## Introduction

We have a simple example of a time-optimal control problem subject to the linear heat equation and pointwise bound constraints on the control. The goal is to steer the heat equation into an $L^{2}$-ball centered at some desired state in the shortest time possible by an appropriate choice of the control. The time-optimal control problem can be transformed to a fixed time interval and both versions are given below.

This particular problem utilizes a control function varying in time only. The exact solution is unknown, but numerical values are provided.

The problem has been used as numerical test in [Bonifacius et al., 2018a, Example 5.2].

## Variables \& Notation

## Unknowns

$$
\begin{aligned}
q \in Q=L^{\infty}\left((0, T) ; \mathbb{R}^{2}\right) & \text { control variable } \\
u \in U=H^{1}\left((0, T) ; L^{2}(\Omega)\right) \cap L^{2}\left((0, T) ; H_{0}^{1}(\Omega) \cap H^{2}(\Omega)\right) & \text { state variable } \\
T & \text { terminal time }
\end{aligned}
$$

## Given Data

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Omega & =(0,1)^{2} & & \text { spatial domain } \\
u_{d} & =0 \in H_{0}^{1}(\Omega) & & \text { desired state } \\
\delta_{0} & =\frac{1}{10}>0 & & \text { tolerance to desired state } \\
\alpha & \geq 0 & & \text { control cost parameter (arbitrary) } \\
u_{0} & =4 \sin \left(\pi x_{1}^{2}\right) \sin \left(\pi x_{2}^{3}\right) & & \text { initial state } \\
c & =0.03 & & \text { coefficient in the PDE } \\
q_{a} & =-1.5 & & \text { lower control bound } \\
q_{b} & =0 & & \text { upper control bound } \\
\omega_{1} & =(0,0.5) \times(0,1) & & \text { control domain 1 } \\
\omega_{2} & =(0.5,1) \times(0,0.5) & & \text { control domain } 2
\end{aligned}
$$

The control-action operator is defined as

$$
\begin{aligned}
B: \mathbb{R}^{2} & \rightarrow L^{2}(\Omega) \\
q=\left(q_{1}, q_{2}\right) & \mapsto B q=q_{1} \chi_{\omega_{1}}+q_{2} \chi_{\omega_{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\chi_{\omega_{1}}$ and $\chi_{\omega_{2}}$ denote the characteristic functions on $\omega_{1}$ and $\omega_{2}$.

## Problem Description

$$
\begin{array}{rlrl}
\text { Minimize } j(T, q) & :=T+\frac{\alpha}{2} \int_{0}^{T}\|q(t)\|_{\mathbb{R}^{2}}^{2} \mathrm{~d} t, \\
T & >0, &  \tag{P}\\
\text { subject to } & \left\{\begin{array}{rlr}
\partial_{t} u-c \triangle u & =B q, & \text { in }(0, T) \times \Omega, \\
u & =0, & \text { on }(0, T) \times \partial \Omega, \\
u(0) & =u_{0}, & \text { in } \Omega, \\
\frac{1}{2}\left\|u(T)-u_{d}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}-\frac{\delta_{0}^{2}}{2} & \leq 0, & \\
q_{a} & \leq q(t) \leq q_{b}, & t \in(0, T) .
\end{array}\right.
\end{array}
$$

The state equation is transformed to the reference time interval $(0,1)$ in order to deal with the variable time horizon; see [Bonifacius et al., 2018a, Section 3.1] for details. Thus, the transformed version of $(P)$ reads

$$
\begin{array}{rlrl}
\operatorname{Minimize} \widehat{j}(T, \widehat{q}) & :=T\left(1+\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \int_{0}^{1}\|\widehat{q}(t)\|_{\mathbb{R}^{2}}^{2} \mathrm{~d} t, \\
T & >0,  \tag{P}\\
\text { subject to }\left\{\begin{array}{rrr} 
\\
\partial_{t} \widehat{u}-T c \triangle \widehat{u} & =T B q, & \text { in }(0,1) \times \Omega, \\
\widehat{u} & =0, & \text { on }(0,1) \times \partial \Omega, \\
\widehat{u}(0) & =u_{0}, & \text { in } \Omega, \\
\frac{1}{2}\left\|\widehat{u}(1)-u_{d}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)}^{2}-\frac{\delta_{0}^{2}}{2} & \leq 0, & \\
q_{a} & \leq \widehat{q}(t) \leq q_{b}, & t \in(0,1)
\end{array}\right.
\end{array}
$$

