

Quasi Differential Quotients

Francesca Angrisani[†] and Franco Rampazzo[‡]

Abstract— We explore basic properties and some applications of Quasi Differential Quotients (*QDQs*) and the related *QDQ*-approximating multi-cones. A *QDQ*, which is a special kind of H.Sussmann’s Approximate Generalized Differential Quotient (*AGDQ*), consists in a notion of generalized differentiation for set-valued maps. *QDQs* have the advantage over *AGDQs* of allowing a genuine, non-punctured, Open Mapping result, so implying stronger set-separation theorems. They have already proved quite useful in the investigation of some connections occurring between infimum gap phenomena and the normality of minima. Moreover, *QDQ*-approximating multi-cones are fit in optimal control to deduce Maximum Principles that involve (set-valued) Lie brackets of nonsmooth vector fields.

I. INTRODUCTION

Extending a result due to Carathéodory, M.W. Botsko [2] gave the following simple characterization of differentiability: a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable at $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ if and only if there exists $\bar{\delta}$ and a map $L : a + B_{\bar{\delta}} \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^n)^*$, continuous at a such that

$$f(x) = f(a) + L(x)(x - a) \quad \forall x \in a + B_{\bar{\delta}}.$$

On the same line of thought, Sussmann proposed (see [12]) two instances of generalized differentials for set-valued maps, the “Generalized Differential Quotients (*GDQ*)” and the “Approximate Generalized Differential Quotient” (*AGDQ*). This was part of a program designed to identifying generalized differentiation theories capable of *automatically* providing a Maximum Principle for minimizers of optimal control problems. This program naturally consists in requiring some properties to be verified by the proposed generalized differentials, including *locality*, *product rules*, *chain rule*, and *open mapping results for the related approximating multi-cones*. Recently, a special subclass of *AGDQs* has been proposed in [7] in order to establish a general, *normality*-based, criterion for the avoidance of infimum-gaps. These particular *AGDQs* have been called *Quasi Differential Quotients* (*QDQs*). Let us also mention that *AGDQ*, hence *QDQs*, and the related approximating multi-cones are chart-independent objects, so that they can be defined on differential manifolds. The main property of *QDQs* consists in the validity of a genuine open mapping result, whereas only a “punctured” open mapping holds true for general *AGDQs*. This fact has proved essential in the proof of the quoted criterion. At the same time, *QDQs* are going to be

utilized for other applications. In particular, they prove to be a quite ductile tool in the program of extending Goh-like conditions for optimal control problems with nonsmooth dynamics. Such conditions involve set-valued Lie brackets, which happen to be *QDQs* of suitable compositions of flows.

In the present paper we wish to present the notion of *QDQ*, by proving some basic properties as well as by recalling some known facts. We also provide some significant examples and give sufficient or necessary conditions for a set to be a *QDQ*. This is intended as the beginning of a more articulate investigation addressed on one hand to the relation between *QDQs* with other notions of generalized differentiation (see e.g. [6], [4]) and, on the other hand, to concrete applications. Here is an outline of the article. In Section 2, we present the definition of *QDQs* in Euclidean spaces and on manifolds, and prove basic properties, comprising locality, linearity, product rules, and a Chain Rule. Section 3 is devoted to *QDQ*-approximating multi-cones and to the above-mentioned open mapping results. Section 4 provides several examples, as well as some results for *QDQs* of curves. Moreover a class of *QDQs* for set-valued maps taking values on “*F*-abundant” (see Def. 4.6) subsets is illustrated. In Section 5 we show that a *set-valued Lie bracket* $[f, g]_{set}(q)$ of Lipschitz continuous vector fields f, g (see [9],[10],[8] and [3]) is a *QDQ* for the commutator-like multi-flow of f and g at q .

II. DEFINITIONS AND BASIC PROPERTIES

A. Quasi-Differential Quotients

Definition 2.1: Assume that $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is a set-valued map, $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$, $\Lambda \subset \text{Lin}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m)$ is a compact set, and $\Gamma \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is any subset. We say that Λ is a *Quasi Differential Quotient* (*QDQ*) of F at (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) in the direction of Γ if there exists a $\delta^* \in (0, +\infty]$ and modulus $\rho : [0, +\infty[\rightarrow [0, +\infty[$ ¹ having the property that

(*) for every $\delta \in (0, \delta^*)$ there is a continuous map $(L_\delta, h_\delta) : (\bar{x} + B_\delta) \cap \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Lin}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m) \times \mathbb{R}^m$ such that, whenever $x \in (\bar{x} + B_\delta) \cap \Gamma$,

$$d(L_\delta(x), \Lambda) \leq \rho(\delta), \quad |h_\delta(x)| \leq \delta \rho(\delta) \quad (1)$$

$$\bar{y} + L_\delta(x) \cdot (x - \bar{x}) + h_\delta(x) \in F(x).$$

The definition of *QDQ* can be extended to (set-valued) functions from a manifold into another manifold.

Definition 2.2: Let \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M} be differential manifolds of class C^1 . Assume that $\tilde{G} : \mathcal{N} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{M}$ is a set-valued map, $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{M}$, $\tilde{\Lambda} \subset \text{Lin}(T_{\bar{x}}\mathcal{N}, T_{\bar{y}}\mathcal{M})$ is a compact set,

¹We call *modulus* a non-decreasing non-negative function $\rho : [0, +\infty[\rightarrow [0, +\infty[$ such that $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \rho(\delta) = 0$.

