

# Error Estimates for the Numerical Approximation of Unregularized Sparse Parabolic Control Problems\*

Eduardo Casas<sup>†</sup>

Mariano Mateos<sup>‡</sup>

Dedicated to Professor Thomas Apel on his 60<sup>th</sup> birthday

## Abstract

We study the numerical approximation of a control problem governed by a semilinear parabolic problem, where the usual Tikhonov regularization term in the cost functional is replaced by a non-differentiable sparsity-promoting term.

**Keywords:** Optimal control, Sparse controls, Semilinear parabolic equations, Finite element approximation.

## 1 Introduction

Let us consider a convex domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $1 \leq d \leq 3$ , with boundary  $\Gamma$ . We will assume that  $\Omega$  is polygonal if  $d = 2$  or polyhedral if  $d = 3$ . Given  $T > 0$  we denote  $I = (0, T)$ ,  $Q = \Omega \times I$  and  $\Sigma = \Gamma \times I$ . In this paper, we investigate the numerical approximation of

$$(P) \min_{u \in \tilde{U}_{ad}} J(u) := \int_Q (y_u(x, t) - y_d(x, t))^2 dx dt + \mu \|u\|_{L^1(Q)},$$

where  $\mu \geq 0$  and

$$U_{ad} = \{u \in L^\infty(Q) : u_{\min} \leq u(x, t) \leq u_{\max} \text{ for a.a. } (x, t) \in Q\}$$

with  $-\infty < u_{\min} < u_{\max} < +\infty$ . For  $\mu > 0$ , we will further suppose that  $u_{\min} < 0 < u_{\max}$ .

Above  $y_u$  denotes the state associated with the control  $u$  related by the following semilinear parabolic state equation

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial y_u}{\partial t} + Ay_u + f(x, t, y_u) &= u & \text{in } Q, \\ y_u &= 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ y_u(0) &= y_0 & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

Assumptions on the data  $A$ ,  $f$ ,  $y_0$ , and the target state  $y_d$  are specified in Section 2.

The obtention of error estimates for the numerical approximation of optimal control problems that do not include a Tikhonov regularization term is a challenging problem. The only references we are aware of

---

\*The authors were supported by MCIN/ AEI/10.13039/501100011033 under research project PID2020-114837GB-I00.

<sup>†</sup>Universidad de Cantabria, Departamento de Matemática Aplicada y Ciencias de la Computación, Santander, Spain, email: eduardo.casas@unican.es

<sup>‡</sup>Universidad de Oviedo, Departamento de Matemáticas, Gijón, Spain, email: mmateos@uniovi.es

are [12, 21, 23, 28], and [16]. In the first four ones, problems governed by elliptic equations are studied. In [23] the equation is elliptic and linear, the variational discretization is used and the control is assumed to be of bang-bang type. In [21], the authors deal with a bilinear control problem governed by a semilinear elliptic equation; a structural assumption on the adjoint state is done, so that error estimates can be obtained for bang-bang controls. In our paper [12], we deal with a control problem governed by a semilinear elliptic equation; a sparsity promoting term is included in the objective functional and error estimates are obtained for the state even in the case of an optimal control with singular arcs. In [28], similar results are obtained for a Dirichlet control problem governed by a linear elliptic equation. One of the main ingredients in the obtention of error estimates for control problems governed by non-linear equations is the use of appropriate and realistic second order sufficient conditions for strong local minima (see Definition 1). In [16], second order sufficient conditions for problems governed by a semilinear parabolic equation in which the controls are only functions of time are obtained before getting the error estimates. For the work at hand, we will use the second order sufficient conditions obtained in [11].

This paper continues a series of previous works [11, 12, 14–16] where related problems are studied.

In [14] and [15], the objective functional has a Tikhonov regularization term and includes a term promoting directional sparsity. Specifically, the numerical approximation of problems with objective function

$$J(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_Q (y_u - y_d)^2 dx dt + \frac{\kappa}{2} \int_Q u^2 dx dt + \mu \|u\|_{L^1(\Omega; L^2(I))}, \quad \kappa > 0,$$

is studied.

In [16], the Tikhonov regularization term is removed; no sparsity-promoting term is included yet in this work and error estimates rely on second order sufficient optimality conditions formulated on the cone  $D_{\bar{u}}^{\tau}$  (see Section 2 below for a definition of this cone). The numerical approximation of that problem is studied and error estimates are obtained.

In [11], it is shown that the smaller cone  $C_{\bar{u}}^{\tau}$  is enough to obtain second order sufficient optimality conditions in problems with no Tikhonov term. No numerical discretization is studied in [11].

The paper [12] deals with error estimates for a problem governed by a semilinear *elliptic* equation where the Tikhonov regularization term is replaced by a non-differentiable sparsity-promoting term. The results of this paper are obtained assuming a condition on the corresponding cone  $C_{\bar{u}}^{\tau}$ .

In the paper at hand, we discretize problem (P) and take advantage of the second order conditions provided in [11] to obtain error estimates for the state variable assuming again only conditions on the smaller cone  $C_{\bar{u}}^{\tau}$ . The novelty with respect to [14] and [15] is that we are able to drop the Tikhonov term; with respect to [16] is that we include a sparsity-promoting term, the control variable depends on both time and space, and we use a smaller cone; and with respect to [12] is that we deal with a parabolic equation.

## 2 Results about the continuous problem

On the partial differential equation (1.1), we make the following assumptions.

(A1)  $A$  denotes the elliptic operator

$$Ay = - \sum_{i,j=1}^d \partial_{x_j} (a_{i,j}(x) \partial_{x_i} y),$$

where  $a_{i,j} \in C^{0,1}(\bar{\Omega})$ , and satisfy the uniform ellipticity condition

$$\exists \lambda_A > 0 : \lambda_A |\xi|^2 \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^d a_{i,j}(x) \xi_i \xi_j \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ and a.a. } x \in \Omega.$$

(A2) We assume that  $f : Q \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a Carathéodory function of class  $C^2$  with respect to the last variable satisfying the following properties:

$$\begin{aligned} \exists C_f \in \mathbb{R} : \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x, t, y) &\geq C_f \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}, \\ f(\cdot, \cdot, 0) &\in L^\infty(Q), \\ \forall M > 0 \exists C_{f,M} > 0 : \left| \frac{\partial^j f}{\partial y^j}(x, t, y) \right| &\leq C_{f,M} \quad \forall |y| \leq M \text{ and } j = 1, 2, \\ \forall \rho > 0 \text{ and } \forall M > 0 \exists \varepsilon > 0 \text{ such that} \\ \left| \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial y^2}(x, t, y_1) - \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial y^2}(x, t, y_2) \right| &< \rho \quad \forall |y_1|, |y_2| \leq M \text{ with } |y_1 - y_2| < \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

for almost all  $(x, t) \in Q$ .

(A3) For the initial state we suppose that  $y_0 \in C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega}) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ , where  $C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega})$  denotes the space of  $\alpha$ -Hölder continuous functions in  $\bar{\Omega}$  with  $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ .

(A4)  $y_d \in L^{\hat{p}}(0, T; L^{\hat{q}}(\Omega))$ , for some  $\hat{p}, \hat{q} \geq 2$  with  $\frac{1}{\hat{p}} + \frac{d}{2\hat{q}} < 1$ .

We denote  $H^{2,1}(Q) = L^2(0, T; H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)) \cap H^1(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$  and  $C^{\beta, \beta/2}(\bar{Q})$  for  $0 < \beta \leq 1$  is the space of Hölder functions with exponent  $\beta$  in  $x$  and  $\beta/2$  in  $t$ ; see [27, pp. 7 and 8]. We have the following result concerning the regularity of the state.

**Theorem 2.1.** *Suppose Assumptions (A1), (A2) and (A3) hold. Then, for every  $u \in L^r(0, T; L^p(\Omega))$  with  $\frac{1}{r} + \frac{d}{2p} < 1$  and  $r, p \geq 2$ , there exists a unique solution  $y_u$  of (1.1) in the space  $H^{2,1}(Q) \cap C^{\beta, \beta/2}(\bar{Q})$  for some  $\beta \in (0, \alpha]$ . Moreover, the following estimate holds*

$$\|y_u\|_{C^{\beta, \beta/2}(\bar{Q})} + \|y_u\|_{H^{2,1}(Q)} \leq \eta(\|u\|_{L^r(0, T; L^p(\Omega))} + M_0),$$

for a monotone non-decreasing function  $\eta : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  with  $\eta(0) = 0$  independent of  $u$ , and

$$M_0 = \|f(\cdot, \cdot, 0)\|_{L^\infty(Q)} + \|y_0\|_{C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega})} + \|y_0\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)}.$$

Further, if  $u_k \rightharpoonup u$  weakly\* in  $L^\infty(Q)$ , then the strong convergence  $\|y_{u_k} - y_u\|_{C(\bar{Q})} \rightarrow 0$  holds.

The existence of a unique solution of (1.1) in the space  $L^2(0, T; H_0^1(\Omega)) \cap L^\infty(Q)$  as well as the estimates in  $L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$  and  $L^2(0, T; H_0^1(\Omega))$  were proved in [8]. The  $H^{2,1}(Q)$  regularity is a well known consequence of the convexity of  $\Omega$ , the Lipschitz regularity of the coefficients  $a_{i,j}$ , and the  $H_0^1(\Omega)$  regularity of  $y_0$ . The reader is referred to [27, Chap. III-§10] or [24] for the Hölder regularity. The convergence  $y_{u_k} \rightarrow y_u$  in  $C(\bar{Q})$  follows easily from the estimates for  $y_{u_k}$  in  $H^{2,1}(Q) \cap C^{\beta, \beta/2}(\bar{Q})$ .

Notice that Theorem 2.1 implies that there exists  $M_\infty > 0$  such that

$$\|y_u\|_{C^{\beta, \beta/2}(\bar{Q})} + \|y_u\|_{H^{2,1}(Q)} \leq M_\infty \quad \forall u \in U_{ad}. \quad (2.1)$$

We denote  $Y = H^{2,1}(Q) \cap C^{\beta, \beta/2}(\bar{Q})$  and  $G : L^\infty(Q) \rightarrow Y$  as the mapping associating to each control the corresponding state  $G(u) = y_u$ .

**Theorem 2.2.** *The mapping  $G$  is of class  $C^2$ . Moreover, for every  $u, v, v_1, v_2 \in L^\infty(Q)$ , we have that  $z_v = G'(u)v$  is the solution of*

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial z}{\partial t} + Az + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x, t, y_u)z = v & \text{in } Q, \\ z = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ z(0) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

and  $z_{v_1, v_2} = G''(u)(v_1, v_2)$  solves the equation

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial z}{\partial t} + Az + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x, t, y_u)z = -\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial y^2}(x, t, y_u)z_{v_1}z_{v_2} & \text{in } Q, \\ z = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ z(0) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

where  $z_{v_i} = G'(u)v_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . Moreover  $z_v$  and  $z_{v_1, v_2}$  are continuous functions in  $\bar{Q}$ .

The proof of this result can be obtained by using the implicit function theorem; see e.g. [18, Theorem 5.1].

For any  $u \in L^\infty(Q)$  and any  $v \in L^1(Q)$ , we will denote  $z_v$  the solution of (2.2).

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $u \in U_{ad}$  be arbitrary. Then, there exists  $C_{q,s} > 0$  independent of  $u$  such that*

$$\|z_v\|_{L^q(Q)} \leq C_{q,s}\|v\|_{L^s(Q)} \quad \forall v \in L^s(Q)$$

if  $q$  and  $s$  satisfy any of the following conditions:

- (A)  $s = 1$  and  $q < (d+2)/d$ ,
- (B)  $s > 1 + d/2$  and  $q = +\infty$ ,
- (C)  $s \in (1, 2)$  and  $q < r_d$ , where  $r_2 = \frac{2s}{2-s}$  and  $r_3 = \frac{5s}{5-2s}$ ,
- (D)  $s = 2$  and  $q < +\infty$  if  $d = 2$  or  $s = 2$  and  $q = 10$  if  $d = 3$ .

