

TURNPIKE PROPERTY FOR GENERALIZED LINEAR-QUADRATIC PROBLEMS *

ROBERTO GUGLIELMI¹ AND ZHUQING LI¹

Abstract. We provide a characterization of the exponential (integral) turnpike property for infinite dimensional generalized linear-quadratic optimal control problems in terms of structural properties of the control system, such as exponential stabilizability and detectability. The proof relies on the analysis of the exponential convergence of solutions to the differential Riccati equations to the algebraic counterpart, and on a necessary condition for exponential stabilizability in terms of a closed range test.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 49N10, 49K20, 93C20, 93D20, 93B99.

January 24, 2023.

1. INTRODUCTION

The turnpike phenomenon describes the long time behavior of optimally controlled systems whose optimal trajectories over a sufficiently large time horizon stay for most of the time close to a prescribed trajectory of the system. The term turnpike property was first coined by Samuelson [25], referring to the property of an efficiently growing economy to approximate for most of the time horizon a balanced equilibrium path, as noticed by von Neumann [22]. Following these results, turnpike phenomena have been widely observed and investigated in the context of mathematical economy [20], mathematical biology [17] and chemical processes [24] among other applications. In the last decade, the turnpike property has been extensively studied by the mathematical community in the context of optimal control, also in connection with the stability of Model Predictive Control schemes [6, 14]. Turnpike properties have been investigated in both the linear and nonlinear setting, for discrete-time systems [7, 16], for finite dimensional continuous-time systems [8, 29], for delay equations [3], for infinite dimensional systems with control inside the domain [4, 23, 27], and for the optimal relaxed problems [19]. The monographs [34–36] present a complete overview on turnpike properties in various optimal control and variational problems.

In most cases, the prescribed trajectory which is approximated by the optimally controlled trajectory is the minimizer of the corresponding optimal steady state problem, i.e., an optimal

Keywords and phrases: turnpike property, long time behavior, linear-quadratic optimal control, detectability, stabilizability

* The authors acknowledge the support of the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC), funding reference number RGPIN-2021-02632

¹ University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON, Canada

steady state of the system. However, turnpike phenomena have been observed towards different target states, for example suitable periodic orbits [26, 27, 33].

Several methods have been developed to derive sufficient conditions to ensure turnpike properties, which can be roughly classified in two techniques: The first one takes advantage of the hyperbolicity around the steady state of the optimality system resulting from the Pontryagin's maximum principle. See, e.g., [1, 23, 27]. This kind of results is suitable to prove the integral and exponential integral turnpike property (see Definition 1) of the optimal state, control and adjoint state towards the solution of the corresponding optimal steady state problem. The second method exploits the connection between turnpike and dissipativity properties of the control system. Dissipativity, first introduced by Willems in [31, 32], describes the abstract energy balance of a dynamical system in terms of the stored and the supplied energy. Several notions of dissipativity have been introduced to serve different purposes (see [21]). In particular, strict dissipativity and strict pre-dissipativity are two notions useful in the characterization of turnpike properties. See, e.g., [9, 12] and the survey [15]. This second methodology allows to establish the measure turnpike property, which guarantees that the Lebesgue measure of the set where the optimal trajectory is far from the turnpike reference is limited by some constant independent of the time horizon. We refer to [28] for the definition of measure turnpike, and a detailed comparison between measure and integral turnpike properties. The measure turnpike property is slightly more general than the exponential integral turnpike, but as a drawback does not provide the same estimates on the control and the adjoint state. The linear-quadratic (LQ) optimal control problem is of particular interest in the study of turnpike properties, because the specific structure of the problem allows for a more explicit analysis. This case has been studied in full details in [10, 11] for finite dimensional LQ optimal control problems in discrete and continuous time respectively, even in the presence of state and control constraints.

Our work differs from the previous ones mainly in three aspects: the problem formulation, the techniques of the proof, and a new explicit formula for the optimal solution of the problem. Indeed, this paper is concerned with the generalized linear-quadratic optimal control problem, i.e., the quadratic term of the running cost function does not have to be strictly positive, and the linear terms of the running cost function can be chosen arbitrarily. Thus, we are not restricted to optimal control problems of tracking type. As a consequence, the existence of a minimizer of the optimal steady state problem does not directly imply the existence of an adjoint steady state. This feature leads to extra difficulties in the application of the methodology based on the analysis of the optimality system. This issue is further discussed in Remark 17 and Appendix B, that provides a counterexample to the existence of an adjoint steady state. For these reasons, we need to design a new method for the proof that does not rely explicitly on the hyperbolicity of the optimality system around the optimal steady states. Instead, we exploit the analytic properties of evolution systems, and a suitable class of perturbations of the optimal control problem. A key estimate in our proof is the exponential convergence of the solutions to the differential Riccati equations to its algebraic counterpart, as given in [23]. However, since we set up the problem in a semigroup framework instead of the classic parabolic framework provided in [18], several proofs in [23] need to be reworked in the current framework. We also develop a closed range test to ensure the existence of the adjoint steady state based on the stabilizability of the control system. Finally, we provide a representation formula of the explicit solution of the generalized LQ problem in terms of the solutions to differential Riccati equations and the adjoint steady state, which in turn explains the importance of the existence of an adjoint steady state. To the best of our knowledge, this formula is not known in the literature, and we believe it is of interest on its own. As an aside, the formula may be used in finding appropriate necessary conditions of turnpike in a semigroup framework. This issue will be addressed in a future work.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the generalized LQ problem and the optimal steady state problem, we define the exponential (integral) turnpike property in infinite dimension, and we state our main result together with some existing results on Riccati equations and perturbations of generators. In Section 3, we develop some essential lemmas on the exponential convergence of the solutions to the differential Riccati equations to its algebraic counterpart and the closed range test. In Section 4, we prove our main result based on several estimates which enable us to treat the uncontrolled evolution system like an exponentially stable semigroup and on the explicit solution of the optimal control. In Section 5 we conclude with the application of our main result to two examples. We start by setting some notations.

Notations Throughout the paper, we use \mathcal{H} , \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{Y} to denote the state, input and output space, respectively, and assume they are all complex Hilbert spaces. We use the same notation $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and $\| \cdot \|$ for the inner product and induced norm in all spaces \mathcal{H} , \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{Y} . We denote by $L(X, Y)$ the space of linear bounded operators between the Hilbert spaces X and Y . Assume $A : D(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is the generator of a strongly continuous semigroup $\mathcal{T} = (\mathcal{T}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ in \mathcal{H} and $B \in L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{H})$. We assume $C \in L(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{Y})$, $K \in L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{H})$, $z \in \mathcal{H}$ and $v \in \mathcal{U}$. Here K is further assumed to be coercive, i.e., there exists $M > 0$ such that $\langle K^* K u, u \rangle \geq M \|u\|^2$ for all $u \in \mathcal{U}$. We use S^* to denote the adjoint operator associated to operator S .

Functional framework We denote by \mathcal{H}_1 , \mathcal{H}_1^d the Hilbert spaces defined on the sets $D(A)$ and $D(A^*)$, respectively, endowed with the inner products

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x, y \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1} &:= \langle (sI - A)x, (sI - A)y \rangle, & \forall x, y \in D(A) \\ \langle x, y \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1^d} &:= \langle (sI - A^*)x, (sI - A^*)y \rangle, & \forall x, y \in D(A^*) \end{aligned}$$

for some $s > w_0(\mathcal{T})$, where $w_0(\mathcal{T})$ is the growth bound of \mathcal{T} . The induced norms of the two inner products are known to be equivalent to the graph norm of A , A^* . See, e.g., [30, Section 2.10].

We denote by \mathcal{H}_{-1} , \mathcal{H}_{-1}^d the Hilbert spaces being the space completions of \mathcal{H} with respect to the inner products

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x, y \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{-1}} &:= \langle (sI - A)^{-1}x, (sI - A)^{-1}y \rangle, & \forall x, y \in \mathcal{H} \\ \langle x, y \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{-1}^d} &:= \langle (sI - A^*)^{-1}x, (sI - A^*)^{-1}y \rangle, & \forall x, y \in \mathcal{H}. \end{aligned}$$

It is well-known that \mathcal{H}_{-1} , \mathcal{H}_{-1}^d are isomorphic to the dual spaces of \mathcal{H}_1^d , \mathcal{H}_1 . For the sake of simplicity, we will identify \mathcal{H}_{-1} , \mathcal{H}_{-1}^d with the dual spaces of \mathcal{H}_1^d , \mathcal{H}_1 by not explicitly writing out the isomorphism between these spaces. So, we may define

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x, \phi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_{-1}^d} &:= \phi(x), & \forall x \in \mathcal{H}_1, \phi \in \mathcal{H}_{-1}^d \\ \langle x, \phi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1^d, \mathcal{H}_{-1}} &:= \phi(x), & \forall x \in \mathcal{H}_1^d, \phi \in \mathcal{H}_{-1} \\ \langle \phi, x \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{-1}^d, \mathcal{H}_1} &:= \overline{\langle x, \phi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_{-1}^d}}, & \forall x \in \mathcal{H}_1, \phi \in \mathcal{H}_{-1}^d \\ \langle \phi, x \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{-1}, \mathcal{H}_1^d} &:= \overline{\langle x, \phi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1^d, \mathcal{H}_{-1}}}, & \forall x \in \mathcal{H}_1^d, \phi \in \mathcal{H}_{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the above notations are linear in the first argument and antilinear in the second argument, similarly to the inner product on a Hilbert space. Moreover, if $\phi \in \mathcal{H}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x, \phi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_{-1}^d} &= \langle x, \phi \rangle, \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{H}_1, \\ \langle x, \phi \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1^d, \mathcal{H}_{-1}} &= \langle x, \phi \rangle, \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{H}_1. \end{aligned}$$

We refer to [30, Sections 2.9 and 2.10] for more details on the embeddings $\mathcal{H}_1 \subset \mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{H}_{-1}^d$.

2. PROBLEM SETTING AND BACKGROUND

2.1. Mathematical setting

The OCP. Given a time horizon $T > 0$, we consider the infinite dimensional generalized linear-quadratic Optimal Control Problem $(\text{OCP})_T$

$$\min_{u \in L^2([0, T], \mathcal{U})} \int_0^T \ell(x(t), u(t)) dt \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \dot{x} = Ax + Bu, \quad x(0) = x_0 \in \mathcal{H}, \quad (2.1)$$

with running cost function $\ell : \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\ell(x, u) := \|Cx\|^2 + \|Ku\|^2 + 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle z, x \rangle + 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle v, u \rangle. \quad (2.2)$$

The solution of system

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dx}{dt} = Ax + Bu & \text{in } [0, T], \\ x(0) = x_0. \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

is considered in the mild sense, that is,

$$x(t) = \mathcal{T}_t x_0 + \int_0^t \mathcal{T}_{t-s} B u(s) ds, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

We denote by $x_T^*(\cdot, x_0)$ and $u_T^*(\cdot, x_0)$, or simply by x^* and u^* when x_0 and T are clear from the context, the optimal trajectory and optimal control of (2.1) corresponding to the initial condition $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ and time horizon $T > 0$. Notice that, due to the strict convexity of ℓ with respect to u and the linearity of (2.3), the optimal control u^* of (2.1) exists and is unique. See, e.g., [18, Theorem 1.1]. Now, we are well-prepared to define the integral and exponential integral turnpike property at a steady state. We recall that a controlled equilibrium of system (2.3) is a pair $(x_e, u_e) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{U}$ such that $Ax_e + Bu_e = 0$.