[†] Francesca Angrisani is with Department of Mathematics, Università degli Studi di Padova, 35131 Padova, Italy francesca.angrisani@unina.it

[‡] Franco Rampazzo is with the Department of Mathematics, Università degli Studi di Padova, 35131 Padova, Italy rampazzo.math@unipd.it

and $\tilde{\Gamma} \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ is any subset. Moreover, let $\phi : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\psi : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ be charts defined on neighborhoods U and V of \bar{x} and \bar{y} , respectively, and assume that $\phi(\bar{x}) = 0$, $\psi(\bar{y}) = 0$. Consider the map $G := \psi \circ \tilde{G} \circ \phi^{-1} : \phi(U) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ and extend it arbitrarily to a map $G : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ (we do not relabel). We say that $\tilde{\Lambda}$ is a *Quasi Differential Quotient (QDQ)* of \tilde{G} at (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) in the direction of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ if $\Lambda := D\psi(\bar{y}) \circ \tilde{\Lambda} \circ D\phi^{-1}(0)$ is a Quasi Differential Quotient of G at $(0, 0)$ in the direction of $\Gamma := \phi(\tilde{\Gamma} \cap U)^2$.

B. Basic properties

We now present some properties which make QDQs fit for proving Maximum Principles via set-separation techniques.

Proposition 2.3: Let \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N} be C^1 real differential manifolds of dimension m and n , respectively, and let $F, G : \mathcal{N} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{M}$ be set-valued maps. Assume that $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{N}$, $\bar{y}, \bar{y}_F, \bar{y}_G \in \mathcal{M}$, $\Gamma, \Gamma_F, \Gamma_G \subseteq \mathcal{M}$, and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$. Then:

- 1) [*Locality*] If U is a neighborhood of \bar{x} and $F(x) = G(x)$ for $x \in U \cap \Gamma$, then Λ is a QDQ for F at (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) in the direction of Γ if and only if it is a QDQ for G at (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) in the direction of Γ .
- 2) [*Linearity*] If $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}^m$ and Λ_F and Λ_G are QDQ for F and G at points (\bar{x}, \bar{y}_F) and (\bar{x}, \bar{y}_G) and in the direction of Γ_F and Γ_G , respectively, then $\alpha\Lambda_F + \beta\Lambda_G$ is a QDQ for $\alpha F + \beta G$ at point $(\bar{x}, \alpha\bar{y}_F + \beta\bar{y}_G)$ in the direction of $\Gamma_F \cap \Gamma_G$.
- 3) [*Set product property*] Under the same assumptions as in 2), except for \mathcal{M} which here is allowed to be any manifold, $\Lambda_F \times \Lambda_G$ is a QDQ at $(\bar{x}, (\bar{y}_F, \bar{y}_G))$, in the direction of $\Gamma_F \times \Gamma_G$ for the set-valued map $F \times G : x \mapsto F(x) \times G(x)$.
- 4) [*Product Rule*] If $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}$, and still using the same notation as in 2), we have $F(\bar{x})\Lambda_G + G(\bar{x})\Lambda_F$ is a QDQ for $FG : x \mapsto F(x)G(x)$.
- 5) If F is single-valued and $L \in \text{Lin}(T_{\bar{x}}\mathcal{N}, T_{\bar{y}}\mathcal{M})$, $\{L\}$ is a QDQ for F at (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) in the direction of \mathcal{M} if and only if F is differentiable at \bar{x} and $L = DF(\bar{x})$.

Proof: The first property, namely locality, is straightforward from the definition. To prove the linearity stated in 2) let $\rho^F, L_\delta^F, h_\delta^F$, and $\rho^G, L_\delta^G, h_\delta^G$ be the maps verifying (*) in Definition 2.1 for Λ_F and Λ_G , respectively. Hence the thesis follows upon defining $h_\delta := \alpha h_\delta^F + \beta h_\delta^G$, $L_\delta := \alpha L_\delta^F + \beta L_\delta^G$ and $\rho := |\alpha|\rho^F + |\beta|\rho^G$.

Property 3) is straightforward. We omit the proof of 4) as well, for it can be trivially obtained by using the same notation as in 2), and multiplying term by term the relations coming from (*) in Definition 2.1.

Let us prove 5) in the case when $\mathcal{N} = \mathbb{R}^m, \mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}^n$, the extension of the property to manifolds being trivial. The sufficiency of the differentiability in order $\{L\}$ be a QDQ at $(\bar{x}, F(\bar{x}))$ in the direction of \mathcal{M} is trivial. To prove that it is also necessary, observe that from $L_\delta(x)(x - \bar{x}) = F(x) - F(\bar{x}) - h_\delta(x)$ and $|L_\delta(x) - L| < \rho(\delta)$, it follows that $|F(x) - F(\bar{x}) - L \cdot (x - \bar{x})| = |(L_\delta(x) - L) \cdot (x - \bar{x}) + h_\delta(x)| \leq 2\delta\rho(\delta)$ holds for all $\delta > 0$,

²One can easily verify that this definition is indeed chart-independent.

provided $|x - \bar{x}| \leq \delta$. Hence F is differentiable at \bar{x} and $L = DF(\bar{x})$. ■

Proposition 2.4 (Chain rule): Let $\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{L}$ be C^1 manifolds of dimensions m, n, l , respectively, let $F : \mathcal{N} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{M}$ and $G : \mathcal{M} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{L}$ be set-valued maps, and consider the composition $G \circ F : x \in \mathcal{N} \rightsquigarrow \bigcup_{y \in F(x)} G(y) \in \mathcal{L}$.

Assume Λ_F is a QDQ for F at point (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) in the direction of Γ_F and Λ_G is a QDQ for G at point (\bar{y}, \bar{z}) in any direction Γ_G containing $F(\Gamma_F)$. Then the set $\Lambda := \Lambda_G \circ \Lambda_F$ of all compositions of elements of Λ_G with elements of Λ_F is a QDQ for $G \circ F$ at (\bar{x}, \bar{z}) in the direction of Γ_F .

