



HAL
open science

Addendum to Pontryagin's maximum principle for dynamic systems on time scales

Loïc Bourdin, Oleksandr Stanzhytskyi, Emmanuel Trélat

► **To cite this version:**

Loïc Bourdin, Oleksandr Stanzhytskyi, Emmanuel Trélat. Addendum to Pontryagin's maximum principle for dynamic systems on time scales. *Journal of Difference Equations and Applications*, 2017, 23 (10), pp.1760-1763. 10.1080/10236198.2017.1363194 . hal-01674566

HAL Id: hal-01674566

<https://hal.science/hal-01674566v1>

Submitted on 3 Jan 2018

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Addendum to *Pontryagin's maximum principle for dynamic systems on time scales*

Loïc Bourdin* Emmanuel Trélat† Oleksandr Stanzhytskyi‡

May 9, 2017

Abstract

This note is an addendum to [1, 2], pointing out the differences between these papers and raising open questions.

Keywords: time scale; optimal control; Pontryagin maximum principle; Ekeland variational principle; packages of needle-like variations.

AMS Classification: 34K35; 34N99; 39A12; 39A13; 49K15; 93C15; 93C55.

The main differences. In view of establishing a time scale version of the Pontryagin Maximum Principle (PMP), the authors of [1, Theorem 1] have developed in 2013 a strategy of proof based on the *Ekeland variational principle*. This strategy was originally considered for the classical continuous case by Ivar Ekeland in his seminal paper [3].

The authors of [2, Theorem 2.11] developed in 2017 a different approach, with *packages of needle-like variations* and *necessary conditions for an extreme in a cone*. Note that the authors of [2] prove moreover in [2, Theorem 2.13] that the necessary conditions derived in the PMP are also sufficient in the linear-convex case.

In the sequel of this paragraph, we focus on the major pros and cons of each approach:

1. In [1]:
 - (a) The set Ω of control constraints is assumed to be closed. This is in order to apply the Ekeland variational principle on a complete metric space.
 - (b) There is no assumption on the time scale \mathbb{T} .
2. In [2]:
 - (a) The set Ω of control constraints is assumed to be convex, but need not to be closed.

*Université de Limoges, Institut de recherche XLIM, Pôle MATHIS. UMR CNRS 7252. Limoges, France (loic.bourdin@unilim.fr).

†Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ Paris 06, CNRS UMR 7598, Laboratoire Jacques-Louis Lions, Institut Universitaire de France, F-75005, Paris, France (emmanuel.trelat@upmc.fr).

‡Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine (ostanzh@gmail.com)

- (b) The time scale \mathbb{T} is assumed to satisfy *density conditions* (see [2, Definition 2.4]) of the kind

$$\lim_{\substack{\beta \rightarrow 0^+ \\ s+\beta \in \mathbb{T}}} \frac{\mu(s+\beta)}{\beta} = 0,$$

for every right-dense points s , in order to guarantee that

$$\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\beta} \int_{[s, s+\beta)_{\mathbb{T}}} x(\tau) \Delta\tau = x(s),$$

for Δ -integrable function x and for right-dense Δ -Lebesgue points s , even for $\beta > 0$ such that $s + \beta \notin \mathbb{T}$. Note that a discussion about this issue was provided in [1, Section 3.1].

Hence, the method developed in [2] allows to remove the closedness assumption done on Ω in [1], but this is at the price of an additional assumption on the time scale \mathbb{T} .

In [1, Section 3.1], the authors explained why other approaches (other than the Ekeland variational principle), based for instance on implicit function arguments, or on Brouwer fixed point arguments, or on separation (Hahn-Banach) arguments, fail for general time scales.

As a conclusion, a time scale version of the PMP without closedness assumption on Ω and without any assumption on the time scale \mathbb{T} still remains an open challenge.

Additional comments on the terminal constraints. In [1] the authors considered constraints on the initial/final state of the kind $g(x(t_0), x(t_1)) \in S$, where S is a nonempty closed convex set and g is a general smooth function.

In [2] the authors considered constraints on the initial/final state of the kind $\Phi_i(x(t_0), x(t_1)) = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$, and $\Phi_i(x(t_0), x(t_1)) \leq 0$ for $i = k+1, \dots, n$, where Φ_i are general smooth functions.

Contrarily to what is claimed in [2], the terminal constraints considered in [2] are only a particular case of the ones considered in [1]. Indeed, it suffices to take

$$g = (\Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_k, \Phi_{k+1}, \dots, \Phi_n)$$

and

$$S = \{0\} \times \dots \times \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^- \times \dots \times \mathbb{R}^-.$$

Moreover, note that the necessary condition $-\Psi \in \mathcal{O}_S(g(x(t_0), x(t_1)))$ obtained in [1, Theorem 1] encompasses both the *sign condition (1)* and the *complementary slackness (2)* obtained in [2, Theorem 2.11]. For the sign condition, it is sufficient to recall that the orthogonal of \mathbb{R}^- at a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^-$ is included in \mathbb{R}^+ . For the complementary slackness, it is sufficient to recall that the orthogonal of S at $g(x(t_0), x(t_1))$ is reduced to $\{0\}$ when $g(x(t_0), x(t_1))$ belongs to the interior of S .

Additional comments on the convexity of Ω . The set Ω is assumed to be convex in [2], while it is not in [1]. As explained in [1, Section 3.1], in order to apply necessary conditions of an extreme in a cone, the authors of [2] require that the parameters of perturbations live in intervals. As a consequence, in order to remove the convexity assumption on Ω , one would need (local-directional) convexity of the set Ω for perturbations at right-scattered points, which is a concept that differs from the stable Ω -dense directions used in [1]. Hence, in spite of the claim done in [2], the convexity assumption on Ω does not seem to be easily removable.

