



# NECESSARY CONDITIONS FOR OPTIMALITY IN ONE NONSMOOTH OPTIMAL CONTROL PROBLEM FOR GOURSAT-DARBOUX SYSTEMS

**Aysel T. Ramazanova**

University Duisburg-Essen

Faculty Mathematics, Non-linear Optimization

Thea-Leymann Str. 9

D-45127 Essen, Germany

## Abstract

We consider a nonsmooth optimal control problem described by a system of second-order hyperbolic equations with Goursat boundary conditions. A number of necessary optimality conditions are proved in terms of directional derivatives.

## 1. Introduction

The main result of the theory of necessary conditions for first-order optimality, Pontryagin's maximum principle, was proven for various optimal

---

Received: October 11, 2024; Accepted: October 21, 2024

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: 49K20, 35B50.

Keywords and phrases: optimal control, necessary conditions, hyperbolic equations.

Communicated by K. K. Azad

---

How to cite this article: Aysel T. Ramazanova, Necessary conditions for optimality in one nonsmooth optimal control problem for Goursat-Darboux systems, *Advances in Differential Equations and Control Processes* 31(4) (2024), 673-681.

<https://doi.org/10.17654/0974324324034>

This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Published Online: November 8, 2024

control problems described by ordinary differential equations, as well as partial differential equations, under the assumption of smoothness of the right-hand sides of the equations describing the controlled process and quality criteria according to state vector [1-5].

To date, based on theoretical and practical needs, much attention has been paid to the study of various nonsmooth optimal control problems. In works [2, 6-8], various non-smooth optimal control problems described by ordinary differential equations were studied. The proposed work is devoted to the study of one problem of optimal control of Goursat-Darboux systems without the assumption of smoothness in the state vector of the quality functional and the right side of the equation describing the process under study.

## 2. Problem Statement

Consider a controlled process described in a rectangle  $D = [t_0, t_1] \times [x_0, x_1]$  by a second-order hyperbolic system

$$z_{tx} = A(t, x)z_t + B(t, x)z_x + f(t, x, z, u) \quad (2.1)$$

with Goursat boundary conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} z(t_0, x) &= a(x), \quad x \in [x_0, x_1], \\ z(t, x_0) &= b(t), \quad t \in [t_0, t_1], \\ a(x_0) &= b(t_0). \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

Here  $A(t, x)$  and  $B(t, x)$  are given  $(n \times n)$  measurable and bounded matrix functions,  $a(x)$ ,  $b(t)$  are given absolutely continuous vector functions, and  $u = u(t, x)$  is measurable and bounded vector function of control actions with values from a given non-empty and bounded set  $U \subset R^r$ , for almost all  $(t, x) \in D$ , i.e.,

$$u(t, x) = U \subset R^r, \quad (t, x) \in D, \quad (2.3)$$

where  $f(t, x, z, u) = (f_1(t, x, z, u), \dots, f_n(t, x, z, u))$  is continuous in the set of variables in a dimensional vector function that satisfies the Lipschitz condition with respect to  $z$ , and each of its components is directionally differentiable with respect to  $z$ .

Each control function that satisfies the above restrictions will be called an *admissible control*.

It is assumed that the boundary value problem (2.1)-(2.2) for a given admissible control  $u(t, x)$  has a unique absolutely continuous solution  $z(t, x)$  defined in  $D$ .

It is required to minimize terminal function

$$S(u) = \Phi(z(t_1, x_1)), \quad (2.4)$$

defined on the solutions of the boundary value problem (2.1)-(2.2) generated by all possible admissible controls.

Here  $\Phi(z)$  is given Lipschitz and directionally differentiable scalar function.

An admissible control  $u(t, x)$  that delivers a minimum value to the functional (2.4) under constraints (2.1)-(2.3) will be called an *optimal control*.

### 3. Optimality Conditions

Let some admissible control  $u(t, x)$  be suspicious for a minimum, and  $(\theta, \xi) \in [t_0, t_1] \times [x_0, x_1]$  be an arbitrary regular point (Lebesgue point, see, for example, [1, 3, 4]) of the control,  $v \in U$  be an arbitrary vector, and  $\varepsilon > 0$  be an arbitrary sufficiently small number such that  $\theta + \varepsilon < t_1$ ,  $\xi + \varepsilon < x_1$ .