Proof: Let us prove Proposition 2.4 when $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}^m, \mathcal{N} = \mathbb{R}^n$, and $\mathcal{L} = \mathbb{R}^l$, the locality and chart independence of the notion of QDQ guaranteeing that the proof is still valid in the general case

Let $\delta_*^F, \delta_*^G, L_\delta^F, L_\delta^G, h_\delta^F, h_\delta^G, \rho^F, \rho^G$, with $0 < \delta < \delta_* := \min\{\delta_*^F, \delta_*^G\}$, the maps involved in the definition of the QDQs Γ_F and Λ_G . In particular, one has, for all $\delta \in (0, \delta_*)$,

$$\bar{y} + L_\delta^F(x) \cdot (x - \bar{x}) + h_\delta^F(x) \in F(x), \forall x \in (\bar{x} + B_\delta) \cap \Gamma_F, \quad (2)$$

$$\bar{z} + L_\delta^G(y) \cdot (y - \bar{y}) + h_\delta^G(y) \in G(y), \forall y \in (\bar{y} + B_\delta) \cap F(\Gamma_F). \quad (3)$$

Let us set

$$M := \max \left\{ \max_{L' \in \Lambda_F} |L'|, \max_{L'' \in \Lambda_G} |L''|, 1 \right\}, \quad \eta(\delta) := \frac{\delta}{3M}, \quad \forall \delta \geq 0.$$

If needed, let us redefine δ^* in order that $\delta^* < 1$ and it small enough to guarantee $\rho^F(\eta(\delta)) \leq M$ for all $\delta < \delta^*$.

Now, let us consider any $x \in (\bar{x} + B_{\eta(\delta)}) \cap \Gamma_F$ and let us set $y := \bar{y} + L_{\eta(\delta)}^F(x) \cdot (x - \bar{x}) + h_{\eta(\delta)}^F(x)$. Clearly, we have $y \in F(\Gamma_F)$, and $|y - \bar{y}| \leq \eta(\delta)[M + 2\rho^F(\eta(\delta))] \leq \delta$, so that $y \in (\bar{y} + B_\delta) \cap F(\Gamma_F)$.

If we set $\xi(x) := \bar{y} + L_{\eta(\delta)}^F(x) \cdot (x - \bar{x}) + h_{\eta(\delta)}^F(x)$, we get

$$\bar{z} + \left\{ L_\delta^G(\xi(x)) \circ L_{\eta(\delta)}^F(x) \right\} \cdot (x - \bar{x}) + h_{\eta(\delta)}(x) \in G(F(x))$$

$$\forall x \in (\bar{x} + B_{\eta(\delta)}) \cap \Gamma_F, \quad (4)$$

where the continuous function $h_{\eta(\delta)}$, defined as

$$h_{\eta(\delta)}(x) := L_\delta^G(\xi(x)) \cdot h_{\eta(\delta)}^F(x) + h_\delta^G(\xi(x))$$

verifies

$$|h_{\eta(\delta)}(x)| \leq M\eta(\delta)\rho^F(\eta(\delta)) + 3M\eta(\delta)\rho^G(3M\eta(\delta)). \quad (5)$$

The function between curly brackets in (4), i.e.

$$\delta \mapsto L_{\eta(\delta)}(x) := L_\delta^G(\xi(x)) \circ L_{\eta(\delta)}^F(x),$$

is also a continuous function as it is composition of continuous functions. Moreover, every image $L_{\eta(\delta)}(x)$ is the composition of a linear functional whose distance from Λ_G is at most $\rho^G(3M\eta(\delta))$ and whose norm is at most M with a linear functional whose distance from Λ_F is at most $\rho^F(\eta(\delta))$. Therefore

$$d(L_{\eta(\delta)}(x), \Lambda) \leq M[\rho^F(\eta(\delta)) + \rho^G(3M\eta(\delta))]. \quad (6)$$

Finally, if one sets

$$\rho(\eta(\delta)) := M \left[\rho^F(\eta(\delta)) + 3\rho^G(3M\eta(\delta)) \right]$$

then formulas (4)-(6) tell us that Λ is a QDQ for $G \circ F$ at (\bar{x}, \bar{z}) in the direction of Γ_F . \blacksquare

III. OPEN MAPPING AND SET-SEPARATION

A. Open mapping

Open mapping results are essential for any reasonable generalized differentiation theory. We recall here a result which, in particular, marks the difference between QDQ s and $AGDQ$ s.

Theorem 3.1 (Open Mapping for QDQ s): Let $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ be a set-valued map and let Γ be a convex cone in \mathbb{R}^n . Let Λ be a QDQ of F at (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) in the direction of Γ and assume that $L \cdot \Gamma = \mathbb{R}^m$ for all L in Λ . Then:

- (i) There exist constants $\alpha, \beta > 0$ such that $\forall a \in (0, \alpha]$

$$\bar{y} + (B_a \setminus \{0\}) \subseteq F(\bar{x} + B_{a\beta} \cap \Gamma).$$

- (ii) There exist $\delta^* > 0$ such that for all $\delta < \delta^*$ and every (L_δ, h_δ) as in Definition 2.1, there exists $x_\delta \in (\bar{x} + B_\delta) \cap \Gamma$ such that:

$$\bar{y} = L_\delta(x_\delta)(x_\delta - \bar{x}) + h_\delta(x_\delta) \in F(x_\delta).$$

In particular, by possibly reducing α , the following inclusions hold for all $a \in (0, \alpha]$

$$\bar{y} + B_a \subseteq F(\bar{x} + B_{a\beta} \cap \Gamma). \quad (7)$$

Remark 3.2: Part (ii) is not true if Λ is just a $AGDQ$. In that case, one can only prove a ‘‘punctured’’ inclusion, namely in general $\bar{y} \notin F(\bar{x} + B_{a\beta} \cap \Gamma)$.

