OPTIMALITY CONDITIONS FOR A CLASS OF OPTIMAL CONTROL PROBLEMS WITH QUASILINEAR ELLIPTIC EQUATIONS *

EDUARDO CASAS[†] AND FREDI TRÖLTZSCH[‡]

Abstract. A class of optimal control problems for quasilinear elliptic equations is considered, where the coefficients of the elliptic differential operator depend on the state function. First- and second-order optimality conditions are discussed for an associated control-constrained optimal control problem. In particular, the Pontryagin maximum principle and second-order sufficient optimality conditions are derived. One of the main difficulties is the non-monotone character of the state equation.

Key words. Optimal control, distributed control, quasilinear elliptic equation, Pontryagin maximum principle, second-order optimality conditions

AMS subject classifications. 49J20, 35J65

1. Introduction.

In this paper, we consider optimal control problems for a quasilinear elliptic equation of the type

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcll} -\mathrm{div}\,[a(x,y(x))\,\nabla y(x)] + f(x,y(x)) & = & u(x) & \text{in} \quad \Omega \\ y(x) & = & 0 & \text{on} \quad \Gamma. \end{array} \right. \tag{1.1}$$

Equations of this type occur, for instance, in models of heat conduction, where the heat conductivity a depends on the spatial coordinate x and on the temperature y. For instance, the heat conductivity of carbon steel depends on the temperature and also on the alloying additions contained, cf. Bejan [2]. If the different alloys of steel are distributed smoothly in the domain, then $a = a(x, y)$ should depend in a sufficiently smooth way on (x, y). Similarly, the heat conductivity depends on (x, y) in the growth of silicon carbide bulk single crystals, see Klein et al. [20].

If a is independent of x, then the well known Kirchhoff transformation is helpful to solve (1.1) uniquely. In the more general case $a = a(x, y)$, in spite of the non monotone character of the equation, there exists a celebrated comparison principle proved by Douglas, Dupont and Serrin [13] that leads to the uniqueness of a solution of (1.1); for a more recent paper, extending this result the reader is referred to Křížek and L. Liu [19]. We will use the approach of [19] to deduce that (1.1) is well posed under less restrictive assumptions than those considered by the previous authors.

For other classes of quasilinear equations, in particular for equations, in which a depends on the gradient of y, we refer, for instance, to Lions [21] and Nečas [24].

As optimization is concerned, there exists a rich literature on the optimal control of semilinear elliptic and parabolic equations. For instance, the Pontryagin principle

*The first author was supported by Spanish Ministry of Education and Science under projects MTM2005-06817 and "Ingenio Mathematica (i-MATH)" No. CSD2006-00032 (Consolider Ingenio 2010). The second author was also supported by the DFG research center "Mathematics for key technologies" (Matheon) in Berlin.

†Dpto. de Matemática Aplicada y Ciencias de la Computación, E.T.S.I. Industriales y de Telecomunicación, Universidad de Cantabria, 39005 Santander, Spain, e-mail: eduardo.casas@unican.es

‡Institut für Mathematik, Technische Universität Berlin, D-10623 Berlin, Germany, e-mail: troeltzsch@math.tu-berlin.de

was discussed for different elliptic problems in [5], [4], [1], while the parabolic case was investigated in [6] or [26]. Problems with quasilinear equations with nonlinearity of gradient type were considered by [8] or [9]. This list on first-order necessary optimality conditions is by far not exhaustive.

Moreover, quite a number of contributions to second-order necessary and/or sufficient optimality conditions were published. We mention only [3], [11], or the state-constrained case in [10], [12], [25].

However, the state equation (1.1) has not yet been investigated in the context of optimal control. The theory of optimality conditions of associated control problems is the main issue of our paper that is organized as follows:

First, we discuss the well-posedness of this equation in different spaces. Next, the differentiability properties of the control-to-state mapping are investigated. Based on these results, the Pontryagin maximum principle is derived. Moreover, second-order necessary and sufficient optimality conditions are established.

Notations. By $B_X(x,r)$ we denote the open ball in a normed space X with radius r centered at x, by $\bar{B}_X(x,r)$ its closure. In some formulas, the partial derivative $\partial/\partial x_j$ is sometimes abbreviated by ∂_j. By c (without index), generic constants are denoted. Moreover, $\langle \cdot\,,\,\cdot\rangle$ stands for the pairing between $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $H^{-1}(\Omega)$.

2. Study of the quasilinear equation.

2.1. Existence, uniqueness and regularity of solutions. The proof of the existence and uniqueness of a solution of (1.1) relies on the following assumptions:

(A1) $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is an open bounded set with a Lipschitz boundary Γ.

(A2) The functions $a : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ are Carathéodory, f is monotone non-decreasing with respect to the second variable for almost all $x \in \Omega$,

$$\exists \alpha_0 > 0 \text{ such that } a(x,y) \geq \alpha_0 \text{ for a.e. } x \in \Omega \text{ and all } y \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{2.1}$$

The function $a(\cdot,0) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and for any $M > 0$ there exist a constant $C_M > 0$ and a function $\phi_M \in L^q(\Omega)$, with $q \geq pn/(n+p)$ and $n < p$, such that for all $|y|, |y_i| \leq M$

$$|a(x,y_2) - a(x,y_1)| \leq C_M|y_2 - y_1| \text{ and } |f(x,y)| \leq \phi_M(x) \text{ for a.e. } x \in \Omega. \tag{2.2}$$

In the rest of the paper q and $p \in (n,+\infty)$ will be fixed. Let us remark that $q \geq pn/(n+p) > n/2$.

Theorem 2.1. *Under the assumptions* ***(A1)*** *and* ***(A2)****, for any element* $u \in W^{-1,p}(\Omega)$ *problem* (1.1) *has a unique solution* $y_u \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$. *Moreover there exists* $\mu \in (0,1)$ *independent of* u *such that* $y_u \in C^\mu(\bar{\Omega})$ *and for any bounded set* $U \subset W^{-1,p}(\Omega)$

$$\|y_u\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} + \|y_u\|_{C^\mu(\bar{\Omega})} \leq C_U \quad \forall u \in U \tag{2.3}$$

for some constant $C_U > 0$. *Finally, if* $u_k \to u$ *in* $W^{-1,p}(\Omega)$, *then* $y_{u_k} \to y_u$ *in* $H_0^1(\Omega) \cap C^\mu(\bar{\Omega})$.

Proof. Existence of a Solution. Depending on $M > 0$, we introduce the truncated function a_M by

$$a_M(x,y) = \begin{cases} a(x,y), & |y| \leq M \\ a(x,+M), & y > +M \\ a(x,-M), & y < -M. \end{cases}$$

In the same way, we define the truncation f_M of f. Let us prove that the equation

$$\begin{cases} -div\,[a_M(x,y)\,\nabla y] + f_M(x,y) = u & \text{in } \Omega \\ y = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma \end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

admits at least one solution $y \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. We define, for fixed $u \in W^{-1,p}(\Omega)$ and $M > 0$, a mapping $F : L^2(\Omega) \to L^2(\Omega)$ by $F(z) = y$, where $y \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ is the unique solution to

$$\begin{cases} -\mathrm{div}\,[a_M(x,z)\,\nabla y] + f_M(x,z) = u & \text{in } \Omega \\ y = 0 & \text{on } \Gamma. \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

Thanks to assumption **(A2)**, (2.2), we have

$$|f_M(x,z)| \leq \phi_M(x)$$

and $\phi_M \in L^q(\Omega) \subset H^{-1}(\Omega)$. Therefore, (2.5) is a linear equation and $u - f_M(\cdot,z)$ belongs to $H^{-1}(\Omega)$, hence (2.5) admits a unique solution $y_M \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and F is well defined. Furthermore, we have

$$\|y_M\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq \frac{1}{\alpha_0}\left(\|u\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} + \|\phi_M\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)}\right). \tag{2.6}$$

Using this estimate and the fact that $H^1(\Omega)$ is compactly embedded into $L^2(\Omega)$, it is easy to apply the Schauder theorem to prove the existence of a fixed point $y_M \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ of F. Obviously, y_M is a solution of (2.4).

Since $q \geq np/(n+p)$ we have that $L^q(\Omega) \subset W^{-1,p}(\Omega)$. Now an application of the Stampacchia truncation method yields

$$\|y_M\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq c_\infty \|u - f(\cdot,0)\|_{W^{-1,p}(\Omega)}, \tag{2.7}$$

where c_∞ depends only on the coercivity constant α_0 given in (2.1) but neither on $\|a_M(\cdot,y_m)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ nor on $f_M(\cdot,y_M)$. For the idea of this method, the reader is referred to Stampacchia [27] or to the exposition for semilinear elliptic equations in Tröltzsch [29, Theorem 7.3]. By taking

$$M \geq c_\infty \|u - f(\cdot,0)\|_{W^{-1,p}(\Omega)},$$

(2.7) implies that $a_M(x,y_M(x)) = a(x,y_M(x))$ and $f_M(x,y_M(x)) = f(x,y_M(x))$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$, therefore $y_M \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ is a solution of (1.1). The Hölder regularity follows as usual; see, for instance, Gilbarg and Trudinger [16, Theorem 8.29]. The inequality (2.3) follows from (2.6), (2.7) and the estimates in [16, Theorem 8.29]. Finally, the convergence property can be deduced from (2.3) easily once the uniqueness is proved.

Uniqueness of a Solution. Here we follow the method by Křížek and Liu [19]. Let us assume that $y_i \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$, $i = 1, 2$, are two solutions of (1.1). The regularity results proved above imply that $y_i \in C(\bar{\Omega})$, $i = 1, 2$. Let us define the open sets

$$\Omega_0 = \{x \in \Omega : y_2(x) - y_1(x) > 0\}$$

and for every $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\Omega_\varepsilon = \{x \in \Omega : y_2(x) - y_1(x) > \varepsilon\}.$$

No we take $z_\varepsilon(x) = \min\{\varepsilon, (y_2(x) - y_1(x))^+\}$, which belongs to $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $|z_\varepsilon| \le \varepsilon$. Multiplying the equations corresponding to y_i by z_ε and doing the usual integration by parts we get

$$\int_\Omega \{a(x, y_i)\nabla y_i \nabla z_\varepsilon + f(x, y_i)z_\varepsilon\}\, dx = \langle u, z_\varepsilon\rangle, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

By subtracting both equations, using the monotonicity of f, (2.1) and (2.2) and the fact that $\nabla z_\varepsilon(x) = 0$ for a.a. $x \notin \Omega_0 \setminus \Omega_\varepsilon$ and in view of $\nabla z_\varepsilon = \nabla(y_2 - y_1)^+ = \nabla(y_2 - y_1)$ a.e. in $\Omega_0 \setminus \Omega_\varepsilon$ we get

$$\alpha_0 \|\nabla z_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \int_\Omega \{a(x, y_2)|\nabla z_\varepsilon|^2 + [f(x, y_2) - f(x, y_1)]z_\varepsilon\} dx$$

$$= \int_\Omega \{a(x, y_2)\nabla(y_2 - y_1)\nabla z_\varepsilon + [f(x, y_2) - f(x, y_1)]z_\varepsilon\} dx$$

and, invoking the weak formulation of the equation for y_1,

$$= \int_\Omega [a(x, y_1)\nabla y_1 - a(x, y_2)\nabla y_1]\nabla z_\varepsilon\, dx = \int_{\Omega_0 \setminus \Omega_\varepsilon} [a(x, y_1)\nabla y_1 - a(x, y_2)\nabla y_1]\nabla z_\varepsilon\, dx$$

$$\le C_M \|y_2 - y_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_0 \setminus \Omega_\varepsilon)} \|\nabla y_1\|_{L^2(\Omega_0 \setminus \Omega_\varepsilon)} \|\nabla z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_0 \setminus \Omega_\varepsilon)}$$

$$\le C_M \varepsilon \|\nabla y_1\|_{L^2(\Omega_0 \setminus \Omega_\varepsilon)} \|\nabla z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_0 \setminus \Omega_\varepsilon)}.$$

From this inequality, along with Friedrich's inequality, we get

$$\|z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le C\|\nabla z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le C'\varepsilon \|\nabla y_1\|_{L^2(\Omega_0 \setminus \Omega_\varepsilon)}. \tag{2.8}$$

Now by $\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} |\Omega_0 \setminus \Omega_\varepsilon| = 0$ and (2.8) we deduce

$$|\Omega_\varepsilon| = \varepsilon^{-2} \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \varepsilon^2 \le \varepsilon^{-2} \int_\Omega |z_\varepsilon|^2 \le C'' \|\nabla y_1\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_0 \setminus \Omega_\varepsilon)} \to 0,$$

which implies that $|\Omega_0| = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} |\Omega_\varepsilon| = 0$ and hence $y_2 \le y_1$. In the same way, we prove that $y_1 \le y_2$ □

Remark 2.2. *Let us remark that the Lipschitz property of a with respect to y assumed in **(A2)** was only necessary to prove the uniqueness of a solution of* (1.1)*, but it was not needed to establish existence and regularity. We can get multiple solutions of*

(1.1) *if the Lipschitz property* (2.2) *fails; see Hlaváček et al. [18] for a one-dimensional example.*

By assuming more regularity on a, f, Γ and u, we can obtain higher regularity of the solutions of (1.1).

THEOREM 2.3. *Let us suppose that **(A1)** and **(A2)** hold. We also assume that* $a : \bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ *is continuous and* Γ *is of class* C^1. *Then, for any* $u \in W^{-1,p}(\Omega)$ (1.1) *has a unique solution* $y_u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. *Moreover, for any bounded set* $U \subset W^{-1,p}(\Omega)$, *there exists a constant* $C_U > 0$ *such that*

$$\|y_u\|_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)} \leq C_U \quad \forall u \in U. \tag{2.9}$$

If $u_k \to u$ *in* $W^{-1,p}(\Omega)$ *then* $y_{u_k} \to y_u$ *strongly in* $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$.

The proof of this theorem follows from Theorem 2.1 and the $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$-regularity results for linear elliptic equations; see Giaquinta [15, Cap. 4, pag. 73] or Morrey [22, pp. 156-157]. It is enough to remark that the function $\hat{a}(x) = a(x, y_u(x))$ is continuous in $\bar{\Omega}$ and $u - f(\cdot, y_u)$ belongs to $W^{-1,p}(\Omega)$.