Definition 1. We say that the optimal control problem (2.1) has the integral turnpike property at some controlled equilibrium (x_e, u_e) if, for any bounded neighborhood \mathcal{N} of x_e and $\varepsilon > 0$, the optimal trajectory $x_T^*(\cdot, x_0)$ and optimal control $u_T^*(\cdot, x_0)$ of (2.1) with initial condition $x_0 \in \mathcal{N}$ satisfy

$$\frac{1}{(b-a)T} \int_{aT}^{bT} x_T^*(t, x_0) dt \rightarrow x_e, \quad \frac{1}{(b-a)T} \int_{aT}^{bT} u_T^*(t, x_0) dt \rightarrow u_e$$

as $T \rightarrow \infty$ for every $a, b \in [0, 1]$, $a \neq b$. Additionally, if there exist positive constants $M, w > 0$ independent of $T > 0$ and $x_0 \in \mathcal{N}$ such that

$$\|x^*(t, x_0) - x_e\| + \|u^*(t, x_0) - u_e\| \leq M(e^{-wt} + e^{-w(T-t)}),$$

we say that the optimal control problem (2.1) shows the exponential (integral) turnpike property at (x_e, u_e) .

Remark 2. Since B is a bounded operator, if (x_e, u_e) is a controlled equilibrium, we have that $Ax_e = -Bu_e \in \mathcal{H}$. This implies that x_e must be an element of $D(A)$.

To study the turnpike property, it is useful to analyse the optimal steady state corresponding to the running cost ℓ . The optimal steady state problem is defined as:

$$\min_{x \in D(A), u \in \mathcal{U}} \ell(x, u) \quad \text{s.t. } Ax + Bu = 0. \quad (2.4)$$

We will also make use of several structural-theoretical properties of the control system under consideration, which we introduce in the following.

We say that the pair (A, C) is exponentially detectable if there exists some $L \in L(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{H})$ such that $A + LC$ generates an exponentially stable semigroup. Similarly, (A, B) is called exponentially stabilizable if there exists $F \in L(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{U})$ such that $A + BF$ is exponentially stable.

The operator $[A \ B] : D(A) \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is defined by

$$[A \ B] \begin{bmatrix} x \\ u \end{bmatrix} := Ax + Bu.$$

Observe that, since A and B are both closed operators, $\ker[A \ B]$ is closed in $\mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{U}$.

We denote by $\begin{bmatrix} A^* \\ B^* \end{bmatrix}$ the adjoint operator of $[A \ B]$. It's easy to check that the domain of $\begin{bmatrix} A^* \\ B^* \end{bmatrix}$ is $D(A^*)$ and that we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} A^* \\ B^* \end{bmatrix} w = \begin{bmatrix} A^* w \\ B^* w \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{U}, \quad \forall w \in D(A^*).$$

Remark 3. With reference to [13, Lemma 10 and Theorem 17], if we assume (A, C) is exponentially detectable and K is coercive, then the optimal steady state problem (2.4) has a unique minimizer (x_e, u_e) , which is characterized by

$$\mathbb{P}_{\ker[A \ B]} \begin{bmatrix} z + C^* C x_e \\ v + K^* K u_e \end{bmatrix} = 0, \quad (2.5)$$

where $\mathbb{P}_{\ker[A \ B]}$ is the projection operator from $\mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{U}$ to its closed subspace $\ker[A \ B]$.

In the following, we will assume that the optimal steady state is at $(x_e, u_e) = (0, 0)$, thanks to the next result.

Lemma 4. *Assume that (A, C) is exponentially detectable. Then the solution of the optimal steady state problem (2.4) is at (x_e, u_e) if and only if the solution of the modified optimal steady state problem*

$$\min_{x \in D(A), u \in \mathcal{U}} \ell(x, u) \quad \text{s.t. } Ax + Bu = 0, \quad (2.6)$$

is at $(0, 0)$, where $\tilde{\ell}$ is defined by

$$\tilde{\ell}(x, u) := \|Cx\|^2 + \|Ku\|^2 + 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle z + C^* C x_e, x \rangle + 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle v + K^* K u_e, u \rangle. \quad (2.7)$$

In this case, the OCP (2.1)-(2.2) satisfies the turnpike property at (x_e, u_e) if and only if the modified OCP

$$\min_{u \in L^2([0, T], \mathcal{U})} \int_0^T \tilde{\ell}(x(t), u(t)) dt \quad \text{s.t. } \dot{x} = Ax + Bu, \quad x(0) = x_0 \in \mathcal{H} \quad (2.8)$$

satisfies the turnpike property at $(0, 0)$.

Proof. For any $x \in \mathcal{H}$ and $u \in \mathcal{U}$, set $\tilde{x} := x - x_e$ and $\tilde{u} := u - u_e$. If (x_e, u_e) is the minimizer of the optimal steady state problem (2.4), we easily see that $(0, 0)$ is the minimizer of

$$\min_{\tilde{x} \in D(A), \tilde{u} \in \mathcal{U}} \ell(\tilde{x} + x_e, \tilde{u} + u_e) \quad \text{s.t. } A\tilde{x} + B\tilde{u} = 0 \quad (2.9)$$

and vice versa. It's not hard to see that $\ell(\tilde{x} + x_e, \tilde{u} + u_e)$ only differs from $\tilde{\ell}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{u})$ by a constant term. So, $(0, 0)$ is the minimizer of problem (2.6).

Now, let (x^*, u^*) be the optimal pair for OCP (2.1). Observe that

$$\frac{d\tilde{x}}{dt} = \frac{d(x - x_e)}{dt} = Ax + Bu = A\tilde{x} + B\tilde{u}.$$

So, $(\tilde{x}^*, \tilde{u}^*) := (x^* - x_e, u^* - u_e)$ is the optimal pair of problem

$$\min_{\tilde{u} \in L^2([0, T], \mathcal{U})} \int_0^T \ell(\tilde{x}(t) + x_e, \tilde{u}(t) + u_e) dt \quad \text{s.t. } \dot{\tilde{x}} = A\tilde{x} + B\tilde{u}, \quad \tilde{x}(0) = \tilde{x}_0 := x_0 - x_e.$$

As mentioned before, $\ell(\tilde{x} + x_e, \tilde{u} + u_e)$ only differs from $\tilde{\ell}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{u})$ by a constant term. So, we have that $(x^* - x_e, u^* - u_e)$ is the optimal pair for modified OCP (2.8) and vice versa. Therefore, we deduce that OCP (2.1) satisfies turnpike property at (x_e, u_e) if and only if the modified OCP (2.1)-(2.7) satisfies turnpike property at $(0, 0)$. \square

Our main result is motivated by the following theorem in finite dimension [11, Theorem 8.1].

Theorem 5. *Suppose $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}^n$, $\mathcal{U} = \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}^k$ with $m, n, k \in \mathbb{N}^+$. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (a) (A, C) is detectable and (A, B) is stabilizable.
- (b) The OCP (2.1) has the (measure) turnpike property at some controlled equilibrium.

It is natural to ask if the above theorem can be extended to the infinite dimensional setting. The main result of this paper, stated in the following theorem, provides a generalization of the implication (a) \Rightarrow (b) in infinite dimension. It must be noted that the turnpike property proved in [11] is the so-called measure turnpike property, while in this paper we deal with the exponential (integral) turnpike property, which is slightly stronger than the former property. In fact, our main result is more related to [23] both in terms of techniques and in terms of the notion of turnpike. However, we refer to Theorem 5 from [11] to emphasise that even in finite dimension condition (a) is necessary for measure turnpike property, thus also for exponential integral turnpike property.

We now state the main result of the paper. Its proof will be divided into several steps, developed in the following sections.

Theorem 6. *Assume that (A, B) is exponentially stabilizable and (A, C) is exponentially detectable, then OCP (2.1) has the (exponential) turnpike property at the optimal steady state.*

2.2. Riccati equations and perturbation of generators

In this section, we introduce some well-known properties of differential and algebraic Riccati equations. For more details on this section, we refer to [2, Part IV, Section 1] and [2, Part V, Section 1] and the references therein.

Let $\Sigma(\mathcal{H})$ denote the Hilbert space of self-adjoint operators endowed with their operator norm. Let $C_s([0, T], \Sigma(\mathcal{H}))$ (resp. $C_s^1([0, T], \Sigma(\mathcal{H}))$) denote the linear vector space (endowed

with the strong operator topology) of all $P : [0, T] \rightarrow \Sigma(\mathcal{H})$ such that $P(\cdot)x$ is a continuous (resp. continuously differentiable) function on $[0, T]$, for every $x \in \mathcal{H}$.

The differential Riccati equation is given by

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dP}{dt} - A^*P - PA + PBB^*P - C^*C = 0 \\ P(0) = P_0 \in \Sigma(\mathcal{H}). \end{cases} \quad (2.10)$$

Definition 7. We call $P \in C_s([0, T], \Sigma(\mathcal{H}))$ a (mild) solution of the differential Riccati equation (2.10) if $P(0) = P_0$ and, for any $x, y \in D(A)$, $\langle P(t)x, y \rangle$ is differentiable on $[0, T]$ and verifies, for each $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\frac{d\langle P(t)x, y \rangle}{dt} - \langle P(t)x, Ay \rangle - \langle P(t)Ax, y \rangle + \langle B^*P(t)x, B^*P(t)y \rangle - \langle Cx, Cy \rangle = 0. \quad (2.11)$$

If A generates a C_0 -semigroup in \mathcal{H} , $B \in L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{H})$, $C \in L(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{Y})$ and P_0 is non-negative, then there exists a unique non-negative solution to equation (2.10). See, e.g., [2, Part IV, Theorem 2.1]. It's well-known that the optimal control for OCP (2.1) with cost function $\ell(x, u) := \|Cx\|^2 + \|Ku\|^2$ is given by the feedback law

$$u^*(t) = -B^*P(T-t)x^*(t),$$

where P is the solution of (2.10) with $P(0) = 0$. Sometimes we want P to have stronger regularity by imposing some restrictions on P_0 . To define the strict solutions of (2.10), for any $F \in \Sigma(\mathcal{H})$, we introduce the bilinear mapping

$$\varphi_F(x, y) := \langle Fx, Ay \rangle + \langle Ax, Fy \rangle, \quad \forall x, y \in D(A).$$

Let $D(\mathcal{A}) := \{F \in \Sigma(\mathcal{H}) \mid \varphi_F \text{ has a continuous extension to } \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H}\}$. For any $F \in D(\mathcal{A})$, since φ_F has a continuous extension in $\mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H}$, there exists a unique bounded linear operator $\mathcal{A}(F) : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ satisfying

$$\langle \mathcal{A}(F)x, y \rangle = \langle Fx, Ay \rangle + \langle Ax, Fy \rangle, \quad \forall x, y \in D(A), F \in D(\mathcal{A}).$$

Definition 8. We say that $P \in C_s([0, T], \Sigma(\mathcal{H}))$ is a strict solution of the differential Riccati equation (2.10) if P satisfies

- (a) $P \in C_s^1([0, T], \Sigma(\mathcal{H}))$,
- (b) $P(t) \in D(\mathcal{A})$ for all $t \geq 0$,
- (c) $\mathcal{A}(P) \in C_s([0, T]; \Sigma(\mathcal{H}))$ and $P' = \mathcal{A}(P) - PBB^*P + C^*C$, $P(0) = P_0$.