*Proof.* (A) From [3, Theorem 6.3] or [7, Theorem 2.2], we know that for  $v \in L^1(Q)$   $z_v \in L^r(I; W^{1,p}(\Omega))$  for all  $r, p \in [1, 2)$  such that  $2/r + d/p > d + 1$  and

$$\|z_v\|_{L^r(I; W^{1,p}(\Omega))} \leq C\|v\|_{L^1(Q)}.$$

Using the Sobolev imbedding  $W^{1,p}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^q(\Omega)$  for  $p = qd/(q+d)$  and setting  $q = r$ , we obtain the condition

$$\frac{2}{q} + \frac{d}{p} = \frac{2}{q} + \frac{q+d}{q} > d + 1,$$

which is equivalent to  $q < (d+2)/d$ . This proves the estimate in case (A).

(B) In this case, the estimate can be deduced from [27, Theorem III.7.1].

(C) In this case, the estimate follows by the Riesz-Thorin interpolation theorem [1, Theorem 1.1.1] between the corresponding estimates for cases (A) and (D). Indeed, for every  $s \in (1, 2)$  we have

$$\frac{1}{s} = \frac{\frac{2}{s} - 1}{1} + \frac{2 - \frac{2}{s}}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{2}{s} - 1 \in (0, 1).$$

Hence, the estimate follows for  $r$  given by the relation

$$\frac{1}{r} = \frac{\frac{2}{s} - 1}{q} + \frac{2 - \frac{2}{s}}{p}$$

for all  $q < +\infty$  if  $d = 2$  and  $q = 10$  if  $d = 3$ . This implies that  $r < \frac{2s}{2-s}$  if  $d = 2$  and  $r < \frac{5s}{5-2s}$  if  $d = 3$ .

(D) This result is proved in [20, Theorem 2.4].  $\square$

**Corollary 2.4.** *For all  $u, v \in U_{ad}$  and all  $q < (d+2)/d$ , there exists a constant  $C_{q,1} > 0$  independent of  $u$  and  $v$  such that*

$$\|y_u - y_v\|_{L^q(Q)} \leq C_{q,1} \|u - v\|_{L^1(Q)}.$$

*Proof.* Denote  $\zeta = y_u - y_v$ . Subtracting the equations satisfied by  $u$  and  $v$  and using the mean value theorem we get

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial t} + A\zeta + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x, t, y_\theta)\zeta = u - v & \text{in } Q, \\ \zeta = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ \zeta(0) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

where  $y_\theta = y_u + \theta(y_u - y_v)$  and  $\theta : Q \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is a measurable function. Then, the result follows from Lemma 2.3 along with (A2) and (2.1).  $\square$

Let us denote

$$F(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_Q (y_u - y_d)^2 dx dt \quad \text{and} \quad j(u) = \|u\|_{L^1(Q)}.$$

Before computing the derivatives of  $F$ , we define for every  $u \in U_{ad}$  its related adjoint state  $\varphi_u$  as the unique solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t} + A^*\varphi + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x, t, y_u)\varphi = y_u - y_d & \text{in } Q, \\ \varphi = 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ \varphi(\cdot, T) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases}$$

and where  $A^*$  is the adjoint of  $A$  given by

$$A^*\psi = - \sum_{i,j=1}^n \partial_{x_j} (a_{j,i}(x) \partial_{x_i} \psi).$$

From Theorem 2.1 we have that, for every  $u \in U_{ad}$ ,  $\varphi_u \in H^{2,1}(Q) \cap C^{\beta,\beta/2}(Q)$  for some  $\beta \in (0, 1]$  and there exists a constant  $C$  independent of  $u$ , such that

$$\|\varphi_u\|_{C^{\beta,\beta/2}(\bar{Q})} + \|\varphi_u\|_{H^{2,1}(Q)} \leq C \quad \forall u \in U_{ad}. \quad (2.3)$$

The next theorem follows from the chain rule, Theorem 2.2 and assumptions (A2) and (A4).

**Theorem 2.5.** *The functional  $F : L^\infty(Q) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is of class  $C^2$  and for every  $u, v, v_1, v_2 \in L^\infty(Q)$*

$$\begin{aligned} F'(u)v &= \int_Q \varphi_u v \, dx \, dt, \\ F''(u)(v_1, v_2) &= \int_Q \left( 1 - \varphi_u \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial y^2}(x, t, y_u) \right) z_{v_1} z_{v_2} \, dx \, dt, \end{aligned}$$

where  $z_{v_i} = G'(u)v_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ .

From (A2), (2.1), Lemma 2.3, and (2.3), we infer that the forms  $F'(u)$  and  $F''(u)$  can be extended through the same formulas to continuous linear and bilinear forms, respectively, in  $L^2(Q)$ . The following result is proved in [19, Lemma 6] for the case  $\theta \equiv 1$ . See [16, Lemma 3.5] for the adaptation of the proof for any measurable function  $\theta : Q \rightarrow [0, 1]$ .

**Lemma 2.6.** *Suppose that  $\bar{u}$  and  $u$  belong to  $U_{ad}$  and  $\theta : Q \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is a measurable function. Then, for every  $\gamma > 0$  there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that*

$$|(F''(u_\theta) - F''(\bar{u}))v^2| \leq \gamma \|z_v\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 \quad \forall v \in L^2(Q) \quad \text{if } \|y_u - y_{\bar{u}}\|_{L^\infty(Q)} < \varepsilon, \quad (2.4)$$

where  $u_\theta = \bar{u} + \theta(u - \bar{u})$  and  $z_v = G'(\bar{u})v$ .

The functional  $j : L^1(Q) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is convex and Lipschitz. The directional derivative of  $j$  at  $u$  in the direction  $v$  can be computed as

$$j'(u; v) = \int_{u>0} v \, dx \, dt + \int_{u=0} |v| \, dx \, dt - \int_{u<0} v \, dx \, dt.$$

In what follows, we will write  $J'(u; v) = F'(u)v + \mu j'(u; v)$ . Moreover, denoting by  $\partial j(u)$  the subdifferential of  $j$  at  $u$  in the sense of convex analysis, we have that  $\lambda \in \partial j(u)$  if and only if  $\lambda(x, t) \in \text{sign}(u(x, t))$  for a.a.  $(x, t) \in Q$ , where  $\text{sign}(u)$  denotes the multi-valued function  $\text{sign}(u) = \{1\}$  if  $u > 0$ ,  $\text{sign}(u) = \{-1\}$  if  $u < 0$ , and  $\text{sign}(u) = [-1, 1]$  if  $u = 0$ .

Existence of a solution of (P) follows in a standard way using Theorem 2.1; see e.g. [10]. Since (P) is not a convex problem, we consider local solutions as well. Let us state precisely the different concepts of local solution.

**Definition 1.** *We say that  $\bar{u} \in U_{ad}$  is an  $L^r(Q)$ -weak local solution of (P), with  $r \in [1, +\infty]$ , if there exists some  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that*

$$J(\bar{u}) \leq J(u) \quad \forall u \in U_{ad} \text{ with } \|\bar{u} - u\|_{L^r(Q)} \leq \varepsilon.$$

*An element  $\bar{u} \in U_{ad}$  is said to be a strong local solution of (P) if there exists some  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that*

$$J(\bar{u}) \leq J(u) \quad \forall u \in U_{ad} \text{ with } \|y_{\bar{u}} - y_u\|_{L^\infty(Q)} \leq \varepsilon.$$

*We say that  $\bar{u} \in U_{ad}$  is a strict (weak or strong) local solution if the above inequalities are strict for  $u \neq \bar{u}$ .*

Next we state first order optimality conditions; see [11, Theorem 2.9].

**Theorem 2.7.** *Suppose  $\bar{u}$  is a local solution of (P) in any of the senses given in Definition 1. Then*

$$J'(\bar{u}; u - \bar{u}) \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U_{ad}$$

*holds. Moreover, there exist  $\bar{y}$  and  $\bar{\varphi}$  in  $Y$  and  $\bar{\lambda} \in \partial j(\bar{u})$  such that*

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \bar{y}}{\partial t} + A\bar{y} + f(x, t, \bar{y}) &= \bar{u} & \text{in } Q, \\ \bar{y} &= 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ \bar{y}(\cdot, 0) &= y_0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (2.5a)$$

$$\begin{cases} -\frac{\partial \bar{\varphi}}{\partial t} + A^*\bar{\varphi} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x, t, \bar{y})\bar{\varphi} &= \bar{y} - y_d & \text{in } Q, \\ \bar{\varphi} &= 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ \bar{\varphi}(\cdot, T) &= 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (2.5b)$$

$$\int_Q (\bar{\varphi} + \mu \bar{\lambda})(u - \bar{u}) \, dx \, dt \geq 0 \quad \forall u \in U_{ad}. \quad (2.5c)$$

**Corollary 2.8.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.7, the following properties are fulfilled:*

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{if } \bar{\varphi}(x, t) > +\mu \text{ then } \bar{u}(x, t) = u_{\min}, \\ &\text{if } \bar{\varphi}(x, t) < -\mu \text{ then } \bar{u}(x, t) = u_{\max}. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, if  $\mu > 0$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{if } \bar{\varphi}(x, t) = +\mu \text{ then } \bar{u}(x, t) \leq 0, \\ &\text{if } \bar{\varphi}(x, t) = -\mu \text{ then } \bar{u}(x, t) \geq 0, \\ &\text{if } |\bar{\varphi}(x, t)| < \mu \text{ then } \bar{u}(x, t) = 0, \\ &\bar{\lambda}(x, t) = \text{Proj}_{[-1, +1]} \left( -\frac{1}{\mu} \bar{\varphi}(x, t) \right), \end{aligned}$$

and  $\bar{\lambda} \in H^1(Q) \cap C^{\beta, \beta/2}(\bar{Q})$  hold.

The reader is referred to [4] for the proof of the above result. In this reference the result is proved for the elliptic case, the changes for the parabolic case being obvious.

Given  $\bar{u} \in U_{ad}$  satisfying (2.5a)–(2.5c), we say that  $v \in L^2(Q)$  satisfies the sign condition if

$$v(x, t) \begin{cases} \geq 0 & \text{if } \bar{u}(x, t) = u_{\min}, \\ \leq 0 & \text{if } \bar{u}(x, t) = u_{\max}. \end{cases} \quad (2.6)$$

We also introduce the cone

$$C_{\bar{u}} = \{v \in L^2(Q) \text{ satisfying (2.6) and } J'(\bar{u}; v) = 0\}.$$

If  $\mu = 0$ , we deduce from Corollary 2.8 that  $\bar{\varphi}(x, t)v(x, t) = |\bar{\varphi}(x, t)v(x, t)|$  for every  $v \in L^2(Q)$  satisfying the sign condition (2.6). Consequently the following identity holds:

$$C_{\bar{u}} = \{v \in L^2(Q) \text{ satisfying (2.6) and } v(x, t) = 0 \text{ if } |\bar{\varphi}(x, t)| > 0\}.$$

For  $\mu > 0$ , from Corollary 2.8 we also infer that

$$C_{\bar{u}} = \left\{ v \in L^2(Q) \text{ satisfying (2.6) and } \begin{aligned} &v(x, t) \begin{cases} \geq 0 & \text{if } \bar{\varphi}(x, t) = -\mu \text{ and } \bar{u}(x, t) = 0 \\ \leq 0 & \text{if } \bar{\varphi}(x, t) = +\mu \text{ and } \bar{u}(x, t) = 0 \\ = 0 & \text{if } \left| |\bar{\varphi}(x, t)| - \mu \right| > 0 \end{cases} \end{aligned} \right\}.$$

We formulate the second order necessary optimality conditions on the critical cone  $C_{\bar{u}}$ .

**Theorem 2.9.** *Suppose  $\bar{u}$  is a local solution of (P) in any of the senses given in Definition 1. Then,  $F''(\bar{u})v^2 \geq 0$  for all  $v \in C_{\bar{u}}$  holds.*

The proof of this theorem is exactly as the one of [5, Theorem 3.7].

