition.

We now prove the lim inf condition (30). Let us consider $(u_\beta)_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}_+} \subset \mathcal{U}_\rho$ such that $u_\beta \rightharpoonup u$ as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$, and such that

$$\liminf_{\beta \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{F}_\rho^\beta(u_\beta) = C.$$

We may assume that $C < +\infty$. If this is not the case, then (30) trivially holds. We can choose $(\beta_m)_{m \geq 0}$ such that $\beta_m \rightarrow +\infty$ and

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{F}_\rho^{\beta_m}(u_{\beta_m}) = \liminf_{\beta \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{F}_\rho^\beta(u_\beta) = C. \quad (34)$$

For every $m \geq 0$, let $x_{\beta_m} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be the curve defined as the solution of Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_{\beta_m}(s) = F(x_{\beta_m}(s))u_{\beta_m}(s), \\ x_{\beta_m}(0) = x_0. \end{cases}$$

We recall that $(u_{\beta_m})_{m \geq 0}$ is a bounded sequence in \mathcal{U} . Therefore, using the sub-linear growth of the controlled vector fields, we obtain that there exists a compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $x_{\beta_m}(s) \in K$ for every $s \in [0, 1]$ and for every $m \geq 0$. Using the identity

$$\dot{x}_{\beta_m} = F(x_{\beta_m})u_{\beta_m},$$

we deduce that the sequence $(x_{\beta_m})_{m \geq 0} \subset W^{1,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^n)$ is bounded. Indeed,

$$\|\dot{x}_{\beta_m}\|_{L^2} \leq \sup_K |F(x)| \|u_{\beta_m}\|_{L^2},$$

for every $m \geq 0$. This shows that $(x_{\beta_m})_{m \geq 0}$ is pre-compact in $W^{1,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^n)$. If we extract a sub-sequence, we have that

$$x_{\beta_{m_j}} \rightharpoonup_{W^{1,2}} x_\infty \quad (35)$$

where $x_\infty \in W^{1,2}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^n)$. The weak convergence (35) implies that

- $F(x_{\beta_{m_j}}) \rightarrow_{C^0} F(x_\infty)$, because $x_{\beta_{m_j}} \rightarrow_{C^0} x_\infty$ and F is Lipschitz on K ;
- $\dot{x}_{\beta_{m_j}} \rightarrow_{L^2} \dot{x}_\infty$ by (35);
- $u_{\beta_{m_j}} \rightarrow_{L^2} u$ by hypothesis.

Hence we can pass to the limit in the equality $\dot{x}_{\beta_{m_j}} = F(x_{\beta_{m_j}})u_{\beta_{m_j}}$, and we obtain that

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_\infty(s) = F(x_\infty(s))u(s), \\ x_\infty(0) = x_0, \end{cases}$$

i.e., $s \mapsto x_\infty(s)$ is the trajectory corresponding to the control u . We observe that the convergence $x_{\beta_{m_j}} \rightarrow_{C^0} x_\infty$ implies that $x_{\beta_{m_j}}(1) \rightarrow x_\infty(1)$. On the other hand, using (34), we have that there exists $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{F}_\rho^{\beta_{m_j}}(u_{\beta_{m_j}}) \leq C_1$$

for every m_j , and this implies that

$$a(x_{\beta_{m_j}}(1)) \leq \frac{C_1}{\beta_{m_j}}.$$

Letting $m_j \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain that $a(x_\infty(1)) = 0$, i.e., $x_\infty(1) = x_1$. This argument proves that, if $u_\beta \rightharpoonup u$ and inequality (33) holds, then the control u steers x_0 to x_1 . This shows that $\mathcal{F}_\rho(u) < +\infty$. To prove (30), we observe that

$$\mathcal{F}_\rho(u) = \frac{1}{2} \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} \|u_{\beta_n}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{F}_\rho^{\beta_n}(u_{\beta_n}) = \liminf_{\beta \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{F}_\rho^\beta(u_\beta).$$

□

Remark 7.4. We observe that the functionals $(\mathcal{F}_\rho^\beta)_{\beta > 0}$ are equi-coercive with respect to the weak topology of \mathcal{U} , being defined on the same compact set \mathcal{U}_ρ . Combining this fact with Theorem 7.2 and [5, Corollary 7.20], we deduce that

$$\liminf_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\mathcal{U}_\rho} \mathcal{F}_\rho^\beta = \inf_{\mathcal{U}_\rho} \mathcal{F}_\rho.$$

Moreover, if $u_\beta \in \mathcal{U}$ is a minimizer of \mathcal{F}_ρ^β for every $\beta > 0$, then any limiting point as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ of the family $(u_\beta)_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ is a minimizer of the Γ -limit \mathcal{F}_ρ .

