

PAPER • OPEN ACCESS


Quasi-best approximation in optimization with PDE constraints

Recent citations

- [A priori error estimates for a linearized fracture control problem](#)
Masoumeh Mohammadi and Winnifried Wollner
- [Optimal control and inverse problems](#)
Christian Clason and Barbara Kaltenbacher

To cite this article: Fernando Gaspoz *et al* 2020 *Inverse Problems* **36** 014004

View the [article online](#) for updates and enhancements.



IOP | ebooks™

Bringing together innovative digital publishing with leading authors from the global scientific community.

Start exploring the collection—download the first chapter of every title for free.

Quasi-best approximation in optimization with PDE constraints

Fernando Gaspoz¹, Christian Kreuzer¹ , Andreas Veese² 
and Winnifried Wollner³ 

¹ Fakultät für Mathematik, Technische Universität Dortmund, Vogelpothsweg 87, 44227 Dortmund, Germany

² Dipartimento di Matematica 'F. Enriques', Università degli Studi di Milano, Via C. Saldini, 50, 20133 Milano, Italy

³ Fachbereich Mathematik, Technische Universität Darmstadt, Dolivostr. 15, 64293 Darmstadt, Germany

E-mail: fernando.gaspoz@tu-dortmund.de, christian.kreuzer@tu-dortmund.de, andreas.veeser@unimi.it and wollner@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de

Received 15 April 2019, revised 28 August 2019

Accepted for publication 25 September 2019

Published 19 December 2019



CrossMark

Abstract

We consider finite element solutions to quadratic optimization problems, where the state depends on the control via a well-posed linear partial differential equation. Exploiting the structure of a suitably reduced optimality system, we prove that the combined error in the state and adjoint state of the variational discretization is bounded by the best approximation error in the underlying discrete spaces. The constant in this bound depends on the inverse square root of the Tikhonov regularization parameter. Furthermore, if the operators of control action and observation are compact, this quasi-best approximation constant becomes independent of the Tikhonov parameter as the mesh size tends to 0 and we give quantitative relationships between mesh size and Tikhonov parameter ensuring this independence. We also derive generalizations of these results when the control variable is discretized or when it is taken from a convex set.

Keywords: PDE constrained optimization, a priori error estimates, quasi-best approximation



Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 licence](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/). Any further distribution of this work must maintain attribution to the author(s) and the title of the work, journal citation and DOI.

1. Introduction

Optimization problems with PDE constraints are ubiquitous, in particular in inverse problems. A basic, and regularly considered, example is the Tikhonov regularized inverse source problem

$$\min_{(q,u) \in L^2 \times H_0^1} \frac{1}{2} |u - u_d|_0^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} |q|_0^2 \quad \text{subject to} \quad -\Delta u = q \quad (1.1)$$

where $|\cdot|_0$ denotes the L^2 -norm over some underlying domain, u_d is the desired state and $\alpha > 0$ scales the cost of the control or, in the case of a regularized inverse source problem, is the Tikhonov parameter tending to 0. In contrast to PDE constrained optimization problems, for inverse problems α is not fixed. Thus it is of interest to analyze the precise interplay of its value and the discretization parameter h used to approximate the PDE.

Of course, additional constraints on the control q and/or the state u can be imposed, and the error due to a discretization of the state equation, and possibly the control, have been analyzed. For piecewise constant discretizations of the control, this has been done in Falk [1] and Geveci [2] including possible box-constraints on the control variable; see also the summary of obtainable convergence orders including Neumann-control in Malanowski [3]. The consideration of element-wise linear functions for the control has been done by Casas and Tröltzsch [4] and Rösch [5] in the presence of control constraints.

Hinze [6] observed that the minimization problem could be solved numerically without prescribing a discretization of the control since the control can be first eliminated and then recovered through the optimality conditions. For this so-called variational discretization, he established $O(h^2)$ convergence for the control in L^2 , even in the presence of box control constraints. It was observed by Meyer and Rösch [7] that the same convergence order can be obtained if a discretized control is used and a post-processing step based upon the optimality conditions is applied.

Due to the structure of the objective in (1.1) these above mentioned estimates make use of the ‘natural norm’

$$|u|_0 + \sqrt{\alpha} |q|_0.$$

Although this norm is natural due to the functional, it induces a scaling $\sqrt{\alpha}$ in all estimates involving the control. Further estimates, for instance of H^1 -norms of the state thereby also contain this scaling. Moreover, the above ‘natural norm’ is not balanced in terms of approximation accuracy, i.e. the error of the state in L^2 will typically decay at least as fast as the error of the control.

The later effect, however, is invisible as long as the approximation accuracy of both terms is limited by the selected discrete spaces, and not by the regularity of the solutions, as it is typically the case for the model (1.1). However, in the presence of pointwise constraints on the state, see, e.g. [8–12] or the gradient of the state [13–16] optimal order estimates can only be obtained for the control variable. Yet numerical results indicate a faster convergence of the error in the state variable in L^2 .

As an alternative to the aforementioned works, one may combine the error in the state with error in the (suitably rescaled) adjoint state p , measuring both in the norms that are given by the functional analytic set-up of the PDE constraint. For problem (1.1), this leads to the norm

$$\|x\|^2 := |u|_1^2 + \frac{1}{\alpha} |p|_1^2, \quad \text{where } x = (u, p) \in H_0^1 \times H_0^1, \quad (1.2)$$

where $|\cdot|_1$ denotes the H_0^1 -norm. For respective counterparts of (1.2), Chrysafinos and Karatzas [17, 18] prove so-called symmetric error estimates or quasi-best approximation results. The growth of the quasi-best approximation constant is limited by α^{-2} and $\alpha^{-3/2}$, respectively.

In this article, we prove abstract quasi-best approximation results, where the discretization error is measured in a counterpart of (1.2). In order to illustrate our results, assume that the underlying domain is convex, let $(V_h)_h$ be a sequence of conforming finite-dimensional spaces that approximates H_0^1 , and consider the variational discretization of (1.1). If we denote by $x_h = (u_h, p_h)$ the pairs of approximate primal and dual states, our results yield (see theorem 3.3 and example 3.9)

$$\|x - x_h\| \leq \nu_h \inf_{v_h \in V_h \times V_h} \|x - v_h\|,$$

where the quasi-best approximation constant satisfies

$$\nu_h \leq \kappa_\alpha := 2 \left(1 + C_F \left(1 + \frac{2C_F}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \right) \right) \quad \text{and} \quad |\nu_h - 1| \leq C_I \kappa_\alpha h \quad \text{as } h \rightarrow 0.$$

Here C_F is the constant in the Friedrichs inequality and C_I is an interpolation constant depending on the shape regularity on the underlying meshes. In contrast to the first, non-asymptotic relationship, the second, asymptotic one exploits the compactness of the observation and control action operators and elliptic regularity theory. Notably, the latter reveals that Céa's lemma, which holds for the constraint discretization, is recovered as $h \rightarrow 0$ and, in particular, ensures an approximation quality independent of α for $h = O(\sqrt{\alpha})$.

The rest of the paper proceeds as follows. In section 2, we state precisely the considered problem class, allowing for any linear, bounded, and inf-sup-stable operator in the constraint. Furthermore, we reduce the optimality system by eliminating the control, and we lay the groundwork for our results by a careful discussion of the continuity and nondegeneracy properties of the associated bilinear form.

Section 3 constitutes the core of this work and establishes the quasi-best approximation for the variational discretization. To this end, the variational discretization is viewed as a Petrov–Galerkin method and we employ the formula for the quasi-best approximation constant in Tantardini and Veiser [19]. For the asymptotic behavior of the quasi-best approximation constant, we additionally invoke a duality argument, which is similar to, but simpler than, Schatz [20].

The last two sections center on generalizations of these results. In section 4, we consider approximate control action operators, covering in particular the discretization of the control variable. Finally, section 5 deals with nonlinear optimality systems arising from additional convex constraints for the control. The derived results complement those of the linear case and the simplification of Schatz' argument comes in quite useful.

Let us conclude this introduction with a table providing an overview of a selection of our result. For each selected quasi-best approximation result, it shows its main features, the *leading* interplay in the quasi-best approximation constant ν_h of the Tikhonov parameter α , the mesh size h , and the quasi-best approximation constant μ_h , see (3.5), of the constraint discretization as $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, $h \rightarrow 0$, and $\mu_h \rightarrow \infty$.

Main features	ν_h	Reference
Variational discretization with <i>continuous</i> control action and observation	$O\left(\frac{\mu_h^2}{\sqrt{\alpha}}\right)$	Theorem 3.3
Variational discretization with <i>compact</i> control action and observation	$\mu_h\left(1 + o\left(\frac{\mu_h}{\sqrt{\alpha}}\right)\right)$	Lemma 3.7
Variational discretization with δ - <i>compact</i> control action and observation as well as δ - <i>regularizing</i> PDE constraint	$\mu_h\left(1 + O\left(\frac{h^\delta \mu_h}{\sqrt{\alpha}}\right)\right)$	Theorem 3.8
Discretization with δ - <i>approximate</i> control action as well as δ - <i>compact</i> observation and δ - <i>regularizing</i> PDE constraint	$\mu_h\left(1 + O\left(\frac{h^\delta \mu_h}{\alpha}\right)\right)$	Theorem 4.5
Convex constraints for control with δ - <i>compact</i> control action and observation as well as δ - <i>regularizing</i> PDE constraint	$\mu_h\left(1 + O\left(\frac{h^\delta \mu_h}{\alpha}\right)\right)$	Corollary 5.6

2. Model optimization problem and reduced optimality system

We introduce our model optimization problem. Assume that the control variable q is taken from a real Hilbert space Q with scalar product $(\cdot, \cdot)_Q$ and induced norm $\|\cdot\|_Q$. Its corresponding state $u \in V_1$ is determined by solving a linear boundary value problem of the form

$$Au = Cq \tag{2.1}$$

with the following setting:

- The *state space* V_1 is a Hilbert space with induced norm $\|\cdot\|_1$. Its dual and the corresponding duality pairing are indicated with V_1^* and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_1$, respectively.
- The *differential operator* A is induced by bilinear form $a: V_1 \times V_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where V_2 is a second Hilbert space with induced norm $\|\cdot\|_2$, dual space V_2^* , and dual pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_2$. In sections 3–5 we shall make a special choice (3.6) for the norm $\|\cdot\|_2$. We assume that the bilinear form a is bounded and satisfies the following non-degeneracy conditions:

$$M_a := \sup_{\|v_1\|_1=1, \|v_2\|_2=1} a(v_1, v_2) < \infty, \tag{2.2a}$$

$$\forall v_1 \in V_1 \quad \left(\forall v_2 \in V_1 \ a(v_1, v_2) = 0 \right) \implies v_1 = 0. \tag{2.2b}$$

$$m_a := \inf_{\|v_2\|_2=1} \sup_{\|v_1\|_1=1} a(v_1, v_2) > 0, \tag{2.2c}$$

Employing well-known inf-sup theory (see e.g. Babuška [21]), we see that the operator $A: V_1 \rightarrow V_2^*$, $v_1 \mapsto a(v_1, \cdot)$ is linear and boundedly invertible.

- The *control action operator* $C: Q \rightarrow V_2^*$ is linear and bounded with constant M_C .

Our goal is then to numerically solve the *constrained optimization problem*

$$\min_{(q,u) \in Q \times V_1} \frac{1}{2} \|Iu - u_d\|_W^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|q\|_Q^2 \quad \text{subject to} \quad Au = Cq \tag{2.3}$$

where we assume in addition:

- The *desired ‘state’* u_d is an element of a Hilbert space W with scalar product $(\cdot, \cdot)_W$ and induced norm $\|\cdot\|_W$.

- The *observation operator* $I: V_1 \rightarrow W$ is linear, and bounded with constant M_I .
- The *cost of the control*, which can be viewed as a Tikhonov regularization, is scaled with the parameter $\alpha > 0$.