Let us state some additional assumptions leading to $W^{2,q}(\Omega)$-regularity for the solutions of (1.1).

(A3) For all $M > 0$, there exists a constant $c_M > 0$ such that the following local Lipschitz property is satisfied:

$$|a(x_1, y_1) - a(x_2, y_2)| \leq c_M \, \{|x_1 - x_2| + |y_1 - y_2|\} \tag{2.10}$$

for all $x_i \in \bar{\Omega}$, $y_i \in [-M, M]$, $i = 1, 2$.

THEOREM 2.4. *Under the hypotheses **(A1)-(A3)** and assuming that* Γ *is of class* $C^{1,1}$, *for any* $u \in L^q(\Omega)$, *equation* (1.1) *has one solution* $y_u \in W^{2,q}(\Omega)$. *Moreover, for any bounded set* $U \subset L^q(\Omega)$, *there exists a constant* $C_U > 0$ *such that*

$$\|y_u\|_{W^{2,q}(\Omega)} \leq C_U \quad \forall u \in U. \tag{2.11}$$

Proof. (i) From Sobolev embedding theorems, cf. Nečas [23, Theorem 3.4], it follows

$$L^q(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W^{-1,\frac{nq}{n-q}}(\Omega), \quad \text{if} \ \ 1 < q < n, \tag{2.12}$$

$$L^q(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W^{-1,\infty}(\Omega), \quad \text{if} \ \ n \leq q < \infty. \tag{2.13}$$

Since $L^q(\Omega) \subset W^{-1,p}(\Omega)$, we can apply Theorem 2.3 to get the existence of at least one solution in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, for every $1 < p < \infty$ if $q \geq n$, and for $p = \frac{nq}{n-q}$ if $q < n$. We have to prove the $W^{2,q}(\Omega)$ regularity. To this aim, we distinct between two cases in the proof.

(ii,a) *Case* $q \geq n$: We have that $y \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ for any $p < \infty$, in particular in $W_0^{1,2q}(\Omega)$. By using assumption **(A3)**, expanding the divergence term of the PDE (1.1) and dividing by a we find that

$$-\Delta y = \underbrace{\frac{1}{a}}_{L^\infty} \Big\{ \underbrace{u - f(\cdot, y)}_{L^q} + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \underbrace{\partial_j a(x, y)}_{L^\infty} \underbrace{\partial_j y}_{L^q} + \underbrace{\frac{\partial a}{\partial y}}_{L^\infty} \underbrace{|\nabla y|^2}_{L^q} \Big\}, \tag{2.14}$$

hence the right-hand side of (2.14) is in $L^q(\Omega)$. Notice that $\frac{\partial a}{\partial y} \in L^\infty$ follows from (2.10) and the boundedness of y. The $C^{1,1}$ smoothness of Γ permits to apply a well-known result by Grisvard [17] on maximal regularity and to get $y \in W^{2,q}(\Omega)$.

(ii,b) *Case* $n/2 < q < n$: Notice that $y \in W_0^{1,\frac{nq}{n-q}}(\Omega)$. It follows that $|\nabla y|^2 \in L^{\frac{nq}{2(n-q)}}(\Omega)$. A simple calculation confirms that

$$\frac{nq}{2(n-q)} > q, \tag{2.15}$$

since this is equivalent to $q > n/2$, consequence of our assumption on q. Therefore, it holds that $|\nabla y|^2 \in L^q(\Omega)$ and once again the right hand side of (2.14) belongs to $L^q(\Omega)$. We apply again the regularity results by Grisvard [17] to obtain $y \in W^{2,q}(\Omega)$. □

COROLLARY 2.5. *Suppose that the assumptions of Theorem 2.4, except the regularity hypothesis of* Γ*, are satisfied with* $q = 2$*. Then, if* $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ *is an open, bounded and convex set,* $n = 2$ *or* $n = 3$*, there exists one solution of* (1.1) $y \in H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$.

Proof. This is a simple extension of Theorem 2.4 for $q = 2$. Notice that we have assumed $n \leq 3$ so that $q > n/2$ is true. The $C^{1,1}$ smoothness of Γ is not needed for convex domains, since maximal regularity holds there, cf. [17]. □

2.2. Differentiability of the control-to-state mapping. In order to derive the first- and second-order optimality conditions for the control problem, we need to assume some differentiability of the functions involved in the control problem. In this section, we will analyze the differentiability properties of the states with respect to the control. To this aim, we require the following assumption.

(A4) The functions a and f are of class C^2 with respect to the second variable and, for any number $M > 0$, there exists a constant $D_M > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{2} \left| \frac{\partial^j a}{\partial y^j}(x,y) \right| + \left| \frac{\partial^j f}{\partial y^j}(x,y) \right| \leq D_M \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega \quad \text{and all } |y| \leq M.$$

Now we are going to study the differentiability of the relation control-state. As a first step we study the linearized equation of (1.1) around a solution y_u. The reader should remark that the well-posedness of the linearized equation is not obvious because of the linear operator is not monotone.

THEOREM 2.6. *Given* $y \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ *for any* $v \in H^{-1}(\Omega)$ *the linearized equation*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcl} -div \left[a(x,y)\nabla z + \dfrac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,y) z \nabla y \right] + \dfrac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x,y)\, z & = & v \quad in\ \Omega \\ z & = & 0 \quad on\ \Gamma \end{array} \right. \tag{2.16}$$

has a unique solution $z_v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$.

REMARK 2.7. *As a consequence of the open mapping theorem, assuming that* ***(A2)*** *and* ***(A4)*** *hold, we know that the relation* $v \mapsto z_v$ *defined by* (2.16) *is an isomorphism between* $H^{-1}(\Omega)$ *and* $H_0^1(\Omega)$*. Indeed, it is enough to note that the linear mapping*

$$z \mapsto -div[a(x,y)\nabla z + \frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,y) z \nabla y] + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x,y)\, z$$

is continuous from $H_0^1(\Omega)$ *to* $H^{-1}(\Omega)$. *To verify this, we notice first that* $a(x,y)$, $\frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,y)$ *and* $\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x,y)$ *are bounded functions because of our assumptions and the boundedness of* y, *which follows from the fact that* $y \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \subset C(\bar{\Omega})$ *for* $p > n$. *The only delicate point is to check that*

$$\frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(\cdot, y) z \nabla y \in L^2(\Omega)^n.$$

This property follows from the Hölder inequality

$$\left(\int_\Omega \left| \frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(\cdot, y) z \nabla y \right|^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \leq D_M \|z\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}(\Omega)} \|\nabla y\|_{L^p(\Omega)}$$

and the fact that

$$H_0^1(\Omega) \subset L^{\frac{2n}{n-2}}(\Omega) \subset L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}(\Omega) \text{ if } n > 2,$$

$$H_0^1(\Omega) \subset L^r(\Omega) \text{ for all } r < \infty \text{ if } n = 2,$$

where we have used that

$$p > n \Rightarrow \frac{2n}{n-2} > \frac{2p}{p-2}.$$

Remark 2.8. *The reader can be easily check that the proof of Theorem 2.6 can be modified in the very obvious way to state that the equation*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcll} -div \left[a(x,y_1)\nabla z + \dfrac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,y_1) z \nabla y_2 \right] + \dfrac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x,y_3)\, z & = & v & in\ \Omega \\ z & = & 0 & on\ \Gamma \end{array} \right.$$

has a unique solution in $z \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ *for any elements* $y_i \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, $i = 1,2,3$.

Proof of Theorem 2.6. First we prove the uniqueness and then the existence.

Uniqueness of solution of (2.16). We follow the same approach used to prove the uniqueness of a solution of (1.1). Let us take $v = 0$ and assume that $z \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ is solution of (2.16), then the goal is to prove that $z = 0$. Thus we define the sets

$$\Omega_0 = \{x \in \Omega : z(x) > 0\} \text{ and } \Omega_\varepsilon = \{x \in \Omega : z(x) > \varepsilon\}.$$

Now we set $z_\varepsilon(x) = \min\{\varepsilon, z^+(x)\}$, so that $z_\varepsilon \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, $|z_\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon$, $z z_\varepsilon \geq 0$, $z \nabla z_\varepsilon = z_\varepsilon \nabla z_\varepsilon$ and $\nabla z \nabla z_\varepsilon = |\nabla z_\varepsilon|^2$. Then multiplying the equation corresponding to z by z_ε and performing an integration by parts we get

$$\int_\Omega \left\{ a(x,y)|\nabla z_\varepsilon|^2 + \frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,y) z_\varepsilon \nabla y \nabla z_\varepsilon + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x,y) z_\varepsilon^2 \right\} dx = 0,$$

then, by the monotonicity of f and **(A2)**,

$$\alpha_0 \|\nabla z_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \int_\Omega \left\{ a(x,y)|\nabla z_\varepsilon|^2 + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x,y) z_\varepsilon^2 \right\} dx$$

$$= -\int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,y) z_\varepsilon \nabla y \nabla z_\varepsilon \, dx = -\int_{\Omega_0 \setminus \Omega_\varepsilon} \frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,y) z_\varepsilon \nabla y \nabla z_\varepsilon \, dx$$

$$\leq C_M \|\nabla y\|_{L^p(\Omega_0 \setminus \Omega_\varepsilon)} \|\nabla z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

From here it follows an inequality analogous to (2.8) and continuing the proof as there we conclude that $|\Omega_0| = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} |\Omega_\varepsilon| = 0$, therefore $z \leq 0$ in Ω. But $-z$ is also a solution of (2.16), by the same arguments we deduce that $-z \leq 0$ in Ω, and therefore $z = 0$.

Existence of solution of (2.16). For every $t \in [0,1]$ let us consider the equation

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcll} -\mathrm{div}\left[a(x,y)\nabla z + t\dfrac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,y) z \, \nabla y_u\right] + \dfrac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x,y)\, z & = & v & \text{in } \Omega \\ z & = & 0 & \text{on } \Gamma. \end{array} \right. \tag{2.17}$$

For $t = 0$, the resulting linear equation is monotone and by an obvious application of the Lax-Milgram Theorem we know that there exists a unique solution $z_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ for every $v \in H^{-1}(\Omega)$. Let us denote by S the set of points $t \in [0,1]$ for which the equation (2.17) defines an isomorphism between $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $H^{-1}(\Omega)$. S is not empty because $0 \in S$. Let us denote by t_{max} the supremum of S. We will prove first that $t_{max} \in S$ and then we will see that $t_{max} = 1$, which concludes the proof of existence.

Let us take a sequence $\{t_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset S$ such that $t_k \to t_{max}$ when $k \to \infty$ and let us denote by z_k the solutions of (2.17) corresponding to the values t_k. Multiplying the equation of z_k by z_k and integrating by parts, using assumptions **(A1)** and **(A2)** we get

$$\alpha_0 \|\nabla z_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq \int_\Omega \left\{ a(x,y)|\nabla z_k|^2 + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x,y) z_k^2 \right\} dx$$

$$= \langle v, z_k \rangle - t_k \int_\Omega \frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,y) z_k \nabla y \nabla z_k \, dx$$

$$\leq \left(\|v\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} + t_k D_M \|\nabla y\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \|z_k\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}(\Omega)} \right) \|\nabla z_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

which implies

$$\|\nabla z_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C \left(\|v\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} + \|z_k\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}(\Omega)} \right). \tag{2.18}$$

In principle it seems that there are two possibilities: either $\{z_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is bounded in $L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}(\Omega)$ or it is not. In the first case (2.18) implies that $\{z_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is bounded in $H_0^1(\Omega)$, then we can extract a subsequence, denoted in the same way, such that $z_k \rightharpoonup z$ weakly in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and strongly in $L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}(\Omega)$ because of the compactness of the embedding $H_0^1(\Omega) \subset L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}(\Omega)$ for $p > n$. Therefore we can pass to the limit in (2.17), with $t = t_k$, and check that z is a solution of (2.17) for $t = t_{max}$, therefore $t_{max} \in S$ as we wanted to prove.

Let us see that the second possibility is not actually a correct assumption. Indeed, let us assume that $\|z_k\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}(\Omega)} \to \infty$, taking a subsequence if necessary. We define

$$\rho_k = \frac{1}{\|z_k\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}(\Omega)}} \to 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{z}_k = \rho_k z_k.$$

Then from 2.18 we deduce

$$\|\nabla \hat{z}_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C\left(\rho_k \|v\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} + \|\hat{z}_k\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}(\Omega)}\right) = C\left(\rho_k\|v\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} + 1\right). \tag{2.19}$$

Moreover $\hat{z}_k$ satisfies the equation

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcl} -\mathrm{div}\left[a(x,y)\nabla\hat{z}_k + t_k\dfrac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,y)\hat{z}_k\,\nabla y\right] + \dfrac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x,y)\hat{z}_k & = & \rho_k v \ \text{ in } \Omega \\ z & = & 0 \ \text{ on } \Gamma. \end{array}\right. \tag{2.20}$$

From (2.19) we know that we can extract a subsequence, denoted once again in the same way, such that $\hat{z}_k \rightharpoonup \hat{z}$ weakly in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and strongly in $L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}(\Omega)$. Then $\|\hat{z}\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}(\Omega)} = 1$ and passing to the limit in (2.20) we have that $\hat{z}$ satisfies the equation

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcl} -\mathrm{div}\left[a(x,y)\nabla\hat{z} + t_{max}\dfrac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,y)\hat{z}\,\nabla y\right] + \dfrac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x,y)\hat{z} & = & 0 \ \text{ in } \Omega \\ z & = & 0 \ \text{ on } \Gamma. \end{array}\right.$$

But we have already proved the uniqueness of solution of (2.16), the fact of including t_{max} in the equation does not matter for the proof, therefore $\hat{z} = 0$, which contradicts the fact that its norm in $L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}(\Omega)$ is one.