Remark 9. If P is a strict solution of (2.10), then P is also a mild solution. If A generates a C_0 -semigroup in \mathcal{H} , $B \in L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{H})$, $C \in L(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{Y})$, P_0 is non-negative and $P_0 \in D(\mathcal{A})$, then there exists a unique strict solution to the differential Riccati equation (2.10). See, e.g., [2, Part IV, Theorem 3.2]. Notice, in particular, that $0 \in D(\mathcal{A})$.

We now introduce the algebraic Riccati equation, which is given by

$$A^*P + PA - PBB^*P + C^*C = 0. \quad (2.12)$$

Definition 10. We call $P \in \Sigma(\mathcal{H})$ a solution of the algebraic Riccati equation (2.12) if for any $x, y \in D(A)$, we have

$$\langle Px, Ay \rangle + \langle PAx, y \rangle - \langle B^*Px, B^*Py \rangle + \langle Cx, Cy \rangle = 0.$$

If A generates a C_0 -semigroup in \mathcal{H} , $B \in L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{H})$, $C \in L(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{Y})$ and the pair (A, B) is exponentially stabilizable, then there exists a minimal non-negative solution to the algebraic Riccati equation. See, e.g., [2, Part V, Proposition 2.3]. We denote such minimal solution by P_{\min} , which is also the unique non-negative solution of (2.12) if we additionally assume that (A, C) is exponentially detectable. It is well known that if (A, B) is exponentially stabilizable, then the optimal control problem on infinite time horizon

$$\min_{u \in L^2([0, \infty), \mathcal{U})} \int_0^\infty \|Cx(t)\|^2 + \|u(t)\|^2 dt \quad \text{s.t. } \dot{x} = Ax + Bu, \quad x(0) = x_0 \quad (2.13)$$

is well-posed, and the optimal control u^* is given by the feedback law

$$u^*(t) = -B^*P_{\min}x^*(t).$$

Moreover, the semigroup generated by $A - BB^*P_{\min}$ is exponentially stable.

We conclude the section by recalling two useful results from [2]. The first one concerns the convergence of P to P_{\min} . In the next section we will generalize the exponential convergence in the infinite dimensional setting.

Proposition 11. *Suppose P is the solution of (2.10) with $P(0) = 0$ and P_{\min} is the minimal solution of (2.12), then we have $P(t) \rightarrow P_{\min}$ in strong operator topology. If \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{Y} are all Euclidean spaces, then $P(t) \rightarrow P_{\min}$ in norm topology and the convergence rate is exponential, i.e., there exists positive constants $M, \eta > 0$ such that*

$$\|P(t) - P_{\min}\| \leq Me^{-\eta t}.$$

We refer to [2, Part V, Proposition 4.2] for a proof of the convergence in strong operator topology. On the other hand, the exponential convergence rate in finite dimensions is a well-known result. In fact, since in finite dimensional spaces the convergence in strong topology is equivalent to the convergence in operator topology, we have that $P(t) \rightarrow P_{\min}$ in matrix norm. The exponential rate is then a consequence of the local stability result [2, Part V, Section 1, Proposition 4.1]. Finally, we recall from [2, Proposition 3.5] a perturbation result that will be useful in the proof of our main theorem.

Proposition 12. *Assume that $F \in C_s([0, T], L(\mathcal{H}))$ and $f \in L^2([0, T], \mathcal{H})$. Then the problem*

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dx(t)}{dt} = Ax(t) + F(t)x(t) + f(t), & t \in [0, T], \\ x(0) = x_0 \in \mathcal{H} \end{cases} \quad (2.14)$$

admits a unique solution in $L^2([0, T], \mathcal{H})$, that is, $x \in H^1([0, T], \mathcal{H}^{-1}) \cap C([0, T], \mathcal{H})$ and

$$\frac{dx(t)}{dt} = Ax(t) + Fx(t) + f(t) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{H}^{-1}, \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

If, in addition, $F \in C_s^1([0, T], L(\mathcal{H}))$, $x_0 \in D(A)$ and $f \in H^1([0, T], \mathcal{H})$, then the solution of problem (2.14) is a strict one, i.e., $x \in C^1([0, T], \mathcal{H}) \cap C([0, T], \mathcal{H}_1)$.

3. EXPONENTIAL CONVERGENCE OF $P(t)$ TO P_{\min}

The proof of our main result crucially relies on the exponential convergence of the solution to the differential Riccati equation $P(t)$ to the solution of the algebraic Riccati equation P_{\min} , that

is, to the generalization of Proposition 11 in the infinite dimensional setting. This turns out to be a consequence of both the stabilizability and detectability of the system. This section is devoted to the proof of this result, preceded by two preliminaries lemmas. The same sort of estimate was used in a critical way in [23, Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.9], where it was proved by combining a careful analysis of the optimality system and classical parabolic equation techniques from [18]. In this work, instead, in order to cope with the generalized optimal control problem (2.1)-(2.3), we must extend the estimate in a more abstract framework, by means of semigroup methods.

Lemma 13. *Assume (A, C) is exponentially detectable, then there exists a constant $M > 0$ such that for every $u \in L^2([0, T], \mathcal{U}), x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$, we have*

$$\|x(T)\|^2 \leq M \left(\int_0^T \|Cx(t)\|^2 + \|u(t)\|^2 dt + \|x_0\|^2 \right), \quad (3.1)$$

where x is the solution of system (2.3).

Proof. Since (A, C) is exponentially detectable, there exists some $F \in L(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{H})$ such that $A + FC$ is exponentially stable. Let $\phi_0 \in D(A^*)$, and let ϕ be the solution to

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d\phi}{dt} = (A^* + C^*F^*)\phi & \text{in } [0, T], \\ \phi(0) = \phi_0. \end{cases}$$

Then, owing to the exponential stability of $A^* + C^*F^*$, there exists some $M > 0$ such that for arbitrary $T > 0$, we have $\|\phi\|_{L^\infty([0, T], \mathcal{H})} \leq M\|\phi_0\|$ and $\|\phi\|_{L^2([0, T], \mathcal{H})} \leq M\|\phi_0\|$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d \langle x(t), \phi(T-t) \rangle}{dt} &= \langle x(t), -(A^* + C^*F^*)\phi(T-t) \rangle + \langle Ax(t) + Bu(t), \phi(T-t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{-1}, \mathcal{H}_1^d} \\ &= -\langle Cx(t), F^*\phi(T-t) \rangle + \langle Bu(t), \phi(T-t) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

So, applying Hölder's inequality, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x(T), \phi_0 \rangle &= \langle x_0, \phi(T) \rangle + \int_0^T -\langle Cx(t), F^*\phi(T-t) \rangle + \langle Bu(t), \phi(T-t) \rangle dt \\ &\leq \|x_0\| \|\phi(T)\| + \|Cx\|_{L^2([0, T], \mathcal{Y})} \|F^*\phi\|_{L^2([0, T], \mathcal{Y})} + \|Bu\|_{L^2([0, T], \mathcal{H})} \|\phi\|_{L^2([0, T], \mathcal{H})} \\ &\leq M_1 \|x_0\| \|\phi_0\| + M_2 \|Cx\|_{L^2([0, T], \mathcal{Y})} \|\phi_0\| + M_3 \|u\|_{L^2([0, T], \mathcal{U})} \|\phi_0\| \\ &\leq \sqrt{M} \|\phi_0\| \left(\|Cx\|_{L^2([0, T], \mathcal{Y})}^2 + \|u\|_{L^2([0, T], \mathcal{U})}^2 + \|x_0\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

for some constants M_1, M_2, M_3 and $M > 0$.

Now, by letting $\phi_0 \rightarrow x(T)$ in \mathcal{H} , we get the estimate (3.1). \square

Lemma 14. *Assume (A, B) is exponentially stabilizable, then there exists $M > 0$ such that, for every $f \in L^2([0, T], \mathcal{Y})$ and $p_0 \in \mathcal{H}$, we have*

$$\|p(T)\|^2 \leq M \left(\int_0^T \|B^*p(t)\|^2 + \|f(t)\|^2 dt + \|p_0\|^2 \right), \quad (3.2)$$

where p is the solution of

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dp}{dt} = A^*p + C^*f & \text{in } [0, T], \\ p(0) = p_0. \end{cases}$$

This is just the dual version of Lemma 13, so we skip the proof.

Lemma 15. (*Exponential convergence rate of P*) *If (A, B) is exponentially stabilizable and (A, C) is exponentially detectable, then there exist some positive numbers M, β such that*

$$\|P_{\min} - P(t)\| \leq Me^{-\beta t}, \quad \forall t \geq 0. \quad (3.3)$$

Proof. Fix some $T > 0$. We denote by x the solution of

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dx}{dt} = (A - BB^*P_{\min})x & \text{in } [0, T], \\ x(0) = x_0 \in \mathcal{H}. \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

Define $p(t) := P_{\min}x(T - t)$ in $[0, T]$. We claim that p coincides with the solution of

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dp(t)}{dt} = A^*p(t) + C^*Cx(T - t) & \text{in } [0, T], \\ p(0) = P_{\min}x(T). \end{cases} \quad (3.5)$$

In fact, suppose $x_0 \in D(A)$, then for any $y \in D(A)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\langle p(t), y \rangle}{dt} &= -\langle P_{\min}Ax(T - t), y \rangle + \langle P_{\min}BB^*P_{\min}x(T - t), y \rangle \\ &= \langle A^*P_{\min}x(T - t) + C^*Cx(T - t), y \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{-1}^d, \mathcal{H}_1}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

So, we have $\frac{dp(t)}{dt} = A^*p(t) + C^*Cx(T - t)$ in \mathcal{H}_{-1}^d .