B. Transversal cones

Let us recall the notions of transversality and strong transversality of cones. Let E be a finite-dimensional, real linear space, and let E^* be its dual space. A subset $\mathcal{K} \subseteq E$ is a *cone* if $\alpha k \in \mathcal{K}$ for all $(\alpha, k) \in [0, +\infty[\times \mathcal{K}$. If $D \subseteq E$ is any subset, let us set

$$\text{Span}^+ D := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \alpha_i v_i : \ell \in \mathbb{N}, \alpha_i \geq 0, v_i \in D, \forall i \leq \ell \right\},$$

$$D^\perp := \left\{ p \in E^* : p \cdot w \leq 0 \quad \forall w \in D \right\} \subseteq E^*.$$

The convex cones $\text{Span}^+ D$ and D^\perp are called the *conic hull* of D and the *polar cone* of D , respectively. Let $\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2 \subseteq E$ be convex cones. We say that \mathcal{K}_1 and $\mathcal{K}_2 \subseteq E$ are *transversal*, if $\mathcal{K}_1 - \mathcal{K}_2 := \{k_1 - k_2 : (k_1, k_2) \in \mathcal{K}_1 \times \mathcal{K}_2\} = E$. \mathcal{K}_1 and \mathcal{K}_2 are *strongly transversal*, if they are transversal and $\mathcal{K}_1 \cap \mathcal{K}_2 \supsetneq \{0\}$.

Proposition 3.3: Two convex cones $\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2 \subseteq E$ are transversal if and only if they are either strongly transversal or complementary linear subspaces, namely $\mathcal{K}_1 \oplus \mathcal{K}_2 = E$ (i.e., $\mathcal{K}_1 + \mathcal{K}_2 = E$ and $\mathcal{K}_1 \cap \mathcal{K}_2 = \{0\}$).

Saying that two cones \mathcal{K}_1 and \mathcal{K}_2 are not strongly transversal is equivalent to saying that they are linearly separable:

Proposition 3.4: Two convex cones $\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2 \subseteq E$ are not transversal if and only if \mathcal{K}_1 and \mathcal{K}_2 are linearly separable, by which we mean that $(-\mathcal{K}_1^\perp \cap \mathcal{K}_2^\perp) \setminus \{0\} \neq \emptyset$, namely, there exists a linear form $\lambda \in E^* \setminus \{0\}$ such that, $\forall (k_1, k_2) \in \mathcal{K}_1 \times \mathcal{K}_2$, $\lambda \cdot k_1 \geq 0$, and $\lambda \cdot k_2 \leq 0$.

In a linear space E , let us call *convex multi-cone* any family of convex cones of E .

Definition 3.5: [7, Def. 2.5] Let \mathcal{M} be a C^1 differentiable manifold, $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ a set, and $z \in \mathcal{E}$. A QDQ approximating multi-cone to \mathcal{E} at z is a convex multi-cone $\mathbf{K} \subseteq T_z \mathcal{N}$ such that there exist an integer $n \geq 0$, a set-valued map $G : \mathbb{R}^n \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{N}$, a convex cone $\Gamma \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, and a Quasi Differential Quotient Λ of G at $(0, z)$ in the direction of Γ such that $G(\Gamma) \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ and $\mathbf{K} = \{L \cdot \Gamma : L \in \Lambda\}$.³ We say that such a triple (G, Γ, Λ) generates the multi-cone \mathbf{K} .

If the triple (G, Γ, Λ) defining a QDQ approximating multi-cone \mathbf{K} can be chosen so that $G(\Gamma) \subseteq \mathcal{E} \setminus \{z\}$, then we say that the \mathbf{K} is *z-ignoring*.

Remark 3.6: Because of local character of the notion of QDQ for a set-valued map, one can equivalently say that a QDQ approximating multi-cone \mathbf{K} is *z-ignoring* if there is some $\delta > 0$ such that $G(B_\delta \cap \Gamma) \subseteq \mathcal{E} \setminus \{z\}$ for some $\delta > 0$.

Remark 3.7: For single-valued maps, QDQ approximating multi-cones consisting of a single cone are precisely Boltyanski’s approximating cones.

Definition 3.8: Let \mathcal{X} be a topological space, and let $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, $y \in \mathcal{D}_1 \cap \mathcal{D}_2$. We say that \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 are *locally separated* at y provided there exists a neighborhood V of y such that $\mathcal{D}_1 \cap \mathcal{D}_2 \cap V = \{y\}$.

The following open-mapping-based result, obtained in [7], characterizes set separation in terms of linear separation of QDQ approximating cones. It includes a crucial approximation property (see (ii) below) whenever one of the cones is *z-ignoring*.

Theorem 3.9: [7, Thm. 2.3] Let $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ be subsets of a C^1 differentiable manifold \mathcal{N} and let $z \in \mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2$. Assume that $\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2$ are QDQ approximating cones of \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 , respectively, at z .

- (i) If \mathcal{K}_1 and \mathcal{K}_2 are strongly transversal, then the sets \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are not locally separated.
- (ii) If \mathcal{K}_1 (or, equivalently, \mathcal{K}_2) is *z-ignoring* and \mathcal{K}_1 and \mathcal{K}_2 are transversal then the sets \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are not locally separated.