Finally we prove that $t_{max} = 1$. If it is false, then let us consider the operators $T_\varepsilon, T_{max} \in \mathcal{L}(H_0^1(\Omega), H^{-1}(\Omega))$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ with $t_{max} + \varepsilon \leq 1$, defined by

$$T_\varepsilon z = -\mathrm{div}\left[a(x,y)\nabla z + (t_{max}+\varepsilon)\frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,y)z\,\nabla y\right] + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x,y)z$$

$$T_{max} z = -\mathrm{div}\left[a(x,y)\nabla z + t_{max}\frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,y)z\,\nabla y\right] + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x,y)z.$$

Then we have

$$\|T_\varepsilon - T_{max}\|_{\mathcal{L}(H_0^1(\Omega),H^{-1}(\Omega))} = \sup_{\|z\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)}\leq 1} \|(T_\varepsilon - T_{max})z\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)}$$

$$\leq D_M \sup_{\|z\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)}\leq 1} \varepsilon\|z\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}(\Omega)}\|\nabla y\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C\varepsilon.$$

Since T_{max} is an isomorphism, if $C\varepsilon < 1$, then T_ε is also an isomorphism, which contradicts the fact that t_{max} is the supremum of S. $\square$

THEOREM 2.9. *Let us suppose that **(A1)**, **(A2)** and **(A4)** hold. We also assume that $a : \bar{\Omega}\times\mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is continuous and Γ is of class C^1. Then the control-to-state* *mapping* $G : W^{-1,p}(\Omega) \to W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, $G(u) = y_u$, *is of class* C^2. *Moreover, for any* $v, v_1, v_2 \in W^{-1,p}(\Omega)$ *the functions* $z_v = G'(u)v$ *and* $z_{v_1,v_2} = G''(u)[v_1, v_2]$ *are the unique solutions in* $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ *of the equations*

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcl} -div \left[a(x,y_u)\nabla z + \dfrac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,y_u)z\,\nabla y_u\right] + \dfrac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x,y)\,z & = & v \quad in\ \Omega \\ z & = & 0 \quad on\ \Gamma \end{array}\right. \tag{2.21}$$

and

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l} -div \left[a(x,y_u)\nabla z + \dfrac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,y_u)z\nabla y_u\right] + \dfrac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x,y_u)\,z = -\dfrac{\partial^2 f}{\partial y^2}(x,y_u)z_{v_1}z_{v_2} \\ \quad +div\left[\dfrac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,y_u)(z_{v_1}\nabla z_{v_2} + \nabla z_{v_1}z_{v_2}) + \dfrac{\partial^2 a}{\partial y^2}(x,y_u)z_{v_1}z_{v_2}\nabla y_u\right] \quad in\ \Omega \\ \hfill z = 0 \quad on\ \Gamma. \end{array}\right. \tag{2.22}$$

respectively, where $z_i = G'(u)v_i$, $i = 1, 2$.

Proof. We introduce the mapping $F : W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \times W^{-1,p}(\Omega) \to W^{-1,p}(\Omega)$ by

$$F(y,u) = -\mathrm{div}\,[a(\cdot,y)\nabla y] + f(\cdot,y) - u.$$

Because of the assumptions **(A2)** and **(A4)**, it is obvious that F is well defined, of class C^2 and $F(y_u, u) = 0$ for every $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. If we prove that

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial y}(y_u,u) : W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \longrightarrow W^{-1,p}(\Omega)$$

is an isomorphism, then we can apply the implicit function theorem to deduce the theorem, getting (2.21) and (2.22) by simple computations. Let us remark that

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial y}(y_u,u)z = -\mathrm{div}\,[a(x,y_u)\nabla z + \frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,y_u)z\,\nabla y_u] + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x,y_u)\,z.$$

According to Theorem 2.6, for any $v \in H^{-1}(\Omega)$, there exists a unique element $z \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial y}(y_u,u)z = v.$$

It is enough to prove that $z \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, if $v \in W^{-1,p}(\Omega) \subset H^{-1}(\Omega)$. More precisely, this means that the unique solution of (2.16) in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ belongs to $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. First of all, let us note that

$$a(\cdot,y_u) \in L^\infty(\Omega),\ \frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(\cdot,y_u)\nabla y_u \in L^p(\Omega)^n,\ \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(\cdot,y_u) \in L^\infty(\Omega) \ \text{ and } \ v \in W^{-1,p}(\Omega).$$

Therefore, we can apply a result by Stampacchia [27, Theorem 4.1 and Remark 4.2] about $L^\infty(\Omega)$-estimates of solutions of linear equations to get that $z \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Now we have that

$$-\mathrm{div}[a(x,y_u)\nabla z] = v + \mathrm{div}[\frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,y_u)z\nabla y_u] - \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x,y_u)z \in W^{-1,p}(\Omega)$$

and $x \mapsto a(x, y_u(x))$ is a continuous real-valued function defined in $\bar{\Omega}$. Finally, as in the proof of Theorem 2.3, we can use the $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$-regularity results for linear equations, see [15, Chpt. 4, pag. 73] or [22, pp. 156-157], to deduce that $z \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. □

From Theorem 2.4 we know that the states y corresponding to controls $u \in L^q(\Omega)$, with $q > n/2$, can have an extra regularity under certain assumptions. In this situation, a natural question arises. Can we prove a result analogous to Theorem 2.9 with $G : L^q(\Omega) \to W^{2,q}(\Omega)$? The answer is positive if we assume some extra regularity of the function a.

(A5) For all $M > 0$, there exists a constant $d_M > 0$ such that the following inequality is satisfied:

$$\left|\frac{\partial^j a}{\partial y^j}(x_1, y_1) - \frac{\partial^j a}{\partial y^j}(x_2, y_2)\right| \le d_M \ \{|x_1 - x_2| + |y_1 - y_2|\} \tag{2.23}$$

for all $x_i \in \bar{\Omega}$, $y_i \in [-M, M]$, $i = 1, 2$ and $j = 1, 2$.

THEOREM 2.10. *Suppose that* ***(A1)*-*(A5)*** *hold and* Γ *is of class* $C^{1,1}$. *Then the control-to-state mapping* $G : L^q(\Omega) \to W^{2,q}(\Omega)$, $G(u) = y_u$, *is of class* C^2. *For any* $v, v_1, v_2 \in L^q(\Omega)$, *the functions* $z_v = G'(u)v$ *and* $z_{v_1,v_2} = G''(u)[v_1, v_2]$ *are the unique solutions in* $W^{2,q}(\Omega) \cap W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ *of the equations* (2.21) *and* (2.22), *respectively.*

Proof. The proof follows the same steps than in the previous theorem with obvious modifications. Let us comment the main differences. This time, the function F is defined by the same expression as above and acts from $(W^{2,q}(\Omega) \cap W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)) \times L^q(\Omega)$ to $L^q(\Omega)$. We have to check that F is well defined and we must determine the first- and second-order derivatives. By using the assumptions **(A3)-(A5)**, we have for $j = 0, 1, 2$ and $y \in W^{2,q}(\Omega) \cap W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{div}\left[\frac{\partial^j a}{\partial y^j}(x, y(x))\nabla y(x)\right] &= \left[\nabla_x \frac{\partial^j a}{\partial y^j}\right](x, y(x)) \cdot \nabla y(x) + \frac{\partial^{j+1} a}{\partial y^{j+1}}(x, y(x))|\nabla y(x)|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{\partial^j a}{\partial y^j}(x, y(x))\Delta y(x) \in L^q(\Omega).\end{aligned} \tag{2.24}$$

We have used the fact that $(\partial^j a/\partial y^j)$ is Lipschitz in x and y, therefore differentiable a.e. and that the chain rule is valid in the framework of Sobolev spaces.

On the other hand, **(A2)** and **(A4)** imply that

$$\frac{\partial^j f}{\partial y^j}(\cdot, y) \in L^q(\Omega) \quad \text{for} \quad j = 0, 1, 2.$$

From these remarks, it is easy to deduce that F is of class C^2. Let us prove that (2.16) has a unique solution $z \in W^{2,q}(\Omega) \cap W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ for any $v \in L^q(\Omega)$. The uniqueness is an immediate consequence of the uniqueness of solution in $H_0^1(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$. It remains to prove the $W^{2,q}$-regularity. We argue similarly to the proof of Theorem 2.3. From (2.16) we get

$$\begin{aligned}-\Delta z &= \frac{1}{a}\left\{v + \operatorname{div}\left[\frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x, \bar{y})\, z\ \nabla \bar{y}\right] - \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x, \bar{y})\, z + v\right\} + \nabla_x a \cdot \nabla z + \frac{\partial a}{\partial y}\nabla \bar{y} \cdot \nabla z \\ &= \frac{1}{a}\left\{v - \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x, \bar{y})\, z + \nabla_x \frac{\partial a}{\partial y}\, z \cdot \nabla \bar{y} + \frac{\partial^2 a}{\partial y^2}\, z\, |\nabla \bar{y}|^2 + \frac{\partial a}{\partial y}\nabla z \cdot \nabla \bar{y}\right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\partial a}{\partial y}\, z\, \Delta \bar{y}\right\} + \nabla_x a \cdot \nabla z + \frac{\partial a}{\partial y}\, \nabla z \cdot \nabla \bar{y}.\end{aligned}$$

The right-hand side is an element of $L^q(\Omega)$. To verify this, consider, for instance, the term with the lowest regularity, i.e. the term $\nabla\bar{y}\cdot\nabla z$:

$$\begin{aligned}\Big(\int_\Omega |\nabla\bar{y}|^q|\nabla z|^q dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{q}} &\le \Big(\int_\Omega |\nabla\bar{y}|^n dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{n}}\Big(\int_\Omega |\nabla z|^{\frac{nq}{n-q}} dx\Big)^{\frac{n-q}{nq}}\\ &\le c\Big(\int_\Omega |\nabla\bar{y}|^{\frac{nq}{n-q}} dx\Big)^{\frac{n-q}{nq}} \|z\|_{W_0^{1,\frac{nq}{n-q}}(\Omega)}\\ &\le c\|\bar{y}\|_{W^{2,q}(\Omega)}\|z\|_{W_0^{1,\frac{nq}{n-q}}(\Omega)},\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $z\in W_0^{1,\frac{nq}{n-q}}(\Omega)$, which is a consequence of the embedding $L^q(\Omega)\subset W^{-1,\frac{nq}{n-q}}(\Omega)$ along with Theorem 2.9. Notice that we have assumed $q>n/2$. This inequality is equivalent to $nq/(n-q)>n$ and is also behind the estimate of the integral containing $\nabla\bar{y}$. $\square$

Remark 2.11. *If $q=2$, then Theorem 2.10 remains true for $n=2$ or $n=3$, if we replace the $C^{1,1}$-regularity of Γ by the convexity of Ω. This is a consequence of the H^2-regularity for the elliptic problems in convex domains.*

3. The control problem. Associated to the state equation (1.1), we introduce the following control problem

$$\text{(P)}\begin{cases}\min J(u)=\displaystyle\int_\Omega L(x,y_u(x),u(x))\,dx\\ u\in L^\infty(\Omega)\\ \alpha(x)\le u(x)\le\beta(x)\ \text{for a.e. } x\in\Omega,\end{cases}$$

where $L:\Omega\times(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R})\to\mathbb{R}$ is a Carathéodory function, $p>n$, and $\alpha,\beta\in L^\infty(\Omega)$, with $\beta(x)\ge\alpha(x)$ for a.e. $x\in\Omega$. First of all, we study the existence of a solution for problem (P).

Theorem 3.1. *Let us assume that **(A1)** and **(A2)** hold. We also suppose that L is convex with respect to u and, for any $M>0$, there exists a function $\psi_M\in L^1(\Omega)$ such that*

$$|L(x,y,u)|\le\psi_M(x)\quad\textit{for a.e. } x\in\Omega\quad\textit{and}\quad |y|,|u|\le M.$$

Then (P) *has at least one optimal solution $\bar{u}$.*

Proof. Let $\{u_k\}_{k=1}^\infty\subset L^\infty(\Omega)$ be a minimizing sequence for (P). Since $\{u_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega)\subset W^{-1,p}(\Omega)$, Theorem 2.3 implies that $\{y_{u_k}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is bounded in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and, taking a subsequence, denoted in the same way, we get $u_k\rightharpoonup\bar{u}$ weakly* in $L^\infty(\Omega)$, hence strongly in $W^{-1,p}(\Omega)$. Therefore, $y_{u_k}\to\bar{y}_u$ in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. Moreover, it is obvious that $\alpha\le\bar{u}\le\beta$, hence $\bar{u}$ is a feasible control for (P). Let us denote by $\bar{y}$ the state associated to $\bar{u}$. Now we prove that $\bar{u}$ is a solution of (P). It is enough to use the convexity of L with respect to u along with the continuity with respect to (y,u) and the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem as follows

$$J(\bar{u})=\int_\Omega L(x,\bar{y}(x),\bar{u}(x))\,dx\le\liminf_{k\to\infty}\int_\Omega L(x,\bar{y}(x),u_k(x))\,dx$$

$$\le\limsup_{k\to\infty}\int_\Omega |L(x,\bar{y}(x),u_k(x))-L(x,y_{u_k}(x),u_k(x))|\,dx$$

$$+\limsup_{k\to\infty}\int_\Omega L(x,y_{u_k}(x),u_k(x))\,dx=\lim_{k\to\infty}J(u_k)=\inf(P).$$

$\square$

Our next goal is to derive the first-order optimality conditions. We get the optimality conditions satisfied by $\bar{u}$ from the standard variational inequality $J'(\bar{u})(u-\bar{u})\geq 0$ for any feasible control u. To argue in this way, we need the differentiability of J, which requires the differentiability of L with respect to u and y. Since we also wish to derive second-order optimality conditions, we require the existence of the second-order derivatives of L. More precisely, our assumption is the following.