Problem (2.3) is a quadratic minimization problem with a linear constraint. The objective function is convex in (q, u) and strictly convex in q . Consequently, standard arguments ensure the existence of a unique solution; see, e.g. Lions [22, theorem 1.1] or Tröltzsch [23, chapter 2.5].

If $Q = L^2 = W$, $V_1 = V_2 = H_0^1$, $A = -\Delta$ is the (weak) Laplacian, and C and I are the canonical compact immersions $L^2 \rightarrow (H_0^1)^*$ and $H_0^1 \rightarrow L^2$, then (2.3) simplifies to the optimization problem (1.1) in the introduction. Notice that, in this case, the operators C and I are related by $C^* = I$.

To formulate the *optimality system* for (2.3), it is useful to define the adjoint operators A^* , C^* , I^* of A , C , I by

$$A^*v_2 = a(\cdot, v_2), \quad (q, C^*v_2)_Q = \langle Cq, v_2 \rangle, \quad \langle I^*w, v_1 \rangle_1 = (Iv_1, w)_W$$

for all $v_1 \in V_1$, $v_2 \in V_2$, $q \in Q$, $w \in W$. Thanks to the convexity of the problem (2.3), a pair $(q, u) \in Q \times V_1$ is a minimum point if and only if there exists $p \in V_2$ such that

$$Au = Cq, \quad A^*p = I^*(Iu - u_d), \quad \alpha q = -C^*p. \tag{2.4}$$

We may eliminate q by inserting the last equation into the first one and multiplying the second equation by $\beta > 0$. We thus obtain the following *reduced optimality system* for the pair $(u, p) \in V_1 \times V_2$:

$$\begin{pmatrix} -\beta I^*I & \beta A^* \\ A & \frac{1}{\alpha} CC^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u \\ p \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -\beta I^*u_d \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.5}$$

Notice that the second row of equations, $Au + \frac{1}{\alpha} CC^*p = 0$, suggests scaling the adjoint state p by the factor $\frac{1}{\alpha}$, while the first row, $-\beta I^*Iu + \beta A^*p = -\beta I^*u_d$, suggests no scaling at all. As a compromise, we propose to use $z = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}}p$ and $\beta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}}$.

We thus transform the optimality system (2.4) into

$$Au = Cq, \quad A^*z = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}}I^*(Iu - u_d), \quad \sqrt{\alpha}q = -C^*z \tag{2.6}$$

and the reduced optimality system (2.5) into

$$\begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}}I^*I & A^* \\ A & \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}}CC^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u \\ z \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}}I^*u_d \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.7}$$

This *rescaled and reduced optimality system* deviates from the usual KKT-formulation, but has an interesting structure. As the KKT-formulation, it is symmetric also for non-symmetric A . The off-diagonal consists of two interrelated invertible operators, while the diagonal entries are (semi-)definite, symmetric operators. Notice that, upon swapping the rows, the roles of the diagonal and off-diagonal can be exchanged. For the optimization problem (1.1), the operator matrix is then diagonally dominant in the sense that CC^* and I^*I are compact operators.

Let us give a weak formulation of the rescaled and reduced optimality system. Its rows are equivalently written as

$$\forall \varphi_1 \in V_1 \quad a(\varphi_1, z) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}}(Iu, I\varphi_1)_W = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}}(u_d, I\varphi_1)_W, \tag{2.8a}$$

$$\forall \varphi_2 \in V_2 \quad a(u, \varphi_2) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} (C^*z, C^*\varphi_2)_Q = 0, \quad (2.8b)$$

and so we are led to introduce the Hilbert space

$$V := V_1 \times V_2 \text{ with } \|v\| := \left(\|v_1\|_1^2 + \|v_2\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2}, \quad v = (v_1, v_2) \in V, \quad (2.9)$$

and the bilinear form $b: V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$b(v, \varphi) := a(v, \varphi) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} c(v, \varphi) \quad (2.10a)$$

with

$$a(v, \varphi) := a(v_1, \varphi_2) + a(\varphi_1, v_2), \quad (2.10b)$$

$$c(v, \varphi) := (C^*v_2, C^*\varphi_2)_Q - (Iv_1, I\varphi_1)_W \quad (2.10c)$$

for $v = (v_1, v_2), \varphi = (\varphi_1, \varphi_2) \in V$. In this notation, the variational formulation of the rescaled and reduced optimality system (2.7) simply reads

$$\text{find } x \in V \text{ such that } \forall \varphi \in V \quad b(x, \varphi) = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} (u_d, I\varphi_1)_W. \quad (2.11)$$

A pair $x = (u, z) \in X$ is a solution of (2.11) if and only if (u, z) is a solution of (2.8) if and only if the triple $(u, z, -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}}C^*z) \in V \times Q$ verifies the rescaled optimality system (2.6). Consequently, thanks to the convexity of (2.3), if $x = (u, z) \in V$ is the unique solution of (2.11), then $(-\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}}C^*z, u) \in Q \times V_1$ is the unique solution of the original optimization problem (2.3).

Let us analyze the bilinear form $b = a + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}}c$. We readily see that

$$a, c, \text{ and so } b \text{ are symmetric.} \quad (2.12)$$

Moreover, even if a is coercive, b is not coercive in general. Consider, for example, a set-up where there exists $v = (v_1, v_2) \in V$ such that $\|Iv_1\|_W > \|C^*v_2\|_Q$. This entails that c is not coercive. As a consequence, b is not coercive for $\alpha > 0$ sufficiently small.

In order to obtain further properties, let us first consider the contributions a and c separately. The bilinear form c is closely related to the original minimization problem (2.3). To see this, observe that, if $(u, z) \in V$ and $\sqrt{\alpha}q = -C^*z$, we have the correspondence

$$\|Iu\|_W^2 + \|C^*z\|_Q^2 = \|Iu\|_W^2 + \alpha \|q\|_Q^2,$$

which motivates us to introduce the ‘energy seminorm’

$$|v| := \left(\|Iv_1\|_W^2 + \|C^*v_2\|_Q^2 \right)^{1/2} \quad (2.13)$$

on V . Thus, denoting by Z the kernel of $|\cdot|$ and realizing that the bilinear form c is well-defined on the quotient space V/Z , we see that

$$\sup_{|v|=1, |\varphi|=1} |c(v, \varphi)| = 1 = \inf_{|v|=1} \sup_{|\varphi|=1} c(v, \varphi), \quad (2.14)$$

where the second identity relies on

$$c((v_1, v_2), (-v_1, v_2)) = \|C^*v_2\|_Q^2 + \|Iv_1\|_W^2 = |v|^2. \quad (2.15)$$

Since

$$\forall v \in V \quad |v| \leq M \|v\| \quad (2.16)$$

with

$$M := \max\{M_I, M_C\},$$

the form c is also continuous in V , with constant M .

The bilinear form \mathbf{a} inherits its continuity and nondegeneracy properties from a . More precisely, we have

$$\sup_{\|v\|=1, \|\varphi\|=1} |\mathbf{a}(v, \varphi)| = M_a \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{\|v\|=1} \sup_{\|\varphi\|=1} \mathbf{a}(v, \varphi) = m_a \quad (2.17)$$

with M_a and m_a from (2.2). While the first identity is straight-forward, the second one hinges on the inf-sup-duality (see Babuška [21])

$$\inf_{\|v_1\|_1=1} \sup_{\|\varphi_2\|_2=1} a(v_1, \varphi_2) = \inf_{\|v_2\|_2=1} \sup_{\|\varphi_1\|_1=1} a(\varphi_1, v_2) \quad (2.18)$$

for a with domain $V_1 \times V_2$.

Turning to the complete bilinear form b , we may sum up the continuity properties as follows: for all $v, \varphi \in V$, we have

$$|b(v, \varphi)| \leq M_a \|v\| \|\varphi\| + \frac{M}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \|v\| |\varphi| \leq \|v\| \|\varphi\|_{\alpha} \quad (2.19)$$

with

$$\|\varphi\|_{\alpha} := M_a \|\varphi\| + \frac{M}{\sqrt{\alpha}} |\varphi|. \quad (2.20)$$

Here we have equipped V as trial space with $\|\cdot\|$ and as test space with $\|\cdot\|_{\alpha}$. The former is in accordance with our scopes in the error analyses below and the latter avoids in particular a dependence on $M/\sqrt{\alpha}$ of the continuity constant of b and in the following bound for the right-hand side in (2.11): for all $\varphi = (\varphi_1, \varphi_2) \in V$,

$$\left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} (u_d, I\varphi_1)_W \right| \leq \frac{M_I}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \|u_d\|_W \|\varphi_1\|_1 \leq \|u_d\|_W \|\varphi\|_{\alpha}. \quad (2.21)$$

The derivation of the nondegeneracy properties of the bilinear form b is more subtle. In order to establish the crucial inf-sup condition (2.2c), let $\varphi = (\varphi_1, \varphi_2) \in V$ be given. We combine the nondegeneracy properties of \mathbf{a} and c and let

$$v = (w_1, w_2) + \gamma(-\varphi_1, \varphi_2), \quad (2.22a)$$

where $\gamma \geq 0$ and $w = (w_1, w_2) \in V$ is chosen with the help of (2.17) such that $\|w\| = \|\varphi\|$ and $\mathbf{a}(w, \varphi) \geq m_a \|\varphi\|^2$. We then have

$$\|v\| \leq \|w\| + \gamma \|\varphi\| \leq (1 + \gamma) \|\varphi\| \quad (2.22b)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} b(v, \varphi) &\geq m_a \|\varphi\|^2 + \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{\alpha}} |\varphi|^2 - \frac{M}{\sqrt{\alpha}} |\varphi| \|\varphi\| \\ &\geq m_a \left(\|\varphi\| + \frac{M}{M_a \sqrt{\alpha}} |\varphi| \right) \|\varphi\| + \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{\alpha}} |\varphi|^2 - \frac{2M}{\sqrt{\alpha}} |\varphi| \|\varphi\| \end{aligned} \quad (2.22c)$$

thanks the continuity (2.14) of c and $m_a \leq M_a$. Using the inequality $2st \leq \epsilon s^2 + t^2/\epsilon$ with $\epsilon = \frac{L}{1+2L}m_a > 0$ and

$$L := M/\sqrt{\alpha}, \quad (2.23a)$$

we may bound the critical term by

$$\frac{2M}{\sqrt{\alpha}}|\varphi|^2 \leq \frac{L}{1+2L}m_a \|\varphi\|^2 + \frac{1+2L}{L} \frac{M^2}{m_a\alpha} |\varphi|^2.$$

Thus, if we define

$$\gamma := \frac{M}{m_a} \left(1 + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \right) \quad (2.23b)$$

by the coefficient of $|\varphi|^2$ divided by $\sqrt{\alpha}$, set

$$\kappa := \frac{1+2L}{1+L}(1+\gamma) = \frac{1+2L}{1+L} \left(1 + \frac{M}{m_a} \left(1 + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \right) \right), \quad (2.23c)$$

and recall (2.22b), we arrive at

$$b(v, \varphi) \geq \frac{1+L}{1+2L} \frac{m_a}{M_a} \|\varphi\|_\alpha \|\varphi\| \geq \frac{1}{\kappa} \frac{m_a}{M_a} \|v\| \|\varphi\|_\alpha, \quad (2.24)$$

where the norms on the right-hand side coincide with those in the continuity bound (2.19). We therefore have the following basic result.

Theorem 2.1 (Bilinear form of reduced optimality system). *If we equip V as trial space with $\|\cdot\|$ from (2.9) and as test space with $\|\cdot\|_\alpha$ from (2.20), then the inf-sup constant m_b and the continuity constant M_b of the bilinear form (2.10) satisfy*

$$0 < \frac{1}{\kappa} \frac{m_a}{M_a} \leq m_b \leq M_b \leq 1,$$

where κ is defined by the relations (2.23).