IV. EXAMPLES

Example 4.1 (The δ -independent case): Let us begin observing that if, for a given set-valued map $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, a point $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$, a subset $\Gamma \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, $\Lambda \subset \text{Lin}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m)$ is a compact set such that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \|d(L(x), \Lambda)\|_{L^\infty(\bar{x} + B_\delta \cap \Gamma)} = 0, \quad \|h(x)\|_{L^\infty(\bar{x} + B_\delta \cap \Gamma)} = o(\delta)$$

³When a QDQ approximating multi-cone is a singleton, namely $\mathbf{K} = \{K\}$, we say that K is a QDQ approximating cone to \mathcal{E} at z .

and $\bar{y} + L(x) \cdot (x - \bar{x}) + h(x) \in F(x)$, where $(L, h) : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Lin}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m) \times \mathbb{R}^m$ is a (δ) -independent continuous function, then Λ is a QDQ . Indeed, one can check that, if $(L_\delta, h_\delta) := (L, h)_{\bar{x} + B_\delta \cap \Gamma}$ and

$$\rho(\delta) := \max \left\{ \|d(L(x), \Lambda)\|_{L^\infty(\bar{x} + B_\delta \cap \Gamma)}, \frac{\|h(x)\|_{L^\infty(\bar{x} + B_\delta \cap \Gamma)}}{\delta} \right\},$$

for every $\delta > 0$, then the properties in Definition 2.1 are met.

However it is not, in general, possible to reduce $\delta \mapsto (L_\delta, h_\delta)$ to a constant in the definition of QDQ , as one can check already in the $n = m = 1$ case below.

Example 4.2 (Clarke's generalized Jacobian): Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set, let $F : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ be a (single-valued) Lipschitz continuous map, and let $x^* \in \Omega$. In [1], we proved a sufficient condition for a set to be a QDQ via approximation of the function: it is possible to infer from that the Clarke's generalized Jacobian⁴ $\partial_C F(\bar{x})$ at \bar{x} is a QDQ for F at $(\bar{x}, F(\bar{x}))$ in the direction of \mathbb{R}^n .

A. The case $n = 1$

Example 4.3: Since $[-1, 1]$ is the Clarke's generalized Jacobian of the function $f(x) := |x|$ at $x = 0$, in view of the previous example it is a QDQ for the function f at $(0, 0)$ in the direction of \mathbb{R} . However, we prefer here to give an explicit construction of the maps L_δ, h_δ . For every $\delta > 0$, let us set

$$g_\delta(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{x}{\delta} \right)^2 + \frac{\delta^2}{2} & \forall x \in [-\delta^2, \delta^2] \\ |x| & \forall x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus [-\delta^2, \delta^2]. \end{cases}$$

For every $\delta > 0$, g_δ is of class C^1 . Moreover, for every $x \in [-\delta, \delta]$, one has $f(x) = |x| = L_\delta(x) \cdot x + h_\delta(x)$, where $L_\delta(x) := \frac{x}{\delta^2} \mathbf{1}_{[-\delta^2, \delta^2]} + \text{sgn}(x) \mathbf{1}_{[-\delta, -\delta^2] \cup [\delta^2, \delta]}$ and $h_\delta(x) := \frac{\delta^2}{2} + (|x| - g_\delta(x)) \mathbf{1}_{[-\delta^2, \delta^2]}$. Notice that $L_\delta([-\delta, \delta]) = [-1, 1]$, and $|h_\delta(x)| \leq \delta^2$, so $\Lambda = [-1, 1]$ meets Definition 2.1 with $\rho(\delta) = \delta$.

By definition of QDQ any compact set $\Lambda' \supseteq \Lambda$ is again a QDQ for the same f at the same point $(0, 0)$ in the same direction. Hence, in this example $[-1, 1]$ is the smallest possible QDQ for f at $(0, 0)$ in the direction of \mathbb{R} .

Actually, while the previous example is a particular case of Clarke's generalized Jacobian (see below), it is also an instance of the following general fact:

Proposition 4.4: Let \mathcal{M} be an m -dimensional manifold of class C^1 and $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ be a continuous curve admitting left and right derivatives $f'(\bar{t}^-)$ and $f'(\bar{t}^+)$ at a point $\bar{t} \in \mathbb{R}$. Any compact set $\Lambda \subseteq \text{Lin}(\mathbb{R}, T_{f(\bar{t})} \mathcal{M})$ containing an arc connecting $f'(\bar{t}^+)$ and $f'(\bar{t}^-)$ is a QDQ for f at $(\bar{t}, f(\bar{t}))$ in the direction of \mathbb{R} . Conversely, any QDQ for f at $(\bar{t}, f(\bar{t}))$

⁴Let us recall that the Clarke's generalized Jacobian $\partial_C F(\bar{x})$ at \bar{x} is defined as the set $\overline{\text{co}} \left\{ v = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} DF(x_n), (x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \text{Diff}(F), x_n \rightarrow \bar{x}^* \right\}$, where $\text{Diff}(f)$ denotes the set comprising all points $x \in \Omega$ such that F is differentiable at x .

in the direction of \mathbb{R} necessarily contains a connected set containing $\{f'(\bar{t}^+), f'(\bar{t}^-)\}$.

Proof: We provide the proof of the result for $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}^m$, the proof for the general case being a straightforward consequence which can be obtained by means of a chart. Assume $\bar{t} = 0$ and $f(\bar{t}) = \mathbf{0}$, which is without loss of generality by linearity and chain rule, and assume there is a curve $\gamma(t)$ defined on $[-1, 1]$ and connecting $f'(0^+)$ and $f'(0^-)$ whose support is contained in Λ . Let us also name $s_\pm(t)$ the segments defined on $[-\delta^2, \frac{-\delta^2}{2}]$ and $[\frac{\delta^2}{2}, \delta^2]$ respectively, connecting $\frac{f(-\delta^2)}{-\delta^2}$ with $f'(0^-)$ and $f'(0^+)$ with $\frac{f(-\delta^2)}{-\delta^2}$, respectively. We define, for every $\delta \in (0, 1)$:

$$L_\delta(t) := \begin{cases} \frac{f(t)}{t} & \text{if } |t| \in [\delta^2, \delta] \\ \gamma\left(\frac{2t}{\delta^2}\right) & \text{if } |t| \leq \frac{\delta^2}{2} \\ s_\pm(t) & \text{if } |t| \in \left[\frac{\delta^2}{2}, \delta^2\right]. \end{cases}$$

It is clear that $L_\delta(t)$ was constructed continuous with a proper choice of the affine functions s_\pm on the two intervals $[-\delta^2, -\frac{\delta^2}{2}]$ and $[\frac{\delta^2}{2}, \delta^2]$. Now, $L_\delta\left(\left[-\frac{\delta^2}{2}, \frac{\delta^2}{2}\right]\right)$ was constructed to be contained in Λ and $L_\delta\left(\left[-\delta, \delta\right] \setminus \left[-\frac{\delta^2}{2}, \frac{\delta^2}{2}\right]\right)$ consists of points whose distance from $f'(\bar{t}^+)$ and $f'(\bar{t}^-)$ is bounded by a suitable modulus $\hat{\rho}(\delta)$ by definition of left and right derivative as limit of one-sided differential quotients.