On the universal Lagrange multipliers. This paragraph is devoted to providing more details on the existence of universal Lagrange multipliers claimed in [2, page 25]. In the sequel, we use the notations of [2], and we denote by \mathcal{S} the unit sphere of \mathbb{R}^{n+1} .

A package P consists of:

- $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$;
- $\bar{\tau} = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_N)$ where τ_i are right-dense points of \mathbb{T} ;
- $\bar{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_N)$ where $v_i \in U$;
- $\bar{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_\nu)$ where r_i are right-scattered points of \mathbb{T} .
- $\bar{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_\nu)$ where $z_i \in U$.

Let $(P_i)_{i \in I}$ denotes the set of all possible packages.

Following the proof of [2, Theorem 2.11], for every $i \in I$, there exists a nonzero vector $\lambda = (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_n)$ (that we renormalize in \mathcal{S}) of Lagrange multipliers such that:

- (i) (1) and (2) in [2, Theorem 2.11] are satisfied;
- (ii) the adjoint vector Ψ solution of (2.9), with the final condition (3.65) which depends on λ , satisfies the initial condition $\Psi(t_0) = L_{x_0}$;
- (iii) (4a) and (4b) in [2, Theorem 2.11] are satisfied, but only at the points contained in $\bar{\tau}$ and \bar{r} respectively.

For every $i \in I$, the above vector λ is not necessarily unique. Then, for every $i \in I$, we denote by K_i the set of all nonzero and renormalized Lagrange multiplier vectors associated with P_i satisfying the above properties.

By continuity of the adjoint vector Ψ with respect to the Lagrange multipliers (dependence from its final condition), we infer that K_i is a nonempty closed subset contained in the compact \mathcal{S} . This is true for every $i \in I$.

Now, let us prove that the family $(K_i)_{i \in I}$ satisfies the finite intersection property. Let $J \subset I$ be a finite subset and let us prove that $\bigcap_{i \in J} K_i \neq \emptyset$. Note that we can construct a package P corresponding to the union of all packages P_i with $i \in J$. It follows that $P \in (P_i)_{i \in I}$, and thus there exists a nonzero and renormalized Lagrange multiplier vector λ associated with P satisfying the above properties. Since $\lambda \in K_i$ for every $i \in J$, we conclude that $\bigcap_{i \in J} K_i \neq \emptyset$.

It follows from the lemma of a centered system in a compact set that $\bigcap_{i \in I} K_i \neq \emptyset$, and we deduce the existence of a universal Lagrange multiplier vector.

On the density conditions and the Cantor set. Contrarily to what is claimed in [2, Example 2.5], the classical Cantor set does not satisfy the density conditions. However, generalized versions of the Cantor set (see, e.g., [4]) that satisfy density conditions can be constructed as follows.

Let $(\alpha_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a real sequence such that $0 < \alpha_k < \frac{1}{2}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \alpha_k = \frac{1}{2}$. Let $(A_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence of compact subsets defined by the induction

$$A_0 = [0, 1], \quad A_{k+1} = \mathcal{T}_k(A_k) \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N},$$

where \mathcal{T}_k denotes the operator removing the open $(\alpha_k, 1 - \alpha_k)$ -central part of all intervals. Note that the classical Cantor set corresponds to the case where $\alpha_k = \frac{1}{3}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

In our situation, we obtain

$$A_1 = [0, \alpha_0] \cup [1 - \alpha_0, 1],$$

$$A_2 = \left([0, \alpha_1 \alpha_0] \cup [(1 - \alpha_1) \alpha_0, \alpha_0] \right) \cup \left([1 - \alpha_0, 1 - (1 - \alpha_1) \alpha_0] \cup [1 - \alpha_1 \alpha_0, 1] \right),$$

etc. We define the generalized Cantor set $\mathbb{T} = \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} A_k$. In order to prove that the time scale \mathbb{T} satisfies the density conditions, from the fractal properties of \mathbb{T} , it suffices to prove that the density condition is satisfied at the right-dense point $0 \in \mathbb{T}$. More precisely, it is sufficient to prove that

$$\lim_{\substack{\beta \rightarrow 0^+ \\ \beta \in \mathbb{T}}} \frac{\mu(\beta)}{\beta} = 0.$$

Since $\mu(\beta) = 0$ for every right-dense point β , we only have to consider the case where β is a right-scattered point of \mathbb{T} . In that case, one can easily see that $\frac{\mu(\beta)}{\beta} \leq \frac{1 - 2\alpha_k}{\alpha_k}$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and that k tends to $+\infty$ when β tends to 0. The conclusion follows from the fact that $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \alpha_k = \frac{1}{2}$.

References

- [1] L. Bourdin and E. Trélat. *Pontryagin maximum principle for finite dimensional nonlinear optimal control problems on time scales*. SIAM J. Control Optim., 51(5):3781–3813, 2013.
- [2] M. Bohner, K. Kenzhebaev, O. Lavrova and O. Stanzhytskyi. *Pontryagin's maximum principle for dynamic systems on time scales*. J. Difference Equ. Appl., 2017.
- [3] I. Ekeland. *On the variational principle*. J. Math. Anal. Appl., 47:324–353, 1974.
- [4] A.F. Turbin and N.V. Pratsevity. *Fractal sets, functions, distribution*. Kyiv : Naukova Dumka, in Ukrainian, 1992.