To formulate second order sufficient conditions, we define the extended cone. For  $\varsigma \geq 0$ , we define

$$C_{\bar{u}}^{\varsigma} = D_{\bar{u}}^{\varsigma} \cap G_{\bar{u}}^{\varsigma},$$

where

$$G_{\bar{u}}^{\varsigma} = \left\{ v \in L^2(Q) \text{ satisfying (2.6) and } J'(\bar{u}; v) \leq \varsigma \|z_v\|_{L^1(Q)} \right\},$$

and

If  $\mu = 0$ ,  $D_{\bar{u}}^\varsigma = \{v \in L^2(Q) \text{ satisfying (2.6) and } v(x, t) = 0 \text{ if } |\bar{\varphi}(x, t)| > \varsigma\}$ ,

If  $\mu > 0$ ,  $D_{\bar{u}}^\varsigma = \left\{ v \in L^2(Q) \text{ satisfying (2.6) and} \right.$

$$v(x, t) \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \geq 0 \quad \text{if } \bar{\varphi}(x, t) = -\mu \text{ and } \bar{u}(x, t) = 0 \\ \leq 0 \quad \text{if } \bar{\varphi}(x, t) = +\mu \text{ and } \bar{u}(x, t) = 0 \\ = 0 \quad \text{if } \left| |\bar{\varphi}(x, t)| - \mu \right| > \varsigma \end{array} \right\}.$$

Notice that  $C_{\bar{u}} = C_{\bar{u}}^0 \subset C_{\bar{u}}^\varsigma$  for all  $\varsigma > 0$ . The following theorem on second order sufficient optimality conditions was proved in [11, Theorem 3.1].

**Theorem 2.10.** *Let  $\bar{u} \in U_{ad}$  satisfy the first order optimality conditions (2.5a)–(2.5c). Suppose in addition that there exist  $\delta > 0$  and  $\varsigma > 0$  such that*

$$F''(\bar{u})v^2 \geq \delta \|z_v\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 \quad \forall v \in C_{\bar{u}}^\varsigma, \quad (2.7)$$

where  $z_v = G'(\bar{u})v$ . Then, there exist  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $\kappa > 0$  such that

$$J(\bar{u}) + \frac{\kappa}{2} \|y_u - \bar{y}\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 \leq J(u) \quad \forall u \in U_{ad} \text{ s.t. } \|y_u - \bar{y}\|_{L^\infty(Q)} < \varepsilon. \quad (2.8)$$

Note that if  $\varsigma < \varsigma'$ , then  $C_{\bar{u}}^\varsigma \subseteq C_{\bar{u}}^{\varsigma'}$ , and hence without loss of generality we can suppose that  $\varsigma < \mu$  in the case  $\mu > 0$ .

The purpose of this work is to obtain error estimates for the approximations described in Section 3 of the state and control variables. As we will show later, the second order sufficient optimality conditions are enough to deduce some error estimates for the approximation of the states. Nevertheless, to get error estimates for the control it is well known that an extra assumption is needed. To this end we introduce the following assumption:

$$\exists \Lambda > 0 \text{ and } \gamma \in (0, 1] : \text{meas}\{(x, t) \in Q : \left| |\bar{\varphi}(x, t)| - \mu \right| \leq \varepsilon\} < \Lambda \varepsilon^\gamma. \quad (\text{H})$$

The second order sufficient optimality condition combined with this assumption lead to a stronger inequality than (2.8). We prove two lemmas to derive this new inequality.

**Lemma 2.11.** *Let  $\bar{u} \in U_{ad}$  satisfy the first order condition (2.5a)–(2.5c) and the structural assumption (H). Then*

$$F'(\bar{u})(u - \bar{u}) + \mu j(u) - \mu j(\bar{u}) \geq \nu \|u - \bar{u}\|_{L^1(Q)}^{1+\frac{1}{\gamma}} \quad \forall u \in U_{ad} \quad (2.9)$$

holds, where  $\nu = \frac{1}{2} [2(u_{\max} - u_{\min})]^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}}$ .

*Proof.* The inequality  $F'(\bar{u})(u - \bar{u}) + \mu j'(\bar{u}; u - \bar{u}) \geq \nu \|u - \bar{u}\|_{L^1(Q)}^{1+\frac{1}{\gamma}}$  was proved in [30, Lemma 6.3]. Then, it is enough to use that  $j(u) - j(\bar{u}) \geq j'(\bar{u}; u - \bar{u})$  to obtain (2.9).  $\square$

**Lemma 2.12.** *Let  $\bar{u} \in U_{ad}$  satisfy (2.5a)–(2.5c) and suppose that there exist  $\varsigma > 0$  and  $\delta > 0$  such that the second order condition (2.7) holds. Then, there exists  $\kappa > 0$  such that for all  $\rho > 0$  a number  $\varepsilon_\rho > 0$  can be found such that*

$$\rho [F'(\bar{u})(u - \bar{u}) + \mu j(u) - \mu j(\bar{u})] + F''(u_\theta)(u - \bar{u})^2 \geq \frac{\kappa}{2} \|y_u - \bar{y}\|_{L^2(Q)}^2$$

for all measurable functions  $\theta : Q \rightarrow [0, 1]$  and all  $u \in U_{ad}$  satisfying  $\|y_u - \bar{y}\|_{L^\infty(Q)} < \varepsilon_\rho$ , where  $u_\theta = \bar{u} + \theta(u - \bar{u})$ .



*Proof.* We split the proof in 2 steps.

*Step 1.-* Consider a measurable function  $\theta : Q \rightarrow [0, 1]$ . Let us prove that there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that for all  $\rho > 0$  a number  $\varepsilon_\rho > 0$  can be found so that

$$\rho J'(\bar{u}; u - \bar{u}) + F''(u_\theta)(u - \bar{u})^2 \geq C \|z_{u-\bar{u}}\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 \quad (2.10)$$

for all  $u \in U_{ad}$  satisfying  $\|y_u - \bar{y}\|_{L^\infty(Q)} < \varepsilon_\rho$ .

As in [11, Theorem 3.1], we distinguish three cases:

*Case 1:*  $u - \bar{u} \in C_{\bar{u}}^\zeta$ . On one hand, since  $\bar{u}$  satisfies (2.5a)–(2.5c) and  $u \in U_{ad}$ , we have that  $J'(\bar{u}; u - \bar{u}) \geq 0$ . Given  $\gamma = \delta/2$ , from Lemma 2.6 we deduce the existence of  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  such that, if  $\|y_u - \bar{y}\|_{L^\infty(Q)} < \varepsilon_0$ , we have

$$|(F''(u_\theta) - F''(\bar{u}))v^2| \leq \frac{\delta}{2} \|z_v\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 \quad \forall v \in L^2(Q).$$

This inequality and the second order condition (2.7) imply

$$F''(u_\theta)v^2 \geq \frac{\delta}{2} \|z_v\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 \quad \forall v \in L^2(Q).$$

Therefore, (2.10) follows with  $C = \frac{\delta}{2}$ .

*Case 2:*  $u - \bar{u} \notin G_{\bar{u}}^\zeta$ . Arguing as in [11, Ineq. (3.8)], we know that there exists  $\varepsilon_1 > 0$  such that, if  $\|y_u - \bar{y}\|_{L^\infty(Q)} < \varepsilon_1$ , we have

$$J'(\bar{u}; u - \bar{u}) \geq \frac{\zeta}{2\varepsilon_1} \|z_{u-\bar{u}}\|_{L^2(Q)}^2.$$

Using [11, Remark 2.6], we have that there exists  $M > 0$  such that

$$F''(u_\theta)(u - \bar{u})^2 \leq M \|z_{u-\bar{u}}\|_{L^2(Q)}^2.$$

Selecting  $\varepsilon_1 < \frac{\rho\zeta}{2M+\delta}$ , (2.10) holds again with  $C = \frac{\delta}{2}$ .

*Case 3:*  $u - \bar{u} \notin D_{\bar{u}}^\zeta$  and  $u - \bar{u} \in G_{\bar{u}}^\zeta$ . Let us define  $\varsigma^* = \varsigma / \max\{1, C_{1,1}\}$ , where  $C_{1,1}$  is defined in Lemma 2.3. If  $u - \bar{u} \notin G_{\bar{u}}^{\varsigma^*}$ , then Case 2 applies. Otherwise, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } \mu = 0, \quad W &= \{(x, t) \in Q : |\bar{\varphi}(x, t)| > \varsigma \text{ and } u(x, t) - \bar{u}(x, t) \neq 0\}, \\ \text{if } \mu > 0, \quad W &= \{(x, t) \in Q : \bar{\varphi}(x, t) = -\mu \text{ and } \bar{u}(x, t) = 0 \text{ and } u(x, t) < 0, \\ &\quad \text{or } \bar{\varphi}(x, t) = +\mu \text{ and } \bar{u}(x, t) = 0 \text{ and } u(x, t) > 0, \\ &\quad \text{or } \left| |\bar{\varphi}(x, t)| - \mu \right| > \varsigma \text{ and } u(x, t) \neq \bar{u}(x, t)\}, \end{aligned}$$

and denote  $V = Q \setminus W$ . Define the functions  $v = (u - \bar{u})\chi_V$  and  $w = (u - \bar{u})\chi_W$ . It is proved in [17, Proposition 3.6] that

$$J'(\bar{u}; u - \bar{u}) \geq \varsigma \|w\|_{L^1(Q)} \quad (2.11)$$

and also that  $v \in C_{\bar{u}}^\zeta$ . Using now that  $u - \bar{u} = v + w$ , (2.4), and (2.7), we deduce the existence of a constant  $c > 0$  such that

$$F''(u_\theta)(u - \bar{u})^2 \geq \frac{\delta}{8} \|z_{u-\bar{u}}\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 - c \|z_w\|_{L^2(Q)}^2. \quad (2.12)$$

In [13], it is proved that there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that, for all  $\varepsilon_2 \in (0, \varepsilon)$ , if  $\|y_u - \bar{y}\|_{L^\infty(Q)} < \varepsilon_2$ , then  $\|z_w\|_{L^\infty(Q)} < 2\varepsilon_2$ . This yields

$$\|z_w\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 \leq 2\varepsilon_2 \|z_w\|_{L^1(Q)} \leq 2\varepsilon_2 C_{1,1} \|w\|_{L^1(Q)}.$$

Using (2.11), (2.12), and this last inequality we get for  $\varepsilon_2 < \min\{\varepsilon, \frac{\rho\varsigma}{2C_{1,1}c}\}$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho J'(\bar{u}; u - \bar{u}) + F''(u_\theta)(u - \bar{u})^2 &\geq \frac{\delta}{8} \|z_{u-\bar{u}}\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 - c \|z_w\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 + \rho\varsigma \|w\|_{L^1(Q)} \\ &\geq \frac{\delta}{8} \|z_{u-\bar{u}}\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 + \left(\frac{\rho\varsigma}{2\varepsilon_2} C_{1,1} - c\right) \|z_w\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 \geq \frac{\delta}{8} \|z_{u-\bar{u}}\|_{L^2(Q)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, taking  $\varepsilon_\rho = \min\{\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2\}$  and  $C = \frac{\delta}{8}$ , (2.10) holds in all cases.

*Step 2.-* Arguing as in [11, Lemma 2.4] we obtain the existence of  $\varepsilon_3 > 0$  such that

$$\|z_{u-\bar{u}}\|_{L^2(Q)} \geq \frac{1}{2} \|y_u - \bar{y}\|_{L^2(Q)} \quad \text{if} \quad \|y_u - \bar{y}\|_{L^\infty(Q)} < \varepsilon_3.$$

Therefore, (2.10) implies that there exists some constant  $C > 0$  such that

$$\rho J'(\bar{u}; u - \bar{u}) + F''(u_\theta)(u - \bar{u})^2 \geq C \|y_u - \bar{y}\|_{L^2(Q)}^2$$

if  $\|y_u - \bar{y}\|_{L^\infty(Q)} < \varepsilon_\rho = \min_{0 \leq i \leq 3} \varepsilon_i$ . Finally, using the convexity of  $j$ , we know that

$$F'(\bar{u})(u - \bar{u}) + \mu j(u) - \mu j(\bar{u}) \geq J'(\bar{u}; u - \bar{u})$$

and the proof is complete.  $\square$

Finally, we obtain sufficient conditions for a strong local solution that will allow us to obtain control error estimates.

