

1-1-2020

Finite element methods for one dimensional elliptic distributed optimal control problems with pointwise constraints on the derivative of the state

S. C. Brenner
Louisiana State University

L. Y. Sung
Louisiana State University

W. Wollner
Technische Universität Darmstadt

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/mathematics_pubs

Recommended Citation

Brenner, S., Sung, L., & Wollner, W. (2020). Finite element methods for one dimensional elliptic distributed optimal control problems with pointwise constraints on the derivative of the state. *Optimization and Engineering* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11081-020-09491-1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Mathematics at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact ir@lsu.edu.

FINITE ELEMENT METHODS FOR ONE DIMENSIONAL ELLIPTIC DISTRIBUTED OPTIMAL CONTROL PROBLEMS WITH POINTWISE CONSTRAINTS ON THE DERIVATIVE OF THE STATE

S.C. BRENNER, L.-Y. SUNG, AND W. WOLLNER

ABSTRACT. We investigate C^1 finite element methods for one dimensional elliptic distributed optimal control problems with pointwise constraints on the derivative of the state formulated as fourth order variational inequalities for the state variable. For the problem with Dirichlet boundary conditions, we use an existing $H^{\frac{5}{2}-\epsilon}$ regularity result for the optimal state to derive $O(h^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon})$ convergence for the approximation of the optimal state in the H^2 norm. For the problem with mixed Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions, we show that the optimal state belongs to H^3 under appropriate assumptions on the data and obtain $O(h)$ convergence for the approximation of the optimal state in the H^2 norm.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let I be the interval $(-1, 1)$ and the function $J : L_2(I) \times L_2(I) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined by

$$(1.1) \quad J(y, u) = \frac{1}{2} [\|y - y_d\|_{L_2(I)}^2 + \beta \|u\|_{L_2(I)}^2],$$

where $y_d \in L_2(I)$ and β is a positive constant.

The optimal control problem is to

$$(1.2) \quad \text{find } (\bar{y}, \bar{u}) = \underset{(y,u) \in \mathbb{K}}{\operatorname{argmin}} J(y, u),$$

where $(y, u) \in H^2(I) \times L_2(I)$ belongs to \mathbb{K} if and only if

$$(1.3) \quad -y'' = u + f \quad \text{on } I,$$

$$(1.4) \quad y' \leq \psi \quad \text{on } I,$$

together with the following boundary conditions for y :

$$(1.5a) \quad y(-1) = y(1) = 0,$$

Date: January 30, 2020.

1991 Mathematics Subject Classification. 49J15, 65N30, 65N15.

Key words and phrases. elliptic distributed optimal control problems, pointwise derivative constraints, cubic Hermite element.

The work of the first and second authors was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant Nos. DMS-16-20273 and DMS-19-13035.

or

$$(1.5b) \quad y(-1) = y'(1) = 0.$$

Remark 1.1. Throughout this paper we will follow standard notation for function spaces and norms that can be found, for example, in [13, 7, 1].

For the problem with the Dirichlet boundary conditions (1.5a), we assume that

$$(1.6) \quad f \in H^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}(I), \psi \in H^{\frac{3}{2}-\epsilon}(I) \quad \forall \epsilon > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_I \psi \, dx > 0.$$

For the problem with the mixed boundary conditions (1.5b), we assume that

$$(1.7) \quad f \in H^1(I), \psi \in H^2(I) \quad \text{and} \quad \psi(1) \geq 0.$$

Remark 1.2. In the case of Dirichlet boundary conditions, clearly we need $\int_I \psi \, dx \geq 0$ since $\int_I y' \, dx = 0$ and $y' \leq \psi$. However $\int_I \psi \, dx = 0$ implies $\int_I (y' - \psi) \, dx = 0$, which together with $y' \leq \psi$ leads to $y' = \psi$. Hence in this case \mathbb{K} is a singleton and the optimal control problem becomes trivial.

The optimal control problem with the Dirichlet boundary conditions (1.5a) is a one dimensional analog of the optimal control problems considered in [11, 12, 14, 22, 25] on smooth or convex domains. In [11, 12], first order optimality conditions were derived for a semilinear elliptic optimization problem with pointwise gradient constraints on smooth domains, where the solution of the state equation is in $W^{1,\infty}$ for any feasible control. These results were extended to non-smooth domains in [25]. On the other hand higher dimensional analogs of the optimal control problem with the mixed boundary conditions (1.5b) are absent from the literature.

Finite element error analysis for the problem with the Dirichlet boundary conditions was first carried out in [14] by a mixed formulation of the elliptic equation and a variational discretization of the control, and in [22] by a standard H^1 -conforming discretization with a possible non-variational control discretization.

The goal of this paper is to show that it is also possible to solve the one dimensional optimal control problem with either boundary conditions as a fourth order variation inequality for the state variable by a C^1 finite element method. We note that such an approach has been carried out for elliptic distributed optimal control problems with pointwise state constraints in, for example, the papers [18, 9, 3, 6, 5, 4, 10]. The analysis in this paper extends the general framework in [8] to the one dimensional problem defined by (1.1)–(1.5).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. We collect information on the optimal control problem in Section 2. The construction and analysis of the discrete problem are treated in Section 3, followed by numerical results in Section 4. We end with some concluding remarks in Section 5. The appendices contain derivations of the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker conditions that appear in Section 2.

Throughout the paper we will use C (with or without subscript) to denote a generic positive constant independent of the mesh sizes.

2. THE CONTINUOUS PROBLEM

Let the space V be defined by

$$(2.1a) \quad V = \{v \in H^2(I) : v(-1) = v(1) = 0\} \quad \text{for the boundary conditions (1.5a),}$$

and

$$(2.1b) \quad V = \{v \in H^2(I) : v(-1) = v'(1) = 0\} \quad \text{for the boundary conditions (1.5b).}$$

The minimization problem defined by (1.1)–(1.5) can be reformulated as the following problem that only involves y :

$$(2.2) \quad \text{Find } \bar{y} = \operatorname{argmin}_{y \in K} \frac{1}{2} [\|y - y_d\|_{L_2(I)}^2 + \beta \|y'' + f\|_{L_2(I)}^2],$$

where

$$(2.3) \quad K = \{y \in V : y' \leq \psi \text{ on } I\}.$$

Note that the closed convex subset K of the Hilbert space V is nonempty for either boundary conditions. In the case of the Dirichlet boundary conditions, the function $y(x) = \int_{-1}^x (\psi(t) - \delta) dt$ belongs to K if we take δ to be $\frac{1}{2} \int_I \psi dx (> 0)$. Similarly, in the case of the mixed boundary conditions, the function $y(x) = \int_{-1}^x [\psi(t) - \delta \sin[(\pi/4)(1+t)]] dt$ belongs to K if we take δ to be $\psi(1) (\geq 0)$.