We determine the special increment of the admissible control  $u(t, x)$  using formula

$$\Delta u(t, x; \varepsilon) = \begin{cases} v - u(t, x), & (t, x) \in D(\varepsilon) = [\theta, \theta + \varepsilon) \times [\xi, \xi + \varepsilon), \\ 0, & (t, x) \in D \setminus D(\varepsilon). \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

$\Delta z(t, x; \varepsilon)$  is a special increment of state  $z(t, x)$ , corresponding to increment (3.1) of control  $u(t, x)$  and  $z(t, x; \varepsilon) = z(t, x) + \Delta z(t, x; \varepsilon)$ .

From the introduced notation, it is clear that  $z(t, x; \varepsilon)$  is a solution to the boundary value problem

$$\begin{aligned} z_{tx}(t, x; \varepsilon) &= A(t, x)z_t(t, x; \varepsilon) + B(t, x)z_x(t, x; \varepsilon) \\ &\quad + f(t, x, z(t, x; \varepsilon), u(t, x) + \Delta u(t, x; \varepsilon)), \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

$$z(t_0, x; \varepsilon) = a(x), \quad z(t, x_0; \varepsilon) = b(t). \quad (3.3)$$

From the boundary value problem (3.2)-(3.3), it follows that the increment  $\Delta z(t, x; \varepsilon)$  of the state  $z(t, x)$  is a solution of the boundary value problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta z_{tx}(t, x; \varepsilon) &= A(t, x)\Delta z_t(t, x; \varepsilon) + B(t, x)\Delta z_x(t, x; \varepsilon) \\ &\quad + f(t, x, z(t, x; \varepsilon), u(t, x) + \Delta u(t, x; \varepsilon)) \\ &\quad + f(t, x, z(t, x; \varepsilon), u(t, x)), \end{aligned}$$

$$\Delta z(t_0, x; \varepsilon) = 0,$$

$$\Delta z(t, x_0; \varepsilon) = 0.$$

From here, passing to the integral equation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta z(t, x; \varepsilon) - z(t, x) &= \int_{t_0}^t \int_{x_0}^x [A(\tau, s)\Delta z_\tau(\tau, s; \varepsilon) + B(\tau, s)\Delta z_s(\tau, s; \varepsilon) \\ &\quad + f(\tau, s, z(\tau, s; \varepsilon), u(\tau, s) + \Delta u(\tau, s; \varepsilon))] \\ &\quad \times [-f(t, x, z(\tau, s), u(\tau, s))] ds d\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

Let us assume

$$h(t, x) = (h_1(t, x), \dots, h_n(t, x)) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{z(t, x; \varepsilon) - z(t, x)}{\varepsilon}.$$

From the estimate given, for example, in [3, 4], we obtain that

$$\|\Delta z(t, x; \varepsilon)\| = \|z(t, x; \varepsilon) - z(t, x)\| \leq L_1 \varepsilon, \quad (t, x) \in D, \quad (3.5)$$

where  $L_1$  is a positive constant.

From (3.5), it is clear that  $t \in [t_0, \theta)$ ,  $x \in [x_0, \xi)$ ,  $h(t, x) = 0$ .

Taking into account the estimate (3.5) from (3.4) and using the fact that the vector function  $f(t, x, z, u)$  has directional derivatives with respect to  $z$ , we obtain that for  $t > \theta$  and  $x > \xi$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & h(t, x) \\ &= \int_{\theta}^t \int_{\xi}^x \left[ A(\tau, s) \cdot h_{\tau}(\tau, s) + B(\tau, s) h_s(\tau, s) + \frac{\partial f(\tau, s, z(\tau, s), u(\tau, s))}{\partial h(\tau, s)} \right] ds d\tau \\ & \quad \times [f(\theta, \xi, z(\theta, \xi), v) - f(\theta, \xi, z(\theta, \xi), u(\theta, \xi))]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

The integral equation (3.6) is equivalent to the following partial differential equation:

$$\begin{aligned} h_{tx}(t, x) &= \frac{\partial f(t, x, z(t, x), u(t, x))}{\partial h(t, x)} + A(t, x) h_t(t, x) \\ & \quad + B(t, x) h_x(t, x), \quad t \geq \theta, \quad x \geq \xi, \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

with boundary conditions

$$h(\theta, x) = f(\theta, \xi, z(\theta, \xi), v) - f(\theta, \xi, z(\theta, \xi), u(\theta, \xi)), \quad (3.8)$$

$$h(t, \xi) = f(\theta, \xi, z(\theta, \xi), v) - f(\theta, \xi, z(\theta, \xi), u(\theta, \xi)). \quad (3.9)$$