Now, for any $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$, we let $(z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset D(A)$ be a sequence such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} z_n = x_0$ in \mathcal{H} . We use x_n and p_n to denote the solutions of (3.4) and (3.5) with x_0 replaced by z_n . It is clear that $x_n \rightarrow x$ in the L^2 norm and $P_{\min}x_n(T) \rightarrow P_{\min}x(T)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. So, we have that p_n converges to the solution of (3.5) pointwisely. It is also clear that $p_n(t) = P_{\min}x_n(T - t) \rightarrow P_{\min}x(T - t)$ pointwisely. So, we must have that $p(t)$ is equal to the solution of (3.5).

Let P be the solution of the differential Riccati equation (2.10) with $P_0 = 0$. Consider the following evolution problem

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d\tilde{x}(t)}{dt} = (A - BB^*P(T - t))\tilde{x}(t) & \text{in } [0, T], \\ \tilde{x}(0) = x_0. \end{cases} \quad (3.7)$$

Notice that $P(T - \cdot) \in C_s([0, T], L(\mathcal{H}))$. Thanks to Proposition 12, there exists a unique solution $\tilde{x} \in H^1([0, T], \mathcal{H}^{-1}) \cap C([0, T], \mathcal{H})$ of problem (3.7). Define $\tilde{p}(t) := P(t)\tilde{x}(T - t)$ in $[0, T]$. Similarly as before, we claim that \tilde{p} coincides with the solution of

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d\tilde{p}(t)}{dt} = A^*\tilde{p}(t) + C^*C\tilde{x}(T - t) & \text{in } [0, T], \\ \tilde{p}(0) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.8)$$

Indeed, if $x_0 \in D(A)$, then by Remark 9 and Proposition 12 we have

$$\tilde{x} \in C^1([0, T], \mathcal{H}) \cap C([0, T], D(A)). \quad (3.9)$$

Let $t \in [0, T]$ and $h \in \mathbb{R}$ be sufficiently small. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\tilde{p}(t+h) - \tilde{p}(t)}{h} &= P(t+h) \left(\frac{\tilde{x}(T-(t+h)) - \tilde{x}(T-t)}{h} + (A - BB^*P(T-t))\tilde{x}(T-t) \right) \\ &\quad - P(t+h)(A - BB^*P(T-t))\tilde{x}(T-t) + \frac{P(t+h) - P(t)}{h}\tilde{x}(T-t). \end{aligned}$$

By the uniform boundedness principle applied to P , (3.7), (3.9) and Remark 9, taking $h \rightarrow 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\tilde{p}(t)}{dt} &= -P(t)(A - BB^*P(t))\tilde{x}(T-t) \\ &\quad + (\mathcal{A}(P(t)) - P(t)BB^*P(t) + C^*C)\tilde{x}(T-t) \\ &= (\mathcal{A}(P(t)) - P(t)A)\tilde{x}(T-t) + C^*C\tilde{x}(T-t) \\ &= A^*P(t)\tilde{x}(T-t) + C^*C\tilde{x}(T-t) \\ &= A^*\tilde{p}(t) + C^*C\tilde{x}(T-t) \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

in \mathcal{H}_d^{-1} . Since $\tilde{p}(0) = 0$, this proves our claim for the case $x_0 \in D(A)$.

Now for any $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$, we let $(\tilde{z}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset D(A)$ be a sequence such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{z}_n = x_0$ in \mathcal{H} . We use \tilde{x}_n and \tilde{p}_n to denote the solutions of (3.7) and (3.8) with x_0 replaced by \tilde{z}_n . By [2, Proposition 3.6], $\tilde{x}_n \rightarrow \tilde{x}$ uniformly (thus also in L^2 norm), so \tilde{p}_n converges to the solution of (3.8) pointwisely. It's clear \tilde{p}_n also converges to \tilde{p} pointwisely. So, the solution of (3.8) coincides with \tilde{p} .

Now we claim that following inequality holds for any $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$:

$$\int_0^T \|B^*(p(t) - \tilde{p}(t))\|^2 + \|C(x(t) - \tilde{x}(t))\|^2 dt \leq \|p(0)\| \|\tilde{x}(T) - x(T)\|, \quad (3.11)$$

where x, p, \tilde{x} and \tilde{p} are the solutions of (3.4), (3.5), (3.7) and (3.8), respectively. To prove this, we first assume that $x_0 \in D(A)$. Since $x, \tilde{x} \in C([0, T], D(A))$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d\langle \tilde{p}(t) - p(t), \tilde{x}(T-t) - x(T-t) \rangle}{dt} \\ &= -\langle p^*(t) - p(t), A(\tilde{x}(T-t) - x(T-t)) \rangle + \langle \tilde{p}(t) - p(t), BB^*(\tilde{p}(t) - p(t)) \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle A^*(\tilde{p}(t) - p(t)), \tilde{x}(T-t) - x(T-t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{-1}^d, \mathcal{H}_1} \\ &\quad + \langle C^*C(\tilde{x}(T-t) - x(T-t)), \tilde{x}(T-t) - x(T-t) \rangle \\ &= \|C(x(T-t) - \tilde{x}(T-t))\|^2 + \|B^*(p(t) - \tilde{p}(t))\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

So, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^T \|B^*(p(t) - \tilde{p}(t))\|^2 + \|C(x(t) - \tilde{x}(t))\|^2 dt \\ &= \langle \tilde{p}(T) - p(T), \tilde{x}(0) - x(0) \rangle - \langle \tilde{p}(0) - p(0), \tilde{x}(T) - x(T) \rangle \\ &= \langle p(0), \tilde{x}(T) - x(T) \rangle \\ &\leq \|p(0)\| \|\tilde{x}(T) - x(T)\|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Since for any $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$, we can find a sequence $(z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset D(A)$ so that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} z_n = x_0$ in \mathcal{H} , and the resulting trajectories x_n, p_n, \tilde{x}_n and \tilde{p}_n will converge to x, p, \tilde{x} and \tilde{p} both pointwisely and in L^2 norm, (3.11) still holds for all $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$.

Notice that

$$\frac{d(\tilde{x}(t) - x(t))}{dt} = A(\tilde{x}(t) - x(t)) - BB^*(\tilde{p}(T-t) - p(T-t)).$$

By Lemma 13, we have that, for some constant $M > 0$,

$$\|\tilde{x}(T) - x(T)\|^2 \leq M \int_0^T \|B^*(p(t) - \tilde{p}(t))\|^2 + \|C(x(t) - \tilde{x}(t))\|^2 dt. \quad (3.13)$$

Applying (3.13) to (3.12), we obtain

$$\int_0^T \|B^*(p(t) - \tilde{p}(t))\|^2 + \|C(x(t) - \tilde{x}(t))\|^2 dt \leq M \|p(0)\|^2. \quad (3.14)$$

Since

$$\frac{d(\tilde{p}(t) - p(t))}{dt} = A^*(\tilde{p}(t) - p(t)) - C^*C(\tilde{x}(T-t) - x(T-t)),$$

by Lemma 14 there exists some $M > 0$ such that

$$\|\tilde{p}(T) - p(T)\|^2 \leq M \left(\int_0^T \|B^*(p(t) - \tilde{p}(t))\|^2 + \|C(x(t) - \tilde{x}(t))\|^2 dt + \|p(0)\|^2 \right). \quad (3.15)$$

Since (A, C) is exponentially detectable, $A - BB^*P_{\min}$ generates an exponentially stable semi-group. So, there exists some constants $M, \beta > 0$ such that

$$\|p(0)\| = \|P_{\min}x(T)\| \leq Me^{-\beta T}\|x_0\|. \quad (3.16)$$

Substituting (3.14) and (3.16) into (3.15), we get, for some $M > 0$,

$$\|\tilde{p}(T) - p(T)\|^2 \leq Me^{-2\beta T}\|x_0\|^2.$$

Finally, since $\|\tilde{p}(T) - p(T)\| = \|(P_{\min} - P(T))x_0\|$, we get (3.3). \square

4. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULT

4.1. Closed range test

In this subsection, we introduce a closed range test which enables us to find the explicit solution of the optimal control problem (2.1).

Lemma 16. *If (A, B) is exponentially stabilizable, then $\text{ran}[A \ B]$ is closed.*

Proof. Suppose $\begin{bmatrix} z \\ v \end{bmatrix} \in \overline{\text{ran}} \begin{bmatrix} A^* \\ B^* \end{bmatrix}$, then there exists a sequence $(w_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset D(A^*)$ such that $\begin{bmatrix} A^* \\ B^* \end{bmatrix} w_n \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} z \\ v \end{bmatrix}$ in $\mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{U}$. Set $z_n := A^*w_n$ and $v_n := B^*w_n$.

For any $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ and $u \in L^2([0, T], \mathcal{U})$, let x denote the solution of

$$\dot{x} = Ax + Bu, \quad x(0) = x_0 \in \mathcal{H}.$$

We then compute that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle z_n, x(t) \rangle + 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle v_n, u(t) \rangle dt &= \int_0^T 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle w_n, Ax(t) + Bu(t) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1^d, \mathcal{H}_{-1}} dt \\ &= 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle w_n, x(T) - x_0 \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

Clearly, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have that

$$\int_0^T 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle z_n, x(t) \rangle + 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle v_n, u(t) \rangle dt \rightarrow \int_0^T 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle z, x(t) \rangle + 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle v, u(t) \rangle dt.$$

So, putting together the two previous relations, we deduce that $2 \operatorname{Re}\langle w_n, x(T) - x_0 \rangle$ will necessarily converge to some real number as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

We claim that $x(T) - x_0$ can actually attain any value in \mathcal{H} . In fact, since (A, B) is exponentially stabilizable, there exists some $K \in L(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{U})$ such that $A + BK$ generates an exponentially stable semigroup \mathcal{T}^{cl} . So, for sufficiently large $T > 0$, $\operatorname{ran}(\mathcal{T}_T^{cl} - I) = \mathcal{H}$, since $\mathcal{T}_T^{cl} - I$ is an invertible operator whose inverse is given by the Neumann series $-\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (\mathcal{T}_T^{cl})^i$. Then, for any $q \in \mathcal{H}$, there exists $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $x(T) - x_0 = \mathcal{T}_T^{cl} x_0 - x_0 = q$, where u is given by $u(t) := K \mathcal{T}_t^{cl} x_0$.