The inequalities of theorem 2.1 yield for the condition number of the bilinear form b (i.e. the ratio of its continuity constant to its inf-sup constant)

$$\frac{M_b}{m_b} \leq \kappa \frac{M_a}{m_a}.$$

The factor M_a/m_a , the condition number of the bilinear form a associated with the constraint, is expected to be a kind of lower bound. In this vein, we may view the factor κ as a bound for the possible amplification of the constraint conditioning, resulting from the interplay of constraint and the objective in the constrained optimization problem (2.3). Inspecting (2.23), we see that κ is a function of the parameters α , M , m_a , and M_a . The next three remarks discuss asymptotic behaviors of κ that will play major roles in what follows or are of independent interest.

Remark 2.2 (Amplification for pure constraint case). Consider the special case $C = 0$ and $I = 0$. Then the rescaled and reduced optimality system (2.7) is a well-posed ‘double’ boundary value problem. Its condition number with respect to $(V, \|\cdot\|) \times (V, \|\cdot\|)$ is M_a/m_a ; see (2.17). As $C = 0$ and $I = 0$ imply $M = 0$, $L = 0$, and so $\gamma = 0$ and $\kappa = 1$, this is reproduced by theorem 2.1.

It is worth mentioning that this limiting case of ‘pure constraint’ is attained in a continuous manner:

$$\kappa - 1 = (1 + o(1)) \frac{M}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \quad \text{as } M \rightarrow 0,$$

where $L = M/\sqrt{\alpha}$ is essentially the operator norm of the perturbation.

Remark 2.3 (Amplification for degenerating constraint). While the continuity constant M_a of the bilinear form a does not enter κ , its inf-sup constant m_a does, in a critical manner. More precisely, we have

$$\kappa = \left(\frac{1 + 2L}{1 + L} \left(1 + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \right) M + o(1) \right) \frac{1}{m_a} \quad \text{as } m_a \rightarrow 0.$$

Notice that the fraction involving L has only values in the interval $[1, 2]$.

Remark 2.4 (Amplification for vanishing regularization). Consider the limit $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ of the Tikhonov regularization parameter (while I and C are fixed). Then $L \rightarrow \infty$ so that

$$\kappa = \left(\frac{4M^2}{m_a} + o(1) \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \quad \text{as } \alpha \rightarrow 0. \quad (2.25)$$

Let us see with a simple example that the inf-sup constant m_b in theorem 2.1 can blow up with this rate and so the lower bound therein cannot be improved for small α without further assumptions on the structure of b .

Consider $V_1 = V_2 = \mathbb{R}^2$, where $\|\cdot\|_1$ and $\|\cdot\|_2$ are the Euclidean norm in \mathbb{R}^2 ,

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{I} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{C} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and $\alpha > 0$. The symmetric bilinear form b of the optimality system is then given by the matrix

$$\mathbf{B} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

For $\varphi_0 = (\sqrt{\alpha}, 0, 1, 0) \in V = \mathbb{R}^4$, we have $\|\varphi_0\|_\alpha = \sqrt{1 + \alpha} + 1$ and

$$\sup_{v \in V} \frac{Bv \cdot \varphi_0}{\|v\|} = \sup_{v \in V} \frac{v \cdot (0, 0, \sqrt{\alpha}, 0)}{\|v\|} = \sqrt{\alpha}$$

so that

$$\inf_{\varphi \in V} \sup_{v \in V} \frac{Bv \cdot \varphi}{\|v\| \|\varphi\|_\alpha} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{2}}. \quad (2.26)$$

Hence, the asymptotic behavior of α in (2.25) is attained.

The chosen norms for V as trial and test space are not always the most convenient ones. This follows from the following remark considering a special case.

Remark 2.5 (Coercive constraints with $C^* = I$). Suppose that $V_1 = V_2$ and $Q = W$ with coinciding scalar products and norms and that the bilinear form a is coercive with constant \tilde{m}_a and $C^* = I$. It is worth noting that, as a is not necessarily symmetric, the best coercivity constant \tilde{m}_a may be much smaller than the inf-sup constant m_a . Given $\varphi \in V$, we proceed as in (2.22) taking $w = \varphi$, $\gamma = 0$, and obtain

$$b(v, \varphi) \geq \tilde{m}_a \left(\|\varphi\|^2 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} |\varphi|^2 \right) \quad (2.27a)$$

because of $c(\varphi, \varphi) = 0$. This fits well to the following variant of the continuity bound (2.19):

$$|b(v, \varphi)| \leq \max\{M_a, 1\} \left(\|v\|^2 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} |v|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\|\varphi\|^2 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} |\varphi|^2 \right)^{1/2} \quad (2.27b)$$

Hence, in this case, the condition number of b with respect to the norms in (2.27) is independent of the Tikhonov regularization parameter α . Nevertheless, if $C^* \neq I$, also this choice of norms cannot offer in general an asymptotic behavior better than $1/\sqrt{\alpha}$ as $\alpha \rightarrow 0$. In fact, recomputing the example in remark 2.4 with the norms in (2.27) does not change the behavior of its inf-sup constant.

Let us conclude this section with the following side product of our discussion of the bilinear form b .

Corollary 2.6 (Existence and uniqueness). *The rescaled and reduced optimality system (2.11) and thus (2.4) has a unique solution.*

Proof. Inequality (2.24) ensures (2.2c) for the bilinear form b and, thanks to the algebraic symmetry of b , also (2.2b). \square

3. Analysis for variational discretization

In this section, we analyze the error of the variational discretization of the optimization problem (2.3) according to Hinze [6]. Our key tool is the rescaled and reduced optimality system (2.7), whose Galerkin solution coincides with the approximate solution of the variational discretization.

3.1. Variational discretization and reduced optimality system

We start by discretizing the PDE constraint (2.1) of the optimization problem (2.3). Recalling its variational formulation

$$\text{find } u \in V_1 \quad \text{such that} \quad \forall \varphi_2 \in V_2 \quad a(u, \varphi_2) = \langle Cq, \varphi_2 \rangle,$$

we choose some conforming finite-dimensional spaces $V_{h,i} \subset V_i$, $i = 1, 2$, such that the restriction of the bilinear form a on $V_{h,1} \times V_{h,2}$ is nondegenerate, i.e. for all $v_{h,1} \in V_{h,1}$, $v_{h,2} \in V_{h,2}$, we have

$$a(v_{h,1}, \cdot)|_{V_{h,2}} = 0 \implies v_{h,1} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad a(\cdot, v_{h,2})|_{V_{h,1}} = 0 \implies v_{h,2} = 0.$$

The corresponding Petrov–Galerkin method then reads

$$\text{find } u_h \in V_{h,1} \quad \text{such that} \quad \forall \varphi_{h,2} \in V_{h,2} \quad a(u_h, \varphi_{h,2}) = \langle Cq, \varphi_{h,2} \rangle.$$

Using this for the constraint in (2.3), we arrive at the (semi-)discrete optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{(\tilde{q}, u_h) \in Q \times V_{h,1}} & \frac{1}{2} \|Iu_h - u_d\|_W^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|\tilde{q}\|_Q^2 \\ \text{subject to} & \quad \forall \varphi_{h,2} \in V_{h,2} \quad a(u_h, \varphi_{h,2}) = (\tilde{q}, C^* \varphi_{h,2})_Q, \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

where we, in addition, assume that I can be exactly evaluated for any function from $V_{h,1}$. As in the continuous case, $(\tilde{q}, u_h) \in Q \times V_{h,1}$ is the unique solution of (3.1) if and only if there exists $z_h \in V_{h,2}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \varphi_{h,2} \in V_{h,2} \quad a(u_h, \varphi_{h,2}) &= (\tilde{q}, C^* \varphi_{h,2})_Q, \\ \forall \varphi_{h,1} \in V_{h,1} \quad a(\varphi_{h,1}, z_h) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} (Iu_h - u_d, I\varphi_{h,1})_W, \\ \sqrt{\alpha} \tilde{q} &= -C^* z_h. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

Also here, we may eliminate the approximate control \tilde{q} by inserting the third equation into the first one. Setting $V_h := V_{h,1} \times V_{h,2}$, the variational formulation of the ensuing discrete rescaled and reduced optimality system is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{find } x_h = (u_h, z_h) \in V_h \text{ such that} \\ \forall \varphi_h = (\varphi_{h,1}, \varphi_{h,2}) \in V_h \quad b(x_h, \varphi_h) &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} (u_d, I\varphi_{h,1})_W. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Its solution x_h is the Galerkin approximation in V_h to the solution x of the variational formulation (2.11) of the rescaled and reduced optimality system. Applying corollary 2.6 to the discrete spaces therefore yields the following approach to uniqueness and existence of the variational discretization of (2.11).

Lemma 3.1 (Discrete well-posedness). *The discrete reduced optimality system (3.3) has a unique variational solution $x_h = (u_h, z_h) \in V_h$. Consequently, the pair (\tilde{q}, u_h) with $\tilde{q} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} C^* z_h$ is the unique solution of the semidiscrete optimization problem (3.1).*

Remarkably, the approximate solutions (\tilde{q}, u_h, z_h) of the variational discretization (3.2) are computable whenever $C^*|_{V_{h,2}}$ and $I|_{V_{h,1}}$ can be evaluated exactly.

3.2. Non-asymptotic quasi-best approximation

We shall assess the quality of the Galerkin approximation $x_h = (u_h, z_h) \in V_h$ from (3.3), assuming that we are interested particularly in the $\|\cdot\|_1$ -error of the approximate state u_h . For this purpose, we compare it with a suitable best error in V_h .

Let us first recall some basic results in Petrov–Galerkin approximation, which we already formulate for the discretization of the constraint. Let $R_{h,1}v_1 \in V_{h,1}$ be the generalized Ritz projection of $v_1 \in V_1$ given by $a(R_{h,1}v_1, \varphi_{h,2}) = a(v_1, \varphi_{h,2})$ for all $\varphi_{h,2} \in V_{h,2}$. Since a satisfies (2.2) and is nondegenerate on $V_{h,1} \times V_{h,2}$, there exists a constant $\mu_h \geq 1$ such that

$$\|v_1 - R_{h,1}v_1\|_1 \leq \mu_h \inf_{v_{h,1} \in V_{h,1}} \|v_1 - v_{h,1}\|_1;$$

see, e.g. Babuška [21]. We refer to the smallest possible choice of μ_h as the *quasi-best approximation constant of the constraint discretization*. Xu and Zikatanov [24] show the identities

$$\mu_h = \|I - R_{h,1}\|_{L(V_{h,1})} = \|R_{h,1}\|_{L(V_{h,1})} \quad (3.4)$$

and Tantardini and Veeger [19, theorem 2.1] give the formula

$$\mu_h = \sup_{\varphi_{h,2} \in V_{h,2}} \frac{\sup_{\|v_1\|_1=1} a(v_1, \varphi_{h,2})}{\sup_{\|v_{h,1}\|_1=1} a(v_{h,1}, \varphi_{h,2})}, \quad (3.5)$$

where v_1 varies in V_1 and $v_{h,1}$ varies in $V_{h,1}$ and, for the sake of notational simplicity, a tedious $\varphi_{h,2} \neq 0$ is avoided.