**Theorem 2.13.** *Let  $\bar{u} \in U_{ad}$  be a control satisfying the first order optimality conditions (2.5a)–(2.5c) and the structural assumption (H). Suppose further that the second order condition (2.7) is fulfilled for some  $\varsigma > 0$  and  $\delta > 0$ . Then, there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that the following inequality holds:*

$$J(\bar{u}) + \frac{\nu}{2} \|u - \bar{u}\|_{L^1(Q)}^{1+\frac{1}{\gamma}} + \frac{\kappa}{4} \|y_u - \bar{y}\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 \leq J(u) \quad \forall u \in U_{ad} : \|y_u - \bar{y}\|_{L^\infty(Q)} < \varepsilon,$$

where  $\nu$  is the constant given in Lemma 2.11 and  $\kappa$  is the constant given in Lemma 2.12.

*Proof.* Performing a Taylor expansion and invoking Lemma 2.11, we infer

$$\begin{aligned} J(u) &= F(u) + \mu j(u) \\ &= F(\bar{u}) + \mu j(\bar{u}) + F'(\bar{u})(u - \bar{u}) + \mu j(u) - \mu j(\bar{u}) + \frac{1}{2} F''(u_\theta)(u - \bar{u})^2 \\ &= J(\bar{u}) + \frac{1}{2} [F'(\bar{u})(u - \bar{u}) + \mu j(u) - \mu j(\bar{u})] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} [F'(\bar{u})(u - \bar{u}) + \mu j(u) - \mu j(\bar{u}) + F''(u_\theta)(u - \bar{u})^2] \\ &\geq J(\bar{u}) + \frac{\nu}{2} \|u - \bar{u}\|_{L^1(Q)}^{1+\frac{1}{\gamma}} + \frac{1}{2} [F'(\bar{u})(u - \bar{u}) + \mu j(u) - \mu j(\bar{u}) + F''(u_\theta)(u - \bar{u})^2]. \end{aligned}$$

The result now follows from Lemma 2.12, taking  $\rho = 1$ .  $\square$

### 3 Numerical approximation

Consider a regular family of triangulations  $\{\mathbb{K}_h\}_{h>0}$  of  $\bar{\Omega}$ , cf. [2, Definition (4.4.13), pp. 107,108] or [22, p. 131], and a set of points  $\{t_j\}_{j=0}^{N_\tau} \subset [0, T]$  with  $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_{N_\tau} = T$ . We will denote by  $N_h$  and  $N_{I,h}$  the number of nodes and interior nodes of the triangulation  $\mathbb{K}_h$ ,  $h_K$  is the diameter of  $K$  for all  $K \in \mathbb{K}_h$  and  $h = \max h_k$ . As usual  $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^{N_h}$  denotes the nodal basis associated with the nodes  $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^{N_h}$  of the triangulation and  $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^{N_{I,h}}$  is the nodal basis associated to the interior nodes. We also set  $I_j = (t_{j-1}, t_j)$ ,  $\tau_j = t_j - t_{j-1}$ , and  $\tau = \max_{1 \leq j \leq N_\tau} \tau_j$ . We denote  $\chi_K$  and  $\chi_j$  the characteristic functions of the element  $K$  and the interval  $I_j$  respectively. We also use the notation  $\sigma = (h, \tau)$ .

We further assume that  $\tau \leq T/4$  and there exist  $\nu > 0$  and  $\rho > 0$  independent of  $h$  and  $\tau$  respectively, such that

$$h \leq \nu h_K \quad \forall K \in \mathbb{K}_h \quad \text{and} \quad \tau \leq \rho \tau_j \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, N_\tau.$$

Finally, following [29], we will also suppose that

$$(A5) \quad \tau |C_f| < 1 \text{ if } C_f < 0, \text{ where } C_f \text{ is given in (A2).}$$

$$(A6) \quad \text{There exist } C > 0 \text{ and } \theta > 0 \text{ independent of } \tau \text{ and } h \text{ such that } \tau \leq Ch^\theta.$$

Notice that, in particular, the hypotheses on the temporal mesh in [29, Assumptions 3.1 and 5.2] are satisfied.

#### 3.1 Approximation of the state equation

Now we define the finite dimensional spaces

$$Y_h = \{y_h \in C(\bar{\Omega}) : y_{h|K} \in P_1(K) \quad \forall K \in \mathbb{K}_h \quad \text{and} \quad y_h = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma\},$$

$$\mathcal{Y}_\sigma = \{y_\sigma \in L^2(I; Y_h) : y_{\sigma|I_j} \in Y_h \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, N_\tau\}.$$

The elements of  $\mathcal{Y}_\sigma$  can be written as

$$y_\sigma = \sum_{j=1}^{N_\tau} y_{h,j} \chi_j = \sum_{j=1}^{N_\tau} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{I,h}} y_{i,j} e_i \chi_j,$$

where  $y_{h,j} \in Y_h$  for  $j = 1, \dots, N_\tau$ ,  $y_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, N_{I,h}$ , and  $j = 1, \dots, N_\tau$ .

We denote by  $I_h : C_0(\bar{\Omega}) \rightarrow Y_h$  the usual continuous piecewise linear interpolation operator given by  $I_h y = \sum_{j=1}^{N_{I,h}} y(x_j) e_j$ . For every  $w \in L^1(I)$ , we define

$$P_\tau w = \sum_{j=1}^{N_\tau} \frac{1}{\tau_j} \int_{I_j} w \, dt \, \chi_j.$$

Finally, we set  $I_\sigma = P_\tau \circ I_h = I_h \circ P_\tau$ .

For every  $u \in L^2(Q)$ , we define its associated discrete state as the unique element  $y_\sigma(u) \in \mathcal{Y}_\sigma$  such that for  $j = 1, \dots, N_\tau$

$$\begin{cases} \int_{\Omega} (y_{h,j} - y_{h,j-1}) z_h \, dx + \tau_j a(y_{h,j}, z_h) \\ \quad + \int_{I_j} \int_{\Omega} f(x, t, y_{h,j}) z_h \, dx \, dt = \int_{I_j} \int_{\Omega} u z_h \, dx \, dt \quad \forall z_h \in Y_h, \\ y_{h,0} = P_h y_0, \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

where  $P_h : L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow Y_h$  denotes the  $L^2$  projection operator, and  $\mathfrak{a} : H^1(\Omega) \times H^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the bilinear form

$$\mathfrak{a}(y, z) = \int_{\Omega} \sum_{i,k=1}^n a_{ik} \partial_{x_i} y \partial_{x_k} z \, dx \quad \forall y, z \in H^1(\Omega).$$

Notice that this can be seen as an implicit Euler scheme; see [29]. Existence and uniqueness of a solution of (3.1) is deduced by a straightforward application of Brouwer's fixed point theorem along with the assumption  $\tau|C_f| < 1$ . The following result follows from [29, Theorem 5.4], [9, Theorem 3.1] and the fact that  $U_{ad}$  is bounded in  $L^\infty(Q)$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *Consider  $u \in U_{ad}$ . Under the assumptions (A1), (A2), and (A4), there exist  $h_0 > 0$ ,  $\tau_0 > 0$ ,  $\delta_0 > 0$ ,  $C > 0$ , independent of  $u$  such that for every  $\tau < \tau_0$  and  $h < h_0$*

$$\|y_\sigma(u)\|_{L^\infty(Q)} \leq C, \tag{3.2}$$

$$\|y_u - y_\sigma(u)\|_{L^2(Q)} \leq C(h^2 + \tau), \tag{3.3}$$

$$\|y_u - y_\sigma(u)\|_{L^\infty(Q)} \leq C|\log h| \log\left(\frac{T}{\tau}\right)^2 \left(h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2}\right). \tag{3.4}$$

*Proof.* The stability estimate (3.2) is proved in [29, Theorem 5.4], and the error estimate (3.3) in [29, Corollary 6.2]. To establish the third inequality we use [29, Theorem 6.5] to deduce

$$\|y_u - y_\sigma(u)\|_{L^\infty(Q)} \leq C|\log h| \left(\log \frac{T}{\tau}\right)^2 \|y_u - \eta_\sigma\|_{L^\infty(Q)} \quad \forall \eta_\sigma \in \mathcal{Y}_\sigma.$$

By choosing  $\eta_\sigma = I_\sigma y_u$  and taking advantage of the Hölder regularity of  $y_u$ , we obtain the claimed estimate.  $\square$

### 3.2 Approximation of the control problem

We will consider piecewise constant approximations of the control.

$$\begin{aligned} U_h &= \{u_h \in L^\infty(\Omega) : u_h|_K \in \mathcal{P}_0(K) \quad \forall K \in \mathbb{K}_h\}, \\ \mathbb{U}_\sigma &= \{u_\sigma = \sum_{j=1}^{N_\tau} u_{h,j} \chi_j : u_{h,j} \in U_h \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, N_\tau\}, \\ \mathbb{U}_{\sigma,ad} &= \left\{ u_\sigma \in \mathbb{U}_\sigma : u_{\min} \leq u_\sigma(x, t) \leq u_{\max} \text{ for a.e. } (x, t) \in Q \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that  $\mathbb{U}_{\sigma,ad} \subset U_{ad}$  and every element  $u_\sigma \in \mathbb{U}_\sigma$  can be written in the form

$$u_\sigma = \sum_{j=1}^{N_\tau} u_{h,j} \chi_j = \sum_{j=1}^{N_\tau} \sum_{K \in \mathbb{K}_h} u_{K,j} \chi_K \chi_j.$$

We define  $\Pi_h : L^1(\Omega) \rightarrow U_h$  by

$$\Pi_h v = \sum_{K \in \mathbb{K}_h} \frac{1}{|K|} \int_K v \, dx \chi_K.$$

We also define  $\pi_\sigma = P_\tau \circ \Pi_h = \Pi_h \circ P_\tau$ .

The discrete problem reads

$$\min_{u_\sigma \in \mathbb{U}_{\sigma,ad}} J_\sigma(u_\sigma), \tag{P_\sigma}$$

where

$$J_\sigma(u) = F_\sigma(u) + \mu j(u) \quad \text{with} \quad F_\sigma(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_Q (y_\sigma(u) - y_d)^2 dx.$$

We observe that

$$j(u_\sigma) = \sum_{j=1}^{N_\tau} \sum_{K \in \mathbb{K}_h} \tau_j |K| |u_{K,j}|.$$

In the next three lemmas we collect and prove some properties that will be needed later.

**Lemma 3.2.** *For every  $u \in L^1(Q)$  and every  $\sigma$ , the inequality  $j(\pi_\sigma u) \leq j(u)$  holds.*

*Proof.* Notice that

$$\pi_\sigma u = \sum_{j=1}^{N_\tau} \sum_{K \in \mathbb{K}_h} \frac{1}{\tau_j |K|} \int_{I_j} \int_K u dx dt \chi_K \chi_j = \sum_{j=1}^{N_\tau} \sum_{K \in \mathbb{K}_h} u_{K,j} \chi_K \chi_j.$$

Then, we have

$$j(\pi_\sigma u) = \sum_{j=1}^{N_\tau} \sum_{K \in \mathbb{K}_h} \tau_j |K| |u_{K,j}| = \sum_{j=1}^{N_\tau} \sum_{K \in \mathbb{K}_h} \left| \int_{I_j} \int_K u dx dt \right| \leq \int_Q |u| dx dt = j(u).$$

□

**Lemma 3.3.** *The following properties are fulfilled:*

$$\lim_{\sigma \rightarrow (0,0)} \|\pi_\sigma u - u\|_{L^1(Q)} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\sigma \rightarrow (0,0)} j(\pi_\sigma u) = j(u) \quad \forall u \in L^1(Q), \quad (3.5)$$

$$\pi_\sigma u \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} u \text{ in } L^\infty(Q) \text{ as } \sigma \rightarrow (0,0) \quad \forall u \in L^\infty(Q), \quad (3.6)$$

$$\|\pi_\sigma u - u\|_{H^1(Q)^*} \leq C(h + \tau) \|u\|_{L^2(Q)} \quad \forall u \in L^2(Q). \quad (3.7)$$

*Proof.* To prove (3.5) we assume first that  $u \in C(\bar{Q})$ . Then, for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$|u(x_2, t_2) - u(x_1, t_1)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{|Q|} \quad \text{if } |x_2 - x_1| + |t_2 - t_1| < \delta.$$

Taking  $\hat{\sigma} = (\hat{h}, \hat{\tau})$  with  $\hat{h} + \hat{\tau} \leq \delta$  we infer for  $\sigma = (h, \tau)$  with  $|\sigma| \leq |\hat{\sigma}|$

$$\|u - \pi_\sigma u\|_{L^1(Q)} = \sum_{j=1}^{N_\tau} \sum_{K \in \mathbb{K}_h} \int_{I_j} \int_K \left| u(x, t) - \frac{1}{\tau_j |K|} \int_{I_j} \int_K u(\xi, s) d\xi ds \right| dx dt \leq \varepsilon.$$

This proves the first identity of (3.5) for continuous functions in  $\bar{Q}$ . The proof for arbitrary elements of  $L^1(Q)$  follows from the density of  $C(\bar{Q})$  in  $L^1(Q)$  and the stability property established in Lemma 3.2.