We thus have proved that, for any $q \in \mathcal{H}$, $2 \operatorname{Re}\langle q, w_n \rangle$ will converge to some real number as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Let us denote such value by $f(q)$. The function f is linear (over the field \mathbb{R}) and real. In order to apply the Riesz's representation theorem, we need to ensure that f is a bounded linear functional (over the field \mathbb{R}). It turns out that the boundedness of f is also a consequence of the exponential stabilizability of (A, B) . Indeed, fix some $T > 0$ so that $\mathcal{T}_T^{cl} - I$ is invertible. Then there exists some constants $M_1, M_2 > 0$ such that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle w_n, \mathcal{T}_T^{cl} x_0 - x_0 \rangle &= \int_0^T 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle w_n, (A + BK) \mathcal{T}_t^{cl} x_0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_1^d, \mathcal{H}_{-1}} dt \\ &= \int_0^T 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle z_n, \mathcal{T}_t^{cl} x_0 \rangle + 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle v_n, K \mathcal{T}_t^{cl} x_0 \rangle dt \leq \int_0^T M_1 \|\mathcal{T}_t^{cl} x_0\| dt \\ &\leq M_2 \|x_0\| \leq M_2 \|(\mathcal{T}_T^{cl} - I)^{-1}\| \|\mathcal{T}_T^{cl} x_0 - x_0\|. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\operatorname{ran}(\mathcal{T}_T^{cl} - I) = \mathcal{H}$, we have

$$f(q) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle w_n, q \rangle \leq C_2 \|(\mathcal{T}_T^{cl} - I)^{-1}\| \|q\|, \quad \forall q \in \mathcal{H}.$$

So f is bounded. By Theorem 24 in Appendix A, we know that $f(q) = 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle q, w \rangle$ for some $w \in \mathcal{H}$. By noticing that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle w_n, q \rangle = 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle w, q \rangle$ and $\operatorname{Re}\langle w, iq \rangle = \operatorname{Im}\langle w, q \rangle$, we know that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle w_n, q \rangle = \langle w, q \rangle$ for any $q \in \mathcal{H}$. So we have that $w_n \rightarrow w$ weakly in \mathcal{H} . The above equality also implies that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle A^* w_n, q \rangle = \langle w, Aq \rangle = \langle A^* w, q \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{-1}^d, \mathcal{H}_1}$ for any $q \in D(A)$, and thus $A^* w_n \rightarrow A^* w$ weakly in \mathcal{H}_{-1}^d as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By the definition of $(w_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, we have that $A^* w_n \rightarrow z$ (strongly) as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in \mathcal{H} , thus also in \mathcal{H}_{-1}^d . So, $z = A^* w \in \mathcal{H}$ and $w \in D(A^*)$. We now prove that $B^* w = v$. As mentioned earlier, $w_n \rightarrow w$ weakly in \mathcal{H} , so $B^* w_n \rightarrow B^* w$ weakly in \mathcal{U} . By definition, we have that $B^* w_n \rightarrow v$ (strongly) in \mathcal{U} , thus we deduce that $B^* w = v$ and $\begin{bmatrix} z \\ v \end{bmatrix} \in \operatorname{ran} \begin{bmatrix} A^* \\ B^* \end{bmatrix}$. So, $\operatorname{ran} \begin{bmatrix} A^* \\ B^* \end{bmatrix}$ is closed. By the closed graph theorem, $\operatorname{ran}[A \ B]$ is closed. \square

4.2. Properties of the evolution operator

In this subsection, we will make some simplifications to OCP (2.1) and prove two crucial estimates. From now on, we assume that the pair (A, C) is exponentially detectable and the pair (A, B) is exponentially stabilizable.

Without loss of generality, we may also assume that $K = I$. Otherwise, we may define a new inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\text{new}}$ on \mathcal{U} by

$$\langle u_1, u_2 \rangle_{\text{new}} = \langle (K^*K)^{\frac{1}{2}}u_1, (K^*K)^{\frac{1}{2}}u_2 \rangle, \quad \forall u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{U}.$$

We now endow \mathcal{U} with the new inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\text{new}}$. Since the norm induced by this inner product is equivalent to the standard norm in \mathcal{U} , we still have that $B \in L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{H})$. The running cost ℓ shall now be recast as

$$\ell(x, u) := \|Cx\|^2 + \|u\|_{\text{new}}^2 + 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle z, x \rangle + 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle (K^*K)^{-1}v, u \rangle_{\text{new}}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{\text{new}}$ is the norm on \mathcal{U} induced by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\text{new}}$.

By Lemma 3, there exists a unique minimizer (x_e, u_e) of the optimal steady state problem (2.4). By (2.5) and Lemma 16, we have that

$$\begin{bmatrix} z + C^*Cx_e \\ v + u_e \end{bmatrix} \in \ker[A \ B]^\perp = \overline{\operatorname{ran}} \begin{bmatrix} A^* \\ B^* \end{bmatrix} = \operatorname{ran} \begin{bmatrix} A^* \\ B^* \end{bmatrix}.$$

So, there exists some $w \in D(A^*)$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} A^*w \\ B^*w \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} z + C^*Cx_e \\ v + u_e \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.2)$$

Remark 17. In the works based on the study of the hyperbolicity of the optimality system, e.g., [23, 27, 29], the vector w actually corresponds to the optimal adjoint steady state. In our setting, however, we have to use different techniques to ensure the existence of w . In particular, unlike [27, 29], the existence of a solution to the optimal steady state problem does not imply the existence of such a vector w (we provide a counterexample in Appendix B). Instead, the existence of w is now guaranteed by the closed range condition of Lemma 16. Besides, in [27, 29] the vector w is understood as the Lagrange multiplier (see Appendix B), it is characterized by

$$\begin{bmatrix} A^*w \\ BB^*w \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} z + C^*Cx_e \\ Bv + BK^*Ku_e \end{bmatrix}.$$

Compared to (4.2), in our setting we do not have B applied to the second line. This is essential for the identity (4.4), which transforms the linear terms of the running cost ℓ into a terminal cost $2 \operatorname{Re}\langle w, x(T) \rangle$, as introduced below.

At this moment, we assume that the optimal steady state $(x_e, u_e) = (0, 0)$. Let P be the solution of the differential Riccati equation (2.10) with $P(0) = 0$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\langle P(T-t)x(t), x(t) \rangle}{dt} &= -\langle P'(T-t)x(t), x(t) \rangle \\ &\quad + 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle P(T-t)x(t), Ax(t) \rangle + 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle B^*P(T-t)x(t), u(t) \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

We now apply a change of variable $\tilde{u}(t) := u(t) + BB^*P(T-t)x(t)$. By combining (2.11) and (4.3), we get the identity

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^T \ell(x(t), u(t)) dt &= \int_0^T (\|Cx(t)\|^2 + \|u(t)\|^2 + 2\operatorname{Re}\langle z, x(t) \rangle + 2\operatorname{Re}\langle v, u(t) \rangle) dt \\
&= \int_0^T (2\operatorname{Re}\langle B^*P(T-t)x(t), u(t) \rangle + \|B^*P(T-t)x(t)\|^2 + \|u(t)\|^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{d\langle P(T-t)x(t), x(t) \rangle}{dt} + 2\operatorname{Re}\langle w, Ax(t) + Bu(t) \rangle) dt \\
&= \int_0^T \|\tilde{u}(t)\|^2 dt + \langle P(T)x_0, x_0 \rangle + 2\operatorname{Re}\langle w, x(T) \rangle - 2\operatorname{Re}\langle w, x_0 \rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

We notice that x and \tilde{u} are related by the following relation

$$\dot{x}(t) = (A - BB^*P(T-t))x(t) + B\tilde{u}(t). \tag{4.5}$$

Since P is a continuous function with respect to the strong topology, by Proposition 12 we deduce that problem (4.5) is well posed. Now, for any $\tau \in [0, T]$, consider the evolution problem

$$\dot{x}(t) = (A - BB^*P(T-t))x(t), \quad x(\tau) = x_0 \in \mathcal{H}, \quad t \in [\tau, T], \tag{4.6}$$

and its corresponding evolution operator $U_T(t, \tau) : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$, that is, $U_T(t, \tau)$ is defined by

$$U_T(t, \tau)x_0 := x(t)$$

with $x(t)$ being the solution of (4.6) at $t \in [\tau, T]$. Then, for each $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$, $U_T(t, \tau)x_0$ satisfies

$$\frac{dU_T(t, \tau)x_0}{dt} = (A - BB^*P(T-t))U_T(t, \tau)x_0, \quad U_T(\tau, \tau)x_0 = x_0.$$

Next, we prove two crucial properties of the evolution operator U_T .

Lemma 18. (*Exponential convergence of U_T*) *There exist some positive constants M, k such that*

$$\|U_T(t, \tau)\| \leq Me^{-k(t-\tau)} \tag{4.7}$$

holds for all possible values of τ, t, T with $0 \leq \tau \leq t \leq T$.

Proof. Suppose $\tau, t, T \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $0 \leq \tau \leq t \leq T$. By Proposition 11, there exist $M, \mu > 0$ such that $\|P(t) - P_{\min}\| \leq Me^{-\mu t}$. For any $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$, let x be the solution to (4.6) and let $y(t) := e^{\lambda(t-\tau)}x(t)$ with some sufficiently small $\lambda > 0$ so that $A - BB^*P_{\min} + \lambda I$ generates an exponentially stable semigroup with growth bound $-\beta < 0$, which is denoted by \mathcal{T}^{cl} . A straightforward computation leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{y}(t) &= (A - BB^*P_{\min} + \lambda I)y(t) + (BB^*P_{\min} - BB^*P(T-t))y(t) \\
y(t) &= \mathcal{T}_{t-\tau}^{cl}y(\tau) + \int_{\tau}^t \mathcal{T}_{t-s}^{cl}(BB^*P_{\min} - BB^*P(T-s))y(s) ds
\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

for all $t \in [\tau, T]$. So, there exist constants M_1 and $M_2 > 0$ such that,

$$\begin{aligned} \|y(t)\| &\leq M_1 \|y(\tau)\| + \int_{\tau}^t M_2 e^{-\mu(T-s)} \|y(s)\| ds \\ &\leq M_1 \|x_0\| + M_2 e^{-\mu(T-t)} \int_{\tau}^t \|y(s)\| ds. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

Now fix some constant $S > 0$ such that $M_2 e^{-\mu S} < \lambda$.

We first discuss the case $\tau \geq T - S$. Referring to (4.9), we can further obtain

$$\|y(t)\| \leq M_1 \|x_0\| + M_2 \int_{\tau}^t \|y(s)\| ds. \quad (4.10)$$

Since $t - \tau \leq S$, applying Grönwall's inequality to (4.10) we get

$$\|y(t)\| \leq M_1 \|x_0\| e^{M_2(t-\tau)} \leq M_1 e^{M_2 S} \|x_0\|. \quad (4.11)$$

So, we deduce that

$$\|U_T(t, \tau)x_0\| = \|x(t)\| \leq \|y(t)\| \leq M_1 e^{(M_2+1)S} e^{-(t-\tau)} \|x_0\|, \quad (4.12)$$

which proves condition (4.7) with suitable coefficients.