A perhaps striking feature of these formulas is that they are not affected by the choices of the norms in the test spaces $V_{h,2}$ and V_2 . This comes in quite useful in our context, as the adjoint state is an auxiliary variable and, in the original approximation problem (2.3), the norm $\|\cdot\|_2$ is free as long as (2.2) continues to hold with $\|\cdot\|_1$. Exploiting this freedom, we henceforth assume

$$\|v_2\|_2 = \sup_{\varphi_1 \in V_1, \|\varphi_1\|_1=1} a(\varphi_1, v_2) \quad (3.6)$$

and so, in particular, measure the error of the approximate adjoint state z_h in this norm. The convenience of the choice (3.6) lies in

$$M_a = 1 = m_a \quad (3.7)$$

and the following consequences thereof. The numerator in (3.5) is $\|\varphi_{h,2}\|_2$, which, together with the inf-sup-duality, see (2.18), yields

$$\inf_{v_{h,1} \in V_{h,1}} \sup_{\varphi_{h,2} \in V_{h,2}} \frac{a(v_{h,1}, \varphi_{h,2})}{\|v_{h,1}\|_1 \|\varphi_{h,2}\|_2} = \frac{1}{\mu_h} = \inf_{v_{h,2} \in V_{h,2}} \sup_{\varphi_{h,1} \in V_{h,1}} \frac{a(\varphi_{h,1}, v_{h,2})}{\|v_{h,2}\|_2 \|\varphi_{h,1}\|_1} \quad (3.8)$$

for the inf-sup constant of $a|_{V_{h,1} \times V_{h,2}}$. Accordingly, the generalized Ritz projection $R_{h,2}v_2 \in V_{h,2}$ of $v_2 \in V_2$ given by $a(\varphi_{h,1}, R_{h,2}v_2) = a(\varphi_{h,1}, v_2)$ for all $\varphi_{h,1} \in V_{h,1}$ verifies

$$\|v_2 - R_{h,2}v_2\|_2 \leq \mu_h \inf_{v_{h,2} \in V_{h,2}} \|v_2 - v_{h,2}\|_2.$$

Setting $R_h = (R_{h,1}, R_{h,2})$, we also have

$$\|v - R_h v\| \leq \mu_h \inf_{v_h \in V_h} \|v - v_h\|. \quad (3.9)$$

Remark 3.2 (Without special choice of the error norm for the adjoint state). One may want to retain an original choice $\|\cdot\|_{2,\text{org}}$ for the norm of V_2 . In this case, the results below continue to hold but their constants have to be revisited. The changes can be determined by the following relationships, where an additional index ‘org’ refers to the setting with $\|\cdot\|_{2,\text{org}}$ and no such index refers to the setting with (3.6):

$$m_{a,\text{org}} \|\cdot\|_{2,\text{org}} \leq \|\cdot\|_2 \leq M_{a,\text{org}} \|\cdot\|_{2,\text{org}}, \quad M_{I,\text{org}} = M_I, \quad M_{a,\text{org}}^{-1} \leq \frac{M_C}{M_{C,\text{org}}} \leq m_{a,\text{org}}^{-1}.$$

After these preparations, we are ready to derive a first result about quasi-best approximation of the variational discretization (3.1).

Theorem 3.3 (Non-asymptotic quasi-best approximation). *Let $x = (u, z)$ be the solution of the optimality system (2.11) corresponding to any desired state $u_d \in W$ and denote by $\|\cdot\|$ the norm from (2.9) with (3.6) as norm in V_2 . The combined error in the corresponding approximate state u_h and its adjoint z_h of the variational discretization is quasi-best in V_h with*

$$\|x - x_h\| \leq \kappa_h \mu_h \inf_{v_h \in V_h} \|x - v_h\|.$$

Here

$$\kappa_h = \frac{1 + 2L}{1 + L} \left(1 + M \left(1 + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \right) \mu_h \right) \quad \text{with} \quad L = \frac{M}{\sqrt{\alpha}},$$

and μ_h is the quasi-best approximation constant of the constraint discretization.

Proof. Let ν_h denote the quasi-best approximation constant of the variational discretization. Thanks to theorem 2.1 and lemma 3.1, we can use the counterpart

$$\nu_h = \sup_{\varphi_h \in V_h} \frac{\sup_{\|v\|=1} b(v, \varphi_h)}{\sup_{v_h \in V_h, \|v_h\|=1} b(v_h, \varphi_h)} \quad (3.10)$$

of (3.5) for the characterization (3.3) of the variational discretization. Let $\varphi_h \in V_h$. The continuity bound (2.19) gives

$$\sup_{\|v\|=1} b(v, \varphi_h) \leq \|\varphi_h\|_\alpha$$

for the numerator in (3.10). For the denominator, we use (2.22), where V is replaced by V_h and, therefore, with $1/\mu_h$ in place of m_a in view of (3.8). We thus obtain

$$\sup_{v_h \in V_h, \|v_h\|=1} b(v_h, \varphi_h) \geq \frac{1}{\kappa_h \mu_h} \|\varphi_h\|_\alpha \quad (3.11)$$

and the proof is finished. \square

In the special situation of remark 2.5, we can obtain the following quasi-best approximation result.

Remark 3.4 (Quasi-best approximation for coercive constraints and $C^* = I$). Suppose that $V_1 = V_2$ and $Q = W$ with coinciding scalar products and norms and that the bilinear form a is V_1 -coercive with constant \tilde{m}_a and $C^* = I$. Exploiting the coercivity and continuity properties of remark 2.5, we derive for the error of the variational discretization (2.11)

$$\|x - x_h\|^2 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} |x - x_h|^2 \leq \frac{\max\{M_a^2, 1\}}{\tilde{m}_a^2} \inf_{v_h \in V_h} \left(\|x - v_h\|^2 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} |x - v_h|^2 \right).$$

The quasi-best approximation constant in the preceding remark 3.4 does not blow up for vanishing regularization. Nonetheless, when measuring the error merely with $\|\cdot\|$, it does not exclude an $\alpha^{-1/4}$ -blow up of the quasi-best approximation constant even in the special case $C^* = I$ considered in remark 2.4 and, in the light of the example therein, it does not exclude an $\alpha^{-3/4}$ -blow up for general operators I and C . As we shall see, the α -dependence in theorem 3.3 is less severe.

Remark 3.5 (Vanishing regularization and quasi-best approximation). As in remark 2.4, we consider the limit $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ for the Tikhonov regularization parameter. Similarly to there, we have

$$\kappa_h = (4M^2\mu_h + o(1)) \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \quad \text{as} \quad \alpha \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.12)$$

This blow up arises from the lower bound of the inf-sup constant in theorem 2.1, which cannot be improved because of (2.26). Note however, that the equivalence of the norms $\|\cdot\|_\alpha$ and

$\sup_{\|v\|=1} b(v, \cdot)$ is not uniform in α . In the light of (3.5), it is therefore conceivable that (3.12) could be improved by using $\sup_{\|v\|=1} b(v, \cdot)$ as test space norm. However, the determination of the discrete inf-sup constant with respect to this abstract norm appears to be much more involved than the approach (2.22), which directly carries over to discrete spaces.

In any case, we shall show below that, under refinement, the α -dependence disappears for many instances of the optimality system (2.6).

3.3. Asymptotic quasi-best approximation

In this section, we complement theorem 3.3. To be more precise, let ν_h denote the *quasi-best approximation constant of the variational discretization* as in the proof of theorem 3.3 and consider a sequence $(V_h)_h$ of discrete spaces leading to a uniform stable constraint discretization in the sense that

$$\exists \bar{\mu} \geq 1 \quad \forall h > 0 \quad \mu_h \leq \bar{\mu}, \quad (3.13)$$

which is equivalent to discrete inf-sup stability in view of (3.8). Theorem 3.3 then ensures the existence of a constant $\bar{\nu}$ such that

$$\forall h > 0 \quad \nu_h \leq \bar{\nu}. \quad (3.14)$$

This upper bound may be pessimistic. To motivate this assessment, represent the bilinear form b by the operator matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} CC^* \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} I^* I & A^* \end{pmatrix},$$

which is the one in (2.7) with swapped rows. If C and I are compact, this matrix is diagonally dominant in an operator sense and can be viewed as a compact perturbation of the diagonal matrix with the entries A and A^* . Therefore, in order to improve on (3.14), we mimic somewhat the argument in Schatz [20], introducing some new twist.

Let us first observe that, in accordance with remark 2.2, theorem 3.3 yields $\nu_h \leq \mu_h$ whenever $M_I = 0 = M_C$. More precisely and generally, we have the following relationship between the two quasi-best approximation constants.

Lemma 3.6 (Quasi-best approximation constants). *The quasi-best approximation constants ν_h and μ_h are related by*

$$|\nu_h - \mu_h| \leq \kappa_h \mu_h \sup_{\|v\|=1} |v - R_h v|,$$

where κ_h is as in theorem 3.3 and R_h is the generalized Ritz projection in (3.9).

Proof. As in the proof of theorem 3.3, we will make use of (3.5) with a replaced by b . Given $v \in V$ and $\varphi_h \in V_h$, we can write

$$b(v, \varphi_h) = b(R_h v, \varphi_h) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} c(v - R_h v, \varphi_h)$$

because of $a(v - R_h v, \varphi_h) = 0$. Hence,

$$\left| \sup_{\|v\|=1} b(v, \varphi_h) - \sup_{\|v\|=1} b(R_h v, \varphi_h) \right| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \sup_{\|v\|=1} |c(v - R_h v, \varphi_h)|.$$

As

$$\frac{\sup_{\|v\|=1} b(R_h v, \varphi_h)}{\sup_{v_h \in V_h, \|v_h\|=1} b(v_h, \varphi_h)} \leq \|R_h\|_{L(V)} = \mu_h$$

with equality for some $\varphi_h \in V_h$, we obtain

$$|\nu_h - \mu_h| \leq \sup_{\varphi \in V_h} \frac{\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \sup_{\|v\|=1} |c(v - R_h v, \varphi_h)|}{\sup_{v_h \in V_h, \|v_h\|=1} b(v_h, \varphi_h)}.$$

Thanks to (2.14), (2.20) and (3.11) this proves the claimed inequality. \square

In order to deploy lemma 3.6, we need additional assumptions for our optimization problem and its discretization. We shall consider two settings: a ‘qualitative’ and a ‘quantitative’ one. The former assumes in addition

$$I : V_1 \rightarrow W \text{ and } C : Q \rightarrow V_2^* \text{ are compact} \quad (3.15a)$$

for the optimization problem and

$$\forall v \in V \quad \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \inf_{v_h \in V_h} \|v - v_h\| = 0, \quad (3.15b)$$

for the constraint discretization. Notice that, owing to remark 3.2, the condition (3.15a) is independent of our choice to equip V_2 with the norm (3.6).

Lemma 3.7 (Qualitative asymptotic quasi-best approximation). *Under the assumptions (3.13) and (3.15), the quasi-best approximation constant ν_h satisfies*

$$\nu_h = \mu_h (1 + \bar{\kappa} o(1)) \quad \text{as } h \rightarrow 0,$$

where

$$\bar{\kappa} = \frac{1 + 2L}{1 + L} \left(1 + M \left(1 + \frac{2M}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \right) \bar{\mu} \right) \quad \text{with } L = \frac{M}{\sqrt{\alpha}}.$$

Proof. In the light of lemma 3.6 and (3.13), it suffices to verify the uniform convergence

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\|v\|=1} |v - R_h v| = 0. \quad (3.16)$$

This follows from a standard argument; we provide details for the sake of completeness. Let $(h_k)_k$ be any sequence with $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} h_k = 0$ and choose v_k such that

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N} \quad \|v_k\| = 1 \text{ and } \sup_{\|v\|=1} |v - R_k v| \leq |v_k - R_k v_k| + \frac{1}{k},$$

where we write k instead h_k whenever the latter is an index. Exploiting (3.13) another time, we see that the sequence given by $d_k := v_k - R_k v_k$ is bounded in the Hilbert space V . Owing to (3.15b), its weak limit $d \in V$ satisfies

$$\mathbf{a}(d, \varphi) = \mathbf{a}(d - d_k, \varphi) + \mathbf{a}(d_k, \varphi - \varphi_k)$$

for any $\varphi \in V$ and $\varphi_k \in V_k$. Choosing φ_k by means of (3.15b), we derive $\mathbf{a}(d, \varphi) = 0$ by $k \rightarrow \infty$. Consequently, (2.17) yields $d = 0$. Thanks to (3.15a), the operator $I : V_1 \rightarrow W$ and

the adjoint $C^* : V_2 \rightarrow Q$ are compact. This turns the weak convergence $d_k \rightharpoonup 0$ in V into strong convergence entailing $|d_k| \rightarrow 0$ and the proof is finished. \square

In order to quantify the convergence in lemma 3.7, we shall use a duality argument. This requires a second, more specific setting of additional assumptions involving the Sobolev spaces H^s , $s \geq 0$, and their norms $|\cdot|_s$ over some domain. We use $|\cdot|_s$ instead of $\|\cdot\|_s$ in order to avoid confusion with the norms $\|\cdot\|_1$ and $\|\cdot\|_2$ of V_1 and V_2 . For $s < 0$, we denote by H^s the (topological) dual space of H^{-s} and $|\cdot|_s$ stands for the dual norm of $|\cdot|_{-s}$.