At the same time, if we define $h_\delta(t)$ to be

$$h_\delta(t) := f(t) - L_\delta(t)t$$

then it is by definition continuous and $h_\delta(t)$ is clearly 0 outside $[-\delta^2, \delta^2]$ and at $t = 0$. For $0 < |t| < \delta^2$, let us consider $|h_\delta(t)|/\delta^2 \leq \frac{|f(t)|}{\delta^2} + |L_\delta(t)| \leq M$ for a suitable constant M . Choosing $\rho(\delta) = \max\{M\delta, \hat{\rho}(\delta)\}$ we have all the properties (*) satisfied hence Λ , which was an arbitrary compact set containing a curve connecting the left and right derivative, is a QDQ for our function at $(0, 0)$, in the direction of \mathbb{R} .

To prove the converse, let Λ be a QDQ for f at $(0, 0)$ in the direction of \mathbb{R} and notice that, by the definition of QDQ , the points

$$L_\delta(\pm\delta) = \frac{f(\pm\delta)}{\pm\delta} - \frac{h_\delta(\pm\delta)}{\pm\delta}$$

have vanishing distances from the compact set Λ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. At the same time, they converge to $f'(0^\pm)$, respectively. Hence $\{f'(0^-), f'(0^+)\} \subseteq \Lambda$. On the other hand let us assume by contradiction that Λ can be split into two disjoint compact sets C_- and C_+ containing $f'(0^-)$ and $f'(0^+)$ respectively. The distance function $d(x, y) : C_- \times C_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function defined on a compact set, hence it has a minimum ε and $\varepsilon > 0$ and the sets $C_\pm^\varepsilon = \{L \in \text{Lin}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^m) : d(L, C_\pm) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}\}$ are still disjoint. If δ is small enough to guarantee $\rho(\delta) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}$ and $|L_\delta(\pm\delta) - f'(0^\pm)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}$, the connected set $L_\delta([-\delta, \delta])$, consisting only of points whose distance from Λ is smaller than $\rho(\delta)$, is necessarily wholly contained in just one of the C_\pm^ε , which is in contradiction with the fact that $L_\delta(\pm\delta) \in C_\pm^\varepsilon$. ■

Remark 4.5: As a consequence of the above Proposition, if \mathcal{M} is a 1-dimensional C^1 manifold and if $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is a continuous curve admitting left and right derivatives $f'(\bar{t}^-)$ and $f'(\bar{t}^+)$ at a point $\bar{t} \in \mathbb{R}$, then *the segment*

$$\left[\min\{f'(\bar{t}^-), f'(\bar{t}^+)\}, \max\{f'(\bar{t}^-), f'(\bar{t}^+)\} \right]$$

is the smallest QDQ of f at t in the direction of \mathbb{R} . However, as soon as $m > 1$, the QDQs of curves, even those which are minimal with respect to inclusion, may very well be non-convex subsets (but always containing a connected set).

B. Set-valued functions ranging in “ F -abundant” subsets

Let us begin with the definition of F -abundant subset:

Definition 4.6: Let $\mathcal{E} \subseteq E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ be subsets and let $F: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ be a (single-valued) map. We say that \mathcal{E} is F -abundant if, for every $\eta > 0$, there exists a continuous map $\theta_\eta: \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ such that $|F(x) - \theta_\eta \circ F(x)| < \eta$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.⁵

We illustrate here a situation where a known QDQ Λ of a map $F: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ happens to be also a QDQ for a set-valued map $\tilde{F}: \mathbb{R}^n \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{E} \subseteq E$, provided \mathcal{E} is F -abundant in E . Such a case is found in applications, in particular for the *infimum gap* problem, e.g. when approximating the reachable set of a control system with (QDQ) approximating cones to the larger reachable set of the convexified system (see [7]).

Example 4.7: Let $F: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ be a (single-valued) map, $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and let Λ be a QDQ of F at $(\bar{x}, F(\bar{x}))$ in the direction of a given set $\Gamma \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. If \mathcal{E} is F -abundant in E then Λ be a QDQ of the set-valued map

$$\tilde{F}: \mathbb{R}^n \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{R}^m, \quad \tilde{F}(x) := \bigcup_{\eta > 0} \theta_\eta \circ F(x),$$

(where the maps θ_η are as in Definition 4.6) at $(\bar{x}, F(\bar{x}))$ in the direction of $\Gamma \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$.

Indeed, for every $\delta > 0$, let $\rho(\delta)$, L_δ , and h_δ be as in Definition 2.1. Defining, for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and any $\delta > 0$,

$$\tilde{L}_\delta(x) := L_\delta(x), \quad \tilde{h}_\delta(x) := (\theta_{\delta\rho(\delta)} \circ F(x) - F(x)) + h_\delta(x)$$

and $\tilde{\rho}(\delta) := 2\rho(\delta)$, we obtain

$$\min_{L' \in \Lambda} |\tilde{L}_\delta(x) - L'| \leq \tilde{\rho}(\delta), \quad |\tilde{h}_\delta(x)| \leq \delta\tilde{\rho}(\delta),$$

$$\bar{y} + \tilde{L}_\delta(x) \cdot (x - \bar{x}) + \tilde{h}_\delta(x) = \theta_\delta \circ F(x) \in \tilde{F}(x)$$

whenever $x \in (\bar{x} + B_\delta) \cap \Gamma$. Hence Λ is QDQ of \tilde{F} at $(\bar{x}, F(\bar{x}))$ in the direction of $\Gamma \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$.