APPENDIX A. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 5.4

Proof. Let $u \in \mathcal{U}$ a degenerate critical point for \mathcal{F}^β , i.e., $d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u) = 0$ and $K := \ker(\text{Hess}_u \mathcal{F}^\beta) \neq 0$. We consider the splitting $\mathcal{U} = K \oplus K^\perp$ and we recall that, in virtue of Corollary 5.3, $\dim K < \infty$. We define the mapping $\mathcal{N} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{N}(v) = P_K(v) + d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u + v), \quad (36)$$

where P_K is the orthogonal projection onto the subspace K . This mapping is real-analytic, and we can consider the differential of \mathcal{N} at $v = 0$:

$$D_0 \mathcal{N} = Id|_K \oplus \text{Hess}_u \mathcal{F}^\beta|_{K^\perp},$$

and we observe that $\text{Hess}_u \mathcal{F}^\beta|_{K^\perp} : K^\perp \rightarrow K^\perp$ is invertible by Fredholm Alternative theorem. Hence we deduce that $D_0 \mathcal{N}$ is invertible and we can apply the Implicit Function Theorem: There exist neighborhoods $V_0, W_0 \ni 0$ and a real-analytic function $\Psi : V_0 \rightarrow W_0$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{N}(\Psi(v)) = v & \text{for every } v \in V_0, \\ \Psi(\mathcal{N}(w)) = w & \text{for every } w \in W_0. \end{cases}$$

We observe that, if $d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u+w) = 0$ for $w \in W_0$, then $\mathcal{N}(w) = P_K(w) \in K \cap V_0$, that implies that $w = \Psi(w_1)$, where $w_1 \in K$ (actually, $w_1 = P_K(w)$). In other words, any $w \in W_0$ such that $d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u+w) = 0$ comes from K through the mapping Ψ . Taking smaller V_0, W_0 if necessary, we may assume that $P_K(V_0) \subset V_0 \cap K$. From now on, if we need to take smaller neighborhoods, we will do that, without explicit specification. Hence we have that

$$\|\Psi(P_K(v)) - v\|_{L^2} = \|\Psi(P_K(v)) - \Psi(\mathcal{N}(v))\|_{L^2} \leq C\|P_K(v) - \mathcal{N}(v)\|_{L^2},$$

that gives

$$\|\Psi(P_K(v)) - v\|_{L^2} \leq C\|d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u+v)\|_{L^2}, \quad (37)$$

where C represents the Lipschitz constant for Ψ . Recalling that $d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u) = 0$ and that $K = \ker(D_u(d\mathcal{F}^\beta))$, for $v \in V_0$ we have that

$$\|d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u + P_K(v))\|_{L^2} \leq C\|P_K(v)\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (38)$$

Using (38), we deduce that for $v \in V_0$

$$\|d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u + P_K(v))\|_{L^2} \leq \|d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u+v)\|_{L^2}. \quad (39)$$

Combining (37) and (38), and recalling that P_K is non-expansive, we obtain that

$$\|\Psi(P_K(v)) - P_K(v)\|_{L^2} \leq C\|v\|_{L^2}^2.$$

The last inequality can be rephrased by saying that

$$\Psi(P_K(v)) = P_K(v) + O(\|v\|_{L^2}^2),$$

and hence we deduce that

$$D_0(\Psi \circ P_K) = P_K. \quad (40)$$

Let us fix an orthonormal base $\{v_i\}_{i=1,\dots,m}$ for the finite-dimensional subspace $K \subset \mathcal{U}$. Then we define the function $f : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$f(\xi) := \mathcal{F}^\beta \left(u + \Psi \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i v_i \right) \right). \quad (41)$$

From now on, we write $\Psi(\xi)$ in place of $\Psi(\sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i v_i)$, and $D_\xi \Psi$ in place of $D_{\sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i v_i} \Psi$. We denote by $|\cdot|$ the usual 2-norm of \mathbb{R}^m . We observe that

$$\nabla f(\xi) = (d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u + \Psi(\xi)) \circ D_\xi \Psi(v_1), \dots, d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u + \Psi(\xi)) \circ D_\xi \Psi(v_m))^T,$$

hence

$$\langle \eta, \nabla f(\xi) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^m} = \langle d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u + \Psi(\xi)), D_\xi \Psi(\sum_{i=1}^m \eta_i v_i) \rangle_{L^2} \quad (42)$$

$$= \langle d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u + \Psi(\xi)), D_\xi \Psi(\sum_{i=1}^m \eta_i v_i) - P_K(\sum_{i=1}^m \eta_i v_i) \rangle_{L^2} \quad (43)$$

$$+ \langle d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u + \Psi(\xi)), P_K(\sum_{i=1}^m \eta_i v_i) \rangle_{L^2}. \quad (44)$$