We suppose that spaces V_1 and V_2 relate to Sobolev spaces in the following way: there are $s_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, 2$, and a constant $C_S \geq 1$ such that

$$V_i \text{ is a closed subspace of } H^{s_i} \text{ and } C_S^{-1} |\cdot|_{s_i} \leq \|\cdot\|_i \leq C_S |\cdot|_{s_i} \text{ for } i = 1, 2. \tag{3.17a}$$

Furthermore, we suppose that there is $\delta > 0$ such that the following three conditions hold. First, the operators C and I have the boundedness properties

$$C \in L(Q, H^{-s_2+\delta}) \quad \text{and} \quad I \in L(H^{s_1-\delta}, W). \tag{3.17b}$$

Thus, the canonical embeddings $H^{-s_2+\delta} \rightarrow H^{-s_2}$ and $H^{s_1} \rightarrow H^{s_1-\delta}$ quantify the compactness assumption (3.15a). Second, the differential operator of the constraint and its adjoint offer the following regularity estimates: there is a constant $C_R > 0$ such that, for all admissible f and g ,

$$|A^{-1}f|_{s_1+\delta} \leq C_R |f|_{-s_2+\delta} \quad \text{and} \quad |A^{-*}g|_{s_2+\delta} \leq C_R |g|_{-s_1+\delta}. \tag{3.17c}$$

Third and last, the approximation spaces V_h verify

$$\inf_{v_h \in V_h} \|v - v_h\| \leq C_{\mathcal{I}} h^\delta \left(|v_1|_{s_1+\delta}^2 + |v_2|_{s_2+\delta}^2 \right)^{1/2} \tag{3.17d}$$

for some constant $C_{\mathcal{I}} > 0$, which quantifies the approximation property (3.15b).

Theorem 3.8 (Quantitative asymptotic best approximation). *Under the assumptions (3.13) and (3.17), the quasi-best approximation constant ν_h satisfies*

$$\nu_h = \mu_h (1 + \bar{\kappa} O(h^\delta)) \quad \text{as } h \rightarrow 0,$$

where $\bar{\kappa}$ is as in lemma 3.7. For the α -dependence of $\bar{\kappa}$, see remark 3.5.

Proof. Similarly as in the first step of the proof of lemma 3.7, inserting (3.13) and

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\|v\|=1} |v - R_h v| = O(h^\delta) \tag{3.18}$$

into lemma 3.6 establishes the claim. To show (3.18), let $v \in V$ with $\|v\| = 1$ and define $\varphi \in V$ as the solution of the following ‘dual’ problem associated with the bilinear form \mathbf{a} :

$$A\varphi_1 = CC^*d_2, \quad A^*\varphi_2 = I^*Id_1,$$

where $d = (d_1, d_2) := v - R_h v$. We thus have

$$\begin{aligned} |v - R_h v|^2 &= |d|^2 = \langle I^*Id_1, d_1 \rangle_1 + \langle CC^*d_2, d_2 \rangle_2 = \mathbf{a}(d, \varphi) = \mathbf{a}(v - R_h v, \varphi) \\ &= \mathbf{a}(v - R_h v, \varphi - \varphi_h) \leq \|v - R_h v\| \|\varphi - \varphi_h\|, \end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

where $\varphi_h \in V_h$ is arbitrary. For the first factor, (3.9) and (3.13) imply

$$\|v - R_h v\| \leq \mu_h \leq \mu. \quad (3.20)$$

For second factor, we employ (3.17d) with suitable $\varphi_h \in V_h$ to obtain

$$\|\varphi - \varphi_h\| \leq C_{\mathcal{I}} h^\delta \left(|\varphi_1|_{s_1+\delta}^2 + |\varphi_2|_{s_2+\delta}^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

and it remains to show that the norms on the right-hand side are suitably bounded. Let consider the first one. Making use of the regularity estimate (3.17c) and the definition of φ_1 , we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} |\varphi_1|_{s_1+\delta} &\leq C_R |A\varphi_1|_{-s_2+\delta} = C_R |CC^*d_2|_{-s_2+\delta} \leq C_R \bar{M}_C \|C^*d_2\|_Q \\ &\leq C_R \bar{M}_C |d| = C_R \bar{M}_C |v - R_h v|, \end{aligned}$$

where \bar{M}_C is the operator norm of C from (3.17b). A similar argument yields

$$|\varphi_2|_{s_2+\delta} \leq C_R \bar{M}_I |v - R_h v|,$$

where \bar{M}_I is the operator norm of I in (3.17b). We insert the previous estimates in the first one and conclude

$$|v - R_h v| \leq \mu C_{\mathcal{I}} C_R \bar{M} h^\delta$$

with $\bar{M} := \max\{\bar{M}_I, \bar{M}_C\}$, i.e. (3.18). \square

Let us exemplify theorem 3.8 by two applications. The first one considers the optimization problem (1.1) of the introduction, while the second one is more involved in the sense that the constraint does not allow for a coercive set-up.

Example 3.9 (Simple model optimization). Discretize the optimization problem (1.1) of the introduction with linear finite elements on quasi-uniform meshes with mesh size h . We have $V_1 = H_0^1 = V_2$ and, if we choose $\|\cdot\|_1 = |\nabla \cdot|_0$, we already have $m_a = 1 = M_a$ and (3.6) does not change the norm in V_2 . Further, $M_I = C_F = M_C$, where C_F is the constant in the Poincaré–Friedrichs inequality. Moreover, we have $s_1 = 1 = s_2$ and, assuming that the underlying domain is convex, $\delta = 1$. Taking Sobolev seminorms instead of norms in (3.17a), we then have $C_S = 1$ for the relevant cases and $C_R = 1$ thanks to elliptic regularity as well as $\bar{M}_I = 1 = \bar{M}_C$. Standard approximation theory shows (3.17d) with $C_{\mathcal{I}}$ depending on the shape regularity of the underlying meshes. Since $\mu_h = 1$, we conclude

$$|\nu_h - 1| \leq 2 \left(1 + C_F \left(1 + \frac{2C_F}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \right) \right) h \quad \text{as } h \rightarrow 0$$

for the quasi-best approximation constant of the variational discretization in this case.

Example 3.10 (Point source control). We consider the following modification of the optimization problem (1.1), where the distributed control is replaced by a finite number of point sources:

$$\min_{(q,u) \in \mathbb{R}^\ell \times H_0^{1-\sigma}} \frac{1}{2} |u - u_d|_0^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} q_j^2 \quad \text{subject to} \quad -\Delta u = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} q_j \delta_{x_j}, \quad (3.21)$$

where the underlying domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is planar, polygonal, Lipschitz, but not necessarily convex, $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^\ell \subset \Omega$ are ℓ distinct points, δ_{x_j} denotes the Dirac functional at the point x_j , and $0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{2}$. The bilinear form $a(v, w) = \int_\Omega \nabla v \cdot \nabla w \, dx$, $v, w \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, has a continuous and inf-sup-stable extension on $V_1 \times V_2$ with $V_1 = H_0^{1-\sigma}(\Omega)$ and $V_2 = H_0^{1+\sigma}(\Omega)$ and allows for a standard discretization with linear finite elements S_h for both trial and test space; see, e.g. [25]. For the verification of the discrete inf-sup condition, denote by R_h and Λ_h the Ritz projection and the Scott-Zhang interpolation operator, respectively. As

$$|R_h \varphi|_{1+\sigma} \leq |\Lambda_h \varphi|_{1+\sigma} + |R_h \varphi - \Lambda_h \varphi|_{1+\sigma} \lesssim |\varphi|_{1+\sigma} + h^{-\sigma} |R_h \varphi - \Lambda_h \varphi|_1$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} h^{-\sigma} |R_h \varphi - \Lambda_h \varphi|_1 &\leq h^{-\sigma} |R_h \varphi - \varphi|_1 + h^{-\sigma} |\varphi - \Lambda_h \varphi|_1 \\ &\lesssim h^{-\sigma} |\varphi - \Lambda_h \varphi|_1 \lesssim |\varphi|_{1+\sigma}, \end{aligned}$$

the continuous inf-sup-condition yields, for any $s_h \in S_h$,

$$|s_h|_{1-\sigma} \lesssim \sup_{|\varphi|_{1+\sigma}=1} a(s_h, \varphi) = \sup_{|\varphi|_{1+\sigma}=1} a(s_h, R_h \varphi) \lesssim \sup_{\varphi_h \in S_h, \|\varphi_h\|_{1+\sigma}=1} a(s_h, \varphi_h),$$

and so

$$|s_h|_{1-\sigma} \leq \mu_h \sup_{\varphi_h \in S_h, \|\varphi_h\|_2=1} a(s_h, \varphi_h),$$

where μ_h depends only on continuous inf-sup constant and on the shape regularity of the underlying mesh and we switched to (3.6) for the norm on V_2 . To complete the setting, we set $W = L^2(\Omega)$, $Q = \mathbb{R}^\ell$, and let I be the canonical embedding $H^{1-\sigma}(\Omega) \rightarrow L^2(\Omega)$ and $C : \mathbb{R}^\ell \rightarrow H^{-(1+\sigma)}(\Omega)$ be given by $Cq = \sum_{j=1}^\ell q_j \delta_{x_j}$. The continuity constants M_I and M_C are of order 1 and ℓ , respectively. Notice that, for $\sigma = 0$, C is not continuous because functions in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ do not have point values in general. Choosing $\delta \in (0, \sigma)$, we have (3.17) with $s_1 = 1 - \sigma$, $s_2 = 1 + \sigma$ and therefore

$$\nu_h = \mu_h \left(1 + \frac{O(h^\delta)}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \right) \quad \text{as } h \rightarrow 0.$$

4. Analysis with approximate control action operator

In this section, we shall analyze the approximation properties of a variational discretization, where the control action operator is approximated. This includes the case of a discretized control space.

4.1. Approximate variational discretization

Let $V_{h,i} \subset V_i$, $i = 1, 2$, be the same finite-dimensional conforming spaces introduced in section 3.1 and assume that the linear operator $C_h^* : V \rightarrow Q$ approximates C^* . Then the (semi-) discrete optimization

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{(\tilde{q}_h, u_h) \in Q \times V_{h,1}} & \frac{1}{2} \|Iu_h - u_d\|_W^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|\tilde{q}_h\|_Q^2 \\ \text{subject to} & \quad \forall \varphi_{h,2} \in V_{h,2} \quad a(u_h, \varphi_{h,2}) = (\tilde{q}_h, C_h^* \varphi_{h,2})_Q, \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

generalizes (3.1). It has the solution $(\tilde{q}_h, \tilde{u}_h) \in Q \times V_{h,1}$ if and only if there exists $\tilde{z}_h \in V_{h,2}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \varphi_{h,2} \in V_{h,2} \quad a(\tilde{u}_h, \varphi_{h,2}) &= (\tilde{q}_h, C_h^* \varphi_{h,2})_Q, \\ \forall \varphi_{h,1} \in V_{h,1} \quad a(\varphi_{h,1}, \tilde{z}_h) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} (I\tilde{u}_h - u_d, I\varphi_{h,1})_W, \\ \sqrt{\alpha}\tilde{q}_h &= -C_h^* \tilde{z}_h. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

As before, we may eliminate \tilde{q}_h . If we define

$$b_h(v, \varphi) := a(v, \varphi) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} c_h(v, \varphi)$$

with

$$c_h(v, \varphi) := (C_h^* v_2, C_h^* \varphi_2)_Q - (Iv_1, I\varphi_1)_W$$

for $v, \varphi \in V = V_1 \times V_2$, then the reduced version of (4.2) is the following perturbation of the optimality system (3.3):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{find } \tilde{x}_h = (\tilde{u}_h, \tilde{z}_h) \in V_h \text{ such that} \\ \forall \varphi_h = (\varphi_{h,1}, \varphi_{h,2}) \in V_h \quad b_h(\tilde{x}_h, \varphi_h) &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} (u_d, I\varphi_{h,1})_W, \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

where $V_h = V_{h,1} \times V_{h,2}$. Before we proceed to analyze its discretization error, let us give an important class of examples.