Using that  $|j(u) - j(\pi_\sigma u)| \leq \|u - \pi_\sigma u\|_{L^1(Q)}$ , the second convergence of (3.5) is obtained. To prove (3.6) we observe that  $\|\pi_\sigma u\|_{L^\infty(Q)} \leq \|u\|_{L^\infty(Q)}$ . Therefore, the existence of subsequences converging weakly\* in  $L^\infty(Q)$  follows. But, (3.5) implies that all the subsequences must converge to  $u$  and, consequently, (3.6) is satisfied.

The third statement follows by duality. Using the well known inequality  $\|\pi_\sigma v - v\|_{L^2(Q)} \leq C(h + \tau)\|v\|_{H^1(Q)}$  and denoting  $S = \{v \in H^1(Q) : \|v\|_{H^1(Q)} = 1\}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - \pi_\sigma u\|_{H^1(Q)^*} &= \sup_{v \in S} \langle u - \pi_\sigma u, v \rangle_{H^1(Q)^*, H^1(Q)} \\ &= \sup_{v \in S} \int_Q (u - \pi_\sigma u)v \, dx \, dt = \sup_{v \in S} \int_Q (u - \pi_\sigma u)(v - \pi_\sigma v) \, dx \, dt \\ &= \sup_{v \in S} \int_Q u(v - \pi_\sigma v) \, dx \, dt \leq \sup_{v \in S} \|u\|_{L^2(Q)} \|v - \pi_\sigma v\|_{L^2(Q)} \\ &\leq \sup_{v \in S} C(h + \tau)\|v\|_{H^1(Q)} \|u\|_{L^2(Q)} = C(h + \tau)\|u\|_{L^2(Q)}. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $u$  be an element of  $U_{ad}$  and let  $\{u_\sigma\}_\sigma$  be a sequence with each  $u_\sigma \in \mathbb{U}_{\sigma, ad}$  such that  $u_\sigma \xrightarrow{*} u$  in  $L^\infty(Q)$ . Then, the following convergence properties are fulfilled.*

$$\lim_{\sigma \rightarrow (0,0)} \|y_\sigma(u_\sigma) - y_u\|_{L^\infty(Q)} = 0, \quad (3.8)$$

$$\lim_{\sigma \rightarrow (0,0)} \|y_\sigma(\pi_\sigma u) - y_\sigma(u_\sigma)\|_{L^\infty(Q)} = 0, \quad (3.9)$$

$$\lim_{\sigma \rightarrow (0,0)} F_\sigma(u_\sigma) = F(u), \quad (3.10)$$

$$j(u) \leq \liminf_{\sigma \rightarrow (0,0)} j(u_\sigma). \quad (3.11)$$

*Proof.* By the triangle inequality, we can write

$$\|y_\sigma(u_\sigma) - y_u\|_{L^\infty(Q)} \leq \|y_\sigma(u_\sigma) - y_{u_\sigma}\|_{L^\infty(Q)} + \|y_{u_\sigma} - y_u\|_{L^\infty(Q)}.$$

The first term converges to 0 thanks to the finite element error estimate (3.4). The convergence to 0 of the second term can be deduced from Theorem 2.1 and the assumption  $u_\sigma \xrightarrow{*} u$ .

For the second statement, we use

$$\|y_\sigma(\pi_\sigma u) - y_\sigma(u_\sigma)\|_{L^\infty(Q)} \leq \|y_\sigma(\pi_\sigma u) - y_{\pi_\sigma u}\|_{L^\infty(Q)} + \|y_{\pi_\sigma u} - y_u\|_{L^\infty(Q)} + \|y_u - y_\sigma(u_\sigma)\|_{L^\infty(Q)}.$$

The first terms converge to 0 thanks to the finite element error estimate (3.4). The convergence to 0 of the second term is consequence of Theorem 2.1 and (3.6). The convergence to 0 of the last term follows from (3.8).

The convergence (3.10) is a straightforward consequence of (3.8). Finally, (3.11) follows from the convexity of  $j$ . □

### 3.3 First order optimality conditions and sparsity properties of the discrete control problem

For every  $u \in L^2(Q)$ , we define its associated discrete adjoint state  $\varphi_\sigma(u) \in \mathcal{Y}_\sigma$  such that for  $j = N_\tau, \dots, 1$

$$\begin{cases} \int_\Omega (\varphi_{h,j} - \varphi_{h,j+1}) z_h \, dx + \tau_j \mathfrak{a}(z_h, \varphi_{h,j}) \\ \quad + \int_{I_j} \int_\Omega \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x, t, y_{h,j}(u)) \varphi_{h,j} z_h \, dx \, dt \\ \quad = \int_{I_j} \int_\Omega (y_{h,j}(u) - y_d) z_h \, dx \, dt \quad \forall z_h \in Y_h, \\ \varphi_{h, N_\tau+1} = 0. \end{cases}$$

The next identity is well known

$$F'_\sigma(u_\sigma)v_\sigma = \int_Q \varphi_\sigma(u_\sigma)v_\sigma \, dx \, dt \quad \forall u_\sigma, v_\sigma \in \mathbb{U}_\sigma.$$

Let us describe now the subdifferential of  $j$  in  $\mathbb{U}_\sigma$ . Consider  $\lambda_\sigma = \sum_{j=1}^{N_\tau} \sum_{K \in \mathbb{K}_h} \lambda_{K,j} \chi_K \chi_j \in \mathbb{U}_\sigma$ . We have that

$$\lambda_\sigma \in \partial j(u_\sigma) \iff \lambda_{K,j} \in \text{sign}(u_{K,j}) \quad \forall K \in \mathbb{K}_h \text{ and all } j = 1, \dots, N_\tau. \quad (3.12)$$

In the next lemma, we state the first order necessary optimality conditions for problem  $(P_\sigma)$ .

**Lemma 3.5.** *Suppose that  $\bar{u}_\sigma$  is a local solution of  $(P_\sigma)$ . Then, the following inequality holds*

$$F'_\sigma(\bar{u}_\sigma)(u_\sigma - \bar{u}_\sigma) + \mu[j(u_\sigma) - j(\bar{u}_\sigma)] \geq J'_\sigma(\bar{u}_\sigma; u_\sigma - \bar{u}_\sigma) \geq 0 \quad \forall u_\sigma \in \mathbb{U}_{\sigma,ad}. \quad (3.13)$$

Further, there exists  $\bar{\lambda}_\sigma \in \partial j_\sigma(\bar{u}_\sigma)$  such that

$$\int_Q (\bar{\varphi}_\sigma + \mu \bar{\lambda}_\sigma)(u_\sigma - \bar{u}_\sigma) \, dx \, dt \geq 0 \quad \forall u_\sigma \in \mathbb{U}_{\sigma,ad}, \quad (3.14)$$

where  $\bar{\varphi}_\sigma = \varphi_\sigma(\bar{u}_\sigma)$ .

The proof of this result is the same as the corresponding one for the continuous problem and can be found, e.g., in [11, Theorem 2.9]. The first inequality in (3.13) follows from the convexity of  $j$ .

Let us denote  $\bar{\phi}_\sigma = \pi_\sigma \bar{\varphi}_\sigma = \sum_{j=1}^{N_\tau} \sum_{K \in \mathbb{K}_h} \bar{\phi}_{K,j} \chi_K \chi_j$ . From (3.12) and (3.14), we have that

$$(\bar{\phi}_{K,j} + \mu \bar{\lambda}_{K,j})(s - \bar{u}_{K,j}) \geq 0 \quad \forall s \in [u_{\min}, u_{\max}].$$

Using these inequalities, we obtain the sparsity properties of the discrete solution. The proof is as the corresponding one for the continuous problem, which can be found in [4].

**Corollary 3.6.** *Let  $\bar{u}_\sigma$  and  $\bar{\lambda}_\sigma$  as in Lemma 3.5, then we have for every  $j = 1, \dots, N_\tau$  and  $K \in \mathbb{K}_h$*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } \bar{\phi}_{K,j} > +\mu \text{ then } \bar{u}_{K,j} &= u_{\min}, \\ \text{if } \bar{\phi}_{K,j} < -\mu \text{ then } \bar{u}_{K,j} &= u_{\max}. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, if  $\mu > 0$ , then the following properties hold

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } |\bar{\phi}_{K,j}| < \mu \text{ then } \bar{u}_{K,j} &= 0, \\ \bar{\lambda}_{K,j} &= \text{Proj}_{[-1,+1]} \left( -\frac{1}{\mu} \bar{\phi}_{K,j} \right). \end{aligned}$$

## 4 Convergence and error estimates

**Theorem 4.1.** *The following statements hold.*

- (A) *Let  $\{\bar{u}_\sigma\}_\sigma$  be a sequence of global solutions of  $(P_\sigma)$ . Then, every weak-\* limit  $\bar{u}$  of a subsequence of  $\{\bar{u}_\sigma\}_\sigma$  is a global solution of  $(P)$ .*

(B) Let  $\bar{u}$  be a strict strong local solution of (P) in the sense of Definition 1. Then, there exists a sequence  $\{\bar{u}_\sigma\}_\sigma$  of local minimizers of  $(P_\sigma)$  such that  $\bar{u}_\sigma \xrightarrow{*} \bar{u}$  in  $L^\infty(Q)$ . Moreover, there exists  $\sigma_0$  such that

$$J_\sigma(\bar{u}_\sigma) \leq J_\sigma(\pi_\sigma \bar{u}) \quad \forall |\sigma| \leq |\sigma_0|. \quad (4.1)$$

*Proof.* (A) Take any  $u \in U_{ad}$  and consider  $\pi_\sigma u \in \mathbb{U}_{\sigma,ad}$ . Using (3.11) and (3.10), the optimality of  $\bar{u}_\sigma$ , and (3.10) and (3.5), we get

$$J(\bar{u}) \leq \liminf_{\sigma \rightarrow (0,0)} J_\sigma(\bar{u}_\sigma) \leq \limsup_{\sigma \rightarrow (0,0)} J_\sigma(\bar{u}_\sigma) \leq \limsup_{\sigma \rightarrow (0,0)} J_\sigma(\pi_\sigma u) = J(u),$$

which proves the first statement.