(A6) $L:\Omega\times(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R})\longrightarrow\mathbb{R}$ is a Carathéodory function, of class C^2 with respect to the last two variables and, for all $M>0$, there exist a constant $C_{L,M}>0$ and functions $\psi_{u,M}\in L^2(\Omega)$ and $\psi_{y,M}\in L^q(\Omega)$, such that

$$\left|\frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(x,y,u)\right|\leq\psi_{u,M}(x),\quad\left|\frac{\partial L}{\partial y}(x,y,u)\right|\leq\psi_{y,M}(x),\quad\|D^2_{(y,u)}L(x,y,u)\|\leq C_{L,M},$$

$$\|D^2_{(y,u)}L(x,y_2,u_2)-D^2_{(y,u)}L(x,y_1,u_1)\|\leq C_{L,M}(|y_2-y_1|+|u_2-u_1|),$$

for a.e. $x\in\Omega$ and $|y|,|y_i|,|u|,|u_i|\leq M$, $i=1,2$, where $D^2_{(y,u)}L$ denotes the second derivative of L with respect to (y,u), i.e. the associated Hessian matrix.

By applying the chain rule and introducing the adjoint state as usual, an elementary calculus leads to the following result.

THEOREM 3.2. *Let us assume that $a:\bar{\Omega}\times\mathbb{R}\mapsto\mathbb{R}$ is continuous, Γ is of class C^1 and* ***(A1)**, **(A2)**, **(A4)*** *and* ***(A6)***. *Then the function $J:L^\infty(\Omega)\to\mathbb{R}$ is of class C^2. Moreover, for every $u,v,v_1,v_2\in L^\infty(\Omega)$, we have*

$$J'(u)v=\int_\Omega\left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(x,y_u,u)+\varphi_u\right)v\,dx \tag{3.1}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}J''(u)v_1v_2=\int_\Omega\Big\{&\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial y^2}(x,y_u,u)z_{v_1}z_{v_2}+\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial y\partial u}(x,y_u,u)(z_{v_1}v_2+z_{v_2}v_1)\\&+\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial u^2}(x,y_u,u)v_1v_2-\varphi_u\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial y^2}(x,y_u)z_{v_1}z_{v_2}\\&-\nabla\varphi_u\left[\frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,y_u)(z_{v_1}\nabla z_{v_2}+\nabla z_{v_1}z_{v_2})+\frac{\partial^2 a}{\partial y^2}(x,y)z_{v_1}z_{v_2}\nabla y_u\right]\Big\}\,dx\end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

where $\varphi_u\in W^{1,p}_0(\Omega)$ is the unique solution of the problem

$$\left\{\begin{aligned}-div\,[a(x,y_u)\nabla\varphi]+\frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,y_u)\nabla y_u\cdot\nabla\varphi+\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x,y_u)\varphi=\frac{\partial L}{\partial y}(x,y_u,u)\ &in\ \Omega\\ \varphi=0\ &on\ \Gamma\end{aligned}\right. \tag{3.3}$$

where $z_{v_i}=G'(u)v_i$ is the solution of (2.21) *for $y=y_u$ and $v=v_i$, $i=1,2$.*

The only delicate point in the proof of the previous theorem is the existence and uniqueness of a solution of the adjoint state equation (3.3). To prove this, let us denote consider the linear operator $T \in \mathcal{L}(W_0^{1,p}(\Omega), W^{-1,p}(\Omega))$ given by

$$Tz = -\text{div}\left[a(x,y)\nabla z + \frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,y)z\,\nabla y\right] + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x,y)\,z.$$

In the proof of Theorem 2.9 we proved that T is bijective. Since T is continuous, we have that it is an isomorphism and its adjoint operator is also an isomorphism $T^* \in \mathcal{L}(W_0^{1,p}(\Omega), W^{-1,p}(\Omega))$ given by

$$T^*\varphi = -\text{div}\,[a(x,y_u)\nabla\varphi] + \frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,y_u)\nabla y_u \cdot \nabla\varphi + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x,y_u)\varphi.$$

This is exactly equivalent to the well-posedness of the adjoint equation (3.3) in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. Finally Theorem 2.1 along with assumption **(A6)** implies that the adjoint state φ_u belongs to the space $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ as claimed in the previous theorem.

REMARK 3.3. *By using the expression given by* (3.2) *for* $J''(u)$*, it is obvious that* $J''(u)$ *can be extended to a continuous bilinear form* $J''(u) : L^2(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

By using the inequality $J'(\bar u)(u - \bar u) \geq 0$ and the differentiability of J given by (3.1) and (3.3) we deduce the first order optimality conditions.

THEOREM 3.4. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.2, if* $\bar u$ *is a local minimum of* (P)*, then there exists* $\bar\varphi \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ *such that*

$$\left\{\begin{aligned} -div\,[a(x,\bar y)\nabla\bar\varphi] + \frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,\bar y)\nabla\bar y \cdot \nabla\bar\varphi + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x,\bar y)\bar\varphi = \frac{\partial L}{\partial y}(x,\bar y,\bar u) \ \textit{in}\ \Omega \\ \bar\varphi = 0 \ \textit{on}\ \Gamma \end{aligned}\right. \tag{3.4}$$

$$\int_\Omega \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(x,\bar y(x),\bar u(x)) + \bar\varphi(x)\right)(u(x) - \bar u(x))\,dx \geq 0 \ \ \textit{for all}\ \alpha \leq u \leq \beta, \tag{3.5}$$

where $\bar y$ *is the state associated to* $\bar u$.

From (3.5) we get as usual

$$\bar u(x) = \left\{\begin{array}{ll} \alpha(x) & \text{if } \bar d(x) > 0 \\ \beta(x) & \text{if } \bar d(x) < 0 \end{array}\right. \quad \text{and} \quad \bar d(x) = \left\{\begin{array}{ll} \geq 0 & \text{if } \bar u(x) = \alpha(x) \\ \leq 0 & \text{if } \bar u(x) = \beta(x) \\ = 0 & \text{if } \alpha(x) < \bar u(x) < \beta(x) \end{array}\right. \tag{3.6}$$

for almost all $x \in \Omega$, where

$$\bar d(x) = \frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(x,\bar y(x),\bar u(x)) + \bar\varphi(x). \tag{3.7}$$

We finish this section by studying the regularity of the optimal solutions of (P).

THEOREM 3.5. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.4 and assuming that*

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial u} : \bar\Omega \times (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{R} \ \textit{is continuous,} \tag{3.8}$$

$$\exists \Lambda_L > 0 \ \textit{such that}\ \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial u^2}(x,y,u) \geq \Lambda_L \ \ \textit{for a.e.}\ x \in \Omega \ \textit{and}\ \forall y,u \in \mathbb{R}^2, \tag{3.9}$$

then the equation

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(x,\bar y(x),t) + \bar\varphi(x) = 0 \tag{3.10}$$

has a unique solution $\bar t = \bar s(x)$ for every $x \in \bar\Omega$. The function $\bar s : \bar\Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous and is related to $\bar u$ by the formula

$$\bar u(x) = Proj_{[\alpha(x),\beta(x)]}(\bar s(x)) = \max\{\min\{\beta(x), \bar s(x)\}, \alpha(x)\}. \tag{3.11}$$

*Moreover, if α, β are contained in $C(\bar\Omega)$, then $\bar u$ belongs to $C(\bar\Omega)$, too. Finally, if Γ is $C^{1,1}$, **(A3)** holds, $q > n$ is taken in the assumptions **(A2)** and **(A6)**, $\alpha, \beta \in C^{0,1}(\bar\Omega)$, and for every $M > 0$ there exists a constant $C_{L,M} > 0$ such that*

$$\left|\frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(x_2, y, u) - \frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(x_1, y, u)\right| \le C_{L,M}|x_2 - x_1| \quad \forall x_i \in \Omega \ \textit{and}\ \forall |y|, |u| \le M, \tag{3.12}$$

then $\bar s, \bar u \in C^{0,1}(\bar\Omega)$.

Proof. Given $x \in \bar\Omega$, let us define the function $g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$g(t) = \frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(x, \bar y(x), t) + \bar\varphi(x).$$

Then g is of class C^1 and from (3.9) we know that it is strictly increasing and

$$\lim_{t\to-\infty} g(t) = -\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{t\to+\infty} g(t) = +\infty.$$

Therefore, there exists a unique element $\bar t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $g(\bar t) = 0$.

Taking $\bar d$ as defined by (3.7) and using (3.6) along with the strict monotonicity of $(\partial L/\partial u)$ with respect to the third variable, we obtain

$$\begin{cases} \text{if } \bar d(x) > 0, \text{ then } \alpha(x) = \bar u(x) > \bar s(x) \\ \text{if } \bar d(x) < 0, \text{ then } \beta(x) = \bar u(x) < \bar s(x) \\ \text{if } \bar d(x) = 0, \text{ then } \bar u(x) = \bar s(x), \end{cases}$$

which implies (3.11).

Let us prove that $\bar s$ is a bounded function. By using the mean value theorem along with (3.8), (3.9) and (3.10) it comes

$$\Lambda_L|\bar s(x)| \le \left|\frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(x, \bar y(x), \bar s(x)) - \frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(x, \bar y(x), 0)\right| = \left|\bar\varphi(x) + \frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(x, \bar y(x), 0)\right|,$$

hence

$$|\bar s(x)| \le \frac{1}{\Lambda_L} \max_{x\in\bar\Omega} \left|\bar\varphi(x) + \frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(x, \bar y(x), 0)\right| < \infty.$$

The continuity of $\bar s$ at every point $x \in \bar\Omega$ follows easily from the continuity of $\bar y$ and $(\partial L/\partial u)$ by using the following inequality

$$\Lambda_L|\bar s(x) - \bar s(x')| \le \left|\frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(x', \bar y(x'), \bar s(x)) - \frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(x', \bar y(x'), \bar s(x'))\right|$$

$$\le |\bar\varphi(x') - \bar\varphi(x)| + \left|\frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(x', \bar y(x'), \bar s(x)) - \frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(x, \bar y(x), \bar s(x))\right|. \tag{3.13}$$

If $\alpha, \beta \in C(\bar{\Omega})$, then the identity (3.11) and the continuity of $\bar{s}$ imply the continuity of $\bar{u}$ in $\bar{\Omega}$.

Finally, if Γ is $C^{1,1}$, **(A3)** and **(A6)** hold with $q > n$, then $\bar{y}, \bar{\varphi} \in W^{2,q}(\Omega) \subset C^{0,1}(\bar{\Omega})$. Then we can get from the inequality (3.13), the boundedness of $\bar{s}$ and (3.12) that $\bar{s} \in C^{0,1}(\bar{\Omega})$. Once again, (3.11) allows to conclude that $\bar{u} \in C^{0,1}(\bar{\Omega})$ assuming that α and β are also Lipschitz in $\bar{\Omega}$. Indeed, it is enough to realize that

$$|\bar{u}(x_2) - \bar{u}(x_1)| \le \max\{|\beta(x_2) - \beta(x_1)|, |\alpha(x_2) - \alpha(x_1)|, |\bar{s}(x_2) - \bar{s}(x_1)|\}$$

$$\le \max\{L_\beta, L_\alpha, L_{\bar{s}}\}|x_2 - x_1|,$$

where L_β, L_α and $L_{\bar{s}}$ are the Lipschitz constants of α, β and $\bar{s}$ respectively. □

4. Pontryagin's Principle. The goal of this section is to derive the Pontryagin's principle satisfied by a local solution of (P). For this purpose, we will make the following assumption.

(A7) $L : \Omega \times (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Carathéodory function of class C^1 with respect to the second variable and, for all $M > 0$, there exists a function $\psi_M \in L^q(\Omega)$, with $q \ge pn/(p+n)$, such that

$$\left|\frac{\partial L}{\partial y}(x, y, u)\right| \le \psi_M(x) \text{ for a.e. } x \in \Omega,\ |u| \le M \text{ and } |y| \le M.$$

Associated with the control problem (P), we define the Hamiltonian as usual by

$$H(x, y, u, \varphi) = L(x, y, u) + \varphi[u - f(x, y)].$$

The Pontryagin's principle is formulated as follows.

THEOREM 4.1. *Let $\bar{u}$ be a local solution of* (P). *We assume that $a : \bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is continuous, Γ is of class C^1 and **(A1)**, **(A2)**, **(A4)** and **(A7)** hold. Then there exists $\bar{\varphi} \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ satisfying* (3.4) *and*

$$H(x, \bar{y}(x), \bar{u}(x), \bar{\varphi}(x)) = \min_{s \in [\alpha_{\varepsilon_{\bar{u}}}(x), \beta_{\varepsilon_{\bar{u}}}(x)]} H(x, \bar{y}(x), s, \bar{\varphi}(x)) \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega, \tag{4.1}$$

where

$$\alpha_{\varepsilon_{\bar{u}}}(x) = \max\{\alpha(x), \bar{u}(x) - \varepsilon_{\bar{u}}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_{\varepsilon_{\bar{u}}}(x) = \max\{\beta(x), \bar{u}(x) - \varepsilon_{\bar{u}}\},$$

$\varepsilon_{\bar{u}} > 0$ is the radius of the $L^\infty(\Omega)$ ball where J achieves the minimum value at $\bar{u}$ among all feasible controls.

To prove this theorem, we will use the following lemma whose proof is given in the annex of the paper. Though a shorter proof can be done by using Lyapunov's theorem, we have preferred to give a constructive proof of the lemma.

LEMMA 4.2. *For every $0 < \rho < 1$, there exists a sequence of Lebesgue measurable sets $\{E_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset \Omega$ such that*

$$|E_k| = \rho|\Omega| \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{\rho}\chi_{E_k} \rightharpoonup 1 \quad \text{in } L^\infty(\Omega) \quad \text{weakly}^\star, \tag{4.2}$$

where $|\cdot|$ denotes the Lebesgue measure.