Example 4.1 (Discretized controls). We consider a conforming discretization of the control variable. More precisely, replacing Q in (3.1) with a finite-dimensional subspace $Q_h \subset Q$ leads to the discrete optimality system

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \varphi_{h,2} \in V_{h,2} \quad a(\tilde{u}_h, \varphi_{h,2}) &= (\tilde{q}_h, C_h^* \varphi_{h,2})_Q, \\ \forall \varphi_{h,1} \in V_{h,1} \quad a(\varphi_{h,1}, \tilde{z}_h) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} (I\tilde{u}_h - u_d, I\varphi_{h,1})_W, \\ \forall p_h \in Q_h \quad (\sqrt{\alpha}\tilde{q}_h, p_h)_Q &= -(C_h^* \tilde{z}_h, p_h)_Q. \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

If we denote by P_h the Q -orthogonal projection onto Q_h , then the third equation means

$$\tilde{q}_h = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} P_h C_h^* \tilde{z}_h$$

and, therefore, the right-hand side of the first equation can be rewritten as follows:

$$(\tilde{q}_h, C_h^* \varphi_{h,2})_Q = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} (P_h C_h^* \tilde{z}_h, C_h^* \varphi_{h,2})_Q = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} (P_h C_h^* \tilde{z}_h, P_h C_h^* \varphi_{h,2})_Q.$$

Hence, the reduced version of (4.4) is a special case of (4.3) with

$$C_h^* = P_h C^*.$$

As the bilinear form b_h coincides with b except for using C_h^* in place of C , the non-asymptotic continuity and nondegeneracy properties of b in sections 2 and 3, e.g. theorem 2.1, immediately carry over by replacing M_C with the operator norm M_{C_h} of C_h^* . In particular, setting $\tilde{M}_h := \max\{M_I, M_{C_h}\}$ and defining

$$\|\varphi\|_{\alpha,h} := M_a \|\varphi\| + \frac{\tilde{M}_h}{\sqrt{\alpha}} |\varphi|, \quad (4.5)$$

inequality (2.19) yields

$$|b_h(v, \varphi)| \leq M_a \|v\| \|\varphi\| + \frac{\tilde{M}_h}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \|v\| |\varphi| \leq \|v\| \|\varphi\|_{\alpha,h} \quad (4.6)$$

for all $v, \varphi \in V$. Furthermore, (3.11) and the inf-sup duality (2.18) for $b_h|_{V_h \times V_h}$ imply

$$\sup_{\varphi_h \in V_h, \|\varphi_h\|_{\alpha,h}=1} b_h(v_h, \varphi_h) \geq \frac{1}{\tilde{\kappa}_h \mu_h} \|v_h\|, \quad (4.7)$$

for all $v_h \in V_h$, where

$$\tilde{\kappa}_h = \frac{1 + 2\tilde{L}}{1 + \tilde{L}} \left(1 + \tilde{M}_h \mu_h \left(1 + \frac{2\tilde{M}_h}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \right) \right) \quad \text{with} \quad \tilde{L} = \frac{\tilde{M}_h}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \quad (4.8)$$

and μ_h is the quasi-best approximation constant of the constraint discretization.

Since the structures of the discrete problems (4.3) and (3.3) are the same, well-posedness of (4.3) follows from lemma 3.1.

4.2. Approximation

As in the error analysis of section 3.2, we adopt the convenient choice

$$(3.6) \text{ as norm in } V_2.$$

Here we start our analysis by splitting the error into an approximation part and a consistency part.

Lemma 4.2 (Approximation and consistency error). *Let $x = (u, z)$ be any solution of the optimality system (2.11) and let \tilde{x}_h be its approximation from (4.3). Then the error satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} \|x - \tilde{x}_h\| &\leq \tilde{\kappa}_h \mu_h \left(\inf_{v_h \in V_h} \|x - v_h\| + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \sup_{\varphi_h \in V_h} \frac{\langle (C_h C_h^* - C C^*)z, \varphi_{h,2} \rangle_2}{\|\varphi_h\|_{\alpha,h}} \right) \\ &\leq 2\tilde{\kappa}_h \mu_h \|x - \tilde{x}_h\|. \end{aligned}$$

Here $\tilde{\kappa}_h$ is defined by (4.8) and μ_h is the quasi-best approximation constant of the constraint discretization from (3.9).

Proof. Define $x_h^* \in V_h$ by

$$\forall \varphi_h \in V_h \quad b_h(x_h^*, \varphi_h) = b_h(x, \varphi_h).$$

Then theorem 3.3 with $b_h, x_h^*, \tilde{\kappa}_h$ in place of b, x_h, κ_h gives

$$\|x - x_h^*\| \leq \tilde{\kappa}_h \mu_h \inf_{v_h \in V_h} \|x - v_h\|$$

and we have the identities

$$\begin{aligned} b_h(x_h^* - \tilde{x}_h, \varphi_h) &= b_h(x - \tilde{x}_h, \varphi_h) = b_h(x, \varphi_h) - b(x, \varphi_h) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \langle C_h C_h^* z - C C^* z, \varphi_{h,2} \rangle_2 \end{aligned}$$

for all $\varphi_h \in V_h$. In view of (4.6) and (4.7), these identities imply

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{\kappa}_h \mu_h} \|x_h^* - \tilde{x}_h\| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \sup_{\varphi_h \in V_h} \frac{\langle (C_h C_h^* - C C^*) z, \varphi_{h,2} \rangle_2}{\|\varphi_h\|_{\alpha,h}} \leq \|x - \tilde{x}_h\|.$$

The claim follows from the obvious inequalities $\|x - \tilde{x}_h\| \leq \|x - x_h^*\| + \|x_h^* - \tilde{x}_h\|$ and $\inf_{v_h \in V_h} \|x - v_h\| \leq \|x - \tilde{x}_h\|$. \square

For the next corollary, it is necessary to consider a class of optimization problems, where all elements of V_h are solutions for suitable data. The class \mathcal{P} consisting of the optimization problems

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{given data } f \in V_2^*, u_d \in W, \\ &\min_{(q,u) \in Q \times V_1} \frac{1}{2} \|Iu - u_d\|_W^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|q\|_Q^2 \quad \text{subject to } Au = Cq + f \end{aligned}$$

has this property whenever I^* is surjective in addition to the assumptions of section 2.

Corollary 4.3 (Necessary condition for quasi-best approximation). *If the approximate variational discretization (4.3) is quasi-best in the class \mathcal{P} , then*

$$\forall v_{2,h} \in V_{2,h} \quad \|C_h^* v_{2,h}\|_Q = \|C^* v_{2,h}\|_Q.$$

Proof. Let $v_{2,h} \in V_{2,h}$ be arbitrary and take some $v_{1,h} \in V_{1,h}$. Then $v_h = (v_{1,h}, v_{2,h}) \in V_h \subset V$ is a possible solution in the class \mathcal{P} . Since (4.3) is quasi-best in \mathcal{P} , the discrete solution is exactly $v_h \in V_h$. Hence, by lemma 4.2 we have $(C_h C_h^* - C C^*) v_{2,h} = 0$, which yields $\|C_h^* v_{2,h}\|_Q = \|C^* v_{2,h}\|_Q$. \square

Although possible, it is difficult to imagine that a practical approximation C_h^* satisfies the condition in corollary 4.3 without coinciding with C . We therefore consider in what follows only assumptions on C_h^* that lead to asymptotic quasi-best approximation. In view of lemma 4.2, this requires, that the consistency error vanishes at least as fast as the best approximation error, i.e.

$$\sup_{\varphi_h \in V_h} \frac{\langle (C_h C_h^* - C C^*) z, \varphi_{h,2} \rangle_2}{\|\varphi_h\|_{\alpha,h}} = o\left(\inf_{v_h \in V_h} \|x - v_h\|\right). \quad (4.9)$$

Moreover, to capture in the limit the compactness of C^* resulting from assumption (3.15a), we assume that

$$d_h \rightarrow 0 \text{ weakly in } V_2 \text{ as } h \rightarrow 0 \implies C_h^* d_h \rightarrow 0 \text{ strongly as } h \rightarrow 0. \quad (4.10)$$

This implies that the operator norms $\|C_h^*\|_{L(V_2, Q)} = \tilde{M}_h = \max\{M_I, M_{C_h}\}$ are uniformly bounded. Indeed, suppose that $\tilde{M}_h \rightarrow \infty$ as $h \rightarrow 0$ and, for each $h > 0$, let $\varphi_2^h \in V_2$ be such that $\|C_h^* \varphi_2^h\|_Q = \tilde{M}_h$ and $\|\varphi_2^h\|_2 = 1$. Then $\varphi_2^h / \tilde{M}_h \rightarrow 0$ in V_2 as $h \rightarrow 0$, which, in view of (4.10), yields a contradiction. Consequently,

$$\tilde{M} := \sup_h \tilde{M}_h = \sup_h \max\{M_I, M_{C_h}\}$$

is finite.

Lemma 4.4 (Qualitative asymptotic quasi-best approximation with approximate control action). *Let $x = (u, z) \in V$ be a solution to problem (2.11) and let $\tilde{x}_h = (\tilde{u}_h, \tilde{z}_h) \in V_h$, $h > 0$, be the corresponding approximations given by (4.3). Furthermore, assume uniform stability (3.13), approximability (3.15b), limiting compactness (4.10), and that $I : V_1 \rightarrow W$ is compact. If the exact solution x satisfies (4.9), we have*

$$\|x - \tilde{x}_h\| \leq \mu_h \left(1 + \frac{\tilde{\kappa}}{\sqrt{\alpha}} o(1) \right) \inf_{v_h \in V_h} \|x - v_h\| \quad \text{as } h \rightarrow 0,$$

where

$$\tilde{\kappa} = \frac{1 + 2\tilde{L}}{1 + \tilde{L}} \left(1 + \tilde{M}\tilde{\mu} \left(1 + \frac{2\tilde{M}}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \right) \right) < \infty \quad \text{with } \tilde{L} = \frac{\tilde{M}}{\sqrt{\alpha}}.$$

Proof. As in the proof of lemma 4.2, define $x_h^* \in V_h$ by

$$\forall \varphi_h \in V_h \quad b_h(x_h^*, \varphi_h) = b_h(x, \varphi_h).$$

We deduce

$$\|x - x_h^*\| \leq \mu_h (1 + \tilde{\kappa}_h o(1)) \inf_{v_h \in V_h} \|x - v_h\| \quad (4.11)$$

by replacing b with b_h and x_h with x_h^* in lemma 3.6 and using the limiting compactness (4.10) instead of the compactness of $C^* : V_2 \rightarrow Q$ in the proof of lemma 3.7. Next, proceeding as in the proof of lemma 4.2, assumption (4.9) on the exact solution gives

$$\frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{\tilde{\kappa}\mu} \|x_h^* - \tilde{x}_h\| = o \left(\inf_{v_h \in V_h} \|x - v_h\| \right).$$

We therefore conclude by inserting the two preceding relationships into the triangle inequality $\|x - \tilde{x}_h\| \leq \|x - x_h^*\| + \|x_h^* - \tilde{x}_h\|$. \square

We turn to prove a quantitative quasi-best approximation result. To this end, we need to specify the qualitative assumptions (4.9) and (4.10) by quantitative ones. We shall assume that

$$\sup_{\varphi_h \in V_h} \frac{\langle (C_h C_h^* - C C^*)z, \varphi_{h,2} \rangle_2}{\|\varphi_h\|_{\alpha,h}} = O(h^\delta) \inf_{v_h \in V_h} \|x - v_h\| \quad (4.12)$$

and that

$$C_h \in L(Q, H^{-s_2+\delta}) \quad \text{is uniformly bounded with respect to } h > 0, \quad (4.13)$$

where $\delta > 0$ is suitably chosen. Note that (4.13) reduces for $C_h = C$ to the part regarding C in the quantitative counterpart (3.17b) of the qualitative compactness (3.15a).