According to the standard theory [15], there is a unique solution \bar{y} of (2.2)–(2.3) characterized by the fourth order variational inequality

$$(2.4) \quad \int_I (\bar{y} - y_d)(y - \bar{y}) dx + \beta \int_I (\bar{y}'' + f)(y'' - \bar{y}'') dx \geq 0 \quad \forall y \in K.$$

We can express (2.4) in the form of

$$(2.5) \quad a(\bar{y}, y - \bar{y}) \geq \int_I y_d(y - \bar{y}) dx - \beta \int_I f(y'' - \bar{y}'') dx \quad \forall y \in K,$$

where

$$(2.6) \quad a(y, z) = \beta \int_I y'' z'' dx + \int_I y z dx.$$

2.1. The Karush-Kuhn-Tucker Conditions. The solution of (2.4) is characterized by the following conditions:

$$(2.7) \quad \int_I (\bar{y} - y_d) z dx + \beta \int_I (\bar{y}'' + f) z'' dx + \int_{[-1,1]} z' d\mu = 0 \quad \forall z \in V,$$

$$(2.8) \quad \int_{[-1,1]} (\bar{y}' - \psi) d\mu = 0,$$

where

$$(2.9) \quad \mu \text{ is a nonnegative finite Borel measure on } [-1, 1].$$

Note that (2.8) is equivalent to the statement that μ is supported on the active set

$$(2.10) \quad \mathcal{A} = \{x \in [-1, 1] : \bar{y}'(x) = \psi(x)\}$$

for the derivative constraint (1.4).

We can also express (2.7) as

$$(2.11) \quad a(\bar{y}, z) - \int_I y_d z \, dx + \beta \int_I f z'' \, dx = - \int_{[-1, 1]} z' \, d\mu \quad \forall z \in V.$$

The Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions (2.7)–(2.9) can be derived from the general theory on Lagrange multipliers that can be found, for example, in [19, 16]. For the simple one dimensional problem here, they can also be derived directly (cf. Appendix A for the Dirichlet boundary conditions and Appendix B for the mixed boundary conditions).

Remark 2.1. In the case of the mixed boundary conditions, additional information on the structure of μ (cf. (2.27)) is obtained in Appendix B.

2.2. Dirichlet Boundary Conditions. We will use (2.7) to obtain additional regularity for \bar{y} that matches the regularity result in [22]. The following lemmas are useful for this purpose.

Lemma 2.2. *We have*

$$(2.12) \quad \int_I f v' \, dx \leq C_\epsilon |f|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}(I)} |v|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}(I)} \quad \forall v \in H^1(I) \quad \text{and} \quad \epsilon \in (0, 1/2).$$

Proof. Observe that

$$(2.13) \quad \int_I g v' \, dx \leq \|g\|_{L_2(I)} |v|_{H^1(I)} \quad \forall v \in H^1(I)$$

if $g \in L_2(I)$, and

$$(2.14) \quad \int_I g v' \, dx \leq |g|_{H^1(I)} \|v\|_{L_2(I)} \quad \forall v \in H^1(I)$$

if $g \in H_0^1(I)$.

Recall that $f \in H^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}(I)$ by the assumption in (1.6). The estimate (2.12) follows from (2.13), (2.14) and bilinear interpolation (cf. [2, Theorem 4.4.1]), together with the following interpolations of Sobolev spaces (cf. [17, Sections 1.9 and 1.11]):

$$[L_2(I), H_0^1(I)]_{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon} = H_0^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}(I) = H^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}(I) \quad \text{and} \quad [H^1(I), L_2(I)]_{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon} = H^{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}(I).$$

□

Note that the map $z \rightarrow z''$ is an isomorphism between V (given by (2.1a)) and $L_2(I)$. Therefore, by the Riesz representation theorem, for any $\ell \in V'$ we can define $p \in L_2(I)$ by

$$(2.15) \quad \int_I p z'' \, dx = \ell(z) \quad \forall z \in V.$$

Lemma 2.3. *Given any $s \in [0, 1]$, the function p defined by (2.15) belongs to $H^{1-s}(I)$ provided that*

$$(2.16) \quad \ell(z) \leq C|z|_{H^{1+s}(I)} \quad \forall z \in H^{1+s}(I).$$

Proof. On one hand, if $\ell \in (H^2(I))'$, we have

$$(2.17) \quad \|p\|_{L_2(I)} \leq \|\ell\|_{(H^2(I))'}.$$

On the other hand, if $\ell \in (H^1(I))'$, then the solution p of (2.15) can also be defined by the conditions that $p \in H_0^1(I)$ and

$$\int_I p'q' dx = -\ell(q) \quad \forall q \in H_0^1(I).$$

Hence in this case we have

$$(2.18) \quad |p|_{H^1(I)} \leq \|\ell\|_{(H^1(I))'}.$$

The estimate (2.16) follows from (2.17), (2.18) and the following interpolations of Sobolev spaces (cf. [17, Sections 1.6 and 1.9]):

$$[L_2(I), H^1(I)]_{1-s} = H^{1-s}(I)$$

and

$$[(H^2(I))', (H^1(I))']_{1-s} = ([H^1(I), H^2(I)]_s)' = (H^{1+s}(I))'.$$

□

Theorem 2.4. *The solution \bar{y} of (2.4) belongs to $H^{\frac{5}{2}-\epsilon}(I)$ for all $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$.*

Proof. Note that, by the Sobolev inequality [1],

$$(2.19) \quad \int_I v d\mu \leq C_\epsilon |v|_{H^{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}(I)} \quad \forall v \in H^1(I) \quad \text{and} \quad \epsilon \in (0, 1/2).$$

Let $p \in L_2(I)$ be defined by

$$(2.20) \quad \beta \int_I pz'' dx = \int_I (y_d - \bar{y})z dx - \beta \int_I f z'' dx - \int_{[-1,1]} z' d\mu \quad \forall z \in V,$$

where V is given by (2.1a). It follows from (2.12), (2.19), (2.20) and Lemma 2.3 (with $s = \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon$) that

$$(2.21) \quad p \text{ belongs to } H^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}(I) \text{ for all } \epsilon \in (0, 1/2).$$