PROPOSITION 4.3. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 4.1, for any* $u \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ *there exist a number* $0 < \hat\rho < 1$ *and measurable sets* $E_\rho \subset \Omega$*, with* $|E_\rho| = \rho|\Omega|$ *for all* $0 < \rho < \hat\rho$*, that have the following properties: If we define*

$$u_\rho(x) = \begin{cases} \bar u(x) & \text{if } x \in \Omega \setminus E_\rho \\ u(x) & \text{if } x \in E_\rho \end{cases},$$

then

$$y_\rho = \bar y + \rho z + r_\rho, \quad \lim_{\rho \searrow 0} \frac{1}{\rho}\|r_\rho\|_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)} = 0 \tag{4.3}$$

$$J(u_\rho) = J(\bar u) + \rho z^0 + r_\rho^0, \quad \lim_{\rho \searrow 0} \frac{1}{\rho}|r_\rho^0| = 0 \tag{4.4}$$

hold true, where $\bar y$ *and* y_ρ *are the states associated to* $\bar u$ *and* y_ρ *respectively,* z *is the unique element of* $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ *satisfying the linearized equation*

$$-div\left[a(x,\bar y)\nabla z + \frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,\bar y) z\, \nabla \bar y\right] + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x,\bar y)\, z = u - \bar u \quad in\ \Omega \tag{4.5}$$

and

$$z^0 = \int_\Omega \left\{\frac{\partial L}{\partial y}(x,\bar y(x),\bar u(x)) z(x) + L(x,\bar y(x),u(x)) - L(x,\bar y(x),\bar u(x))\right\} dx. \tag{4.6}$$

Proof. Let us define the function $g \in L^1(\Omega)$ by

$$g(x) = L(x,\bar y(x),u(x)) - L(x,\bar y(x),\bar u(x)).$$

Given $\rho \in (0,1)$, we take a sequence $\{E_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ as in Lemma 4.2. Since $L^\infty(\Omega)$ is compactly embedded in $W^{-1,p}(\Omega)$, there exists k_ρ such that

$$\left|\int_\Omega \left(1 - \frac{1}{\rho}\chi_{E_k}(x)\right) g(x)\, dx\right| + \|(1 - \frac{1}{\rho}\chi_{E_k})(u - \bar u)\|_{W^{-1,p}(\Omega)} < \rho \quad \forall k \ge k_\rho. \tag{4.7}$$

Let us denote $E_\rho = E_{k_\rho}$. Let us introduce $z_\rho = (y_\rho - \bar y)/\rho$. By subtracting the equations satisfied by y_ρ and $\bar y$ and dividing by ρ we get

$$-\text{div}\left[a(x,\bar y)\nabla z_\rho + \frac{a(x,y_\rho) - a(x,\bar y)}{\rho}\nabla y_\rho\right] + \frac{f(x,y_\rho) - f(x,\bar y)}{\rho} = \frac{u_\rho - \bar u}{\rho} \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Now setting

$$a_\rho(x) = \int_0^1 \frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x, \bar y(x) + \theta(y_\rho(x) - \bar y(x))\, d\theta$$

$$f_\rho(x) = \int_0^1 \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x, \bar y(x) + \theta(y_\rho(x) - \bar y(x))\, d\theta$$

we deduce from the above identity

$$-\text{div}\,[a(x,\bar y)\nabla z_\rho + a_\rho(x) z_\rho\, \nabla y_\rho] + f_\rho(x) z_\rho = \frac{1}{\rho}\chi_{E_\rho}(u - \bar u) \quad \text{in } \Omega. \tag{4.8}$$

Let us define $T, T_\rho : W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \mapsto W^{-1,p}(\Omega)$ by

$$T\xi = -\text{div}\left[a(x,\bar y)\nabla\xi + \frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,\bar y)\xi\,\nabla\bar y\right] + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x,\bar y)\xi$$
$$T_\rho\xi = -\text{div}\,[a(x,\bar y)\nabla\xi + a_\rho(x)\xi\,\nabla y_\rho] + f_\rho(x)\xi.$$

Since $y_\rho \to \bar y$ in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \subset C(\bar\Omega)$, we deduce from our assumptions on a and f that

$$a_\rho(x) \to \frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,\bar y(x)) \text{ and } f_\rho(x) \to \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x,\bar y(x)) \text{ uniformly in } \bar\Omega, \tag{4.9}$$

and consequently

$$\|T_\rho - T\|_{\mathcal{L}(W_0^{1,p}(\Omega),W^{-1,p}(\Omega))} \le C\Big\{\|y_\rho - \bar y\|_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)}$$

$$+\|a_\rho(x) - \frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,\bar y(x))\|_{C(\bar\Omega)} + \|f_\rho(x) - \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x,\bar y(x))\|_{C(\bar\Omega)}\Big\} \to 0. \tag{4.10}$$

Since T is an isomorphism, by taking $\hat\rho$ small enough, we have that T_ρ is also an isomorphism and $T_\rho^{-1} \to T^{-1}$ in $\mathcal{L}(W^{-1,p}(\Omega), W_0^{1,p}(\Omega))$ too. Taking into account (4.7), we obtain

$$\|z - z_\rho\|_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)} = \|T^{-1}(u-\bar u) - T_\rho^{-1}[\frac{1}{\rho}\chi_{E_\rho}(u-\bar u)]\|_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)}$$

$$\le \|T_\rho^{-1}[(1-\frac{1}{\rho}\chi_{E_\rho})(u-\bar u)]\|_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)} + \|(T^{-1}-T_\rho^{-1})(u-\bar u)\|_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)}$$

$$\le C\|(1-\frac{1}{\rho}\chi_{E_\rho})(u-\bar u)\|_{W^{-1,p}(\Omega)} + \|T^{-1}-T_\rho^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(W_0^{1,p}(\Omega),W^{-1,p}(\Omega))}\|u-\bar u\|_{W^{-1,p}(\Omega)} \to 0.$$

Now it is enough to notice that, by definition of z_ρ and the convergence $z_\rho \to z$ in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, we have

$$\varepsilon_\rho = \frac{y_\rho - \bar y}{\rho} - z \to 0,$$

hence $y_\rho = \bar y + \rho z + \rho\varepsilon_\rho$. By putting $r_\rho = \rho\varepsilon_\rho$ we get (4.3). Finally, let us prove (4.4). Similarly to the definitions of a_ρ and f_ρ, we introduce

$$L_\rho(x) = \int_0^1 \frac{\partial L}{\partial y}(x, \bar y(x) + \theta(y_\rho(x) - \bar y(x), u_\rho(x))\,d\theta.$$

Then we have

$$\frac{J(u_\rho) - J(\bar u)}{\rho} = \int_\Omega \frac{L(x,y_\rho(x),u_\rho(x)) - L(x,\bar y(x),\bar u(x))}{\rho}\,dx$$

$$= \int_\Omega \frac{L(x,y_\rho(x),u_\rho(x)) - L(x,\bar y(x),u_\rho(x))}{\rho}\,dx$$

$$+\int_\Omega \frac{L(x,\bar y(x),u_\rho(x)) - L(x,\bar y(x),\bar u(x))}{\rho}\,dx$$

$$= \int_\Omega L_\rho(x) z_\rho(x)\,dx + \int_\Omega \frac{1}{\rho}\chi_{E_\rho}(x)[L(x,\bar y(x),u(x)) - L(x,\bar y(x),\bar u(x))]dx \to$$

$$\to \int_\Omega \frac{\partial L}{\partial y}(x,\bar y(x),\bar u(x)) z(x)\,dx + \int_\Omega [L(x,\bar y(x),u(x)) - L(x,\bar y(x),\bar u(x))]dx = z^0,$$

which implies (4.4). □

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Since $\bar u$ is a local solution of (P), there exists $\varepsilon_{\bar u} > 0$ such that J achieves the minimum at $\bar u$ among all feasible pairs of $\bar B_{L^\infty(\Omega)}(\bar u, \varepsilon_{\bar u})$. Let us take $u \in B_{L^\infty(\Omega)}(\bar u, \varepsilon_{\bar u})$ with $\alpha(x) \le u(x) \le \beta(x)$ a.e $x \in \Omega$. Following Proposition 4.3, we consider the sets $\{E_\rho\}_{\rho>0}\}$ such that (4.3) and (4.4) hold. Then $u_\rho \in B_{L^\infty(\Omega)}(\bar u, \varepsilon_{\bar u})$ and therefore, (4.4) leads to

$$0 \le \lim_{\rho \searrow 0} \frac{J(u_\rho) - J(\bar u)}{\rho} = z^0.$$

By using (4.5) and the adjoint state given by (3.4), we get from the previous inequality after an integration by parts

$$0 \le \int_\Omega \{\bar\varphi(x)(u(x) - \bar u(x)) + L(x,\bar y(x),u(x)) - L(x,\bar y(x),\bar u(x))\}\,dx$$

$$= \int_\Omega [H(x,\bar y(x),u(x),\bar\varphi(x)) - H(x,\bar y(x),\bar u(x),\bar\varphi(x))]dx. \tag{4.11}$$

Since u is an arbitrary feasible control in the ball $B_{L^\infty(\Omega)}(\bar u, \varepsilon_{\bar u})$, taking into account the definitions of $\alpha_{\varepsilon_{\bar u}}$ and $\beta_{\varepsilon_{\bar u}}$ given in the statement of Theorem 4.1, we deduce from (4.11)

$$\int_\Omega H(x,\bar y(x),\bar u(x),\bar\varphi(x))\,dx = \min_{\alpha_{\varepsilon_{\bar u}} \le u \le \beta_{\varepsilon_{\bar u}}} \int_\Omega [H(x,\bar y(x),u(x),\bar\varphi(x))\,dx. \tag{4.12}$$

To conclude the proof, we will show that (4.12) implies (4.1). Let the sequence $\{q_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ exhaust the rational numbers contained in $[0,1]$. For every j we set $u_j = q_j\alpha_{\varepsilon_{\bar u}} + (1 - q_j)\beta_{\varepsilon_{\bar u}}$. Then every function u_j belongs to $L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $\alpha_{\varepsilon_{\bar u}}(x) \le u_j(x) \le \beta_{\varepsilon_{\bar u}}(x)$ for every $x \in \Omega$. Now we introduce functions $F_0, F_j : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ by

$$F_0(x) = H(x,\bar y(x),\bar u(x),\bar\varphi(x)) \quad \text{and} \quad F_j(x) = H(x,\bar y(x),u_j(x),\bar\varphi(x)), \quad j = 1,\ldots,\infty.$$

Associated to these integrable functions we introduce the set of Lebesgue regular points E_0 and $\{E_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$, which are known to satisfy $|E_j| = |\Omega|$ for $j = 0,1,\ldots,\infty$, and

$$\lim_{r \searrow 0} \frac{1}{|B_r(x_0)|} \int_{B_r(x_0)} F_j(x)\,dx = F_j(x_0) \quad \forall x_0 \in E_j,\ j = 0,1,\ldots,\infty, \tag{4.13}$$

where $B_r(x_0)$ is the Euclidean ball in $\mathbb{R}^n$ of center x_0 and radius r. Let us set $E = \cap_{j=0}^\infty E_j$, then it is obvious that $|E| = |\Omega|$ and (4.13) holds for every $x_0 \in E$. Given $x_0 \in E$ and $r > 0$ we define

$$u_{j,r}(x) = \begin{cases} \bar u(x) & \text{if } x \notin B_r(x_0) \\ u_j(x) & \text{if } x \in B_r(x_0),\ j = 1,\ldots,\infty. \end{cases}$$

From (4.12) and the above definition we deduce

$$\int_\Omega H(x,\bar y(x),\bar u(x),\bar\varphi(x))\,dx \le \int_\Omega H(x,\bar y(x),u_{j,r}(x),\bar\varphi(x))\,dx,$$

therefore

$$\frac{1}{|B_r(x_0)|}\int_{B_r(x_0)} H(x,\bar y(x),\bar u(x),\bar\varphi(x))\,dx$$

$$\le \frac{1}{|B_r(x_0)|}\int_{B_r(x_0)} H(x,\bar y(x),u_j(x),\bar\varphi(x))\,dx,$$

and passing to the limit when $r\to 0$ we get

$$H(x_0,\bar y(x_0),\bar u(x_0),\bar\varphi(x_0)) \le H(x_0,\bar y(x_0),u_j(x_0),\bar\varphi(x_0)).$$

Since the function $s\to H(x_0,\bar y(x_0),s,\bar\varphi(x_0))$ is continuous and $\{u_j(x_0)\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is dense in $[\alpha_{\varepsilon_{\bar u}}(x_0),\beta_{\varepsilon_{\bar u}}(x_0)]$, we get

$$H(x_0,\bar y(x_0),\bar u(x_0),\bar\varphi(x_0)) \le H(x_0,\bar y(x_0),s,\bar\varphi(x_0)) \quad \forall s\in[\alpha_{\varepsilon_{\bar u}}(x_0),\beta_{\varepsilon_{\bar u}}(x_0)].$$

Finally, (4.1) follows from the previous inequality and the fact that x_0 is an arbitrary point of E. ◻

Remark 4.4. *If we consider that $\bar u$ is a global solution or even a local solutions of (P) in the sense of the $L^p(\Omega)$ topology, then* (4.1) *holds with $\varepsilon_{\bar u}=0$, more precisely*

$$H(x,\bar y(x),\bar u(x),\bar\varphi(x)) = \min_{s\in[\alpha(x),\beta(x)]} H(x,\bar y(x),s,\bar\varphi(x)) \quad \textit{for a.e. } x\in\Omega.$$

The proof is the same. The only point we have to address is that the functions u_ρ defined in Proposition 4.3 corresponding to feasible controls u satisfy

$$\|u_p-\bar u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} = \left(\int_{E_\rho}|u(x)-\bar u(x)|^p\,dx\right)^{1/p} \le \|u-\bar u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}|E_\rho|^{1/p}$$

$$\le \|\beta-\alpha\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}|\Omega|^{1/p}\rho^{1/p}.$$

Therefore for ρ small enough the functions u_ρ are in the corresponding ball of $L^p(\Omega)$ where $\bar u$ is the minimum.

5. Second-order optimality conditions. The goal of this section is to prove first necessary and next sufficient second-order optimality conditions. For it we will assume that **(A1)**,**(A2)**, **(A4)** and **(A6)** hold, the function $a:\bar\Omega\times\mathbb{R}\longrightarrow\mathbb{R}$ is continuous, and Γ is of class C^1.