Moreover, we observe that $d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u + \Psi(\xi)) \in K$. Indeed, by definition of \mathcal{N} , we have that

$$d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u + \Psi(\xi)) = \mathcal{N}(\Psi(\xi)) - P_K(\Psi(\xi)) = \sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i v_i - P_K(\Psi(\xi)) \in K$$

Using (40) we obtain that $D_{\xi=0}\Psi = P_K$, hence we have that

$$\|D_\xi \Psi - P_K\|_{L^2} \leq C \|\sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i v_i\|_{L^2} = C|\xi|,$$

where we used that $\xi \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i v_i$ is an isometry. If we take η such that $\sum_{i=1}^m \eta_i v_i$ is parallel to $d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u + \Psi(\xi))$ and we use it in (42)-(44), we obtain that

$$\|d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u + \Psi(\xi))\|_{L^2} \leq |\nabla f(\xi)| + C\|d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u + \Psi(\xi))\|_{L^2}|\xi|. \quad (45)$$

On the other hand, if we take η parallel to $\nabla f(\xi)$, we obtain that

$$|\nabla f(\xi)| \leq (1 + C|\xi|)\|d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u + \Psi(\xi))\|_{L^2} \quad (46)$$

Combining (45) and (46), and taking ξ close enough to 0, we obtain that

$$\frac{1}{2}|\nabla f(\xi)| \leq \|d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u + \Psi(\xi))\|_{L^2} \leq 2|\nabla f(\xi)|. \quad (47)$$

Owing to (47), we deduce that

$$\{v \in V_0 : d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u + v) = 0\} = \{\Psi(\xi) : \sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i v_i \in V_0, \nabla f(\xi) = 0\}. \quad (48)$$

Finally, using that $d\mathcal{F}^\beta$ is Lipschitz in a neighborhood of u , we obtain that

$$\|\mathcal{F}^\beta(u + v) - \mathcal{F}^\beta(u + \Psi(P_K(v)))\| \leq C\|d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u + v)\|_{L^2}\|v - \Psi(P_K(v))\|_{L^2},$$

and using (37) we have

$$\|\mathcal{F}^\beta(u + v) - \mathcal{F}^\beta(u + \Psi(P_K(v)))\| \leq C\|d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u + v)\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (49)$$

We recall that the Lojasiewicz inequality holds for the function $f : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, hence there exists $\gamma \in (1, 2)$ such that

$$|f(\xi) - f(0)| \leq C|\nabla f(\xi)|^\gamma. \quad (50)$$

Let us consider $v \in V_0$ and let ξ be such that $\sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i v_i = P_K(v)$. Using (49), (50) and (47), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{F}^\beta(u + v) - \mathcal{F}^\beta(u)| &\leq |\mathcal{F}^\beta(u + v) - \mathcal{F}^\beta(u + \Psi(P_K(v)))| + |f(\xi) - f(0)| \\ &\leq C\|d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u + v)\|_{L^2}^2 + C|\nabla f(\xi)|^\gamma \\ &\leq C\|d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u + v)\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u + \Psi(\xi))\|_{L^2}^\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using (39) and recalling that $\|d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u + v)\|_{L^2} < 1$, we have that

$$|\mathcal{F}^\beta(u + v) - \mathcal{F}^\beta(u)| \leq C\|d\mathcal{F}^\beta(u + v)\|_{L^2}^\gamma, \quad (51)$$

for every $v \in V_0$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] A.A. Agrachev, R.V. Gamkrelidze. The exponential representation of flows and the chronological calculus. *USSR Sbornik* 35:727–785 (1975).
- [2] A.A. Agrachev, Yu.L. Sachkov. *Control Theory from the Geometric Viewpoint*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg (2004).
- [3] A.A. Agrachev, D. Barilari, U. Boscain. *A Comprehensive Introduction to Sub-Riemannian Geometry*. Cambridge University Press (2019).
- [4] A. Ambrosetti, G. Prodi. *A Primer of Nonlinear Analysis*. Cambridge University Press (1995).
- [5] G. Dal Maso. *An Introduction to Γ -convergence*. Birkhäuser, Boston, MA (1993).
- [6] J.D. Lee, M. Simchowitz, M.I. Jordan, B. Recht. Gradient Descent Only Converges to Minimizers. *29th Annual Conference on Learning Theory, in PMLR* 49:1246–1257 (2016).
- [7] I. Panageas, G. Piliouras. Gradient descent only converges to minimizers: non-isolated critical points and invariant regions. *Innovations of Theoretical Computer Science* (2017).
- [8] M. Shub. *Global Stability of Dynamical Systems*. Springer Berlin (1987).
- [9] L. Simon. *Theorems on Regularity and Singularity of Energy Minimizing Maps*. Birkhäuser Basel (1996).

(A. Scagliotti) SCUOLA INTERNAZIONALE SUPERIORE DI STUDI AVANZATI, TRIESTE, ITALY
Email address: ascaglio@sissa.it