Comparing (2.7) and (2.20), we see that

$$\int_I \bar{y}'' z'' dx = \int_I pz'' dx \quad \forall z \in V$$

and hence $\bar{y}'' = p$, which together with (2.21) concludes the proof. □

Corollary 2.5. *We have $\bar{u} = -\bar{y}'' - f \in H^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}(I)$ for all $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$.*

Example 2.6. We take $\beta = \psi = 1$ and the exact solution

$$(2.22) \quad \bar{y}(x) = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{2}(x+1) + \frac{1}{2}(x+1)^3 + \frac{1}{12}(1-x^2)^3 & -1 < x \leq 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2}(x-1) + \frac{1}{2}(x-1)^3 + \frac{1}{12}(1-x^2)^3 & 0 \leq x < 1 \end{cases}.$$

It follows from a direct calculation that

$$\bar{y}'(x) = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{2} + \frac{3}{2}(x+1)^2 - \frac{1}{2}x(1-x^2)^2 & -1 < x \leq 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2} + \frac{3}{2}(x-1)^2 - \frac{1}{2}x(1-x^2)^2 & 0 \leq x < 1 \end{cases},$$

and

$$\bar{y}''(x) = \begin{cases} 3(x+1) - \frac{1}{2}(1-6x^2+5x^4) & -1 < x < 0 \\ 3(x-1) - \frac{1}{2}(1-6x^2+5x^4) & 0 < x < 1 \end{cases}.$$

It is straightforward to check that \bar{y} belongs to K , $\mathcal{A} = \{0\}$, and for $z \in V$,

$$(2.23) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_I \bar{y}'' z'' dx &= \int_{-1}^0 3(x+1)z'' dx + \int_0^1 3(x-1)z'' dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_I (1-6x^2+5x^4)z'' dx \\ &= 6z'(0) + \int_I g z dx, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$g(x) = 6(1-5x^2).$$

Now we take

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 7(x^2-1) & -1 < x < 0 \\ 0 & 0 < x < 1 \end{cases}$$

so that $f \in H^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}(I)$ for all $\epsilon > 0$ and

$$(2.24) \quad \int_I f z'' dx = 7 \int_{-1}^0 (x^2-1)z'' dx = -7z'(0) + 14 \int_{-1}^0 z dx \quad \forall z \in V.$$

Putting (2.23) and (2.24) together we have

$$(2.25) \quad - \int_I (14\chi_{(-1,0)} + g)z dx + \int_I (\bar{y}'' + f)z'' dx + z'(0) = 0 \quad \forall z \in V,$$

where

$$\chi_S(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \in S \\ 0 & \text{if } x \notin S \end{cases}$$

is the characteristic function of the set S , and the KKT conditions (2.7)–(2.9) are satisfied (with μ being the Dirac point measure at the origin) if we choose

$$(2.26) \quad y_d = \bar{y} + 14\chi_{(-1,0)} + g,$$

Remark 2.7. It follows from Example 2.6 that the regularities of \bar{y} and \bar{u} stated in Theorem 2.4 and Corollary 2.5 are sharp under the assumptions on the data in (1.6).

2.3. Mixed Boundary Conditions. In this case the nonnegative Borel measure μ on $[-1, 1]$ satisfies (cf. (B.8)–(B.10))

$$(2.27) \quad d\mu = \beta[\rho dx + \gamma d\delta_{-1}],$$

where $\rho \in L_2(I)$ is nonnegative, γ is a nonnegative number and δ_{-1} is the Dirac point measure at -1 .

Theorem 2.8. *The solution \bar{y} of (2.4) belongs to $H^3(I)$.*

Proof. Recall that $f \in H^1(I)$ by the assumption in (1.7). After substituting (2.27) into (2.7) and carrying out integration by parts, we have

$$(2.28) \quad \beta \int_I \bar{y}'' z'' dx = \int_I (y_d - \bar{y}) z dx + \beta \int_I (f' - \rho) z' dx + \beta [f(-1) - \gamma] z'(-1) \quad \forall z \in V,$$

where V is given by (2.1b).

Let $H^1(I; 1) = \{v \in H^1(I) : v(1) = 0\}$ and $p \in H^1(I; 1)$ be defined by

$$(2.29) \quad \int_I p' q' dx = - \int_I \Phi q dx + \int_I (f' - \rho) q dx + [f(-1) - \gamma] q(-1) \quad \forall q \in H^1(I; 1),$$

where $\Phi \in H^1(I; 1)$ is defined by

$$(2.30) \quad \beta \Phi' = y_d - \bar{y}.$$

Note that (2.29) is the weak form of the two-point boundary value problem

$$-p'' = -\Phi + f' - \rho \quad \text{in } I \quad \text{and} \quad p'(-1) = \gamma - f(-1), \quad p(1) = 0,$$

and hence we can conclude from elliptic regularity that

$$(2.31) \quad p \in H^2(I).$$

Finally (2.28)–(2.30) imply

$$\int_I \bar{y}'' z'' dx = \int_I p' z'' dx \quad \forall z \in V$$

and hence $\bar{y}'' = p'$ because the map $z \rightarrow z''$ is also an isomorphism between V (defined by (1.5b)) and $L_2(I)$. The theorem then follows from (2.31). \square

Corollary 2.9. *We have $\bar{u} = -\bar{y}'' - f \in H^1(I)$.*

Example 2.10. We take $\beta = \psi = 1$, $f = 0$ and the exact solution is given by

$$(2.32) \quad \bar{y}(x) = \int_{-1}^x p(t) dt,$$

where

$$(2.33) \quad p(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & -1 < x \leq \frac{1}{3} \\ \sin \left[\frac{\pi}{4}(9x - 1) \right] & \frac{1}{3} \leq x < 1 \end{cases}.$$

We have $\mathcal{A} = [-1, 1/3]$, $p \in H^2(I)$,

$$(2.34) \quad p''_+(1/3) = -(9\pi/4)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad p(1) = p''(1) = 0.$$

If we choose the function Φ by

$$(2.35) \quad \Phi(x) = \begin{cases} -(9\pi/4)^2 & -1 \leq x \leq \frac{1}{3} \\ p''(x) & \frac{1}{3} \leq x \leq 1 \end{cases},$$

then $\Phi \in H^1(I; 1)$ by (2.34) and (2.35), and

$$(2.36) \quad \int_I p'q'dx = - \int_I \Phi q dx - \int_{-1}^{\frac{1}{3}} (9\pi/4)^2 q dx \quad \forall q \in H^1(I; 1).$$