If $\bar u$ is a feasible control for problem (P) and there exists $\bar\varphi\in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ satisfying (3.4) and (3.5), then we introduce the cone of critical directions

$$C_{\bar u} = \{h\in L^2(\Omega): h(x) = \begin{cases} \ge 0 & \text{if } \bar u(x)=\alpha(x)\\ \le 0 & \text{if } \bar u(x)=\beta(x)\\ =0 & \text{if } \bar d(x)\neq 0\end{cases} \quad \text{for a.e. } x\in\Omega\} \tag{5.1}$$

where $\bar{d}$ is defined by (3.7). In the previous section, we introduced the Hamiltonian H associated to the control problem. It is easy to check that

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial u}(x, \bar{y}(x), \bar{u}(x), \bar{\varphi}(x)) = \bar{d}(x).$$

In the sequel, we will use the notation

$$\bar{H}_u(x) = \frac{\partial H}{\partial u}(x, \bar{y}(x), \bar{u}(x), \bar{\varphi}(x)) \text{ and } \bar{H}_{uu}(x) = \frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial u^2}(x, \bar{y}(x), \bar{u}(x), \bar{\varphi}(x)).$$

Now we prove the necessary second-order optimality conditions.

THEOREM 5.1. *Let us assume that $\bar{u}$ is a local solution of* (P) *and let $\bar{\varphi} \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ be the adjoint state given by* (3.4). *Then the following inequalities hold*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} J''(\bar{u})h^2 \geq 0 \quad \forall h \in C_{\bar{u}} \\ \bar{H}_{uu}(x) \geq 0 \quad \textit{for a.a. } x \textit{ with } \bar{H}_u(x) = 0. \end{array} \right. \tag{5.2}$$

Proof. Let us take $h \in C_{\bar{u}}$ arbitrarily and $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_{\bar{u}}$. Then we define

$$h_\varepsilon(x) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 0 \;\text{ if } \quad \alpha(x) < \bar{u}(x) < \alpha(x) + \varepsilon \text{ or } \beta(x) - \varepsilon < \bar{u}(x) < \beta(x) \\ \max\{-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}, \min\{+\frac{1}{\varepsilon}, h(x)\}\} \quad \text{otherwise.} \end{array} \right.$$

It is clear that $h_\varepsilon \in C_{\bar{u}} \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $h_\varepsilon \to h$ in $L^2(\Omega)$. Moreover, we have

$$\alpha(x) \leq \bar{u}(x) + t h_\varepsilon(x) \leq \beta(x) \;\text{ for a.e. } x \in \Omega \quad \text{and } 0 \leq t < \varepsilon^2.$$

Therefore, if we define $g_\varepsilon : [0, \varepsilon^2] \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $g_\varepsilon(t) = J(\bar{u} + t h_\varepsilon)$, we have

$$g_\varepsilon(0) = \min_{t \in [0, \varepsilon^2]} g_\varepsilon(t).$$

From our assumptions it is clear that g_ε is a C^2 function. From the fact $h_\varepsilon \in C_{\bar{u}}$ we deduce that

$$g'_\varepsilon(0) = J'(\bar{u})h_\varepsilon = \int_\Omega \bar{H}_u(x) h_\varepsilon(x)\, dx = 0.$$

Now, an elementary calculus and Theorem 3.2 yield

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq g''_\varepsilon(0) = J''(\bar{u})h_\varepsilon^2 = &\int_\Omega \left\{ \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial y^2}(x, \bar{y}, \bar{u}) z_{h_\varepsilon}^2 + 2 \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial y \partial u}(x, \bar{y}, \bar{u}) z_{h_\varepsilon} h_\varepsilon \right. \\ &+ \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial u^2}(x, \bar{y}, \bar{u}) h_\varepsilon^2 - \bar{\varphi} \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial y^2}(x, \bar{y}) z_{h_\varepsilon}^2 \\ &\left. - \nabla \bar{\varphi} \cdot \left[2 \frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x, \bar{y}) z_{h_\varepsilon} \nabla z_{h_\varepsilon} + \frac{\partial^2 a}{\partial y^2}(x, \bar{y}) z_{h_\varepsilon}^2 \nabla \bar{y} \right] \right\} dx, \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

where $z_{h_\varepsilon} \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ is the solution of (2.16) corresponding to $v = h_\varepsilon$. Moreover, the convergence $h_\varepsilon \to h$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ implies that $z_{h_\varepsilon} \to z_h$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$, where z_h is the solution of (2.16) for $v = h$; see Remark 2.7. Now we estimate the terms of (5.3). Arguing as in Remark 2.7, taking into account the embedding $H_0^1(\Omega) \subset L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}(\Omega)$ and assumption **(A4)**, we get

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla\bar\varphi(x) \cdot \frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,\bar y) z_{h_\varepsilon}(x) \nabla z_{h_\varepsilon}(x)|\,dx \le D_M \|\nabla\bar\varphi\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \|\|z_{h_\varepsilon}\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}(\Omega)} \|\nabla z_{h_\varepsilon}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

$$\le C D_M \|\bar\varphi\|_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)} \|\|z_{h_\varepsilon}(x)\|^2_{H_0^1(\Omega)}.$$

Analogously we have

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla\bar\varphi(x) \cdot \frac{\partial^2 a}{\partial y^2}(x,\bar y) z^2_{h_\varepsilon}(x) \nabla \bar y(x)|\,dx \le D_M \|\nabla\bar\varphi\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \|\|z_{h_\varepsilon}\|^2_{L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}(\Omega)} \|\nabla \bar y\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \le$$

$$C D_M \|\bar\varphi\|_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)} \|\|z_{h_\varepsilon}(x)\|^2_{H_0^1(\Omega)} \|\bar y\|_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)}.$$

The rest of the terms in the integral (5.3) are easy to estimate with the help of the assumptions **(A4)** and **(A6)**. Therefore, we can pass to the limit in (5.3) and deduce

$$0 \le \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} J''(\bar u) h_\varepsilon^2 = J''(\bar u) h^2.$$

This proves the first inequality of (5.2). Finally, the second inequality is an obvious consequence of (4.1). Indeed, it is a standard conclusion of (4.1) that

$$\bar H_u(x) = \begin{cases} \ge 0 & \text{if } \bar u(x) = \alpha(x) \\ \le 0 & \text{if } \bar u(x) = \beta(x) \\ = 0 & \text{if } \alpha(x) < \bar u(x) < \beta(x) \end{cases} \qquad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega$$

and

$$\bar H_{uu}(x) \ge 0 \ \text{ if } \ \bar H_u(x) = 0 \ \text{ for a.e. } x \in \Omega.$$

□

Let us consider the Lagrangian function associated to the control problem (P)

$$\mathcal{L} : L^\infty(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

given by the expression

$$\mathcal{L}(u,y,\varphi) = \mathcal{J}(y,u) + \int_\Omega \{\varphi[u - f(x,y)] - a(x,y)\nabla\varphi\cdot\nabla y\}\,dx$$

$$= \int_\Omega \{H(x,y(x),u(x),\varphi(x)) - a(x,y(x))\nabla\varphi(x)\cdot\nabla y(x)\}\,dx,$$

where we denote

$$\mathcal{J}(y,u) = \int_\Omega L(x,y(x),u(x))\,dx.$$

Defining $\bar{H}_y$, $\bar{H}_{yy}$ and $\bar{H}_{yu}$ similarly to $\bar{H}_u$ and $\bar{H}_{uu}$, after obvious modifications, we can write the first and second order derivatives of $\mathcal{L}$ with respect to (y,u) as follows

$$D_{(y,u)}\mathcal{L}(\bar{u},\bar{y},\bar{\varphi})(z,h) = \int_\Omega \left\{\bar{H}_y(x)z(x) + \bar{H}_u(x)h(x)\right\} dx$$

$$-\int_\Omega \nabla\bar{\varphi}(x)\cdot\left\{a(x,\bar{y}(x))\nabla z(x) + \frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,\bar{y}(x))z(x)\nabla\bar{y}(x)\right\} dx.$$

If we assume that z is the solution of (2.16) associated to $v = h$, then by using the adjoint state (3.4) we get

$$D_{(y,u)}\mathcal{L}(\bar{u},\bar{y},\bar{\varphi})(z,h) = \int_\Omega \bar{H}_u(x)h(x)\,dx, \tag{5.4}$$

Moreover, we find

$$D^2_{(y,u)}\mathcal{L}(\bar{u},\bar{y},\bar{\varphi})(z,h)^2 = \int_\Omega \left\{\bar{H}_{yy}(x)z^2(x) + 2\bar{H}_{yu}(x)z(x)h(x) + \bar{H}_{uu}(x)h^2(x)\right\} dx$$

$$-\int_\Omega \nabla\bar{\varphi}(x)\cdot\left\{\frac{\partial^2 a}{\partial y^2}(x,\bar{y}(x))z^2(x)\nabla\bar{y}(x) + 2\frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,\bar{y}(x))z(x)\nabla z(x)\right\} dx.$$

Once again if we take z as the solution of (2.16) associated to $v = h$ we deduce from (3.2)

$$J''(\bar{u})h^2 = D^2_{(y,u)}\mathcal{L}(\bar{u},\bar{y},\bar{\varphi})(z,h)^2. \tag{5.5}$$

Therefore the necessary optimality conditions (5.2) can be written as follows

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l} D^2_{(y,u)}\mathcal{L}(\bar{u},\bar{y},\bar{\varphi})(z,h)^2 \geq 0 \quad \forall (z,h)\in H^1_0(\Omega)\times C_{\bar{u}} \text{ satisfying (2.16)} \\ \bar{H}_{uu}(x)\geq 0 \quad \text{if} \quad \bar{H}_u(x) = 0 \quad \text{ for a.e. } x\in\Omega \end{array}\right. \tag{5.6}$$

We finish this section by establishing the sufficient second-order optimality conditions.

THEOREM 5.2. *Let us assume that $\bar{u}$ is a feasible control for the problem* (P) *and there exists $\bar{\varphi}\in W^{1,p}_0(\Omega)$ satisfying* (3.4) *and* (3.5). *If, in addition, there exist $\mu > 0$ and $\tau > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{array}{l} J''(\bar{u})h^2 > 0 \ \forall h\in C_{\bar{u}}\setminus\{(0,0)\} \\ \bar{H}_{uu}(x)\geq\mu \quad \textit{if} \quad |\bar{H}_u(x)|\leq\tau \quad \textit{for a.e. } x\in\Omega, \end{array} \tag{5.7}$$

then there exist $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ such that

$$J(\bar{u}) + \frac{\delta}{2}\|u-\bar{u}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq J(u) \tag{5.8}$$

for every feasible control $u\in L^\infty(\Omega)$ for (P) *such that $\|u-\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\leq\varepsilon$.*

REMARK 5.3.

1.- *If we compare the first inequality of* (5.7) *with the analogous of* (5.2)*, we see that the gap is minimal between the necessary and sufficient conditions, as it is usual in finite dimension. However, the second inequality of* (5.7) *is stronger than the corresponding one of* (5.2)*. This is a consequence of the infinite number of constraints on the control: one constraint for every point of* Ω*. In general we cannot take* $\tau = 0$*. The reader is referred to Dunn [14] for a simple example proving the impossibility of taking* $\tau = 0$*.*

2.- *Let us recall that* $\bar{H}_{uu}(x) = (\partial^2 L/\partial u^2)(x, \bar{y}(x), \bar{u}(x))$*. Therefore, the second condition of* (5.7) *is satisfied if we assume that the second derivative of* L *with respect to* u *is strictly positive. A standard example is given by the function*

$$L(x, y, u) = L_0(x, y) + \frac{N}{2}u^2, \quad \textit{with } N > 0.$$

3.- *The sufficient optimality conditions* (5.7) *can be written as follows*

$$D^2_{(y,u)}\mathcal{L}(\bar{u}, \bar{y}, \bar{\varphi})(z, h)^2 > 0 \ \forall (z, h) \in (H^1_0(\Omega) \times C_{\bar{u}}) \setminus \{(0, 0)\} \ \textit{verifying } (2.16)$$
$$\bar{H}_{uu}(x) \geq \mu \quad \textit{if} \quad |\bar{H}_u(x)| \leq \tau \quad \textit{for a.e. } x \in \Omega.$$

Once again this is an obvious consequence of (5.5)*.*

Proof. Step 1: Preparations. We will argue by contradiction. Let us assume that there exists a sequence of feasible controls for (P), $\{u_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset L^\infty(\Omega)$, such that

$$\|u_k - \bar{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} < \frac{1}{k} \quad \text{and} \quad J(\bar{u}) + \frac{1}{k}\|u_k - \bar{u}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} > J(u_k). \tag{5.9}$$

Let us define

$$y_k = G(u_k) = y_{u_k}, \ \bar{y} = G(\bar{u}) = y_{\bar{u}}, \ \rho_k = \|u_k - \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \ \text{and} \ v_k = \frac{1}{\rho_k}(u_k - \bar{u}), \tag{5.10}$$

then

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \|y_k - \bar{y}\|_{W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)} = 0, \quad \lim_{k\to\infty} \rho_k = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \|v_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = 1 \quad \forall k. \tag{5.11}$$

By taking a subsequence, if necessary, we can assume that $v_k \rightharpoonup v$ weakly in $L^2(\Omega)$. We will prove that $v \in C_{\bar{u}}$. Next, we will use (5.7). In this process we will need the following result

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{\rho_k}(y_k - \bar{y}) = z \quad \text{in} \quad H^1_0(\Omega), \tag{5.12}$$

where $z \in H^1_0(\Omega)$ is the solution of (2.16) corresponding to the state $\bar{y}$. Let us prove it. We will set $z_k = (y_k - \bar{y})/\rho_k$. By subtracting the state equations satisfied by (y_k, u_k) and $(\bar{y}, \bar{u})$, dividing by ρ_k and applying the mean value theorem we get

$$-\text{div}\,[a(x, y_k)\nabla z_k + \frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x, \bar{y} + \theta_k(y_k - \bar{y}))z_k \nabla \bar{y}] + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x, \bar{y} + \nu_k(y_k - \bar{y}))z_k = v_k. \tag{5.13}$$

Taking into account that $z_k \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, we can multiply the equation (5.13) by z_k and make an integration by parts to get with the aid of (2.1) and (5.11) that

$$\alpha_0 \int_\Omega |\nabla z_k(x)|^2\, dx \leq \int_\Omega a(x, y_k)|\nabla z_k(x)|^2\, dx$$

$$= \int_\Omega \left\{ v_k z_k - \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x, \bar y + \nu_k(y_k - \bar y)) z_k^2 - \frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x, \bar y + \theta_k(y_k - \bar y)) z_k \nabla z_k \nabla \bar y \right\} dx$$

$$\leq \|v_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|z_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + C\|z_k\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}(\Omega)} \|\nabla \bar y\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla z_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

We have used that the term $-\partial f/\partial y\, z_k^2$ is non-positive. Therefore,

$$\|\nabla z_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C \left\{ 1 + \|z_k\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}(\Omega)} \right\}.$$

As in the proof of Theorem 2.6, $\{z_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ must be bounded in $L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}(\Omega)$, otherwise we could obtain a non zero solution of (2.16). Then, the above inequality leads to the boundedness of $\{z_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$. Therefore we can extract a subsequence, denoted in the same way, such that $z_k \rightharpoonup z$ weakly in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and strongly in $L^{\frac{2p}{p-2}}(\Omega)$. Thanks to this convergence and to (5.10), we get the strong convergences in $L^2(\Omega)$

$$\frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x, \bar y + \theta_k(y_k - \bar y)) z_k \nabla \bar y \to \frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x, \bar y) z \nabla \bar y \;\text{ and }\; \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x, \bar y + \nu_k(y_k - \bar y)) z_k \to \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x, \bar y) z.$$

Therefore we can pass to the limit in (5.13) and deduce

$$-\mathrm{div}\, [a(x, \bar y)\nabla z + \frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x, \bar y) z \nabla \bar y] + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x, \bar y) z = v. \tag{5.14}$$

Moreover by using (5.13), (5.14), and the uniform convergence $y_k \to \bar y$ it is easy to prove that

$$\int_\Omega a(x, \bar y)|\nabla z_k|^2\, dx \to \int_\Omega a(x, \bar y)|\nabla z|^2\, dx.$$

This fact, along with the weak convergence of $\{z_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$, implies the strong convergence $z_k \to z$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$.