By assumption, the function  $\Phi(z)$  is differentiable in any direction and satisfies the Lipschitz condition. Therefore, using the formula

$$z(t, x; \varepsilon) = z(t, x) + \varepsilon h(t, x) + o(\varepsilon; t, x),$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& S(u(t, x; \varepsilon)) - S(u(t, x)) \\
&= \Phi(z(t_1, x_1) + \varepsilon h(t_1, x_1) + o(\varepsilon; t_1, x_1)) - \Phi(z(t_1, x_1)) \\
&= \Phi(z(t_1, x_1) + \varepsilon h(t_1, x_1) + o(\varepsilon; t_1, x_1)) - \Phi(z(t_1, x_1) + \varepsilon h(t_1, x_1)) \\
&\quad + \Phi(z(t_1, x_1) + \varepsilon h(t_1, x_1)) - \Phi(z(t_1, x_1)). \tag{3.10}
\end{aligned}$$

By virtue of the Lipschitz condition, we obtain that

$$| \Phi(z(t_1, x_1) + \varepsilon h(t_1, x_1) + o(\varepsilon; t_1, x_1)) - \Phi(z(t_1, x_1) + \varepsilon h(t_1, x_1)) | \leq L_2 \varepsilon,$$

where  $L_2$  is a positive constant.

Therefore, from (3.10), we get that

$$S(u(t, x; \varepsilon)) - S(u(t, x)) = \varepsilon \frac{\partial \Phi(z(t_1, x_1))}{\partial h(t_1, x_1)} + o(\varepsilon).$$

It follows from the resulting expansion.

**Theorem 3.1.** *For an admissible control  $u(t, x)$  to be an optimal control, it is necessary that the inequality*

$$\frac{\partial \Phi(z(t_1, x_1))}{\partial h(t_1, x_1)} \geq 0, \tag{3.11}$$

*holds for all variations  $h(t_1, x_1)$  of the state  $z(t_1, x_1)$ .*

From the obtained general optimality condition (3.11), we can obtain more constructively verifiable necessary optimality conditions, in particular Pontryagin's maximum principle.

Let the functions  $f(t, x, z, u)$  and  $\Phi(z)$  be continuously differentiable with respect to  $z$ . Then the boundary value problem (3.7)-(3.9) takes the form

$$h_{tx}(t, x) = A(t, x)h_t(t, x) + B(t, x)h_x(t, x) + \frac{\partial f(t, x, z(t, x), u(t, x))}{\partial h(t, x)}, \tag{3.12}$$

$$h(\theta, x) = f(\theta, \xi, z(\theta, \xi), v) - f(\theta, \xi, z(\theta, \xi), u(\theta, \xi)), \quad (3.13)$$

$$h(t, \xi) = f(\theta, \xi, z(\theta, \xi), v) - f(\theta, \xi, z(\theta, \xi), u(\theta, \xi)). \quad (3.14)$$

Based on the formula for the integral representation of solutions to the linear Goursat-Darboux boundary value problem (see, for example, [5]), the problem (3.12)-(3.14) admits the representation

$$\begin{aligned} h(t, x) = & R(t, x, t_0, x_0)[f(\theta, \xi, z(\theta, \xi), v) - f(\theta, \xi, z(\theta, \xi), u(\theta, \xi))] \\ & - \int_{\theta}^t R(t, x, \tau, \xi)B(\tau, \xi) \\ & \times [f(\theta, \xi, z(\theta, \xi), v) - f(\theta, \xi, z(\theta, \xi), u(\theta, \xi))]d\tau \\ & - \int_{\xi}^x R(t, x, \theta, s)A(\tau, \xi) \\ & \times [f(\theta, \xi, z(\theta, \xi), v) - f(\theta, \xi, z(\theta, \xi), u(\theta, \xi))]ds. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $R(t, x, \tau, s)$  is an  $(n \times n)$  matrix function, which is a solution to the Volterra integral equation

$$\begin{aligned} R(t, x, \tau, s) = & \int_s^x R(t, x, \tau, \beta)A(\tau, \beta)d\beta \\ & + \int_{\tau}^t R(t, x, \alpha, s)B(\alpha, s)d\alpha \\ & + \int_{\tau}^t \int_s^x R(t, x, \alpha, \beta)f_z(\alpha, \beta, z(\alpha, \beta), u(\alpha, \beta))d\alpha d\beta. \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