Therefore (2.29) is valid if we take

$$(2.37) \quad \rho = (9\pi/4)^2 \chi_{[-1, 1/3]} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma = 0.$$

Finally we define y_d according to (2.30) so that

$$(2.38) \quad y_d(x) = \begin{cases} \bar{y}(x) & -1 < x < \frac{1}{3} \\ \bar{y}(x) + p'''(x) & \frac{1}{3} < x < 1 \end{cases}.$$

Putting (2.32) and (2.36)–(2.38) together, we see that the KKT conditions (2.7)–(2.9) are valid provided we define the Borel measure μ by

$$d\mu = (9\pi/4)^2 \chi_{[-1, 1/3]} dx.$$

3. THE DISCRETE PROBLEM

Let \mathcal{T}_h be a quasi-uniform partition of I and $V_h \subset V$ be the cubic Hermite finite element space [13] associated with \mathcal{T}_h . The discrete problem is to

$$(3.1) \quad \text{find } \bar{y}_h = \operatorname{argmin}_{y_h \in K_h} \frac{1}{2} [\|y_h - y_d\|_{L_2(I)}^2 + \beta \|y_h'' + f\|_{L_2(I)}^2],$$

where

$$(3.2) \quad K_h = \{y \in V_h : P_h y' \leq P_h \psi \quad \text{on } [-1, 1]\},$$

and P_h is the nodal interpolation operator for the P_1 finite element space [13, 7] associated with \mathcal{T}_h . In other words the derivative constraint (1.4) is only imposed at the grid points.

The nodal interpolation operator from $C^1(\bar{I})$ onto V_h will be denoted by Π_h . Note that

$$(3.3) \quad \Pi_h y \in K_h \quad \forall y \in K.$$

In particular, the closed convex set K_h is nonempty.

The minimization problem (3.1)–(3.2) has a unique solution characterized by the discrete variational inequality

$$\int_I (\bar{y}_h - y_d)(y_h - \bar{y}_h) dx + \beta \int_I (\bar{y}_h'' + f)(y_h'' - \bar{y}_h'') dx \geq 0 \quad \forall y_h \in K_h,$$

which can also be written as

$$(3.4) \quad a(\bar{y}_h, y_h - \bar{y}_h) \geq \int_I y_d(y_h - \bar{y}_h)dx - \beta \int_I f(y_h'' - \bar{y}_h'')dx \quad \forall y_h \in K_h.$$

We begin the error analysis by recalling some properties of P_h and Π_h .

For $0 \leq s \leq 1 \leq t \leq 2$, we have an error estimate

$$(3.5) \quad \|\zeta - P_h\zeta\|_{H^s(I)} \leq Ch^{t-s}|\zeta|_{H^t(I)} \quad \forall \zeta \in H^t(I)$$

that follows from standard error estimates for P_h (cf. [13, 7]) and interpolation between Sobolev spaces [1].

For $0 \leq s \leq 1$ and $2 \leq t \leq 4$, we also have the estimates

$$(3.6) \quad \|\zeta - \Pi_h\zeta\|_{L_2(I)} + h^2|\zeta - \Pi_h\zeta|_{H^2(I)} \leq Ch^t|\zeta|_{H^t(I)} \quad \forall \zeta \in H^s(I),$$

$$(3.7) \quad |\zeta - \Pi_h\zeta|_{H^{1+s}(I)} \leq Ch^{t-s-1}|\zeta|_{H^t(I)} \quad \forall \zeta \in H^s(I),$$

that follow from standard error estimates for Π_h (cf. [13, 7]) and interpolation between Sobolev spaces.

3.1. An Intermediate Error Estimate. Let the energy norm $\|\cdot\|_a$ be defined by

$$(3.8) \quad \|v\|_a^2 = a(v, v) = \|v\|_{L_2(I)}^2 + \beta|v|_{H^2(I)}^2.$$

We have, by a Poincaré–Friedrichs inequality [21],

$$(3.9) \quad C_1\|v\|_a \leq \|v\|_{H^2(I)} \leq C_2\|v\|_a \quad \forall v \in V.$$

Observe that (3.4), (3.8) and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality imply

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\bar{y} - \bar{y}_h\|_a^2 &= a(\bar{y} - \bar{y}_h, \bar{y} - y_h) + a(\bar{y} - \bar{y}_h, y_h - \bar{y}_h) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}\|\bar{y} - \bar{y}_h\|_a^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\bar{y} - y_h\|_a^2 + a(\bar{y}, y_h - \bar{y}_h) \\ &\quad - \int_I y_d(y_h - \bar{y}_h)dx + \beta \int_I f(y_h'' - \bar{y}_h'')dx \quad \forall y_h \in K_h, \end{aligned}$$

and we have, by (2.8)–(2.11) and (3.2),

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{aligned} &a(\bar{y}, y_h - \bar{y}_h) - \int_I y_d(y_h - \bar{y}_h)dx + \beta \int_I f(y_h'' - \bar{y}_h'')dx \\ &= \int_{[-1,1]} (\bar{y}_h' - y_h')d\mu \\ &= \int_{[-1,1]} (\bar{y}_h' - P_h\bar{y}_h')d\mu + \int_{[-1,1]} (P_h\bar{y}_h' - P_h\psi)d\mu + \int_{[-1,1]} (P_h\psi - \psi)d\mu \\ &\quad + \int_{[-1,1]} (\psi - \bar{y}')d\mu + \int_{[-1,1]} (\bar{y}' - y_h')d\mu, \\ &\leq \int_{[-1,1]} (\bar{y}_h' - P_h\bar{y}_h')d\mu + \int_{[-1,1]} (P_h\psi - \psi)d\mu + \int_{[-1,1]} (\bar{y}' - y_h')d\mu \end{aligned}$$

for all $y_h \in K_h$.