Note that the problems $(P)$ and $(\widehat{P})$ are equivalent. The unknowns for the transformed problem $(\widehat{P})$ are $\widehat{q} \in \widehat{Q}=L^{\infty}\left((0,1) ; \mathbb{R}^{2}\right)$ and $\widehat{u} \in \widehat{U}=H^{1}\left((0,1) ; L^{2}(\Omega)\right) \cap$ $L^{2}\left((0,1) ; H_{0}^{1}(\Omega) \cap H^{2}(\Omega)\right)$.

## Optimality System

The first-order necessary optimality conditions for $(\widehat{P})$ are formally given as follows: for given local minimizers $\bar{q} \in \widehat{Q} \bar{u} \in \widehat{U}, \bar{T}>0$ there exists Lagrange multipliers $\bar{\mu}>0$ and $\bar{z} \in W(0,1)=\left\{v \in L^{2}\left(0,1 ; H_{0}^{1}(\Omega)\right): \partial_{t} v \in L^{2}\left(0,1 ; H^{-1}(\Omega)\right)\right\}$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{0}^{1} 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}\|\bar{q}(t)\|_{\mathbb{R}^{2}}^{2}+(B \bar{q}(t)+c \triangle \bar{u}(t), \bar{z}(t))_{L^{2}(\Omega)} \mathrm{d} t & =0 \\
\int_{0}^{1} \bar{T}\left(\alpha \bar{q}(t)+B^{*} \bar{z}(t), q(t)-\bar{q}(t)\right)_{\mathbb{R}^{2}} \mathrm{~d} t & \geq 0, \quad \forall q_{a} \leq q(t) \leq q_{b} \\
\left\|\bar{u}(1)-u_{d}\right\|_{L^{2}(\Omega)} & =\delta_{0}
\end{aligned}
$$

where the adjoint state $\bar{z} \in W(0,1)$ is determined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\partial_{t} \bar{z}(t)-\bar{T} \triangle \bar{z}(t)=0, \quad t \in(0,1) \quad \bar{z}(1)=\bar{\mu}\left(\bar{u}(1)-u_{d}\right) \tag{0.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

It can be shown that the above optimality conditions are satisfied in the given example, see, [Bonifacius et al., 2018a, Theorem 3.10].

## Supplementary Material

For the example, no analytical solution is known. However, numerical values from [Bonifacius et al., 2018a, Example 5.2] are provided. The state and adjoint state equations are discretized by means of the discontinuous Galerkin scheme in time (corresponding to a version of the implicit Euler method) and linear finite elements in space. This scheme is guaranteed to converge with a rate $|\log k|\left(k+h^{2}\right)$ with $k$ denoting the temporal mesh size and $h$ the spatial mesh size; cf. [Bonifacius et al., 2018a, Corollary 4.16]. For further details on the implementation we refer to [Bonifacius et al., 2018a, Section 5].
The following table provides results for [Bonifacius et al., 2018a, Example 5.2] and they were provided by the authors for different values of the control cost parameter $\alpha$, number of time steps $M$ and number of spatial nodes $N$. The analysis for the case $\alpha=0$ can be found in Bonifacius et al. [2018b].

|  |  | $\alpha=10$ | $\alpha=1$ | $\alpha=0.1$ | $\alpha=0.01$ | $\alpha=0.001$ | $\alpha=0$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $M$ | $N$ |  | $\bar{T}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 640 | 289 | 2.605661 | 2.075153 | 1.845201 | 1.808456 | 1.808257 | 1.808255 |
| 1280 | 1089 | 2.593450 | 2.061039 | 1.830766 | 1.794457 | 1.794261 | 1.794260 |
| 2560 | 4225 | 2.589968 | 2.057095 | 1.826762 | 1.790567 | 1.790372 | 1.790370 |
| 5120 | 16641 | 2.588884 | 2.055897 | 1.825559 | 1.789395 | 1.789200 | 1.789198 |
| 10240 | 16641 | 2.588670 | 2.055684 | 1.825355 | 1.789193 | 1.788998 | 1.788997 |
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