(B) Since  $\bar{u}$  is a strict local solution of (P), there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that

$$J(\bar{u}) < J(u) \quad \forall u \in U_{ad} \text{ with } \|y_u - \bar{y}\|_{L^\infty(Q)} < \varepsilon, \quad u \neq \bar{u}, \quad (4.2)$$

where  $\bar{y} = y_{\bar{u}}$ . Consider the auxiliary problems

$$\min_{u_\sigma \in V_{\sigma,ad,\varepsilon}} J_\sigma(u_\sigma), \quad (P_{\sigma,\varepsilon})$$

where

$$V_{\sigma,ad,\varepsilon} = \{u_\sigma \in \mathbb{U}_{\sigma,ad} : \|y_\sigma(u_\sigma) - \bar{y}\|_{L^\infty(Q)} \leq \varepsilon\}.$$

From (3.6) and (3.8) we deduce the existence of  $\sigma_0$  such that  $\pi_\sigma \bar{u} \in V_{\sigma,ad,\varepsilon}$  for  $|\sigma| < |\sigma_0|$ . Therefore,  $V_{\sigma,ad,\varepsilon}$  is a nonempty compact set for every  $|\sigma| < |\sigma_0|$ . Since  $J_\sigma$  is a continuous function,  $(P_{\sigma,\varepsilon})$  has a solution  $\bar{u}_\sigma$  and (4.1) holds.

Since  $\{\bar{u}_\sigma\}_\sigma$  is bounded in  $L^\infty(Q)$ , we can extract a subsequence, still indexed by  $\sigma$ , such that  $\bar{u}_\sigma \xrightarrow{*} u^*$ . Since  $\mathbb{U}_{\sigma,ad} \subset U_{ad}$  and  $U_{ad}$  is weakly\* closed in  $L^\infty(Q)$ , we have that  $u^* \in U_{ad}$ .

Using that  $\bar{u}_\sigma \in V_{\sigma,ad,\varepsilon}$  and (3.9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|y_{u^*} - \bar{y}\|_{L^\infty(Q)} &\leq \|y_{u^*} - \bar{y}_\sigma\|_{L^\infty(Q)} + \|\bar{y}_\sigma - \bar{y}\|_{L^\infty(Q)} \\ &\leq \|y_{u^*} - \bar{y}_\sigma\|_{L^\infty(Q)} + \varepsilon \rightarrow \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

and hence  $\|y_{u^*} - \bar{y}\|_{L^\infty(Q)} \leq \varepsilon$ . Using (3.11) and (3.10), the local optimality of  $\bar{u}_\sigma$ , and (3.10) and (3.5), we get

$$J(u^*) \leq \liminf_{\sigma \rightarrow (0,0)} J_\sigma(\bar{u}_\sigma) \leq \limsup_{\sigma \rightarrow (0,0)} J_\sigma(\bar{u}_\sigma) \leq \limsup_{\sigma \rightarrow (0,0)} J_\sigma(\pi_\sigma \bar{u}) = J(\bar{u}).$$

From (4.2), we deduce that  $u^* = \bar{u}$  and the second statement is proved.  $\square$

## 4.1 State error estimates

In the next result, we obtain error estimates for the optimal state when the solution satisfies a second order sufficient optimality condition.

**Theorem 4.2.** *Let  $\bar{u}$  be a local solution of (P) satisfying the second order condition (2.7) and let  $\{\bar{u}_\sigma\}$  be a sequence of local solutions of  $(P_\sigma)$  such that  $\bar{u}_\sigma \xrightarrow{*} \bar{u}$  in  $L^\infty(Q)$  and (4.1) holds. Then, there exists a constant  $C > 0$  independent of  $\sigma$  such that*

$$\|\bar{y}_\sigma - \bar{y}\|_{L^2(Q)} \leq C\sqrt{h + \tau},$$

where  $\bar{y} = y_{\bar{u}}$  and  $\bar{y}_\sigma = y_\sigma(\bar{u}_\sigma)$ .



**Remark 1.** From theorems 2.10 and 4.1(B) we deduce the existence of a sequence  $\{\bar{u}_\sigma\}$  satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 4.2. If every  $(P_\sigma)$  has only a local solution in a neighborhood of  $\bar{u}$  for  $|\sigma| \leq |\sigma_0|$ , then these solutions satisfy (4.1). Although, existence of an infinite number of solutions of  $(P_\sigma)$  in every neighborhood of  $\bar{u}$  cannot be discarded, it is a rather pathological case.

*Proof of Theorem 4.2.* By the triangle inequality, we have that

$$\|\bar{y}_\sigma - \bar{y}\|_{L^2(Q)} \leq \|\bar{y}_\sigma - y_{\bar{u}_\sigma}\|_{L^2(Q)} + \|\bar{y}_{\bar{u}_\sigma} - \bar{y}\|_{L^2(Q)}.$$

Since  $\{\bar{u}_\sigma\}_\sigma$  is bounded in  $L^\infty(Q)$ , then we can apply (3.3) to the first term to have

$$\|\bar{y}_\sigma - y_{\bar{u}_\sigma}\|_{L^2(Q)} \leq C(h^2 + \tau). \quad (4.3)$$

For the second term, we first notice that the weak-\* convergence of  $\bar{u}_\sigma$  to  $\bar{u}$  and the last statement of Theorem 2.1 imply that  $\|\bar{y}_{\bar{u}_\sigma} - \bar{y}\|_{L^\infty(Q)} \rightarrow 0$ . Therefore, for  $|\sigma|$  small enough  $\|\bar{y}_{\bar{u}_\sigma} - \bar{y}\|_{L^\infty(Q)} < \varepsilon$ , where  $\varepsilon$  is the one given in Theorem 2.10. Using (2.8), we have that

$$\frac{\kappa}{2} \|\bar{y}_{\bar{u}_\sigma} - \bar{y}\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 \leq J(\bar{u}_\sigma) - J(\bar{u}).$$

From Lemma 3.2, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} J(\bar{u}_\sigma) - J(\bar{u}) &= \left( J(\bar{u}_\sigma) - J_\sigma(\bar{u}_\sigma) \right) + \left( J_\sigma(\bar{u}_\sigma) - J_\sigma(\pi_\sigma \bar{u}) \right) \\ &\quad + \left( J_\sigma(\pi_\sigma \bar{u}) - J(\pi_\sigma \bar{u}) \right) + \left( J(\pi_\sigma \bar{u}) - J(\bar{u}) \right) \\ &\leq \left( F(\bar{u}_\sigma) - F_\sigma(\bar{u}_\sigma) \right) + \left( J_\sigma(\bar{u}_\sigma) - J_\sigma(\pi_\sigma \bar{u}) \right) \\ &\quad + \left( F_\sigma(\pi_\sigma \bar{u}) - F(\pi_\sigma \bar{u}) \right) + \left( F(\pi_\sigma \bar{u}) - F(\bar{u}) \right) = \text{I} + \text{II} + \text{III} + \text{IV}. \end{aligned}$$

From the assumption (4.1), we infer that  $\text{II} = J_\sigma(\bar{u}_\sigma) - J_\sigma(\pi_\sigma \bar{u}) \leq 0$ . Using the  $L^\infty(Q)$  bounds (2.1) and (3.2), and the finite element error estimate (3.3), we get

$$\begin{aligned} F(\bar{u}_\sigma) - F_\sigma(\bar{u}_\sigma) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_Q ((y_{\bar{u}_\sigma} - y_d)^2 - (\bar{y}_\sigma - y_d)^2) \, dx \, dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_Q (y_{\bar{u}_\sigma} - \bar{y}_\sigma)(y_{\bar{u}_\sigma} + \bar{y}_\sigma + 2y_d) \, dx \, dt \leq C \|y_{\bar{u}_\sigma} - \bar{y}_\sigma\|_{L^2(Q)} \leq C(h^2 + \tau). \end{aligned}$$

Analogously, we obtain  $F_\sigma(\pi_\sigma \bar{u}) - F(\pi_\sigma \bar{u}) \leq C \|y_\sigma(\pi_\sigma \bar{u}) - y_{\pi_\sigma \bar{u}}\|_{L^2(Q)} \leq C(h^2 + \tau)$ . To estimate the last term, we use the mean value theorem to deduce the existence of  $u_\theta = \bar{u} + \theta(\pi_\sigma \bar{u} - \bar{u})$ , where  $\theta$  is a measurable function such that  $0 \leq \theta(x, t) \leq 1$  for a.e.  $(x, t) \in Q$ , Theorem 2.5, the regularity of the adjoint state, (2.3), and (3.7) to obtain

$$F(\pi_\sigma \bar{u}) - F(\bar{u}) = F'(u_\theta)(\pi_\sigma \bar{u} - \bar{u}) = \int_Q \varphi_{u_\theta}(\pi_\sigma \bar{u} - \bar{u}) \, dx \, dt \leq \|\varphi_{u_\theta}\|_{H^1(Q)} \|\pi_\sigma \bar{u} - \bar{u}\|_{H^1(Q)^*} \leq C(\tau + h).$$

Gathering all the estimates, we obtain the desired result.  $\square$

## 4.2 Bang-off-bang controls and control error estimates

The goal of this section is to obtain error estimates for  $\|\bar{u} - \bar{u}_\sigma\|_{L^1(Q)}$ . We recall that  $\beta \in (0, 1]$  is the exponent introduced in Theorem 2.1 and  $\gamma \in (0, 1]$  is given in the structural assumption (H).

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $\bar{u} \in U_{ad}$  satisfy the first order conditions (2.5a)–(2.5c) and the structural assumption (H). Then for all  $s \geq 1$  there exists  $C > 0$  independent of  $\sigma$ ,  $s$  and  $\gamma$  such that*

$$\|\bar{u} - \pi_\sigma \bar{u}\|_{L^s(Q)} \leq C(h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2})^{\gamma/s} \quad (4.4)$$

and

$$|F'(\bar{u})(\pi_\sigma \bar{u} - \bar{u}) + \mu j(\pi_\sigma \bar{u}) - \mu j(\bar{u})| \leq C(h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2})^{1+\gamma}. \quad (4.5)$$

*Proof.* We will write the proof for the case  $\mu > 0$ . For  $\mu = 0$ , the proof follows the same sketch, but in a slightly simplified way; see [12, Lemma 7].

Denote  $\mathbb{I}_\tau = \{I_j, j = 1, \dots, N_\tau\}$  and consider an element  $K \in \mathbb{K}_h$  and an interval  $I \in \mathbb{I}_\tau$  where  $|\bar{\varphi}(x, t) - \mu$  changes sign, i.e.,

$$\text{there exist } (x^-, t^-), (x^o, t^o), (x^+, t^+) \in K \times I \text{ s.t. } \begin{cases} |\bar{\varphi}(x^-, t^-) - \mu| < 0, \\ |\bar{\varphi}(x^o, t^o) - \mu| = 0, \\ |\bar{\varphi}(x^+, t^+) - \mu| > 0. \end{cases} \quad (4.6)$$

Denote  $\mathbb{S}_\sigma = \{(K, I) \in \mathbb{K}_h \times \mathbb{I}_\tau : \text{satisfying (4.6)}\}$ . If  $(x, t) \in K \times I$ , with  $(K, I) \in \mathbb{S}_\sigma$ , then

$$\left| |\bar{\varphi}(x, t) - \mu| \right| = \left| |\bar{\varphi}(x, t) - \mu - (|\bar{\varphi}(x^o, t^o) - \mu|) \right| = \left| |\bar{\varphi}(x, t) - |\bar{\varphi}(x^o, t^o)|| \right| \leq M(h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2}), \quad (4.7)$$

where  $M = \max\{1, \|\bar{\varphi}\|_{C^{\beta, \beta/2}(\bar{Q})}\}$ . Denote  $S = \cup\{K \times I : (K, I) \in \mathbb{S}_\sigma\}$ . We have proved that

$$S \subset \left\{ (x, t) \in Q : \left| |\bar{\varphi}(x, t) - \mu| \right| \leq M(h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2}) \right\}.$$

By the structural assumption (H), we have that  $\text{meas } S \leq \Lambda M^\gamma (h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2})^\gamma \leq \Lambda M (h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2})^\gamma$ .

Now consider a pair  $(K, I) \in (\mathbb{K}_h \times \mathbb{I}_\tau) \setminus \mathbb{S}_\sigma$ . From Corollary 2.8, we have that  $\bar{u}(x, t)$  is constant in  $K \times I$ , so  $\pi_\sigma \bar{u} \equiv \bar{u}$  in  $K \times I$ . This implies that

$$\|\bar{u} - \pi_\sigma \bar{u}\|_{L^s(Q)} = \|\bar{u} - \pi_\sigma \bar{u}\|_{L^s(S)} \leq (u_{\max} - u_{\min})(\Lambda M)^{1/s} (h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2})^{\gamma/s}$$

and (4.4) follows for  $C = (u_{\max} - u_{\min}) \max\{\Lambda M, 1\}$ .