It follows from (3.10) and (3.11) that

$$(3.12) \quad \|\bar{y} - \bar{y}_h\|_a^2 \leq 2 \left[\int_{[-1,1]} (\bar{y}'_h - P_h \bar{y}'_h) d\mu + \int_{[-1,1]} (P_h \psi - \psi) d\mu \right] \\ + \inf_{y_h \in K_h} \left(\|\bar{y} - y_h\|_a^2 + 2 \int_{[-1,1]} (\bar{y}' - y'_h) d\mu \right).$$

3.2. Dirichlet Boundary Conditions. The following estimates will allow us to produce concrete error estimates from (3.12). First of all, we have

$$(3.13) \quad \int_{[-1,1]} (\bar{y}'_h - P_h \bar{y}'_h) d\mu = \int_{[-1,1]} [(\bar{y}'_h - \bar{y}') - P_h(\bar{y}'_h - \bar{y}')] d\mu + \int_{[-1,1]} (\bar{y}' - P_h \bar{y}') d\mu \\ \leq C_\epsilon \left(h^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon} \|\bar{y} - \bar{y}_h\|_a + h^{1-\epsilon} |y|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}-\epsilon}(I)} \right) \quad \forall \epsilon > 0$$

by (2.19), Theorem 2.4, (3.5) and (3.9); secondly

$$(3.14) \quad \int_{[-1,1]} (P_h \psi - \psi) d\mu \leq C_\epsilon h^{1-\epsilon} |\psi|_{H^{\frac{3}{2}-\epsilon}(I)} \quad \forall \epsilon > 0$$

by the assumption on ψ in (1.6) and (3.5). Finally, in view of Theorem 2.4, (2.19), (3.6)–(3.7) and (3.9), we also have

$$(3.15) \quad \|\bar{y} - \Pi_h \bar{y}\|_a^2 + 2 \int_{[-1,1]} [\bar{y}' - (\Pi_h \bar{y})'] d\mu \leq C_\epsilon h^{1-\epsilon} \quad \forall \epsilon > 0.$$

Putting (3.3), (3.12)–(3.15) and Young's inequality together, we arrive at the estimate

$$(3.16) \quad \|\bar{y} - \bar{y}_h\|_a \leq C_\epsilon h^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}$$

that is valid for any $\epsilon > 0$, which in turn implies the following result, where $\bar{u}_h = -\bar{y}''_h - f$ is the approximation for $\bar{u} = -\bar{y}'' - f$.

Theorem 3.1. *Under the assumptions on the data in (1.6), we have*

$$|\bar{y} - \bar{y}_h|_{H^1(I)} + \|\bar{u} - \bar{u}_h\|_{L_2(I)} \leq C_\epsilon h^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon} \quad \forall \epsilon > 0.$$

Remark 3.2. Numerical results in Section 4 indicate that $|\bar{y} - \bar{y}_h|_{H^1(I)}$ is of higher order.

3.3. Mixed Boundary Conditions. In this case we have

$$(3.17) \quad \int_{[-1,1]} (\bar{y}'_h - P_h \bar{y}'_h) d\mu = \beta \left[\int_I (\bar{y}'_h - P_h \bar{y}'_h) \rho dx + \gamma (\bar{y}'_h - P_h \bar{y}'_h)(-1) \right] \\ = \beta \left[\int_I [(\bar{y}'_h - \bar{y}') - P_h(\bar{y}'_h - \bar{y}')] \rho dx + \int_I (\bar{y}' - P_h \bar{y}') \rho dx \right] \\ \leq C \left(h \|\bar{y} - \bar{y}_h\|_a + h^2 |\bar{y}|_{H^3(I)} \right)$$

by (2.27), Theorem 2.8, (3.5) and (3.9);

$$(3.18) \quad \int_{[-1,1]} (P_h \psi - \psi) d\mu = \beta \int_I (P_h \psi - \psi) \rho dx \leq Ch^2$$

by the assumption on ψ in (1.7), (2.27) and (3.5); and

$$(3.19) \quad \|\bar{y} - \Pi_h \bar{y}\|_a^2 + 2 \int_{[-1,1]} [\bar{y}' - (\Pi_h \bar{y})'] d\mu \leq Ch^2$$

by (2.27), Theorem 2.8, (3.6), (3.7) and (3.9).

Combining (3.12) and (3.17)–(3.19) with Young's inequality, we find

$$(3.20) \quad \|\bar{y} - \bar{y}_h\|_a \leq Ch,$$

which immediately implies the following result, where $\bar{u}_h = -\bar{y}_h'' - f$ is the approximation for $\bar{u} = -\bar{y}'' - f$.

Theorem 3.3. *Under the assumptions on the data in (1.7), we have*

$$\|\bar{y} - \bar{y}_h\|_{H^1(I)} + \|\bar{u} - \bar{u}_h\|_{L_2(I)} \leq Ch.$$

Remark 3.4. Numerical results in Section 4 again indicate that $\|\bar{y} - \bar{y}_h\|_{H^1(I)}$ is of higher order.

4. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In the first experiment, we solved the problem in Example 2.6 on a uniform mesh with dyadic grid points. The errors of \bar{y}_h in various norms are reported in Table 4.1. We observed $O(h^2)$ convergence in $|\cdot|_{H^2(I)}$ and higher convergence in the lower order norms. This phenomenon can be justified as follows.

Note that for this example the first term on the right-hand side of (3.12) vanishes because μ is supported at the origin which is one of the grid points where \bar{y}_h (resp. ψ) and $P_h \bar{y}_h$ (resp., $P_h \psi$) assume identical values. The remaining term on the right-hand side of (3.12) is bounded by

$$\|\bar{y} - (\Pi_h \bar{y})\|_a^2 + 2 \int_I [\bar{y}' - (\Pi_h \bar{y})'] d\mu = \|\bar{y} - (\Pi_h \bar{y})\|_a^2 \leq Ch^4,$$

where we have used the estimate (3.6), with I replaced by the intervals $(-1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$, the norm equivalence (3.9), and the fact that \bar{y} defined by (2.22) is a sextic polynomial on each of these intervals.

In the second experiment we solved the problem in Example 2.6 on slightly perturbed meshes where the origin is no longer a grid point. The errors are reported in Table 4.2. We observed $O(h^{0.5})$ convergence in the $|\cdot|_{H^2(I)}$ (which agrees with Theorem 3.1) and $O(h)$ convergence in the lower order norms.

In the third experiment, we solved the problem in Example 2.10 on a uniform mesh with dyadic grid points. We observed $O(h)$ convergence in $|\cdot|_{H^2(I)}$ from the results in Table 4.3 (which agrees with Theorem 3.3) and $O(h^2)$ convergence in the lower order norms.