We now consider the case $\tau < T - S$. If $t \in [\tau, T - S]$, from (4.9) we can further obtain

$$\|y(t)\| \leq M_1 \|x_0\| + M_2 e^{-\mu S} \int_{\tau}^t \|y(s)\| ds. \quad (4.13)$$

Applying Grönwall's inequality to (4.13), we have

$$\|y(t)\| \leq M_1 \|x_0\| e^{M_2 e^{-\mu S}(t-\tau)}.$$

We thus get that

$$\|x(t)\| = e^{-\lambda(t-\tau)} \|y(t)\| \leq M_1 \|x_0\| e^{(M_2 e^{-\mu S} - \lambda)(t-\tau)}. \quad (4.14)$$

Since $M_2 e^{-\mu S} - \lambda < 0$, we conclude that (4.7) is satisfied with suitable coefficients also in this case. It remains to prove (4.7) in the case $\tau < T - S$ and $t \in (T - S, T]$. From the definition of U_T , we know that

$$U_T(t, \tau) = U_{T-\tau}(t - \tau, 0) = U_S(S - T + t, 0) U_{T-\tau}(T - S - \tau, 0). \quad (4.15)$$

Notice that $U_S(S - T + t, 0)$ satisfies the estimate (4.12), so we have

$$\|U_S(S - T + t, 0)\| \leq M_1 e^{(M_2+1)S} e^{-(S-T+t)} \|x_0\| \leq M_1 e^{(M_2+1)S} \|x_0\|. \quad (4.16)$$

It is also clear that $U_{T-\tau}(T - S - \tau, 0)$ satisfies the estimate (4.14), so we have

$$\|U_{T-\tau}(T - S - \tau, 0)\| \leq M_1 e^{(M_2 e^{-\mu S} - \lambda)(T - S - \tau)} \|x_0\| \leq M_1 e^{(M_2 e^{-\mu S} - \lambda)(t - S - \tau)} \|x_0\|. \quad (4.17)$$

Combining (4.15)-(4.17), we deduce that (4.7) is satisfied also in this case with suitable coefficients M and k .

By choosing the largest M and the smallest k among all the 3 cases, we conclude that (4.7) holds for all possible values of τ, t, T such that $0 \leq \tau \leq t \leq T$. \square

Lemma 19. *The operators $\Phi_t^T : L^2([0, t], \mathcal{U}) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ defined by*

$$\Phi_t^T(\tilde{u}) := \int_0^t U_T(t, s) B \tilde{u}(s) ds$$

are uniformly bounded in norm for all possible values of t, T with $0 \leq t \leq T$.

Proof. By Lemma 18 and Hölder's inequality, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi_t^T(\tilde{u})\| &: \leq \int_0^t \|U_T(t, s)\| \|B\tilde{u}(s)\| ds \\ &\leq \left(\int_0^t M^2 e^{-2k(t-s)} ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^t \|B\|^2 \|\tilde{u}(s)\|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq M \|B\| \left(\frac{1 - e^{-2kt}}{2k} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\tilde{u}\| \leq M \|B\| \left(\frac{1}{2k} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\tilde{u}\| \end{aligned}$$

where M and k are the coefficients given in Lemma 18. So, we conclude that Φ_t^T are uniformly bounded in norm for all possible values of t and T with $0 \leq t \leq T$. \square

4.3. Explicit solutions of the optimal control

In this subsection, we give an explicit representation of the optimal control.

Lemma 20. *Let $\hat{U}_T(t, \tau)$ be defined as the evolution operator of the problem*

$$\dot{z}(t) = (A^* - P(t)BB^*)z(t), \quad z(\tau) = x_0 \in \mathcal{H}, \quad t \in [\tau, T] \quad (4.18)$$

where P is the solution of (2.10) with $P(0) = 0$. Then the optimal control of problem (2.1) is given in a feedback form by

$$u^*(t) = -B^*P(T-t)(x^*(t) - x_e) - B^*\hat{U}_T(T-t, 0)w + u_e, \quad (4.19)$$

where w is the vector given in (4.2).

Proof. We first assume the optimal steady state $(x_e, u_e) = (0, 0)$ and $K = I$. By Remark 9 and Proposition 12, since $w \in D(A^*)$, we have

$$\hat{U}_T(\cdot, 0)w \in C([0, T], D(A^*)) \cap C^1([0, T], \mathcal{H}).$$

From (4.22) we deduce that

$$\frac{d\hat{U}_T(T-t, 0)w}{dt} = -(A^* - P(T-t)BB^*)\hat{U}_T(T-t, 0)w.$$

Let x be any solution of problem (2.3) with initial condition $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle x(T), w \rangle - 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle x_0, \hat{U}_T(T, 0)w \rangle \\
&= 2 \int_0^T \frac{d \operatorname{Re} \langle x(t), \hat{U}_T(T-t, 0)w \rangle}{dt} dt \\
&= \int_0^T 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle Ax(t) + Bu(t), \hat{U}_T(T-t, 0)w \rangle_{H^{-1}, H^d} dt \\
&\quad + 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle x(t), -(A^* - P(T-t)BB^*)\hat{U}_T(T-t, 0)w \rangle dt \\
&= \int_0^T 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle u(t), B^*\hat{U}_T(T-t, 0)w \rangle \\
&\quad + 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle B^*P(T-t)x(t), B^*\hat{U}_T(T-t, 0)w \rangle dt.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

Combining (4.4) and (4.20), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^T \ell(x(t), u(t)) dt \\
&= \int_0^T \|u(t) + B^*P(T-t)x(t)\|^2 dt + \langle P(T)x_0, x_0 \rangle + 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle w, x(T) - x_0 \rangle \\
&= \int_0^T \|u(t) + B^*P(T-t)x(t)\|^2 + 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle u(t), B^*\hat{U}_T(T-t, 0)w \rangle \\
&\quad + 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle B^*P(T-t)x(t), B^*\hat{U}_T(T-t, 0)w \rangle dt + M_0 \\
&= \int_0^T \|u(t) + B^*P(T-t)x(t) + B^*\hat{U}_T(T-t, 0)w\|^2 dt + M
\end{aligned}$$

where $M_0, M \in \mathbb{R}$ are constants independent of u given by

$$\begin{aligned}
M_0 &:= \langle P(T)x_0, x_0 \rangle - 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle w, x_0 \rangle + 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle x_0, \hat{U}_T(T, 0)w \rangle, \\
M &:= M_0 - \int_0^T \|B^*\hat{U}_T(T-t, 0)w\|^2 dt.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves that, if (4.19) can give a solution to problem (2.3) in mild sense, then this solution is optimal. Moreover, the closed loop trajectory (if it exists) given by the feedback law (4.19) must satisfy

$$\dot{x}^*(t) = (A - BB^*P(T-t))x^*(t) - BB^*\hat{U}_T(T-t, 0)w, \quad x^*(0) = x_0 \in \mathcal{H}, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

By Proposition 12, this problem admits a unique solution $x^* \in L^2([0, T], \mathcal{H})$. Thus, (4.19) provides the optimal solution of (2.3).

If $(x_e, u_e) \neq (0, 0)$, by Lemma 4, the optimal optimal trajectory x^* satisfies

$$\frac{dx^*}{dt}(t) = \frac{d(x^* - x_e)}{dt}(t) = (A - BB^*P(T-t))(x^*(t) - x_e) - BB^*\hat{U}_T(T-t, 0)w.$$

Simple calculation shows that the optimal control u^* is given by

$$u^*(t) = -B^*P(T-t)(x^*(t) - x_e) - B^*\hat{U}_T(T-t, 0)w + u_e.$$

□

Remark 21. Until now, we solve the explicit form of the optimal control when $K = I$. For the case $K \neq I$, the optimal control u^* is given as

$$u^*(t) = -(K^*K)^{-1}B^*P(T-t)(x^*(t) - x_e) - (K^*K)^{-1}B^*\hat{U}_T(T-t, 0)w + u_e,$$

where P is the solution of the differential Riccati equation

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dP}{dt} - A^*P - PA + PB(K^*K)^{-1}B^*P - C^*C = 0 \\ P(0) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (4.21)$$

and $\hat{U}_T(t, \tau)$ is the evolution operator of the problem

$$\dot{z}(t) = (A^* - P(t)B(K^*K)^{-1}B^*)z(t), \quad z(\tau) = x_0 \in \mathcal{H}, \quad t \in [\tau, T]. \quad (4.22)$$

4.4. Proof of Theorem 6

In this subsection, we prove our main result.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that the unique optimal steady state of problem (2.4) is at $(0, 0)$ and $K = I$. Fix \mathcal{N} to be some bounded neighborhood of $x_e = 0$ and $T > 0$. Now let (x^*, u^*) denote the optimal pair of problem (2.1) corresponding to the initial condition $x_0 \in \mathcal{H}$. Let

$$\tilde{u}^*(t) := u^*(t) + B^*P(T-t)x^*(t) = -B^*\hat{U}_T(T-t, 0)w.$$

By definition of \tilde{u}^* , \tilde{u}^* is the optimal control of our modified system (4.5). Recall from (4.4) that

$$\int_0^T \ell(x^*(t), u^*(t)) dt = \int_0^T \|\tilde{u}^*(t)\|^2 dt + \langle P(T)x_0, x_0 \rangle + 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle w, x^*(T) - x_0 \rangle. \quad (4.23)$$

For an arbitrary $T_0 \in [0, T]$, consider the modified input function defined by

$$\tilde{u}(t) := \begin{cases} 0 & t \in [0, T_0) \\ \tilde{u}^*(t) & t \in [T_0, T]. \end{cases}$$

Denote the solution of (4.5) corresponding to the modified input $\tilde{u}(t)$ by $x(t)$, then we can recover the input u of the original system (2.3) which generates the same trajectory x by setting

$$u(t) := \begin{cases} -B^*P(T-t)x(t) & t \in [0, T_0) \\ -B^*P(T-t)x(t) - B^*\hat{U}_T(T-t, 0)w & t \in [T_0, T]. \end{cases}$$

Now the cost functional is given by

$$\int_0^T \ell(x(t), u(t)) dt = \int_{T_0}^T \|\tilde{u}^*(t)\|^2 dt + \langle P(T)x_0, x_0 \rangle + 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle w, x(T) - x_0 \rangle, \quad (4.24)$$

where $x(T) = x^*(T) - U_T(T, T_0)\Phi_{T_0}^T(\tilde{u}^*)$. In fact, by the standard properties of the evolution system (4.5), we have that

$$x^*(T_0) - x(T_0) = \int_0^{T_0} U_T(T_0, s)B\tilde{u}^*(s)ds = \Phi_{T_0}^T(\tilde{u}^*),$$

and thus

$$x^*(T) - x(T) = U_T(T, T_0)(x^*(T_0) - x(T_0)) = U_T(T, T_0)\Phi_{T_0}^T(\tilde{u}^*).$$

We now consider the difference between (4.24) and (4.23), and by Lemma 18 and Lemma 19, we deduce the existence of some constant $M > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{u}^*\|_{L^2([0, T_0], \mathcal{U})}^2 &:= \int_0^{T_0} \|\tilde{u}^*(t)\|^2 dt \leq 2 \operatorname{Re} \langle w, -U_T(T, T_0)\Phi_{T_0}^T(\tilde{u}^*) \rangle \\ &\leq M e^{-k(T-T_0)} \|\tilde{u}^*\|_{L^2([0, T_0], \mathcal{U})}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

That is, $\|\tilde{u}^*\|_{L^2([0, T_0], \mathcal{U})} \leq M e^{-k(T-T_0)}$. Since $x^*(T_0) = U_T(T_0, 0)x^*(0) + \Phi_{T_0}^T(\tilde{u}^*)$, we now have that, for some $M > 0$,

$$\|x^*(T_0)\| \leq M(e^{-kT_0}\|x_0\| + e^{-k(T-T_0)}). \quad (4.26)$$

Recall from Lemma 20 that $u^*(t) = -B^*P(T-t)x^*(t) - B^*\hat{U}_T(T-t, 0)w$. We now prove that also u^* satisfies an estimate like (4.26). Indeed, since P is continuous in strong topology and P converges to P_{\min} strongly as $t \rightarrow \infty$, for any $x \in \mathcal{H}$ we have that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} P(t)x = 0, \text{ and } \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} P(t)x = P_{\min}x.$$

By the uniform boundedness principle, there exists some constant $M > 0$ such that

$$\|P(t)\| < M, \quad \forall t \in [0, \infty). \quad (4.27)$$

On the other hand, we claim that, for any possible values of τ, t, T with $0 \leq \tau \leq t \leq T$, the operator \hat{U}_T satisfies the estimate

$$\|\hat{U}_T(t, \tau)\| \leq M e^{-k(t-\tau)} \quad (4.28)$$

with some constants $M, k > 0$. The proof will follow similar lines as the one of Lemma 18.