Step 2: $v \in C_{\bar u}$. Since $\alpha(x) \leq u_k(x) \leq \beta(x)$ a.e., we have that $v_k(x) \geq 0$ if $\bar u(x) = \alpha(x)$ and $v_k(x) \leq 0$ if $\bar u(x) = \beta(x)$ a.e. Since the set of functions satisfying these sign conditions is convex and closed in $L^2(\Omega)$, then it is weakly closed, therefore the weak limit v of $\{v_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ satisfies the sign condition too. It remains to prove that $v(x) = 0$ for almost all x such that $\bar d(x) \neq 0$. From (5.9), by using the mean value theorem we obtain

$$\frac{\rho_k}{k} = \frac{1}{k\rho_k}\|u_k - \bar u\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} > \frac{J(u_k) - J(\bar u)}{\rho_k}$$

$$= \int_\Omega \frac{\partial L}{\partial y}(x, \bar y + \theta_k(y_k - \bar y), \bar u + \theta_k(u_k - \bar u)) z_k\, dx$$

$$+ \int_\Omega \frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(x, \bar y + \theta_k(y_k - \bar y), \bar u + \theta_k(u_k - \bar u)) v_k\, dx.$$

Taking limits in both sides of the inequality, using (3.4), (5.14), the already proved convergence $z_k \to z$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and integrating by parts we get

$$0 \geq \int_\Omega \left\{ \frac{\partial L}{\partial y}(x, \bar y, \bar u) z + \frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(x, \bar y, \bar u) v \right\} dx =$$

$$\int_\Omega \left\{\bar\varphi + \frac{\partial L}{\partial u}(x,\bar y,\bar u)\right\} v\,dx = \int_\Omega \bar d(x)v(x)\,dx = \int_\Omega |\bar d(x)||v(x)|\,dx,$$

the last equality being a consequence of proved signs for v and (3.6). The previous inequality implies that $|\bar d(x)v(x)| = 0$ holds almost everywhere, hence $v(x) = 0$ if $\bar d(x) \neq 0$ as we wanted to prove.

Step 3: $v = 0$. The next step consists of proving that v does not satisfy the first condition of (5.7). This will lead to the identity $v = 0$. By using (5.9), the definition of $\mathcal{L}$ and the fact that $(\bar y, \bar u)$ and (y_k, u_k) satisfy the state equation we get

$$\mathcal{L}(u_k, y_k, \bar\varphi) = \mathcal{J}(y_k, u_k) < \mathcal{J}(\bar y, \bar u) + \frac{1}{k}\|u_k - \bar u\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

$$= \mathcal{L}(\bar u, \bar y, \bar\varphi) + \frac{1}{k}\|u_k - \bar u\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}. \tag{5.15}$$

Performing a Taylor expansion up to the second order, we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}(u_k, y_k, \bar\varphi) = \mathcal{L}(\bar u + \rho_k v_k, \bar y + \rho_k z_k, \bar\varphi) = \mathcal{L}(\bar u, \bar y, \bar\varphi) + \rho_k D_{(y,u)}\mathcal{L}(\bar u, \bar y, \bar\varphi)(z_k, v_k)$$

$$+\frac{\rho_k^2}{2} D^2_{(y,u)}\mathcal{L}(\bar u + \theta_k\rho_k v_k, \bar y + \theta_k\rho_k z_k, \bar\varphi)(z_k, v_k)^2.$$

This equality, along with (5.15) and (5.9), leads to

$$\rho_k D_{(y,u)}\mathcal{L}(\bar u, \bar y, \bar\varphi)(z_k, v_k) + \frac{\rho_k^2}{2} D^2_{(y,u)}\mathcal{L}(w_k, \xi_k, \bar\varphi)(z_k, v_k)^2 < \frac{1}{k}|u_k - \bar u\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \frac{\rho_k^2}{k},$$

where we have put $\xi_k = \bar y + \theta_k\rho_k z_k$ and $w_k = \bar u + \theta_k\rho_k v_k$. It is obvious that $\xi_k \to \bar y$ in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and $w_k \to \bar u$ in $L^\infty(\Omega)$. Dividing the previous inequality by ρ_k^2 and taking into account the expressions obtained for the derivatives of $\mathcal{L}$ we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\rho_k}\int_\Omega \bar H_u(x)v_k(x)\,dx + \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega \left\{H^k_{yy}(x)z_k^2(x) + 2H^k_{yu}(x)z_k(x)v_k(x) + H^k_{uu}(x)v_k^2(x)\right\} dx$$

$$-\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega \left\{\frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,\xi_k)z_k\nabla z_k + \frac{\partial^2 a}{\partial y^2}(x,\xi_k)z_k^2\nabla\xi_k\right\}\nabla\bar\varphi\,dx < \frac{1}{k}, \tag{5.16}$$

where

$$H^k_{yy}(x) = H_{yy}(x, \xi_k(x), w_k(x), \bar\varphi(x)),$$

with analogous definitions for H^k_{uu} and H^k_{yu}. It is easy to check that

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l} (H^k_{yy}(x), H^k_{yu}(x), H^k_{uu}(x)) \to (\bar H_{yy}(x), \bar H_{yu}(x), \bar H_{uu}(x)) \\ |H^k_{yy}(x)| + |H^k_{yu}(x)| + |H^k_{uu}(x)| \leq C \end{array}\right. \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \Omega.$$

for some constant $C < \infty$. We also have the following convergence properties

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l} \dfrac{\partial^j a}{\partial y^j}(x,\xi_k)z_k\nabla\bar\varphi \to \dfrac{\partial^j a}{\partial y^j}(x,\bar y)z\nabla\bar\varphi,\ j = 1,2 \\ \nabla z_k \longrightarrow \nabla z \ \text{ and } \ z_k\nabla\xi_k \longrightarrow z\nabla\bar y \end{array}\right. \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega)^n.$$

Using these properties we can pass to the limit in (5.16) as follows

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty}\left\{\frac{1}{\rho_k}\int_\Omega \bar H_u(x)v_k(x)\,dx+\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega H^k_{uu}(x)v_k^2(x)\,dx\right\}$$
$$+\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega[\bar H_{yy}(x)z^2(x)+2\bar H_{yu}(x)z(x)v(x)]\,dx$$
$$-\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega\left\{\frac{\partial a}{\partial y}(x,\bar y)z\nabla z+\frac{\partial^2 a}{\partial y^2}(x,\bar y)z^2\nabla\bar y\right\}\nabla\bar\varphi\,dx\le 0. \tag{5.17}$$

The rest of the proof is devoted to verify that the above upper limit is bounded from below by $\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega \bar H_{uu}v_k^2\,dx$. If this is proved, then from (5.17) and (5.5) we deduce that $J''(\bar u)v^2 = D^2_{(y,u)}\mathcal{L}(\bar u,\bar y,\bar\varphi)(z,v)^2\le 0$. According to (5.7) this is possible only if $v=0$. The proof of the mentioned lower estimate is quite technical, which makes an important difference with respect to the finite dimension. In our framework the difficulty is due to the fact that we only have a weak convergence $v_k\rightharpoonup v$. To overcome this difficulty we use a convexity argument. In order to achieve this goal the essential tool is the second condition of (5.7).

From **(A4)** and **(A6)** we get

$$\|\bar H_{uu}-H^k_{uu}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\le C\left\{\|\bar y-y_k\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}+\|\bar u-u_k\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\right\}\to 0.$$

Using this property, $\|v_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}=1$, and the identity $\bar H_u(x)v_k(x)=|\bar H_u(x)||v_k(x)|$ we obtain

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty}\left\{\frac{1}{\rho_k}\int_\Omega \bar H_u(x)v_k(x)\,dx+\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega H^k_{uu}(x)v_k^2(x)\,dx\right\}$$
$$=\limsup_{k\to\infty}\left\{\frac{1}{\rho_k}\int_\Omega |\bar H_u(x)||v_k(x)|\,dx+\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega \bar H_{uu}(x)v_k^2(x)\,dx\right\}$$
$$\ge\limsup_{k\to\infty}\left\{\frac{1}{\rho_k}\int_{\{|\bar H_u(x)|>\tau\}}\left[|\bar H_u(x)||v_k(x)|+\frac{1}{2}\bar H_{uu}(x)v_k^2(x)\right]dx\right.$$
$$\left.+\frac{1}{2}\int_{\{|\bar H_u(x)|\le\tau\}}\bar H_{uu}(x)v_k^2(x)\,dx\right\} \tag{5.18}$$

where τ is given by (5.7).

Remembering that $\rho_k\|v_k\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}=\|u_k-\bar u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}<1/k$, we deduce the existence of an integer $k_0>0$ such that

$$\frac{\|\bar H_{uu}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\rho_k\|v_k\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}{\tau}<\frac{\|\bar H_{uu}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}{k\tau}<1\quad\forall k\ge k_0,$$

therefore

$$\frac{\tau}{\rho_k}|v_k(x)|\ge\|\bar H_{uu}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}v_k^2(x)\ \ \text{for a.e. } x\in\Omega\ \ \forall k\ge k_0.$$

Then we have with the help of the second condition of (5.7)

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty}\left\{\frac{1}{\rho_k}\int_{\{|\bar H_u|>\tau\}}\left[|\bar H_u||v_k|+\frac{1}{2}\bar H_{uu}v_k^2\right]dx+\frac{1}{2}\int_{\{|\bar H_u|\le\tau\}}\bar H_{uu}v_k^2\,dx\right\}$$

$$\geq \limsup_{k\to\infty}\left\{\int_{\{|\bar H_u|>\tau\}}\left[\|\bar H_{uu}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}+\frac{1}{2}\bar H_{uu}\right]v_k^2\,dx+\frac{1}{2}\int_{\{|\bar H_u|\le\tau\}}\bar H_{uu}v_k^2\,dx\right\}$$

$$\geq \int_{\{|\bar H_u|>\tau\}}\left[\|\bar H_{uu}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}+\frac{1}{2}\bar H_{uu}\right]v^2\,dx+\frac{1}{2}\int_{\{|\bar H_u|\le\tau\}}\bar H_{uu}v^2\,dx\geq\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega \bar H_{uu}v^2\,dx. \tag{5.19}$$

Combining (5.18) and (5.19) we get the searched lower estimate.

Step 4: Final contradiction. Using that $\|v_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}=1$ along with (5.16), (5.17), (5.18), (5.19), the second condition of (5.7) and the fact that $v=0$ we deduce

$$0\geq \limsup_{k\to\infty}\left\{\int_{\{|\bar H_u|>\tau\}}\left[\|\bar H_{uu}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}+\frac{1}{2}\bar H_{uu}\right]v_k^2\,dx+\frac{1}{2}\int_{\{|\bar H_u|\le\tau\}}\bar H_{uu}v_k^2\,dx\right\}$$

$$\geq \limsup_{k\to\infty}\left\{\frac{\|\bar H_{uu}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}}{2}\int_{\{|\bar H_u|>\tau\}}v_k^2\,dx+\frac{\mu}{2}\int_{\{|\bar H_u|\le\tau\}}v_k^2\,dx\right\}$$

$$\geq \frac{\min\{\|\bar H_{uu}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)},\mu\}}{2}\limsup_{k\to\infty}\int_\Omega v_k^2\,dx=\frac{\min\{\|\bar H_{uu}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)},\mu\}}{2}>0,$$

providing the contradiction that we were looking for. ☐

We finish this section by formulating a different version of the sufficient second order optimality conditions which is equivalent to (5.7); see [7, Theorem 4.4] for the proof of this equivalence. This formulation is very useful for numerical purposes.