DOFs	$\ \bar{y} - \bar{y}_h\ _{L_2(I)}$	$\ \bar{y} - \bar{y}_h\ _{L_\infty(I)}$	$ \bar{y} - \bar{y}_h _{H^1(I)}$	$ \bar{y} - \bar{y}_h _{H^2(I)}$
2^1	1.082369 e-01	1.545433 e-01	3.788872 e-01	2.178934 e+00
2^2	5.972336 e-03	7.142850 e-03	2.452678 e-02	7.191076 e-01
2^3	1.223603 e-03	1.806781 e-03	8.520509 e-03	1.114423 e-01
2^4	8.653379 e-05	1.732075 e-04	1.200903 e-03	3.118910 e-02
2^5	5.561252 e-06	1.295847 e-05	1.542654 e-04	8.001098 e-03
2^6	3.508709 e-07	8.804766 e-07	1.929895 e-05	2.012955 e-03
2^7	2.199861 e-08	5.729676 e-08	2.303966 e-06	5.040206 e-04

TABLE 4.1. Numerical results for Example 2.6 on meshes with dyadic grid points

DOFs	$\ \bar{y} - \bar{y}_h\ _{L_2(I)}$	$\ \bar{y} - \bar{y}_h\ _{L_\infty(I)}$	$ \bar{y} - \bar{y}_h _{H^1(I)}$	$ \bar{y} - \bar{y}_h _{H^2(I)}$
$2+2^1$	5.972336 e-03	7.142850 e-03	2.452678 e-02	1.910760 e-01
$2+2^2$	3.045281 e-02	3.279329 e-02	1.188082 e-01	1.285638 e+00
$2+2^3$	3.187355 e-02	3.182310 e-02	1.071850 e-01	1.022401 e+00
$2+2^4$	3.216705 e-02	3.175715 e-02	1.048464 e-01	8.070390 e-01
$2+2^5$	3.220153 e-02	3.175558 e-02	1.044763 e-01	6.496040 e-01
$2+2^6$	1.814346 e-02	2.074403 e-02	5.740999 e-02	4.408863 e-01
$2+2^7$	9.754613 e-03	1.167762 e-02	2.983716 e-02	3.016101 e-01

TABLE 4.2. Numerical results for Example 2.6 on meshes where 0 is not a grid point

DOFs	$\ \bar{y} - \bar{y}_h\ _{L_2(I)}$	$\ \bar{y} - \bar{y}_h\ _{L_\infty(I)}$	$ \bar{y} - \bar{y}_h _{H^1(I)}$	$ \bar{y} - \bar{y}_h _{H^2(I)}$
$1 + 2^2$	1.406813 e+01	1.658318 e+01	1.269278 e+01	2.070271 e+01
$1 + 2^3$	4.654073 e+00	4.618639 e+00	4.221134 e+00	1.379991 e+01
$1 + 2^4$	1.574605 e+00	1.683229 e+00	1.376788 e+00	8.047102 e+00
$1 + 2^5$	3.745106 e-01	3.781562 e-01	3.252880 e-01	4.073631 e+00
$1 + 2^6$	9.856747 e-02	1.022258 e-01	8.574934 e-02	2.081469 e+00
$1 + 2^7$	2.378457 e-02	2.368760 e-02	2.075267 e-02	1.037836 e+00
$1 + 2^8$	5.802109 e-03	5.661900 e-03	5.218542 e-03	5.212004 e-01

TABLE 4.3. Numerical results for Example 2.10 on meshes with dyadic grid points

In the final experiment, we solved the problem in Example 2.10 by a uniform mesh that includes $1/3$ as a grid point. The errors are reported in Table 4.4. We observed similar convergence behavior as the dyadic case, but the magnitude of the errors is smaller. This can be justified by the observation that the term (cf. (3.17))

$$\int_I (\bar{y} - P_h \bar{y}') \rho \, dx = \int_0^{\frac{1}{3}} (\bar{y} - P_h \bar{y}') \rho \, dx = 0$$

because $\bar{y}(x) = 1 + x$ on the active set $\mathcal{A} = [-1, 1/3]$ and $1/3$ is a grid point. On the other hand the corresponding integral is nonzero for dyadic meshes.

DOFs	$\ \bar{y} - \bar{y}_h\ _{L_2(I)}$	$\ \bar{y} - \bar{y}_h\ _{L_\infty(I)}$	$ \bar{y} - \bar{y}_h _{H^1(I)}$	$ \bar{y} - \bar{y}_h _{H^2(I)}$
$1 + 3 \cdot 2^1$	2.448013 e+00	2.343224 e+00	2.236575 e+00	1.082726 e+01
$1 + 3 \cdot 2^2$	6.406496 e-01	6.095607 e-01	5.795513 e-01	5.541353 e+00
$1 + 3 \cdot 2^3$	1.616111 e-01	1.539557 e-01	1.461718 e-01	2.778978 e+00
$1 + 3 \cdot 2^4$	4.025578 e-02	3.858795 e-02	3.665436 e-02	1.390198 e+00
$1 + 3 \cdot 2^5$	9.822613 e-03	9.653193 e-03	9.268709 e-03	6.951994 e-01
$1 + 3 \cdot 2^6$	2.233582 e-03	2.413687 e-03	2.657435 e-03	3.476583 e-01

TABLE 4.4. Numerical results for Example 2.10 on uniform meshes where $1/3$ is a grid point

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We have demonstrated in this paper that the convergence analysis developed in [8] can be adopted to elliptic distributed optimal control problems with pointwise constraints on the derivatives of the state, at least in a simple one dimensional setting.

The results in this paper can be extended to two-sided constraints of the form $\psi_1 \leq y' \leq \psi_2$, where ψ_i and ψ_2 are sufficiently regular and $\psi_1 < 0 < \psi_2$ on I . In particular, they are valid for the constraints defined by $|y'| \leq 1$.

It would be interesting to find out if the results in this paper can be extended to higher dimensions. We note that the higher dimensional analogs of the variational inequality for the derivative (cf. (B.5)) lead to obstacle problems for the vector Laplacian. Such obstacle problems are of independent interest and appear to be open.