Recall that the evolution system corresponding to $\hat{U}_T(\cdot, \tau)$ is

$$\dot{z}(t) = (A^* - P(t)BB^*)z(t), \quad z(\tau) = x_0, \quad \tau \leq t \leq T.$$

Let $y(t) := e^{\lambda(t-\tau)}z(t)$ with some sufficiently small $\lambda > 0$ so that $A - BB^*P_{\min} + \lambda I$ generates an exponentially stable semigroup T^{cl} with growth bound $-\beta < 0$.

Then $A^* - P_{\min}BB^* + \lambda I$ generates the adjoint semigroup $(T^{cl})^*$ whose growth bound is also $-\beta$. Similar to (4.8) and (4.9), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} y(t) &= (\mathcal{T}_{t-\tau}^{cl})^* y(\tau) + \int_{\tau}^t (\mathcal{T}_{t-s}^{cl})^* (P_{\min} - P(s))BB^* y(s) ds \\ \|y(t)\| &\leq M_1 \|x_0\| + M_2 e^{-\mu\tau} \int_{\tau}^t \|y(s)\| ds, \end{aligned} \quad (4.29)$$

with some constants $M_1, M_2 > 0$. Now fix some $S > 0$ such that $M_2 e^{-\mu S} < \lambda$. In a similar manner as in the proof of Lemma 18, we can easily prove that if $\tau \geq S$, then (4.28) holds with some suitable coefficients M, k independent of T .

For the case $\tau < S$ and $t \leq S$, observe from (4.29) that

$$\|y(t)\| \leq M_1 \|x_0\| + M_2 \int_{\tau}^t \|y(s)\| ds$$

holds for some constants $M_1, M_2 > 0$. By Grönwall's inequality, we have

$$\|\hat{U}_T(t, \tau)x_0\| \leq \|y(t)\| \leq M_1 \|x_0\| e^{M_2(t-\tau)} \leq M_1 \|x_0\| e^{-(t-\tau)} e^{(M_2+1)S}. \quad (4.30)$$

This implies that (4.28) holds with some suitable coefficients M, k .

Finally, if $t > S$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{U}_T(t, \tau)\| &= \|\hat{U}_T(t, S)\hat{U}_T(S, \tau)\| \\ &\leq M e^{-k(t-S)} \|\hat{U}_T(S, \tau)\| = M e^{-k(t-\tau)} e^{kS} \|\hat{U}_T(S, \tau)\| \end{aligned} \quad (4.31)$$

with some $M, k > 0$, since $\hat{U}_T(t, \tau)$ satisfies the estimate of the first case. By choosing $t = S$ in (4.30), we get that

$$\|\hat{U}_T(S, \tau)x_0\| \leq M_1 \|x_0\| e^{M_2(S-\tau)} \leq M_1 \|x_0\| e^{M_2 S}.$$

That is, $\hat{U}_T(S, \tau)$ is uniformly bounded in norm by some constant independent of τ and T . Combining this with (4.31), we prove the estimate (4.28) holds also for the case $\tau < S$ and $t > S$.

Finally, since $u^*(t) = -B^*P(T-t)x^*(t) - B^*\hat{U}_T(T-t, 0)w$, combining (4.26)-(4.28) gives

$$\|u^*(t)\| \leq M_1 (e^{-kt} \|x_0\| + e^{-k(T-t)}) + M_2 e^{-k(T-t)} \quad (4.32)$$

for some sufficiently large constants $M_1, M_2 > 0$. Since $x_0 \in \mathcal{N}$ and \mathcal{N} is a bounded neighborhood of $x_e = 0$, (4.26) and (4.32) imply our main theorem. \square

5. APPLICATIONS

In this section, we apply our main result to two examples.

Example 22. (The heat equation) Let $\mathcal{H} = L^2(0, 1)$ endowed with the L^2 inner product. We define $A : D(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} D(A) &= H^2(0, 1) \cap H_0^1(0, 1), \\ \text{and } Ah &= \frac{d^2 h}{dx^2}, \quad \forall h \in D(A), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} H_0^1(0, 1) &:= \left\{ f \in L^2[0, 1] \mid \frac{df}{dx} \in L^2[0, 1], f(0) = f(1) = 0 \right\}, \\ \text{and } H^2(0, 1) &:= \left\{ f \in L^2[0, 1] \mid \frac{df}{dx}, \frac{d^2 f}{dx^2} \in L^2[0, 1] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then A generates a C_0 -semigroup \mathcal{T} on \mathcal{H} . See, e.g., [30, Example 2.6.8]. Let $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{C}$. We define $B : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ and $C : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} Bu &= b(x)u, & Ch(x) &= \langle h(x), c(x) \rangle, \\ \text{where } b(x) &= \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \text{Id}_{[x_0-\varepsilon, x_0+\varepsilon]}(x), \\ c(x) &= \frac{1}{2v} \text{Id}_{[x_1-v, x_1+v]}(x) \end{aligned}$$

where Id_S is the characteristic function of a set S and $v, \varepsilon > 0$ are sufficiently small constants. Clearly, B and C are bounded operators.

This functional framework is suitable to describe the following physical system: Consider a metal slab of length one with no heat flow at each end. Suppose we can act on the system by means of a point actuator around a point $x_0 \in (0, 1)$ to heat or cool this bar, and we can use a point sensor around a point $x_1 \in (0, 1)$ to measure the temperature. This model is described by the PDE

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial h}{\partial t}(x, t) = \frac{\partial^2 h}{\partial x^2}(x, t) + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \text{Id}_{[x_0-\varepsilon, x_0+\varepsilon]}(x)u(t), \\ h(x, 0) = h_0(x), \\ \frac{\partial h}{\partial x}(0, t) = \frac{\partial h}{\partial x}(1, t) = 0, \\ y(t) = \frac{1}{2v} \int_{x_1-v}^{x_1+v} h(x, t) dx. \end{cases}$$

Consider the problem of minimizing following running cost

$$\ell(h, u) := \|Ch - y_0\|^2 + \|u\|^2$$

with $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. That is, our goal is to constantly keep the temperature around x_1 close to y_0 , but we can only influence the temperature of this slab through the part close to point x_0 .

By [5, Lemma 2.4.7 and Theorem 8.1.6], (A, B) is exponentially stabilizable and (A, C) is exponentially detectable. We can thus apply Theorem 6, and conclude that the optimal control problem (2.1) with running cost ℓ satisfies the exponential turnpike property at the optimal steady state given by Remark 3. Specifically, given a bounded set $\mathcal{N} \in L^2(0, 1)$, the optimal trajectory h^* corresponding to initial condition $h_0 \in \mathcal{N}$ satisfies

$$\|Ch^*(\cdot, t) - y_0\| \leq M(e^{-kt} + e^{-k(T-t)})$$

for some constants $M, K > 0$ for any $t \in [0, T]$. This implies that the average temperature on $[x_1 - v, x_1 + v]$ will be close to y_0 for most of the time. Similarly, the optimal control u^* will stay close to a specific value for most of the time horizon. The setting of this example can be generalized to the multidimensional case as well, again relying on [5, Theorem 8.1.6].

Example 23. (Elastic string) Let $\mathcal{H} = H_0^1(0, 1) \times L^2[0, 1]$, then \mathcal{H} is a Hilbert space with respect to the inner product

$$\left\langle \begin{bmatrix} f_1 \\ g_1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} f_2 \\ g_2 \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle := \int_0^1 \frac{df_1}{dx}(s) \overline{\frac{df_2}{dx}(s)} + g_1(s) \overline{g_2(s)} ds. \quad (5.1)$$

$$(5.2)$$

Let $A : D(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be defined on $D(A) = [H^2(0, 1) \cap H_0^1(0, 1)] \times H_0^1(0, 1)$ by

$$A \begin{bmatrix} f \\ g \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} g \\ \frac{d^2 f}{dx^2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \forall \begin{bmatrix} f \\ g \end{bmatrix} \in D(A).$$

Then A generates a C_0 -semigroup \mathcal{T} on \mathcal{H} . It is well-known that this semigroup is a diagonalizable semigroup with pure imaginary eigenvalues. See [30, Example 2.7.13] for reference.

Denote $\mathcal{U} = L^2(0, 1)$, take $\xi, \eta \in [0, 1]$ with $\xi < \eta$ and consider the control operator $B \in L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{H})$ defined by

$$Bu := \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \text{Id}_{[\xi, \eta]} u \end{bmatrix}, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{U}.$$

It is well-known that the pair (A, B) defined above is exactly controllable, thus exponentially stabilizable. See [30, Example 11.2.2].

The previous functional framework is well-suited to describe the locally distributed control of a string equation with Dirichlet boundary conditions

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial t^2}(x, t) = \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x^2}(x, t) + \text{Id}_{[\xi, \eta]} u(x, t), \\ f(x, 0) = f_0(x), \quad \frac{df}{dt}(x, 0) = g_0(x), \quad \begin{bmatrix} f_0 \\ g_0 \end{bmatrix} \in D(A), \\ f(0, t) = f(1, t) = 0 \end{cases}$$

as a first-order linear control system on \mathcal{H} of the form (2.3). We now define the observation operator $C : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow L^2(0, 1)$ by

$$C \begin{bmatrix} f \\ g \end{bmatrix} := g, \quad \forall \begin{bmatrix} f \\ g \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{H}$$

and introduce the running cost ℓ by

$$\ell \left(\begin{bmatrix} f \\ g \end{bmatrix}, u \right) := \left\| C \begin{bmatrix} f \\ g \end{bmatrix} \right\|^2 + \|u - u_0\|^2, \quad \forall \begin{bmatrix} f \\ g \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{H},$$

for some possibly nonzero $u_0 \in L^2(0, 1)$. This choice of ℓ entails that we want to stabilize the string, while keeping the control as close as possible to the target value u_0 .