V. LIE BRACKETS OF LIPSCHITZ VECTOR FIELDS

Let $f, g: \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be two Lipschitz vector fields and $q \in \Omega$. For $\eta > 0$ sufficiently small, and for $t \in (-\eta, \eta)$, we shall use $\Phi_t^f(q)$ to denote the value at t of the solution of

$$\begin{cases} y'(\tau) = f(y(\tau)) \\ y(0) = q \end{cases}.$$

⁵The notion of F -abundant set generalizes the control-theoretical concept of *abundant set*, which was introduced by J. Warga [13] and successively elaborated by B. Kaskosz [5].

As soon as $f, g \in C^1$, it is well known that the multi-flow

$$\Psi_t(q) := [\Phi_t^{-g} \circ \Phi_t^{-f} \circ \Phi_t^g \circ \Phi_t^f](q)$$

verifies $\Psi_t(q) = q + t^2[f, g](q) + o(t^2)$, where $[f, g]$ is the Lie bracket, namely $[f, g] = Dg \cdot f - Df \cdot g$. In [9], a set-valued generalization $[f, g]_{set}$ of the Lie bracket has been introduced for Lipschitz vector fields. It is defined by setting, for every q in the common domain of f and g ,

$$[f, g]_{set}(q) = \overline{\text{co}} \left\{ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [f, g](q_n) \right\},$$

where limits are taken over sequences $q_n \rightarrow q$, $q_n \in \text{Diff}(f) \cap \text{Diff}(g)$, $\text{Diff}(f)$ and $\text{Diff}(g)$ denoting the sets of differentiability points of f and g , respectively.⁶ Using this bracket, the authors of [9], proved a Chow's type theorem to non-smooth fields. Furthermore, in [10] it was shown that these multi-valued Lie brackets can be used to test commutativity of non-smooth fields and to estimate $\Psi_t(q) - q$ to the second order, while in [8] they were used to extend Frobenius' Theorem. Lastly, in an oncoming article [1] we are going to establish Goh-like second order conditions for optima, by means of these set-valued Lie brackets. For this aim we need the following result:

Proposition 5.1: Let Ω be a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^n , $f, g: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be Lipschitz vector fields and $q \in \Omega$. The set $[f, g]_{set}(q)$ is a QDQ for the function

$$F: \varepsilon \mapsto \Psi_{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}(q)$$

at point $(0, q)$ in the direction of \mathbb{R}^+ .

Proof: We are going to make use of the following integral formula, established in [9],⁷

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi_{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^{-X_2} \circ \Phi_{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^{-X_1} \circ \Phi_{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^{X_2} \circ \Phi_{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^{X_1}(q) = \\ & = q + \int_0^{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \int_0^{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} [X_1, X_2](\theta(q, \sigma, \sqrt{\varepsilon}, \tau)) d\tau d\sigma + o(\varepsilon), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where X_1, X_2 are C^1 vector fields, and $\theta(x, \sigma, t, \tau) = \Phi_{\tau-t}^{X_1} \circ \Phi_\tau^{X_2} \circ \Phi_t^{X_1}(x)$. Let us consider a mollifier, i.e. a C^∞ function $\varphi(x) \geq 0$ having support contained in $B_1(0)$ and L^1 norm equal to 1. For every $\eta > 0$, we set

$$F_\eta(\varepsilon) := \Phi_{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^{-g_\eta} \circ \Phi_{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^{-f_\eta} \circ \Phi_{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^{g_\eta} \circ \Phi_{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}^{f_\eta}(q),$$

where f_η and g_η denote the convolutions $f * \varphi_\eta$ and $g * \varphi_\eta$, respectively, with $\varphi_\eta := \frac{1}{\eta^n} \varphi\left(\frac{x}{\eta}\right)$. If we take $X_1 := f_\eta, X_2 := g_\eta$ in (8), and moreover, we set

$$\eta = \eta(\varepsilon) := \varepsilon^2,$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} & F_\eta(\varepsilon) - F_\eta(0) = \\ & = \int_0^{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \int_0^{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} [f_{\eta(\varepsilon)}, g_{\eta(\varepsilon)}](\theta(q, \sigma, \sqrt{\varepsilon}, \tau)) d\tau d\sigma + o(\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

⁶For any subset $S \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\overline{\text{co}}(S)$ denotes the closure of the convex hull of S .

⁷More precisely, the authors of [9] proved an *exact* integral formula, of which (8) is a straightforward consequence.

From this inequality, and observing that there exists a constant $c > 0$ (depending on the Lipschitz constant and L^∞ norm of f and g) such that

$$|F_\eta(\varepsilon) - F(\varepsilon)| < c\eta(\varepsilon) \quad \forall \eta, \varepsilon > 0,$$

we get

$$F(\varepsilon) - F(0) = \varepsilon L(\varepsilon) + o(\varepsilon)$$

where

$$L(\varepsilon) := \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \int_0^{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} [f_{\eta(\varepsilon)}, g_{\eta(\varepsilon)}](\theta(q, \sigma, \sqrt{\varepsilon}, \tau)) d\tau d\sigma.$$

It is clear that $L(\varepsilon)$ depends continuously on ε and that the same holds true for the map $h(\varepsilon) := F(\varepsilon) - F(0) - \varepsilon L(\varepsilon) = o(\varepsilon)$.