APPENDIX A. KKT CONDITIONS FOR THE DIRICHLET BOUNDARY CONDITIONS

First we note that

$$(A.1) \quad \mathcal{A} \neq [-1, 1]$$

since $\int_I y' dx = 0$ and $\int_I \psi dx > 0$, and also

$$(A.2) \quad \{y' : y \in V\} = \{v \in H^1(I) : \int_I v dx = 0\} = H^1(I)/\mathbb{R}.$$

Let $\mathcal{K} = \{v \in H^1(I)/\mathbb{R} : v \leq \psi \text{ in } I\}$. We can rewrite (2.4) in the form of

$$(A.3) \quad \int_I \Phi(q - p) dx + \int_I (p' + f)(q' - p') dx \geq 0 \quad \forall q \in \mathcal{K},$$

where

$$(A.4) \quad p = \bar{y}'$$

and the function $\Phi \in H^1(I)/\mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$(A.5) \quad \beta\Phi' = y_d - \bar{y}.$$

Let the bounded linear functional $L : H^1(I)/\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined by

$$(A.6) \quad Lv = \int_I \Phi v \, dx + \int_I (p' + f)v' \, dx.$$

Observe that (A.3) implies

$$(A.7) \quad Lv = 0 \quad \text{if } v \in H^1(I)/\mathbb{R} \text{ and } \mathcal{A} \cap \text{supp } v = \emptyset,$$

since in this case $\pm\epsilon v + p \in \mathcal{K}$ for $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$.

Since the active set \mathcal{A} is a closed subset of $[0, 1]$, according to (A.1) there exist two numbers $a, b \in I$ such that $a < b$ and $[a, b] \cap \mathcal{A} = \emptyset$. Let $G = (-1, a) \cup (b, 1)$. Then we have (i) $\mathcal{A} \cap I \subset G$ and (ii) there exists a bounded linear extension operator $E_G : H^1(G) \rightarrow H^1(I)/\mathbb{R}$.

Remark A.1. Observe that a bounded linear extension operator $E_G^* : H^1(G) \rightarrow H^1(I)$ can be constructed by reflections (cf. [1]). The operator E_G can then be defined by

$$E_G(v) = E_G^*(v) - \left(\int_I E_G^*(v) \, dx \right) \phi,$$

where ϕ is a smooth function with compact support in (a, b) such that $\int_I \phi \, dx = 1$.

We define a bounded linear map $T_G : H^1(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$(A.8) \quad T_G v = L\tilde{v}$$

where \tilde{v} is any function in $H^1(I)/\mathbb{R}$ such that $\tilde{v} = v$ on G . T_G is well-defined because the existence of \tilde{v} is guaranteed by the extension operator E_G and the independence of the choice of \tilde{v} follows from (A.7).

Let $v \in H^1(G)$ be nonnegative. Then $-\epsilon\tilde{v} + p \in \mathcal{K}$ for $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ because $p \leq \psi$ on G and $p < \psi$ on the compact set $[a, b] = I \setminus G$. Hence we have

$$(A.9) \quad -T_G v = \epsilon^{-1} T_G(-\epsilon v) = \epsilon^{-1} L(-\epsilon\tilde{v}) \geq 0$$

by (A.3) and (A.6).

It follows from (A.9) and the Riesz-Schwartz Theorem [23, 24] for nonnegative functionals that

$$(A.10) \quad T_G v = - \int_{[-1, a] \cup [b, 1]} v \, d\mu_{\bar{G}} \quad \forall v \in H^1(G).$$

where $\mu_{\bar{G}}$ is a nonnegative Borel measure on $[-1, a] \cup [b, 1]$.

Because of (A.8) and (A.10), we have

$$(A.11) \quad -Lv = -T(v|_G) = \int_{[-1, a] \cup [b, 1]} v \, d\mu_{\bar{G}} \quad \forall v \in H^1(I)/\mathbb{R},$$

and the observation (A.7) implies that $\mu_{\bar{G}}$ is supported on \mathcal{A} .

We conclude from (A.6) and (A.11) that

$$(A.12) \quad \int_I \Phi v \, dx + \int_I (p' + f)v' \, dx + \int_{[-1,1]} v \, d\tilde{\mu} = 0 \quad \forall v \in H^1(I)/\mathbb{R},$$

where $\tilde{\mu}$ is the trivial extension of $\mu_{\bar{c}}$ to $[-1, 1]$. It follows that

$$\int_{[-1,1]} (\bar{y}' - \psi) d\mu = 0,$$

where $\mu = \beta\tilde{\mu}$, and in view of (A.2), (A.4), (A.5) and (A.12),

$$\int_I (\bar{y} - y_d)z \, dx + \beta \int_I (\bar{y}'' + f)z'' \, dx + \int_{[-1,1]} z' d\mu = 0 \quad \forall z \in V.$$

APPENDIX B. KKT CONDITIONS FOR THE MIXED BOUNDARY CONDITIONS

In this case we have, by (2.1b),

$$(B.1) \quad \{y' : y \in V\} = \{v \in H^1(I) : v(1) = 0\} = H^1(I; 1).$$

Let $\mathcal{K} = \{v \in H^1(I; 1) : v \leq \psi \text{ in } I\}$. We can rewrite (2.4) in the form of

$$(B.2) \quad \int_I \Phi(q - p) \, dx + \int_I (p' + f)(q' - p') \, dx \geq 0 \quad \forall q \in \mathcal{K},$$

where

$$(B.3) \quad p = \bar{y}' \in \mathcal{K},$$

and the function $\Phi \in H^1(I; 1)$ is defined by

$$(B.4) \quad \beta\Phi' = y_d - \bar{y}.$$

Note that $f \in H^1(I)$ by the assumption in (1.7). After integration by parts, the inequality (B.2) becomes

$$(B.5) \quad -f(-1)[q(-1) - p(-1)] + \int_I (\Phi - f')(q - p) \, dx + \int_I p'(q' - p') \, dx \geq 0 \quad \forall q \in \mathcal{K}.$$

The variational inequality defined by (B.3) and (B.5) is equivalent to a second order obstacle problem with mixed boundary conditions whose coincidence set is identical to the active set \mathcal{A} in (2.10).

Since $\psi \in H^2(I)$ by the assumption in (1.7), we can apply the penalty method in [20] to show that

$$(B.6) \quad \text{the solution } p \text{ of (B.5) belongs to } H^2(I),$$

and, after integration by parts, we have

$$(B.7) \quad -f(-1)q(-1) + \int_I (\Phi - f')q \, dx + \int_I p'q' \, dx + \int_{[-1,1]} q \, d\nu = 0 \quad \forall q \in H^1(I; 1),$$

where

$$(B.8) \quad d\nu = (p'' + f' - \Phi)dx + (f(-1) + p'(-1))d\delta_{-1},$$

and δ_{-1} is the Dirac point measure at -1 .