THEOREM 5.4. *Let us assume that $\bar u$ is a feasible control for problem* (P). *We also assume that there exists $\bar\varphi\in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ satisfying* (3.4) *and* (3.5). *Then* (5.7) *holds if and only there exist $\delta,\sigma>0$ such that*

$$J''(\bar u)h^2\geq\delta\|h\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\quad\forall h\in C^\sigma_{\bar u} \tag{5.20}$$

where

$$C^\sigma_{\bar u}=\{h\in L^2(\Omega): h(x)=\begin{cases}\geq 0 & \textit{if } \bar u(x)=\alpha(x)\\ \leq 0 & \textit{if } \bar u(x)=\beta(x)\\ =0 & \textit{if } |\bar d(x)|>\sigma\end{cases}\quad \textit{for a.e. } x\in\Omega\}.$$

6. Annex. Proof of Lemma 4.1.

Step 1. Construction of the sets E_k. First, we cover Ω by the smallest n-cube with edges parallel to the coordinate axis and split it into small sub-cubes of equal size. This is done as follows:

For $1 \le j \le n$ let $\pi_j : \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the j-th projection $\pi_j(x) = x_j$. We set

$$A_j = \min_{x\in\bar\Omega} \pi_j(x) \text{ and } B_j = \max_{x\in\bar\Omega} \pi_j(x),\ j = 1,\dots,n.$$

For every integer $k \ge 1$ we define

$$a^i_{j,k} = A_j + \frac{i-1}{k}(B_j - A_j), \quad i = 1,\dots,k+1,\ j = 1,\dots,n.$$

For any multi-index $\alpha \in \{1,\dots,k\}^n$ let us consider the n-cubes

$$Q_\alpha = \prod_{j=1}^n [a^{\alpha_j}_{j,k}, a^{\alpha_j+1}_{j,k}].$$

The following properties are obvious

$$Q = \bigcup_{\alpha\in\{1,\dots,k\}^n} Q_\alpha, \quad \overset{o}{Q}_\alpha \cap \overset{o}{Q}_{\alpha'} = \emptyset \text{ if } \alpha \ne \alpha', \quad |Q_\alpha| = \frac{\prod_{j=1}^n (B_j - A_j)}{k^n}.$$

Let us denote

$$F_\alpha = Q_\alpha \cap \Omega, \text{ and } I_k = \{\alpha \in \{1,\dots,k\}^n : |F_\alpha| > 0\}.$$

For any $\alpha \in I_k$ we consider a measurable subset $E_\alpha \subset \overset{o}{F}_\alpha$, with $|E_\alpha| = \rho|F_\alpha|$. Finally we set

$$E_k = \bigcup_{\alpha\in I_k} E_\alpha,$$

then

$$|E_k| = \sum_{\alpha\in I_k} |E_\alpha| = \rho \sum_{\alpha\in I_k} |F_\alpha| = \rho|\Omega|.$$

Step 2. $(1/\rho)\chi_{E_k} \rightharpoonup 1$ *in* $L^\infty(\Omega)$ *weakly**. Since $\{(1/\rho)\chi_{E_k}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ and the step functions are dense in $L^1(\Omega)$, it is sufficient to prove that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_\Omega \left(1 - \frac{1}{\rho}\chi_{E_k}(x)\right) s(x)\, dx = 0$$

for every step function $s \in L^1(\Omega)$. Then the previous convergences hold if and only if

$$\frac{1}{\rho} \lim_{k\to\infty} |A \cap E_k| = |A| \tag{6.1}$$

for every Lebesgue measurable set $A \subset \Omega$. This proof is split into four parts.

Part I. $A = C$ *is a closed* n*-cube.* Let k_0 be large enough so that

$$\text{diameter}(Q_\alpha) < \frac{1}{2}\text{distance}(C,\Gamma)\ \forall\alpha \in \{1,\dots,n\}^n \text{ and } k \ge k_0.$$

Notice that distance(C,Γ) is positive, since $A \subset \Omega$ and A is closed. For every $k \ge k_0$ the above inequality implies that

$$Q_\alpha \cap C \ne \emptyset \Rightarrow Q_\alpha \subset \Omega \Rightarrow Q_\alpha = F_\alpha.$$

It is obvious that the number of sets Q_α such that $Q_\alpha \cap C \neq \emptyset$ and $Q_\alpha \not\subset C$ is of order $O(k^{n-1})$ when $k \to \infty$.

On the other hand

$$|Q_\alpha| = \prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{B_j - A_j}{k} \leq \frac{\text{diameter}(\Omega)^n}{k^n} \quad \forall \alpha \in I_k,$$

therefore

$$\sum_{Q_\alpha \cap C \neq \emptyset,\ Q_\alpha \not\subset C} |Q_\alpha| = O(\frac{1}{k}). \tag{6.2}$$

As a consequence we have

$$\sum_{E_\alpha \cap C \neq \emptyset,\ Q_\alpha \not\subset C} |E_\alpha| \leq \sum_{Q_\alpha \cap C \neq \emptyset,\ Q_\alpha \not\subset C} |Q_\alpha| = O(\frac{1}{k}). \tag{6.3}$$

Using (6.2) and (6.3) we obtain

$$|C| = \sum_{\alpha \in I_k} |Q_\alpha \cap C| = \sum_{Q_\alpha \subset C} |Q_\alpha| + O(\frac{1}{k})$$

$$= \frac{1}{\rho} \sum_{Q_\alpha \subset C} |E_\alpha| + O(\frac{1}{k}) = \frac{1}{\rho} \sum_{\alpha \in I_k} |E_\alpha \cap C| + O(\frac{1}{k}). \tag{6.4}$$

Combining (6.3) and (6.4) we deduce

$$|C| = \lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{1}{\rho} \sum_{\alpha \in I_k} |E_\alpha \cap C| = \lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{1}{\rho} |E_k \cap C|, \tag{6.5}$$

hence (6.1) is proven for closed sets A.

Part II. $A = V$ is an open set. Let us consider a sequence of closed n-cubes $\{C_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ whose sides are parallel to the axes such that

$$V = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} C_j \quad \text{and} \quad \overset{o}{C}_i \cap \overset{o}{C}_j = \emptyset \ \text{ if } \ i \neq j.$$

Any open and bounded set can be exhausted in this way, see, for instance, Stein [28]. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. Then there exists a non-negative integer k_ε such that

$$\sum_{j=k_\varepsilon+1}^{\infty} |E_k \cap C_j| < \varepsilon. \tag{6.6}$$

The equation (6.5) was proven for an arbitrary closed n-cube C, hence it holds true for all C_j, too. By using (6.5) we get from the above inequality

$$\limsup_{k \to \infty} \frac{1}{\rho} |E_k \cap V| = \limsup_{k \to \infty} \frac{1}{\rho} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |E_k \cap C_j| \leq \limsup_{k \to \infty} \frac{1}{\rho} \sum_{j=1}^{k_\varepsilon} |E_k \cap C_j| + \frac{\varepsilon}{\rho}$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{k_\varepsilon} \limsup_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{\rho}|E_k \cap C_j| + \frac{\varepsilon}{\rho} = \sum_{j=1}^{k_\varepsilon} |C_j| + \frac{\varepsilon}{\rho} \le |V| + \frac{\varepsilon}{\rho},$$

where we made use of (6.5) in the last equality. Since ε is arbitrary, we deduce from the previous inequalities

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{\rho}|E_k \cap V| \le |V|. \tag{6.7}$$

Let us prove the opposite inequality. Once again we take $\varepsilon > 0$ arbitrary. Since

$$|V| = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |C_j|,$$

there exists k_ε such that

$$|V| \le \sum_{j=1}^{k} |C_j| + \varepsilon \quad \forall k \ge k_\varepsilon.$$

From this inequality and identity (6.5), we obtain

$$|V| \le \sum_{j=1}^{k_\varepsilon} \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{\rho}|E_k \cap C_j| + \varepsilon = \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{\rho}|E_k \bigcap [\bigcup_{j=1}^{k_\varepsilon} C_j]| + \varepsilon \le \liminf_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{\rho}|E_k \cap V| + \varepsilon.$$

Since ε is arbitrary we deduce

$$|V| \le \liminf_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{\rho}|E_k \cap V|. \tag{6.8}$$

Combining (6.7) and (6.8) we get

$$|V| \le \liminf_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{\rho}|E_k \cap V| \le \limsup_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{\rho}|E_k \cap V| \le |V|,$$

which implies

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{\rho}|E_k \cap V| = |V|. \tag{6.9}$$

Part III. $A = K$ is a compact set. Taking into account that the complementary set of K in Ω, denoted by $\Omega \setminus K$, is open, using (6.9) and remembering that $|E_k| = \rho|\Omega|$, we deduce

$$|K| = |\Omega| - |\Omega \setminus K| = |\Omega| - \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{\rho}|E_k \cap (\Omega \setminus K)| = |\Omega| - \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{\rho}[|E_k| - |E_k \cap K|]$$

$$= |\Omega| - \lim_{k\to\infty} [|\Omega| - \frac{1}{\rho}|E_k \cap K|] = \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{\rho}|E_k \cap K|. \tag{6.10}$$

Part IV. A is a Lebesgue measurable set. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, it is known that there exist an open set $V \subset \Omega$ and a compact set $K \subset \Omega$ such that $K \subset A \subset V$ and

$$|A| - \varepsilon \le |K| \le |A| \le |V| \le |A| + \varepsilon.$$

Then

$$|A| - \varepsilon \le |K| = \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{\rho}|E_k \cap K| \le \liminf_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{\rho}|E_k \cap A|$$

$$\le \limsup_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{\rho}|E_k \cap A| \le \liminf_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{\rho}|E_k \cap V| = |V| \le |A| + \varepsilon.$$

Finally, since ε is arbitrary we get (6.1) from the above inequalities. ∎

REFERENCES

[1] J.-J. Alibert and J.-P. Raymond, *Boundary control of semilinear elliptic equations with discontinuous leading coefficients and unbounded controls*, Numer. Funct. Anal. and Optimization, 3&4 (1997), pp. 235–250.
[2] A. Bejan, *Convection heat transfer*, J. Wiley & Sons, New York, 1995.
[3] F. Bonnans, *Second-order analysis for control constrained optimal control problems of semilinear elliptic systems*, Appl. Math. and Optimization, 38 (1998), pp. 303–325.
[4] F. Bonnans and E. Casas, *Une principe de Pontryagine pour le contrôle des systèmes semilinéaires elliptiques*, J. Diff. Equations, 90 (1991), pp. 288–303.
[5] E. Casas, *Control of an elliptic problem with pointwise state constraints*, SIAM J. Control and Optimization, 4 (1986), pp. 1309–1322.
[6] ———, *Pontryagin's principle for state-constrained boundary control problems of semilinear parabolic equations*, SIAM J. Control and Optimization, 35 (1997), pp. 1297–1327.
[7] E. Casas and M. Mateos, *Second order optimality conditions for semilinear elliptic control problems with finitely many state constraints*, SIAM J. Control and Optimization, 40 (2002), pp. 1431–1454.
[8] E. Casas and L. Fernandez, *Distributed control of systems governed by a general class of quasilinear elliptic equations*, J. of Diff. Equations, 104 (1993), pp. 20–47.
[9] E. Casas and L. Fernández, *Dealing with integral state constraints in control problems of quasilinear elliptic equations*, SIAM J. Control Optim., 33 (1995), pp. 568–589.
[10] E. Casas and F. Tröltzsch, *Second order necessary and sufficient optimality conditions for optimization problems and applications to control theory*, SIAM J. Optimization, 13 (2002), pp. 406–431.
[11] E. Casas, F. Tröltzsch, and A. Unger, *Second order sufficient optimality conditions for a nonlinear elliptic control problem*, Z. für Analysis und ihre Anwendungen (ZAA), 15 (1996), pp. 687–707.
[12] ———, *Second order sufficient optimality conditions for some state-constrained control problems of semilinear elliptic equations*, SIAM J. Control and Optimization, 38 (2000), pp. 1369–1391.
[13] J. Douglas, T. Dupont and J. Serrin, *Uniqueness and comparison theorems for nonlinear elliptic equations in divergence form*, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal., 42 (1971), pp. 157–168.
[14] J. C. Dunn, *On second order sufficient optimality conditions for structured nonlinear programs in infinite-dimensional function spaces*, in Mathematical Programming with Data Perturbations, A. Fiacco, ed., Marcel Dekker, 1998, pp. 83–107.
[15] M. Giaquinta, *Introduction to Regularity Theory for Nonlinear Elliptic Systems*, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1993. Lecture Notes in Mathematics.
[16] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger, *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*, Springer, Berlin, 1998.
[17] P. Grisvard, *Elliptic Problems in Nonsmooth Domains*, Pitman, Boston, 1985.
[18] I. Hlaváček, M. Křížek and J. Malý, *On Galerkin approximations of quasilinear nonpotential elliptic problem of a nonmonotone type*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 184 (1994), pp. 168–189.
[19] M. Křížek and L. Liu, *On the maximum and comparison principles for a steady-state nonlinear heat conduction problem*, Z. Angew. Math. Mech., 83 (2003), pp. 559–563.
[20] O. Klein, P. Philip, J. Sprekels and K . Wilmański, *Radiation- and convection-driven transient heat transfer during sublimation growth of silicon carbide single crystals*, J. of Crystal Growth, 222 (2001), pp. 832–851.
[21] J. L. Lions, *Quelques mèthodes des rèsolution des problèmes aux limites non linèaires*, Dunod, Gauthier–Villars, Paris, 1969.

[22] C. Morrey, *Multiple integrals in the calculus of variations*, Springer–Verlag, New York, 1966.
[23] J. Nečas, *Les méthodes directes en théorie des equations elliptiques*, Academia, Prague, 1967.
[24] ———, *Introduction to the theory of nonlinear elliptic equations*, vol. 52 of Teubner Texts in Mathematics, BSB Teubner, Leipzig, 1983.
[25] J.-P. Raymond and F. Tröltzsch, *Second order sufficient optimality conditions for nonlinear parabolic control problems with state constraints*, Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems, 6 (2000), pp. 431–450.
[26] J.-P. Raymond and H. Zidani, *Hamiltonian Pontryagin's principles for control problems governed by semilinear parabolic equations*, Applied Math. and Optimization, 39 (1999), pp. 143–177.
[27] G. Stampacchia, *Equations elliptiques du second ordre à coefficients discontinus*, Ann. Inst. Fourier, Grenoble, 15 (1965), pp. 189–258.
[28] E. Stein, *Singular integrals and differentiability properties of functions*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1970.
[29] F. Tröltzsch, *Optimale Steuerung partieller Differentialgleichungen – Theorie, Verfahren und Anwendungen*, Vieweg, Wiesbaden, 2005.