By entering the notation

$$\begin{aligned} K(t, x) = & R(t, x, t_0, x_0) - \int_{\theta}^t R(t, x, \tau, \xi)B(\tau, \xi)d\tau \\ & - \int_{\xi}^x R(t, x, \theta, s)A(\tau, \xi)ds, \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

from (3.15), we get that

$$h(t_1, x_1) = K(t_1, x_1) [f(\theta, \xi, z(\theta, \xi), v) - f(\theta, \xi, z(\theta, \xi), u(\theta, \xi))]. \quad (3.17)$$

Taking into account (3.17) from the inequality (3.11), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial \Phi'(z(t_1, x_1))}{\partial z} K(t_1, x_1) \\ & \times [f(\theta, \xi, z(\theta, \xi), v) - f(\theta, \xi, z(\theta, \xi), u(\theta, \xi))] \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

Assuming that

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\theta, \xi) &= -K'(t_1, x_1) \frac{\partial \Phi(z(t_1, x_1))}{\partial z}, \\ H(\theta, \xi, z(\theta, \xi), u(\theta, \xi), \psi(\theta, \xi)) &= \psi'(\theta, \xi) f(\theta, \xi, z(\theta, \xi), u(\theta, \xi)), \end{aligned}$$

from the inequality (3.18), due to the arbitrariness of  $(\theta, \xi) \in [t_0, t_1] \times [x_0, x_1]$  and  $v \in U$ , we arrive at the following statement:

**Theorem 3.2** (An analogue of Pontryagin's maximum principle). *If the functions  $f(t, x, z, u)$  and  $(z)$  are continuously differentiable with respect to  $z$ , then for optimality of the admissible control  $u(t, x)$ , it is necessary that the inequality*

$$H(\theta, \xi, z(\theta, \xi), v, \psi(\theta, \xi)) - H(\theta, \xi, z(\theta, \xi), u(\theta, \xi), \psi(\theta, \xi)) \leq 0,$$

holds for all  $v \in U$ ,  $(\theta, \xi) \in [t_0, t_1] \times [x_0, x_1]$ .

## References

- [1] L. S. Pontryagin, V. G. Boltyansky, R. V. Gamkrelidze and E. F. Mishchenko, *Mathematical Theory of Optimal Processes*, M. Nauka, 1984, p. 384.
- [2] R. Gabasov and F. M. Kirillova, *Book: The Maximum Principle in the Theory of Optimal Control* by M. Liebrock, Vol. 22, 2011, 272 pp.
- [3] V. I. Sumin, *Functional Volterra equations in the theory of optimal control with distributed systems*, UNN Publishing House, Nizhny-Novgorod, 1992, 110 pp.



- [4] M. B. Suryanarayana, Necessary conditions for optimization problems with hyperbolic partial differential equations, *SIAM Journal on Control* 11 (1973), 130-147.
- [5] S. S. Akhiev and T. K. Akhmedov, On the integral representation of solutions of some systems of differential equations, *Izvestia, An Azerbaijan. SSR. Ser. Phys.-Techn. and Math. Sci.* 11 (1973), 116-120.
- [6] V. V. Alsevich, Necessary optimality conditions for minimax optimal control problems, *Differential Equations* 8 (1976), 1384-1391.
- [7] D. A. Juraev, Theory of ill-posed problems for solving applied mathematics equations, *Center for Computer Science, Mathematics, and Engineering Physics Journal* 1 (2023), 1-10.
- [8] A. Telman Ramazanova, Necessary conditions for the existence of a saddle point in one optimal control problem for systems of hyperbolic equations, *European Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics* 14(4) (2021), 1402-1414.
- [9] Kyazim K. Hasanov and Leila K. Hasanova, Necessary conditions of optimality in Goursat-Darboux problem with generalized controls, *Journal of Automation and Information Sciences* 33(5-8) (2001), 9.
- [10] An Li and Jane J. Ye, Necessary optimality conditions for optimal control problems with non smooth mixed state and control constraints, *Set-Valued and Variational Analysis* 24 (2016), 449-470.