The variational inequality (B.5) is then equivalent to

$$(B.9a) \quad p \leq \psi \quad \text{in } I,$$

$$(B.9b) \quad p'' + f' - \Phi \geq 0 \quad \text{in } I,$$

$$(B.9c) \quad f(-1) + p'(-1) \geq 0,$$

$$(B.9d) \quad \int_{[-1,1]} (p - \psi)d\nu = 0.$$

Consequently the KKT conditions (2.7)–(2.9) hold for the Borel measure

$$(B.10) \quad \mu = \beta\nu.$$

Remark B.1. In the special case where $f = 0$ and ψ is a positive constant, the condition (B.9d) implies $p'(-1) = 0$ if $-1 \notin \mathcal{A}$, and the conditions (B.9a) and (B.9c) imply $p'(-1) = 0$ if $-1 \in \mathcal{A}$. Therefore we have $p'(-1) = 0$ if $f = 0$ and ψ is a positive constant, in which case μ is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Hence it is necessary to choose $\gamma = p'(-1) = 0$ in Example 2.10.

REFERENCES

- [1] R.A. Adams and J.J.F. Fournier. *Sobolev Spaces (Second Edition)*. Academic Press, Amsterdam, 2003.
- [2] J. Bergh and J. Löfström. *Interpolation Spaces*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1976.
- [3] S.C. Brenner, C.B. Davis, and L.-Y. Sung. A partition of unity method for a class of fourth order elliptic variational inequalities. *Comp. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 276:612–626, 2014.
- [4] S.C. Brenner, J. Gedicke, and L.-Y. Sung. C^0 interior penalty methods for an elliptic distributed optimal control problem on nonconvex polygonal domains with pointwise state constraints. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 56:1758–1785, 2018.
- [5] S.C. Brenner, T. Gudi, K. Porwal, and L.-Y. Sung. A Morley finite element method for an elliptic distributed optimal control problem with pointwise state and control constraints. *ESAIM:COCV*, 24:1181–1206, 2018.
- [6] S.C. Brenner, M. Oh, S. Pollock, K. Porwal, M. Schedensack, and N. Sharma. A C^0 interior penalty method for elliptic distributed optimal control problems in three dimensions with pointwise state constraints. In S.C. Brenner, editor, *Topics in Numerical Partial Differential Equations and Scientific Computing*, volume 160 of *The IMA Volumes in Mathematics and its Applications*, pages 1–22, Cham-Heidelberg-New York-Dordrecht-London, 2016. Springer.
- [7] S.C. Brenner and L.R. Scott. *The Mathematical Theory of Finite Element Methods (Third Edition)*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2008.
- [8] S.C. Brenner and L.-Y. Sung. A new convergence analysis of finite element methods for elliptic distributed optimal control problems with pointwise state constraints. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 55:2289–2304, 2017.
- [9] S.C. Brenner, L.-Y. Sung, and Y. Zhang. A quadratic C^0 interior penalty method for an elliptic optimal control problem with state constraints. In O. Karakashian X. Feng and Y. Xing, editors, *Recent Developments in Discontinuous Galerkin Finite Element Methods for Partial Differential Equations*, volume

- 157 of *The IMA Volumes in Mathematics and its Applications*, pages 97–132, Cham-Heidelberg-New York-Dordrecht-London, 2013. Springer. (2012 John H. Barrett Memorial Lectures).
- [10] S.C. Brenner, L-Y. Sung, and Y. Zhang. C^0 interior penalty methods for an elliptic state-constrained optimal control problem with Neumann boundary condition. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 350:212–232, 2019.
 - [11] E. Casas and J.F. Bonnans. Contrôle de systèmes elliptiques semilinéaires comportant des contraintes sur l'état. In H. Brezis and J.L. Lions, editors, *Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations and their Applications 8*, pages 69–86. Longman, New York, 1988.
 - [12] E. Casas and L.A. Fernández. Optimal control of semilinear elliptic equations with pointwise constraints on the gradient of the state. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 27:35–56, 1993.
 - [13] P.G. Ciarlet. *The Finite Element Method for Elliptic Problems*. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1978.
 - [14] K. Deckelnick, A. Günther, and M. Hinze. Finite element approximation of elliptic control problems with constraints on the gradient. *Numer. Math.*, 111:335–350, 2009.
 - [15] I. Ekeland and R. Témam. *Convex Analysis and Variational Problems*. Classics in Applied Mathematics. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 1999.
 - [16] K. Ito and K. Kunisch. *Lagrange Multiplier Approach to Variational Problems and Applications*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, 2008.
 - [17] J.L. Lions and E. Magenes. *Non-Homogeneous Boundary Value Problems and Applications I*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1972.
 - [18] W. Liu, W. Gong, and N. Yan. A new finite element approximation of a state-constrained optimal control problem. *J. Comput. Math.*, 27:97–114, 2009.
 - [19] D.G. Luenberger. *Optimization by Vector Space Methods*. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, 1969.
 - [20] M.K.V. Murthy and G. Stampacchia. A variational inequality with mixed boundary conditions. *Israel J. Math.*, 13:188–224 (1973), 1972.
 - [21] J. Nečas. *Direct methods in the theory of elliptic equations*. Springer, Heidelberg, 2012.
 - [22] C. Ortner and W. Wollner. A priori error estimates for optimal control problems with pointwise constraints on the gradient of the state. *Numer. Math.*, 118:587–600, 2011.
 - [23] W. Rudin. *Real and Complex Analysis*. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1966.
 - [24] L. Schwartz. *Théorie des Distributions*. Hermann, Paris, 1966.
 - [25] W. Wollner. Optimal control of elliptic equations with pointwise constraints on the gradient of the state in nonsmooth polygonal domains. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 50:2117–2129, 2012.

SUSANNE C. BRENNER, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND CENTER FOR COMPUTATION AND TECHNOLOGY, LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY, BATON ROUGE, LA 70803, USA

E-mail address: `brenner@math.lsu.edu`

LI-YENG SUNG, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND CENTER FOR COMPUTATION AND TECHNOLOGY, LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY, BATON ROUGE, LA 70803, USA

E-mail address: `sung@math.lsu.edu`

WINNIFRIED WOLLNER, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT DARMSTADT, GERMANY

E-mail address: `wollner@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de`