To prove the last statement, we use that for  $h, \tau$  small enough so that

$$2M(h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2}) < \frac{\mu}{2},$$

we have that for every  $(x, t) \in S$ ,  $|\bar{\varphi}(x, t) - \mu| > \mu/2$ . Since  $\bar{\varphi} \in C(\bar{Q})$ , we have that either  $\bar{\varphi} > \mu/2$  or  $\bar{\varphi} < -\mu/2$  on every set  $K \times I$  such that  $(K, I) \in \mathbb{S}_\sigma$ . From Corollary 2.8 we deduce that in the first case  $\bar{u} \leq 0$  and in the second case,  $\bar{u} \geq 0$ . This property is shared by  $\pi_\sigma \bar{u}$ . Using these properties on the signs

in  $S$ , the fact that  $\bar{u} = \pi_\sigma \bar{u}$  in  $Q \setminus S$ , (4.7) and (4.4), we infer:

$$\begin{aligned}
|F'(\bar{u})(\pi_\sigma \bar{u} - \bar{u}) + \mu j(\pi_\sigma \bar{u}) - \mu j(\bar{u})| &= \left| \int_Q \bar{\varphi}(\pi_\sigma \bar{u} - \bar{u}) \, dx \, dt + \mu \int_Q |\pi_\sigma \bar{u}| \, dx \, dt - \mu \int_Q |\bar{u}| \, dx \, dt \right| \\
&= \left| \int_S \bar{\varphi}(\pi_\sigma \bar{u} - \bar{u}) \, dx \, dt + \mu \int_S |\pi_\sigma \bar{u}| \, dx \, dt - \mu \int_S |\bar{u}| \, dx \, dt \right| \\
&= \left| \int_{S \cap \{\bar{\varphi} > 0\}} \bar{\varphi}(\pi_\sigma \bar{u} - \bar{u}) \, dx \, dt - \mu \int_{S \cap \{\bar{\varphi} > 0\}} \pi_\sigma \bar{u} \, dx \, dt + \mu \int_{S \cap \{\bar{\varphi} > 0\}} \bar{u} \, dx \, dt \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_{S \cap \{\bar{\varphi} < 0\}} \bar{\varphi}(\pi_\sigma \bar{u} - \bar{u}) \, dx \, dt + \mu \int_{S \cap \{\bar{\varphi} < 0\}} \pi_\sigma \bar{u} \, dx \, dt - \mu \int_{S \cap \{\bar{\varphi} < 0\}} \bar{u} \, dx \, dt \right| \\
&= \left| \int_{S \cap \{\bar{\varphi} > 0\}} (\bar{\varphi} - \mu)(\pi_\sigma \bar{u} - \bar{u}) \, dx \, dt + \int_{S \cap \{\bar{\varphi} < 0\}} (|\bar{\varphi}| - \mu)(\bar{u} - \pi_\sigma \bar{u}) \, dx \, dt \right| \\
&\leq \| |\bar{\varphi}| - \mu \|_{L^\infty(S)} \| \bar{u} - \pi_\sigma \bar{u} \|_{L^1(S)} \leq M(h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2}) C(h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2})^\gamma.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, (4.5) is satisfied.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.4.** *For every  $u \in U_{ad}$  there exists a constant  $C > 0$ , independent of  $u$ , such that*

$$\| \varphi_u - \varphi_\sigma(u) \|_{L^\infty(Q)} \leq C |\log h| \log \left( \frac{T}{\tau} \right)^2 (h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2}).$$

*Proof.* By the triangle inequality, we have that

$$\| \varphi_u - \varphi_\sigma(u) \|_{L^\infty(Q)} \leq \| \varphi_u - \varphi^\sigma \|_{L^\infty(Q)} + \| \varphi^\sigma - \varphi_\sigma(u) \|_{L^\infty(Q)}, \quad (4.8)$$

where  $\varphi^\sigma \in C^{\beta, \beta/2}(\bar{Q})$  is the solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\frac{\partial \varphi^\sigma}{\partial t} + A^* \varphi^\sigma + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x, t, y_\sigma(u)) \varphi^\sigma &= y_\sigma(u) - y_d & \text{in } Q, \\ \varphi^\sigma &= 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ \varphi^\sigma(\cdot, T) &= 0 & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (4.9)$$

For later use, we notice that Assumption (A2), estimate (3.2) and Lemma 2.3 imply that there exists  $C^* > 0$  independent of  $u$  and  $\sigma$  such that  $\| \varphi^\sigma \|_{L^\infty(Q)} \leq C^*$ . Let us denote  $\xi^\sigma = \varphi_u - \varphi^\sigma$ . We have that

$$\begin{cases} -\frac{\partial \xi^\sigma}{\partial t} + A^* \xi^\sigma + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x, t, y_u) \xi^\sigma &= \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x, t, y_\sigma(u)) - \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x, t, y_u) \right) \varphi^\sigma + y_u - y_\sigma(u) & \text{in } Q, \\ \xi^\sigma &= 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ \xi^\sigma(\cdot, T) &= 0 & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

By the mean value theorem, we know that there exists a measurable function  $\theta : Q \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that, denoting  $y_{\sigma, \theta} = y_\sigma(u) + \theta(y_u - y_\sigma(u))$ , we have that

$$\begin{cases} -\frac{\partial \xi^\sigma}{\partial t} + A^* \xi^\sigma + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x, t, y_u) \xi^\sigma &= \left( \frac{\partial f^2}{\partial y^2}(x, t, y_{\sigma, \theta}) \varphi^\sigma + 1 \right) (y_u - y_\sigma(u)) & \text{in } Q, \\ \xi^\sigma &= 0 & \text{on } \Sigma, \\ \xi^\sigma(\cdot, T) &= 0 & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

From (2.1) and (3.2), we know that there exists a constant  $M_\infty > 0$  such that  $\|y_{\sigma,\theta}\|_{L^\infty(Q)} \leq M_\infty$ . Using Lemma 2.3, Assumption (A2), the estimate  $\|\varphi^\sigma\|_{L^\infty(Q)} \leq C^*$ , and the finite element error estimate (3.4) we have

$$\|\varphi_u - \varphi^\sigma\|_{L^\infty(Q)} \leq C\|y_u - y_\sigma(u)\|_{L^\infty(Q)} \leq C|\log h| \log\left(\frac{T}{\tau}\right)^2 \left(h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2}\right).$$

To estimate the second term in the right hand side of (4.8), we have that, from [29, Theorem 6.5],

$$\|\varphi^\sigma - \varphi_\sigma(u)\|_{L^\infty(Q)} \leq C|\log h| \left(\log \frac{T}{\tau}\right)^2 \|\varphi^\sigma - \eta_\sigma\|_{L^\infty(Q)} \quad \forall \eta_\sigma \in \mathcal{Y}_\sigma.$$

By choosing  $\eta_\sigma = I_\sigma \varphi^\sigma$  and taking advantage of the Hölder regularity of  $\varphi^\sigma$ , we obtain the claimed estimate.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.5.** *Let  $\bar{u}$  be a local solution of (P) satisfying the structural assumption (H) and the second order condition (2.7). Let  $\{\bar{u}_\sigma\}_\sigma$  be a sequence of local solutions of  $(P_\sigma)$  such that (4.1) holds and  $\bar{u}_\sigma \xrightarrow{*} \bar{u}$  in  $L^\infty(Q)$ . Then there exists  $\sigma_0$  such that:*

*If  $\gamma < 1$  or  $d > 1$ , there exists a constant  $C_s > 0$  independent of  $\sigma$  such that, for all  $|\sigma| < |\sigma_0|$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{u}_\sigma - \bar{u}\|_{L^1(Q)} &\leq C_s (h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2})^{\frac{\gamma}{s}}, \\ \|\bar{y}_\sigma - \bar{y}\|_{L^2(Q)} &\leq C_s (h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2})^{\frac{\gamma(\gamma+1)}{2s}}, \end{aligned}$$

*for  $s = 1$  if  $d = 1$ , for all  $s > 1$  if  $d = 2$ , and all  $s > 5/4$  if  $d = 3$ .*

*If  $d = 1$  and  $\gamma = 1$ , there exists a constant  $C > 0$  independent of  $\sigma$  such that*

$$\|\bar{u}_\sigma - \bar{u}\|_{L^1(Q)} + \|\bar{y}_\sigma - \bar{y}\|_{L^2(Q)} \leq C|\log h| \log\left(\frac{T}{\tau}\right)^2 \left(h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2}\right) \quad \forall |\sigma| < |\sigma_0|. \quad (4.10)$$

*Proof.* First, we use the enhanced first order optimality condition in Lemma 2.11 and the first order optimality condition for the discrete problem (3.13) to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\nu}{2} \|\bar{u}_\sigma - \bar{u}\|_{L^1(Q)}^{1+\frac{1}{\gamma}} + \frac{1}{2} [F'(\bar{u})(\bar{u}_\sigma - \bar{u}) + \mu j(\bar{u}_\sigma) - \mu j(\bar{u})] \\ &\leq F'(\bar{u})(\bar{u}_\sigma - \bar{u}) + \mu j(\bar{u}_\sigma) - \mu j(\bar{u}) \\ &\leq [F'(\bar{u})(\bar{u}_\sigma - \bar{u}) + \mu j(\bar{u}_\sigma) - \mu j(\bar{u})] + [F'_\sigma(\bar{u}_\sigma)(\pi_\sigma \bar{u} - \bar{u}_\sigma) + \mu j(\pi_\sigma \bar{u}) - \mu j(\bar{u}_\sigma)] \\ &\leq [F'(\bar{u}) - F'_\sigma(\bar{u}_\sigma)](\bar{u}_\sigma - \pi_\sigma \bar{u}) + [F'(\bar{u})(\pi_\sigma \bar{u} - \bar{u}) + \mu j(\pi_\sigma \bar{u}) - \mu j(\bar{u})]. \end{aligned}$$

Using this and the second estimate in Lemma 4.3, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\nu}{2} \|\bar{u}_\sigma - \bar{u}\|_{L^1(Q)}^{1+\frac{1}{\gamma}} + \frac{1}{2} [F'(\bar{u})(\bar{u}_\sigma - \bar{u}) + \mu j(\bar{u}_\sigma) - \mu j(\bar{u})] \\ &\leq [F'(\bar{u}) - F'_\sigma(\bar{u}_\sigma)](\bar{u}_\sigma - \pi_\sigma \bar{u}) + C(h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2})^{1+\gamma} \\ &= [F'(\bar{u}) - F'_\sigma(\bar{u}_\sigma)](\bar{u}_\sigma - \pi_\sigma \bar{u}) + [F'(\bar{u}_\sigma) - F'_\sigma(\bar{u}_\sigma)](\bar{u}_\sigma - \pi_\sigma \bar{u}) + C(h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2})^{1+\gamma} \\ &= \text{I} + \text{II} + C(h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2})^{1+\gamma}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

Let us estimate I:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I} &= [F'(\bar{u}) - F'_\sigma(\bar{u}_\sigma)](\bar{u}_\sigma - \bar{u}) + [F'(\bar{u}) - F'_\sigma(\bar{u}_\sigma)](\bar{u} - \pi_\sigma \bar{u}) \\ &= -F''(u_\theta)(\bar{u}_\sigma - \bar{u})^2 + \int_Q (\bar{\varphi} - \varphi_{\bar{u}_\sigma})(\bar{u} - \pi_\sigma \bar{u}) \, dx \, dt. \end{aligned}$$

If  $d = 1$ , we deduce from Corollary 2.4 and Lemma 2.3 that

$$\|\bar{\varphi} - \varphi_{\bar{u}_\sigma}\|_{L^\infty(Q)} \leq C_{\infty,2} \|\bar{y} - y_{\bar{u}_\sigma}\|_{L^2(Q)} \leq C_{\infty,2} C_{2,1} \|\bar{u} - \bar{u}_\sigma\|_{L^1(Q)}.$$