In view of Example 4.1, to prove that $[f, g]_{set}(q)$ is indeed a QDQ of F at $(0, q)$ in the direction of \mathbb{R}^+ , it only remains to check that $L(\varepsilon)$ has vanishing distance from it as ε approaches 0. To this aim, let us set $D := \text{Diff}(f) \cap \text{Diff}(g)$, and, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, $D^\varepsilon(\theta) := B_1(0) \cap \{\nu : \theta + \eta(\varepsilon)\nu \in D\}$, and

$$Dg_{\eta(\varepsilon)}(\theta) = \int_{D^\varepsilon(\theta)} \varphi(\nu) Dg(\theta + \eta(\varepsilon)\nu) d\nu$$

$$Df_{\eta(\varepsilon)}(\theta) = \int_{D^\varepsilon(\theta)} \varphi(\nu) Df(\theta + \eta(\varepsilon)\nu) d\nu.$$

Therefore, by the definition of Lie bracket we get

$$\begin{aligned} [f_{\eta(\varepsilon)}, g_{\eta(\varepsilon)}](\theta) &= \\ &= \int_{D^\varepsilon(\theta)} \varphi(\nu) [f, g](\theta) d\nu + E_{f, g}(\eta(\varepsilon))(\theta) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} E_{f, g}(\eta(\varepsilon))(\theta) &:= \\ &= \int_{D^\varepsilon(\theta)} \varphi(\nu) Dg(\theta + \eta(\varepsilon)\nu) [f(\theta + \eta(\varepsilon)\nu) - f_{\eta(\varepsilon)}(\theta)] d\nu - \\ &- \int_{D^\varepsilon(\theta)} \varphi(\nu) Df(\theta + \eta(\varepsilon)\nu) [g(\theta + \eta(\varepsilon)\nu) - g_{\eta(\varepsilon)}(\theta)] d\nu. \end{aligned}$$

If $r > 0$, it is easy to show that, if we choose a positive constant $\bar{\varepsilon} > 0$ small enough, we have $\theta(q, \sigma, \sqrt{\varepsilon}, \tau) \in B_r(q)$, for all $\varepsilon < \bar{\varepsilon}$. Using the Lipschitz continuity of f and g and the convergence of the mollified fields to the original fields, one can easily prove that $|E_{f, g}(\eta)(\theta)| \leq C\eta$, for some constant C and for all $\theta \in B_r(q)$.

Therefore, by (9) we get

$$\begin{aligned} [f_{\eta(\varepsilon)}, g_{\eta(\varepsilon)}](\theta(q, \sigma, \sqrt{\varepsilon}, \tau)) &= \\ &= \int_{D^\varepsilon(\theta(q, \sigma, \sqrt{\varepsilon}, \tau))} \varphi(\nu) [f, g](\theta) d\nu \in \\ &\quad \overline{\text{co}}\{[f, g](x), x \in D \cap B_r(q)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

If we also take $\bar{\varepsilon}$ small enough so that $\varepsilon < \bar{\varepsilon}$ implies $\eta = \eta(\varepsilon) < \frac{r}{2C}$, we have proved that for any $r > 0$ there

is $\bar{\varepsilon}$ small enough such that

$$\begin{aligned} L(\varepsilon) &= \\ &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \int_0^{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \left(\int_{D^\varepsilon(\theta)} \varphi(\nu) [f, g](\theta) d\nu + E_{f, g}(\eta) \right) d\tau d\sigma, \end{aligned}$$

where we have written θ instead of $\theta(q, \sigma, \sqrt{\varepsilon}, \tau)$, has distance less than r from $\overline{\text{co}}\{[f, g](x), x \in D \cap B_r(q)\}$. ■

REFERENCES

- [1] F. Angrisani, F. Rampazzo *Goh-like conditions for nonsmooth control systems*, in preparation.
- [2] M.W. Botsko, R.A. Gosser, *On the differentiability of functions of several variables*, Amer. Math. Monthly 92, No. 9, 1985, pp. 663–665.
- [3] E. Feleqi, F. Rampazzo, *Iterated Lie brackets for nonsmooth vector fields*. Nonlinear Diff. Eq. Appl. 24, 61 (2017).
- [4] F. Clarke, *Functional Analysis, Calculus of Variations and Optimal Control*, GTM, volume 264, Springer (2013).
- [5] B. Kaskosz, *Extremality, controllability and abundant subsets of generalized control systems*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, vol. 101 (1999) pp. 73–108.
- [6] B.S. Mordukhovich *Variational Analysis and applications*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, 2018.
- [7] M. Palladino, F. Rampazzo, *A geometrically based criterion to avoid infimum gaps in optimal control*, Journal of Differential Equations, Vol. 269 (2020) pp. 10107–10142.
- [8] F. Rampazzo, *Frobenius-type theorems for Lipschitz distributions*, Journal of Differential Equations, Vol. 243 (2007) pp. 270–300.
- [9] F. Rampazzo, H.J. Sussmann, *Set-valued differentials and a nonsmooth version of Chow's Theorem*, Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, February 2001.
- [10] F. Rampazzo, H.J. Sussmann, *Commutators of flow maps of nonsmooth vector fields*, Journal of Differential Equations, Vol. 232 (2007) pp. 134–175.
- [11] H.J. Sussmann, *Generalized differentials, variational generators, and the maximum principle with state constraints*, Nonlinear and optimal control theory, Lecture Notes in Math., 1932, Springer, Berlin, (2008) pp. 221–287.
- [12] H.J. Sussmann, *Warga derivative containers and other generalized differentials* Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, December 2002.
- [13] J. Warga, *Controllability, extremality, and abnormality in nonsmooth optimal control*, J. Optim. Theory and Applic., vol. 41, no. 1 (1983) pp. 239–260.
- [14] J. Warga, *Optimal Control of Differential and Functional Equations*, Academic Press, New York (1972).