Theorem 4.5 (Quantitative asymptotic quasi-best approximation with approximate control action). Let x , \tilde{x}_h , $h > 0$, and $\tilde{\kappa}$ be as in lemma 4.4. In addition, assume uniform stability (3.13) and that there exists $\delta > 0$ such that we have (3.17), where (4.13) replaces the assumption on C in (3.17b). If the exact solution x satisfies also (4.12) with the same δ , we have

$$\|x - \tilde{x}_h\| \leq \mu_h \left(1 + \frac{\tilde{\kappa}}{\sqrt{\alpha}} O(h^\delta) \right) \inf_{v_h \in V_h} \|x - v_h\| \quad \text{as } h \rightarrow 0,$$

Proof. We follow the lines of the proof of lemma 4.4, but replacing (4.9) with (4.12) and (4.11) with a quantitative argument in the spirit of theorem 3.8. To this end, it suffices to use (4.13) instead of (3.17b). \square

We conclude this section by assessing the key assumptions (4.9) and (4.12) by a remark and an example.

Remark 4.6 (Ensuring dominated consistency error). As

$$\sup_{\varphi_h \in V_h} \frac{\langle (C_h C_h^* - CC^*)z, \varphi_{h,2} \rangle_2}{\|\varphi_h\|_{\alpha,h}} \leq \|C_h C_h^* - CC^*\|_{L(V_2, V_2^*)}$$

for

$$\|C_h C_h^* - CC^*\|_{L(V_2, V_2^*)} := \sup_{\varphi_h \in V_h} \frac{\langle (C_h C_h^* - CC^*)z, \varphi_{h,2} \rangle_2}{\|\varphi_h\|_2},$$

we may verify assumptions (4.9) and (4.12) using relationships for $\|C_h C_h^* - CC^*\|_{L(V_2, V_2^*)}$.

Example 4.7 (Simple model optimization and piecewise constant controls). Consider the setting of example 3.9, but with problem (1.1) with linear finite elements for the constraint and piecewise constants for the control variable. In the light of example 4.1, this full discretization can be cast into (4.3) with $C_h = P_h C$, where P_h is the L^2 -projection onto piecewise constants. By duality, we have

$$\|C_h C_h^* - CC^*\|_{L(V_2, V_2^*)} \leq c_1 h^2,$$

where c_1 depends on the shape regularity of the underlying meshes. Suppose that there is a constant c_2 such that

$$\inf_{v_h \in V_h} \|x - v_h\| \geq c_2 h.$$

This holds for example if the matrix norm of the Hessian of the exact state or its adjoint state are bounded away from 0 in a fixed subdomain. We conclude

$$\|C_h C_h^* - CC^*\|_{L(V_2, V_2^*)} \leq c_1 h^2 \leq \frac{c_1}{c_2} h \inf_{v_h \in V_h} \|x - v_h\|,$$

i.e. (4.12) with $\delta = 1$ and a constant depending on the exact solution under consideration.

5. Analysis with control constraints

This section generalizes our approach to optimization problems that are nonlinear because of constraints on the control.

5.1. Control constraints and discretization

Let $K \subset Q$ be the set of admissible controls. We assume that

$$K \text{ is nonempty, closed, and convex} \quad (5.1)$$

and denote by $\Pi_K : Q \rightarrow K$ the projection operator onto K which is characterized by $\|q - \Pi_K q\|_Q = \inf_{p \in K} \|q - p\|_Q$ or, equivalently, by

$$\forall p \in K \quad (q - \Pi_K q, \Pi_K q - p)_Q \geq 0.$$

The latter characterization implies

$$(\Pi_K(q) - \Pi_K(p), q - p)_Q \geq \|\Pi_K(q) - \Pi_K(p)\|_Q^2 \quad (5.2)$$

for all $q, p \in Q$, which in turn shows that the operator Π_K is strongly monotone and Lipschitz continuous, in both cases with constant 1.

The generalization of problem (2.3) incorporating convex control constraints is then the *convex optimization problem*

$$\min_{(q,u) \in K \times V_1} \frac{1}{2} \|Iu - u_d\|_W^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|q\|_Q^2 \quad \text{subject to} \quad Au = Cq. \quad (5.3)$$

Thanks to (5.1), a solution (q, u) is characterized by the existence of $z \in V$ such that the following counterpart of the rescaled optimality system (2.6) is satisfied:

$$Au = Cq, \quad A^*z = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} I^*(Iu - u_d), \quad q = \Pi_K\left(-\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} C^*z\right). \quad (5.4)$$

As in section 2, we insert the third equation into the first one and consider the corresponding *weak formulation of the rescaled and reduced optimality system*:

$$\text{find } x \in V \text{ such that } \forall \varphi \in V \quad b_K(x, \varphi) = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} (u_d, I\varphi_1)_W, \quad (5.5)$$

where $b_K := a + c_{K,\alpha}$ and

$$c_{K,\alpha}(v, \varphi) := -\left(\Pi_K\left(-\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} C^*v_2\right), C^*\varphi_2\right)_Q - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} (Iv_1, I\varphi_1)_W,$$

which already incorporates the $1/\sqrt{\alpha}$ -scaling. In contrast to the previous sections, $c_{K,\alpha}$ and so b_K are in general not linear in the first argument. Nonetheless, if we introduce the pseudometric

$$\delta_{K,\alpha}(v, w)^2 := \alpha \left\| \Pi_K\left(-\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} C^*v_2\right) - \Pi_K\left(-\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} C^*w_2\right) \right\|_Q^2 + \|I(v_1 - w_1)\|_Q^2,$$

inequality (5.2) leads to the following replacement of the properties (2.14) of the bilinear form c : if $v, w \in V$ and $\varphi = -(v_1 - w_1, v_2 - w_2)$, then

$$c_{K,\alpha}(v, \varphi) - c_{K,\alpha}(w, \varphi) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \delta_{K,\alpha}(v, w)^2, \quad (5.6a)$$

while, for any $v, w, \varphi \in V$ arbitrary, we have,

$$|c_{K,\alpha}(v, \varphi) - c_{K,\alpha}(w, \varphi)| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \delta_{K,\alpha}(v, w) |\varphi|. \quad (5.6b)$$

In addition, we have, for $v, w \in V$,

$$\delta_{K,\alpha}(v, w) \leq |v - w|. \quad (5.7)$$

The continuity bound (5.6b) leads to

$$|b_K(v, \varphi) - b_K(w, \varphi)| \leq d_{K,\alpha}(v, w) \|\varphi\| \quad (5.8)$$

with the metric

$$d_{K,\alpha}(v, w) := M_a \|v - w\| + \frac{M}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \delta_{K,\alpha}(v, w), \quad v, w \in V.$$

Notice that the role of the two arguments of c and b_K cannot be interchanged. We adapt (2.22) to this new situation in the following way: given $v, w \in V$, we choose $\varphi = T_K(v - w)$, where $T_K : V \rightarrow V$ is the linear operator given by

$$T_K \psi := m_a(A^{-1} J_2 \psi_2, A^{-*} J_1 \psi_1) + \gamma(-\psi_1, \psi_2), \quad (5.9)$$

γ as in (2.23b), and $J_i : V_i \rightarrow V_i^*$ is the Riesz map for V_i , $i = 1, 2$. In view of (2.24), we thus obtain the following counterpart of theorem 2.1.

Theorem 5.1 (Properties of form b_K). *If we equip V as trial space with $d_{K,\alpha}$ and as test space with $\|\cdot\|$, then we have, for any $v, w, \varphi \in V$,*

$$\begin{aligned} b_K(v, T_K(v - w)) - b_K(w, T_K(v - w)) &\geq \frac{1 + L}{1 + 2L} \frac{m_a}{M_a} d_{K,\alpha}(v, w) \|v - w\| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\kappa} \frac{m_a}{M_a} d_{K,\alpha}(v, w) \|T_K(v - w)\| \end{aligned}$$

and

$$|b_K(v, \varphi) - b_K(w, \varphi)| \leq d_{K,\alpha}(v, w) \|\varphi\|,$$

where κ is defined by (2.23).

Also here, we can conclude existence and uniqueness as a side-product.

Corollary 5.2 (Well-posedness with control constraints). *The optimization problem (5.5) has a unique solution.*

Proof. We shall apply Zarantonello's theorem of strongly monotone operators [26, theorem 25.B] in the Hilbert space $(V, \|\cdot\|)$. To prepare this, we first observe that

$$T_K \text{ is a linear isomorphism on } (V, \|\cdot\|). \quad (5.10)$$

Indeed, it is continuous with constant $1 + \gamma$ owing to (2.22b) and boundedly invertible on account of the consequence

$$\frac{1 + L}{1 + 2L} \frac{m_a}{M_a} \|v\| \|v\|_\alpha \leq b(T_K v, v) \leq \|T_K v\| \|v\|_\alpha$$

of (2.19) and (2.24) for the bilinear form b . Let us consider the nonlinear operator $\tilde{B}_K : V \rightarrow V^*$ defined by

$$\langle \tilde{B}_K v, \varphi \rangle = b_K(v, T_K \varphi),$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the duality pairing associated with $(V, \|\cdot\|)$. Making use of theorem 5.1, (2.19) and (5.7), we see that, for all $v, w \in V$,

$$\langle \tilde{B}_K v - \tilde{B}_K w, v - w \rangle \geq \frac{1+L}{1+2L} m_a \|v - w\|^2$$

and

$$\langle \tilde{B}_K v - \tilde{B}_K w, \varphi \rangle \leq \left(M_a + \frac{M^2}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \right) (1 + \gamma) \|v - w\| \|\varphi\|.$$

Hence, \tilde{B}_K is strongly monotone and Lipschitz continuous and therefore boundedly invertible by [26, theorem 25.B]. In light of (5.10), we can conclude by noting $T_K^{-*} \tilde{B}_K v = b_K(v, \cdot)$ for all $v \in V$. \square

In order to discretize the optimization problem (5.3) with control constraints, we proceed as in section 3.1. Introducing the discrete space $V_h = V_{h,1} \times V_{h,2}$ as therein, the variational discretization can be characterized as follows:

$$\text{find } x_h \in V_h \text{ such that } \forall \varphi_h \in V_h \quad b_K(x_h, \varphi_h) = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} (u_d, I\varphi_{h,1})_W. \quad (5.11)$$

Here we need that $\Pi_K(-C^*v_{h,2}/\sqrt{\alpha})$ can be evaluated exactly for $v_{h,2} \in V_{h,2}$. This occurs, for example, when we consider (1.1) with box constraints and discretize with linear finite elements. If Π_K has to be approximated, the subsequent error analysis involves additional technicalities, similar to those addressed in section 4.