In other words, given a time horizon $T > 0$, we want to minimize the cost functional

$$J^T(f, u) := \int_0^T \int_0^1 \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial t}(x, t) \right)^2 + (u(x, t) - u_0(x))^2 dx dt.$$

Now, [30, Theorem 7.4.1] ensures that the pair (A, C) is exactly observable, thus it is exponentially detectable. Thanks to Theorem 6, we deduce that the optimal control problem (2.1) satisfies the exponential turnpike property at the optimal steady state given by Remark 3. In particular, if we let f^* and u^* denote the optimal trajectory and optimal control minimizing J^T , then the turnpike property implies that $\frac{df}{dt}(\cdot, t)$ will be close to 0 in the L^2 sense for most of the time horizon, and $f^*(\cdot, t)$ and $u^*(\cdot, t)$ will stay close to the optimal steady state predicted by Remark 3 with respect to the inner product (5.1) and L^2 inner product, respectively. This example can be also generalized to the multidimensional case. See [30, Theorem 7.4.1].

REFERENCES

- [1] B. D. Anderson and P. V. Kokotovic. Optimal control problems over large time intervals. Automatica, 23(3):355–363, 1987.
- [2] A. Bensoussan, G. Prato, M. C. Delfour, and S. K. Mitter. Representation and control of infinite dimensional systems. Systems & control. Birkhäuser, Boston, 2nd ed. edition, 2007.
- [3] D. A. Carlson. The existence of catching-up optimal solutions for a class of infinite horizon optimal control problems with time delay. SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 28(2):402–422, 1990.
- [4] D. A. Carlson, A. Haurie, and A. Jabrane. Existence of overtaking solutions to infinite dimensional control problems on unbounded time intervals. SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 25(6):1517–1541, 1987.
- [5] R. F. Curtain and H. Zwart. An introduction to infinite-dimensional linear systems theory, volume 21. Springer Science & Business Media, 1995.
- [6] T. Damm, L. Grüne, M. Stieler, and K. Worthmann. An exponential turnpike theorem for dissipative discrete time optimal control problems. SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 52(3):1935–1957, 2014.
- [7] T. Damm, L. Grüne, M. Stieler, and K. Worthmann. An exponential turnpike theorem for dissipative discrete time optimal control problems. SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 52(3):1935–1957, 2014.
- [8] T. Faulwasser, M. Korda, C. N. Jones, and D. Bonvin. On turnpike and dissipativity properties of continuous-time optimal control problems. Automatica, 81:297–304, 2017.
- [9] L. Grüne. Economic receding horizon control without terminal constraints. Automatica, 49(3):725–734, 2013.
- [10] L. Grüne and R. Guglielmi. Turnpike properties and strict dissipativity for discrete time linear quadratic optimal control problems. SIAM J. Cont. Optim., 56(2):1282–1302, 2018.
- [11] L. Grüne and R. Guglielmi. On the relation between turnpike properties and dissipativity for continuous time linear quadratic optimal control problems. Mathematical Control & Related Fields, 11(1):169, 2021.
- [12] L. Grüne and M. A. Müller. On the relation between strict dissipativity and the turnpike property. Syst. Contr. Lett., 90:45–53, 2016.
- [13] L. Grüne, F. Philipp, and M. Schaller. Strict dissipativity for generalized linear-quadratic problems in infinite dimensions. 2022. Preprint, arXiv:2202.08178.
- [14] L. Grüne. Approximation properties of receding horizon optimal control. Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung, 118:3–37, 03 2016.
- [15] L. Grüne. Dissipativity and optimal control: Examining the turnpike phenomenon. IEEE Control Systems Magazine, 42(2):74–87, 2022.
- [16] L. Grüne and M. A. Müller. On the relation between strict dissipativity and turnpike properties. Systems & Control Letters, 90:45–53, 2016.
- [17] A. Ibañez. Optimal control of the lotka–volterra system: turnpike property and numerical simulations. Journal of Biological Dynamics, 11(1):25–41, 2017. PMID: 27642712.
- [18] J. L. Lions. Optimal control of systems governed by partial differential equations. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften in Einzeldarstellungen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Anwendungsgebiete ; Bd. 170. Springer, Berlin, 1971.
- [19] Lou, Hongwei and Wang, Weihai. Turnpike properties of optimal relaxed control problems. ESAIM: COCV, 25:74, 2019.
- [20] L. W. McKenzie. Chapter 26 optimal economic growth, turnpike theorems and comparative dynamics. volume 3 of Handbook of Mathematical Economics, pages 1281–1355. Elsevier, 1986.
- [21] P. Moylan. Dissipative Systems and Stability. <http://pmoylan.org/pages/research/DissBook.html>, 08 2014.
- [22] J. v. Neumann. A Model of General Economic Equilibrium 1. The Review of Economic Studies, 13(1):1–9, 04 1945.
- [23] A. Porretta and E. Zuazua. Long time versus steady state optimal control. SIAM journal on control and optimization, 51(6):4242–4273, 2013.
- [24] J. B. Rawlings and R. Amrit. Optimizing Process Economic Performance Using Model Predictive Control, pages 119–138. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2009.
- [25] P. SAMUELSON. A catenary turnpike theorem involving consumption and the golden rule. The American economic review, 55(3):486–496, 1965.
- [26] P. Samuelson. The periodic turnpike theorem. Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications, 1(1):3–13, 1976.
- [27] E. Trélat, C. Zhang, and E. Zuazua. Steady-state and periodic exponential turnpike property for optimal control problems in hilbert spaces. SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 56(2):1222–1252, 2018.
- [28] E. Trélat and C. Zhang. Integral and measure-turnpike properties for infinite-dimensional optimal control systems. Mathematics of control, signals, and systems, 30(1):1–34, 2018.
- [29] E. Trélat and E. Zuazua. The turnpike property in finite-dimensional nonlinear optimal control. Journal of Differential Equations, 258(1):81–114, 2015.

- [30] M. Tucsnak and G. Weiss. Observation and control for operator semigroups. Birkhäuser advanced texts. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2009.
- [31] J. C. Willems. Dissipative dynamical systems. I. General theory. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., 45:321–351, 1972.
- [32] J. C. Willems. Dissipative dynamical systems. II. Linear systems with quadratic supply rates. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., 45:352–393, 1972.
- [33] M. Zanon, L. Grune, and M. Diehl. Periodic optimal control, dissipativity and mpc. IEEE transactions on automatic control, 62(6):2943–2949, 2017.
- [34] A. J. Zaslavski. Turnpike properties in the calculus of variations and optimal control. Nonconvex optimization and its applications ; v. 80. Springer, New York, 2006.
- [35] A. J. Zaslavski. Turnpike phenomenon and infinite horizon optimal control. Springer optimization and its applications ; 99. Springer, Cham, 2014.
- [36] A. J. Zaslavski. Turnpike Theory of Continuous-Time Linear Optimal Control Problems. Springer Optimization and Its Applications, 104. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 1st ed. 2015. edition, 2015.

APPENDIX A. AN EXTENSION TO RIESZ’S REPRESENTATION THEOREM

In the proof of Lemma 16, we claim $f(x) = 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle w, x \rangle$ for some $w \in \mathcal{H}$. We now give a short proof of this.

Theorem 24. *Suppose \mathcal{H} is a complex Hilbert space and $f : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a bounded linear functional over \mathbb{R} , then $f(x) = 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle x, w \rangle$ for some $w \in \mathcal{H}$.*

Proof. It’s easy to verify $g(x) := f(x) - f(ix)i$ is a bounded linear functional over \mathbb{C} . By Riesz’s representation theorem, we have $g(x) = \langle x, 2w \rangle$ for some $w \in \mathcal{H}$. So,

$$f(x) = \frac{g(x) + \overline{g(x)}}{2} = 2 \operatorname{Re}\langle x, w \rangle.$$

□

APPENDIX B. A COUNTEREXAMPLE TO THE EXISTENCE OF THE ADJOINT STEADY STATE

In this section, we provide a counterexample showing that, in general, the existence of a unique minimizer of the optimal steady state problem does not guarantee the existence of the adjoint steady state. More precisely, we claim that the existence of a unique minimizer (x_e, u_e) for the optimal steady state problem (2.4) does not ensure the existence of an element $w \in \mathcal{H}$ such that

$$u_e = (K^*K)^{-1}B^*w - (K^*K)^{-1}v \tag{B.1}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} Ax_e + B(K^*K)^{-1}B^*w - B(K^*K)^{-1}v = 0, \\ C^*Cx_e + z - A^*w = 0. \end{cases} \tag{B.2}$$

Notice that (B.1) and (B.2) are obtained from the infinite dimensional analogy of the classic Lagrange multiplier approach, which has been utilized in [27]. Indeed, the vector w corresponds to the optimal adjoint steady state in [27]. Our counterexample shows that the Lagrange multiplier approach fails in the general setting considered in this paper.

Let $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{U} = \mathcal{Y} = \ell^\infty$, $A = 0$ and $C = K = I$. Let B be defined by

$$B(x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots) := (x_1, \frac{x_2}{2}, \frac{x_3}{3}, \dots),$$

and let $z = 0$ and $v = (1, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}, \dots)$. Then, the optimal steady state problem (2.4) admits a unique minimizer $(x_e, u_e) = (0, 0)$. In fact, since $A = 0$, we must have $u_e = 0$ while x_e can be arbitrarily chosen. Since $C = I$ and $z = 0$, $x_e = 0$ minimizes running cost (2.2).

We now check the existence of $w = (w_1, w_2, w_3, \dots)$. The first line of (B.2) now reads

$$0 + BB^*w - Bv = 0. \tag{B.3}$$

Since B is self-adjoint, (B.3) is equivalent to

$$\left(\frac{1}{1^2}w_1, \frac{1}{2^2}w_2, \frac{1}{3^2}w_3, \dots\right) = \left(\frac{1}{1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1}}, \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{3} \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}, \dots\right). \tag{B.4}$$

So, $w = (\sqrt{1}, \sqrt{2}, \sqrt{3}, \dots)$, which is not an element in \mathcal{H} . In fact, since our A is bounded, we have $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{-1}^d$, so w is not even an element in \mathcal{H}_{-1}^d .

As we can see, the above optimal steady state problem does admit a unique minimizer $(0, 0)$, but there exists no corresponding optimal adjoint steady state w characterized by (B.1) and (B.2). This issue has been properly resolved in Section 4.1, where we relied on the stabilizability assumption to get a closed range condition.