Existence and uniqueness of solutions to (5.11) can be established in a similar way as corollary 5.2. Using (3.6) as the norm in V_2 , the major change is to replace the operator (5.9) by $T_{K,h} : V_h \rightarrow V_h$ given by

$$T_{K,h}\psi_h := \frac{1}{\mu_h} (A_h^{-1} J_{h,2}\psi_2, A_h^{-*} J_{h,1}\psi_{h,1}) + \gamma(-\psi_{h,1}, \psi_{h,2}), \quad (5.12)$$

where $A_h v_{h,1} := a(v_{h,1}, \cdot)|_{V_{h,2}}$, $v_{h,1} \in V_{h,1}$, is the discrete counterpart of A , $1/\mu_h$ is its inf-sup constant, γ is as in (2.23), and $J_{h,i} : V_{h,i} \rightarrow V_{h,i}^*$ is the Riesz map for $V_{h,i}$, $i = 1, 2$.

5.2. Quasi-best approximation

We analyze the quasi-best approximation properties of the nonlinear variational discretization (5.11), adopting again

$$(3.6) \text{ as norm in } V_2.$$

The following non-asymptotic result draws heavily on theorem 5.1, which needed an α -dependent error notion for V as trial space.

Theorem 5.3 (Non-asymptotic quasi-best approximation with control constraints). *If x_h is the approximation given by (5.11) to an arbitrary solution x of (5.5), then its error is quasi-best in V_h in that*

$$d_{K,\alpha}(x, x_h) \leq (\kappa_h \mu_h + 1) \inf_{v_h \in V_h} d_{K,\alpha}(x, v_h),$$

where κ_h and μ_h are as in theorem 3.3.

Proof. Given any $v_h \in V_h$, we first write

$$d_{K,\alpha}(x, x_h) \leq d_{K,\alpha}(x, v_h) + d_{K,\alpha}(v_h, x_h). \quad (5.13)$$

To bound the second term, we employ theorem 5.1 with, respectively, V_h , $T_{K,h}$, $1/\mu_h$, 1, and κ_h in place of V , T_K , m_a , M_a , and κ . Writing $\varphi_h = T_{K,h}(v_h - x_h)$, the definitions of x and x_h thus yield,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\kappa_h \mu_h} d_{K,\alpha}(v_h, x_h) \|\varphi_h\| &\leq b_K(v_h, \varphi_h) - b_K(x_h, \varphi_h) \\ &= b_K(v_h, \varphi_h) - b_K(x, \varphi_h) \leq d_{K,\alpha}(x, v_h) \|\varphi_h\| \end{aligned}$$

and the claimed inequality is established as $T_{K,h}$ is invertible. \square

The ‘+1’ in the bound for the quasi-best approximation constant in theorem 5.3 arises from the triangle inequality (5.13), which is avoided in deriving in (3.5). Yet, the following asymptotic quasi-best approximation results involving the generalized Ritz projection from (3.9) are not affected by such an augmentation.

Lemma 5.4 (Nonlinear variational and generalized Ritz approximations). *Let x and x_h be as in theorem 5.3. The generalized Ritz projection $R_h x$ of x and x_h are related by*

$$d_{K,\alpha}(x_h, R_h x) \leq \kappa_h \mu_h \frac{M}{\sqrt{\alpha}} |x - R_h x|,$$

where κ_h and μ_h are as in theorem 3.3.

Proof. Applying theorem 5.1 with the setting as in theorem 5.3, writing $\varphi_h = T_{K,h}(x_h - R_h x)$, and recalling (5.7), we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\kappa_h \mu_h} d_{K,\alpha}(x_h, R_h x) \|\varphi_h\| &\leq b_K(x_h, \varphi_h) - b_K(R_h x, \varphi_h) \\ &= b_K(x, \varphi_h) - b_K(R_h x, \varphi_h) \\ &= c_{K,\alpha}(x, \varphi_h) - c_{K,\alpha}(R_h x, \varphi_h) \leq \frac{M}{\sqrt{\alpha}} |x - R_h x| \|\varphi_h\| \end{aligned}$$

and, again thanks to the invertibility of $T_{K,h}$, the proof is finished. \square

Let us sharpen lemma 5.4 with the help of the additional assumptions and arguments from section 3.3 regarding the linear optimality system.

Theorem 5.5 (Supercloseness to the generalized Ritz approximation). *Let x , x_h , and $R_h x$ be as in lemma 5.4. Moreover, assume (3.13) and define $\bar{\kappa}$ as in lemma 3.7. If (3.15) holds, then*

$$d_{K,\alpha}(x_h, R_h x) \leq \frac{M}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \bar{\kappa} \bar{\mu} o(\|x - R_h x\|) \text{ as } h \rightarrow 0.$$

More specifically, if (3.17) holds, then

$$d_{K,\alpha}(x_h, R_h x) \leq \frac{M}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \bar{\kappa} \bar{\mu} O(h^\delta \|x - R_h x\|) \text{ as } h \rightarrow 0.$$

For the α -dependence of $\bar{\kappa}$, see remark 2.4.

Proof. In view of lemma 5.4, it suffices to show $|x - R_h x| = o(\|x - R_h x\|)$. To this end, we modify the argument in lemma 3.7 slightly; a similar argument has been used by [27] under

weaker assumptions on $(V_h)_h$. Let $(h_k)_k$ be any sequence with $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} h_k = 0$ and, writing k whenever h_k is an index, consider

$$d_k := \begin{cases} \frac{x - R_k x}{\|x - R_k x\|}, & \text{if } x \neq R_k x, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The sequence $(d_k)_k$ is bounded in the Hilbert space V by definition. For its weak limit $d \in V$, we have

$$\mathbf{a}(d, \varphi) = \mathbf{a}(d - d_k, \varphi) + \mathbf{a}(d_k, \varphi - \varphi_k)$$

for arbitrary $\varphi \in V$ and $\varphi_k \in V_h$. Consequently, (3.15b), $k \rightarrow \infty$, and (2.17) yield $d = 0$. In view of (3.15a), $d_k \rightarrow 0$ weakly in V then implies $|d_k| \rightarrow 0$.

For the second statement, we just note that the main step of the proof of theorem 3.8 with $v = x - R_h x$ leads to $|v - R_h v| = O(h^\delta \|x - R_h x\|)$. \square

In view of the inverse triangle inequality

$$\left| \|x - x_h\| - \|x - R_h x\| \right| \leq \|x_h - R_h x\| \leq d_{K,\alpha}(x_h, R_h x).$$

Theorem 5.5 readily yields the following asymptotic quasi-best approximation result.

Corollary 5.6 (Asymptotic quasi-best approximation with control constraints). *Let $\nu_{K,h}$ be the quasi-best approximation constant for the nonlinear variational discretization (5.11) with respect to $\|\cdot\|$. Moreover, assume (3.13) and define $\bar{\kappa}$ as in lemma 3.7. If (3.15) holds, then*

$$\nu_{K,h} \leq \mu_h \left(1 + \frac{M}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \bar{\kappa} o(1) \right) \text{ as } h \rightarrow 0.$$

More specifically, if (3.17) holds, then

$$\nu_{K,h} \leq \mu_h \left(1 + \frac{M}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \bar{\kappa} O(h^\delta) \right) \text{ as } h \rightarrow 0.$$

For the α -dependence of $\bar{\kappa}$, see remark 2.4.

In comparison with lemma 3.7 and theorem 3.8, corollary 5.6 features an additional $M/\sqrt{\alpha}$ -factor. This factor stems from the fact that the derivation we went through used an error notion that also incorporates it.


Acknowledgment

Andreas Veeseer is partially supported by the Italian PRIN ‘‘Numerical Analysis for Full and Reduced Order Methods for the efficient and accurate solution of complex systems governed by Partial Differential Equations.’’

ORCID iDs

Christian Kreuzer  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2923-4428>

Andreas Veeseer  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2152-2911>

Winnifried Wollner  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6571-8043>

References

- [1] Falk R S 1973 Approximation of a class of optimal control problems with order of convergence estimates *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **44** 28–47
- [2] Geveci T 1979 On the approximation of the solution of an optimal control problem governed by an elliptic equation *RAIRO Anal. Numér.* **13** 313–28
- [3] Malanowski K 1982 Convergence of approximations versus regularity of solutions for convex, control-constrained optimal-control problems *Appl. Math. Optim.* **8** 69–95
- [4] Casas E and Tröltzsch F 2003 Error estimates for linear-quadratic elliptic control problems *Analysis and Optimization of Differential Systems (Constanta, 2002)* pp 89–100
- [5] Rösch A 2006 Error estimates for linear-quadratic control problems with control constraints *Optim. Methods Softw.* **21** 121–34
- [6] Hinze M 2005 A variational discretization concept in control constrained optimization: the linear-quadratic case *Comput. Optim. Appl.* **30** 45–61
- [7] Meyer C and Rösch A 2004 Superconvergence properties of optimal control problems *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **43** 970–85
- [8] Casas E and Mateos M 2002 Uniform convergence of the FEM. Applications to state constrained control problems *Comput. Appl. Math.* **21** 67–100
- [9] Deckelnick K and Hinze M 2007 Convergence of a finite element approximation to a state-constrained elliptic control problem *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **45** 1937–53
- [10] Meyer C 2008 Error estimates for the finite-element approximation of an elliptic control problem with pointwise state and control constraints *Control Cybern.* **37** 51–85
- [11] Deckelnick K and Hinze M 2008 Numerical analysis of a control and state constrained elliptic control problem with piecewise constant control approximations *Numerical Mathematics and Advanced Applications* pp 597–604
- [12] Neitzel I and Wollner W 2018 *A priori* L^2 -discretization error estimates for the state in elliptic optimization problems with pointwise inequality state constraints *Numer. Math.* **138** 273–99
- [13] Deckelnick K, Günther A and Hinze M 2009 Finite element approximation of elliptic control problems with constraints on the gradient *Numer. Math.* **111** 335–50
- [14] Günther A and Hinze M 2011 Elliptic control problems with gradient constraints—variational discrete versus piecewise constant controls *Comput. Optim. Appl.* **49** 549–66
- [15] Ortner C and Wollner W 2011 *A priori* error estimates for optimal control problems with pointwise constraints on the gradient of the state *Numer. Math.* **118** 587–600
- [16] Wollner W 2013 *A priori* error estimates for optimal control problems with constraints on the gradient of the state on nonsmooth polygonal domains *Control and Optimization with PDE Constraints (International Series of Numerical Mathematics vol 164)* ed K Bredies et al (Boston, MA: Birkhäuser) pp 193–215
- [17] Chrysafinos K and Karatzas E N 2015 Symmetric error estimates for discontinuous Galerkin time-stepping schemes for optimal control problems constrained to evolutionary Stokes equations *Comput. Optim. Appl.* **60** 719–51
- [18] Chrysafinos K and Karatzas E N 2012 Symmetric error estimates for discontinuous Galerkin approximations for an optimal control problem associated to semilinear parabolic PDE's *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.: B* **17** 1473–506
- [19] Tantardini F and Veerer A 2016 The L^2 -projection and quasi-optimality of Galerkin methods for parabolic equations *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **54** 317–40
- [20] Schatz A H 1974 An observation concerning Ritz–Galerkin methods with indefinite bilinear forms *Math. Comput.* **28** 959–62
- [21] Babuška I 1971 Error-bounds for finite element method *Numer. Math.* **16** 322–33
- [22] Lions J-L 1971 *Optimal Control of Systems Governed by Partial Differential Equations (Die Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften)* 1st edn (Berlin: Springer)
- [23] Tröltzsch F 2005 *Optimale Steuerung partieller Differentialgleichungen* 1st edn (Berlin: Springer) (<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-8348-9357-4>)
- [24] Xu J and Zikatanov L 2003 Some observations on Babuška and Brezzi theories *Numer. Math.* **94** 195–202
- [25] Gaspoz F D, Morin P and Veerer A 2017 *A posteriori* error estimates with point sources in fractional Sobolev spaces *Numer. Methods Part. Differ. Equ.* **33** 1018–42
- [26] Zeidler E 1990 *Nonlinear Functional Analysis and Its Applications. II/B* (New York: Springer)
- [27] Feischl M, Führer T and Praetorius D 2014 Adaptive FEM with optimal convergence rates for a certain class of nonsymmetric and possibly nonlinear problems *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **52** 601–25