Using (4.4) and Young's inequality, we infer the existence of  $C > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_Q (\bar{\varphi} - \varphi_{\bar{u}_\sigma})(\bar{u} - \pi_\sigma \bar{u}) \, dx \, dt &\leq \|\bar{\varphi} - \varphi_{\bar{u}_\sigma}\|_{L^\infty(Q)} \|\bar{u} - \pi_\sigma \bar{u}\|_{L^1(Q)} \\ &\leq C \|\bar{u} - \bar{u}_\sigma\|_{L^1(Q)} C(h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2})^\gamma \leq \frac{\nu}{8} \|\bar{u} - \bar{u}_\sigma\|_{L^1(Q)}^{1+\frac{1}{\gamma}} + C(h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2})^{\gamma(\gamma+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $d = 2$  or  $d = 3$ , we proceed as follows. Using Corollary 2.4, the same technique as in the proof of Lemma 4.4, and Lemma 2.3, we obtain

$$\|\bar{\varphi} - \varphi_{\bar{u}_\sigma}\|_{L^r(Q)} \leq C_{r,q} \|\bar{y} - y_{\bar{u}_\sigma}\|_{L^q(Q)} \leq C_{r,q} C_{q,1} \|\bar{u} - \bar{u}_\sigma\|_{L^1(Q)}$$

for all  $q < (d+2)/d$  and for all  $r < r_d$ , where  $r_d = q/(2-q)$  if  $d = 2$  and  $r_d = 5q/(5-2q)$  if  $d = 3$ ; see Lemma 2.3. We observe that  $r_d \rightarrow +\infty$  if  $d = 2$  and  $r_d \nearrow 5$  if  $d = 3$  as  $q \nearrow (d+2)/d$ . Therefore, taking  $s = r/(r-1)$ , using (4.4) and Young's inequality, we have for all  $s > 1$  if  $d = 2$  and  $s > 5/4$  if  $d = 3$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_Q (\bar{\varphi} - \varphi_{\bar{u}_\sigma})(\bar{u} - \pi_\sigma \bar{u}) \, dx \, dt &\leq \|\bar{\varphi} - \varphi_{\bar{u}_\sigma}\|_{L^r(Q)} \|\bar{u} - \pi_\sigma \bar{u}\|_{L^s(Q)} \\ &\leq C_{r,q} C_{q,1} \|\bar{u} - \bar{u}_\sigma\|_{L^1(Q)} C(h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2})^{\gamma/s} \leq \frac{\nu}{8} \|\bar{u} - \bar{u}_\sigma\|_{L^1(Q)}^{1+\frac{1}{\gamma}} + C_s (h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2})^{\gamma \frac{\gamma+1}{s}}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C_s$  depends on  $s$ . We have proved the following inequality for I:

$$I \leq -F''(u_\theta)(\bar{u}_\sigma - \bar{u})^2 + \frac{\nu}{8} \|\bar{u} - \bar{u}_\sigma\|_{L^1(Q)}^{1+\frac{1}{\gamma}} + C_s (h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2})^{\gamma \frac{\gamma+1}{s}} \quad (4.12)$$

for  $s = 1$  if  $d = 1$ , for all  $s > 1$  if  $d = 2$ , and all  $s > 5/4$  if  $d = 3$ . To estimate II we use Lemma 4.4, (4.4), and Young's inequality as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} II &= [F'(\bar{u}_\sigma) - F'_\sigma(\bar{u}_\sigma)](\bar{u}_\sigma - \pi_\sigma \bar{u}) = \int_Q (\varphi_{\bar{u}_\sigma} - \bar{\varphi}_\sigma)(\bar{u}_\sigma - \pi_\sigma \bar{u}) \, dx \, dt \\ &\leq C |\log h| \log \left( \frac{T}{\tau} \right)^2 (h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2}) (\|\bar{u}_\sigma - \bar{u}\|_{L^1(Q)} + \|\bar{u} - \pi_\sigma \bar{u}\|_{L^1(Q)}) \\ &\leq C \left( |\log h| \log \left( \frac{T}{\tau} \right)^2 (h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2}) \right)^{\gamma+1} + \frac{\nu}{8} \|\bar{u}_\sigma - \bar{u}\|_{L^1(Q)}^{1+\frac{1}{\gamma}} \\ &\quad + C |\log h| \log \left( \frac{T}{\tau} \right)^2 (h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2})^{\gamma+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

Gathering estimates (4.11), (4.12), (4.13), and taking into account only the lowest order terms, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\nu}{4} \|\bar{u}_\sigma - \bar{u}\|_{L^1(Q)}^{1+\frac{1}{\gamma}} + \frac{1}{2} [F'(\bar{u})(\bar{u}_\sigma - \bar{u}) + \mu j(\bar{u}_\sigma) - \mu j(\bar{u})] + F''(u_\theta)(\bar{u}_\sigma - \bar{u})^2 \\ &\leq C_s (h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2})^{\frac{\gamma(\gamma+1)}{s}} + C (|\log h| \log \left( \frac{T}{\tau} \right)^2 (h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2}))^{\gamma+1} \end{aligned}$$

for  $s = 1$  if  $d = 1$ , for all  $s > 1$  if  $d = 2$  and all  $s > 5/4$  if  $d = 3$ .

Now we use Lemma 2.12 for  $\rho = 1/2$ . The weak-\* convergence of  $\bar{u}_\sigma$  to  $\bar{u}$  implies the strong convergence in  $L^\infty(Q)$  of  $y_{\bar{u}_\sigma}$  to  $\bar{y}$ , so there exists  $\sigma_0$  such that  $\|y_{\bar{u}_\sigma} - \bar{y}\|_{L^\infty(Q)} < \varepsilon_\rho$  for  $|\sigma| < |\sigma_0|$ . Hence, the above inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\nu}{4} \|\bar{u}_\sigma - \bar{u}\|_{L^1(Q)}^{1+\frac{1}{\gamma}} + \frac{\kappa}{2} \|y_{\bar{u}_\sigma} - \bar{y}\|_{L^2(Q)}^2 \\ & \leq C_s (h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2})^{\frac{\gamma(\gamma+1)}{s}} + C \left( |\log h| \log \left( \frac{T}{\tau} \right)^2 (h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2}) \right)^{\gamma+1} \quad \forall |\sigma| < |\sigma_0|. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, combining this estimate and (4.3), the result follows.  $\square$

## 5 Numerical example

We modify slightly the example presented in [6, Remark 2.11]. As in that reference, we define  $\Omega = (0, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}$ ,  $T = 1$ ,  $\mu = 4 \times 10^{-3}$ ,  $u_{\min} = -10$ ,  $u_{\max} = 20$ ,  $y_0 \equiv 0$ , and

$$y_d(x, t) = \exp(20[(x - 0.2)^2 + (t - 0.2)^2]) + \exp(20[(x - 0.7)^2 + (t - 0.9)^2]).$$

We further take the nonlinearity  $f(x, t, y) = |y|y^3$ .

To discretize the problem, we use meshes uniform in both time and space of size  $\sigma_{i,j} = (h_i, \tau_j)$ , where  $h_i = 2^{-i}$  and  $\tau_j = 2^{-j}$ . The problem is solved via a Tikhonov regularization approach: for a decreasing sequence of values of  $\kappa > 0$ , we look for a solution of

$$\min_{u_\sigma \in \mathbb{U}_{\sigma, ad}} J_{\sigma, \kappa}(u_\sigma) = J_\sigma(u_\sigma) + \frac{\kappa}{2} \int_Q u_\sigma^2 \, dx \, dt.$$

Each of these problems is solved using a semismooth Newton method, globalized with the help of a merit function –see [26]–, taking as initial guess an approximation of the solution for the previous value of  $\kappa$ . We stop when we find the same solution for three consecutive values of  $\kappa$ . Since we do not have the reference solution, we compare with the solution for  $\sigma_{I,I}$  for a big enough index  $I$ .

For the final solution,  $I = 9$ ,  $\kappa \approx 3.5 \times 10^{-8}$  and approximately 99.9% of the components of  $\bar{u}_{\sigma_{I,I}}$  belong to  $\{u_{\min}, 0, u_{\max}\}$ ; see Figure 1. In Figure 2 the optimal state and adjoint state are shown.

Three tests are carried out. In the first test, we take  $h_i = \tau_i$ ,  $i = 5, 6, 7$ ; in the second one, we take a fixed fine discretization in time given by  $\tau_I$ ,  $I = 9$ , and solve for  $h_i$ ,  $i = 5, 6, 7$ ; finally, we fix the discretization parameter in space to  $h_I$ ,  $I = 9$ , and solve for  $\tau_i$ ,  $i = 5, 6, 7$ . For the first test, we measure the experimental order of convergence (EOC) between two consecutive simultaneous refinement levels by setting

$$EOC_{y,i} = \log_2 \left( \frac{e_{y,i-1}}{e_{y,i}} \right), \quad EOC_{u,i} = \log_2 \left( \frac{e_{u,i-1}}{e_{u,i}} \right),$$

where

$$e_{y,i} = \|\bar{y} - \bar{y}_{\sigma_{i,i}}\|_{L^2(Q)} \approx \|\bar{y}_{\sigma_{I,I}} - \bar{y}_{\sigma_{i,i}}\|_{L^2(Q)}, \quad e_{u,i} = \|\bar{u} - \bar{u}_{\sigma_{i,i}}\|_{L^1(Q)} \approx \|\bar{u}_{\sigma_{I,I}} - \bar{u}_{\sigma_{i,i}}\|_{L^1(Q)}.$$

Analogous notation is used for the refinements in space and in time, respectively.

We obtain the results summarized in Table 1 for simultaneous refinement, Table 2 for refinement in space, and Table 3 for refinement in time. The observed experimental order of convergence is  $O(h + \tau)$ . Since the problem is set in dimension  $d = 1$  and numerically it seems that assumption (H) holds for  $\gamma = 1$ , the order of convergence expected from estimate (4.10) should be, nevertheless, at most close to




Figure 1: The optimal control exhibits a typical bang-off-bang behaviour. Black dots have been marked in the few space-time patches where the numerical approximation exhibits a singular behaviour.




Figure 2: Optimal state and adjoint state.

$h_i = \tau_i$	$\ \bar{y} - \bar{y}_{\sigma_{i,i}}\ _{L^2(Q)}$	$EOC_{y,i}$	$\ \bar{u} - \bar{u}_{\sigma_{i,i}}\ _{L^1(Q)}$	$EOC_{u,i}$
$2^{-5}$	2.52E-2	—	4.93E-1	—
$2^{-6}$	1.25E-2	1.0	2.40E-1	1.0
$2^{-7}$	5.85E-3	1.1	1.19E-1	1.0
		1.1		1.0

Table 1: Experimental order of convergence. Simultaneous refinement.

$h_i$	$\ \bar{y} - \bar{y}_{\sigma_{i,i}}\ _{L^2(Q)}$	$EOC_{y,i}$	$\ \bar{u} - \bar{u}_{\sigma_{i,i}}\ _{L^1(Q)}$	$EOC_{u,i}$
$2^{-5}$	3.30E-3	—	3.29E-1	—
$2^{-6}$	1.39E-3	1.2	1.90E-1	0.8
$2^{-7}$	5.86E-4	1.2	8.30E-2	1.2
		1.2		1.0

Table 2: Experimental order of convergence. Refinement in space for  $\tau_I = 2^{-9}$ .

$\tau_i$	$\ \bar{y} - \bar{y}_{\sigma_{i,i}}\ _{L^2(Q)}$	$EOC_{y,i}$	$\ \bar{u} - \bar{u}_{\sigma_{i,i}}\ _{L^1(Q)}$	$EOC_{u,i}$
$2^{-5}$	2.49E-2	—	3.50E-1	—
$2^{-6}$	1.25E-2	1.0	1.64E-1	1.1
$2^{-7}$	5.82E-3	1.1	7.46E-2	1.1
		1.0		1.1

Table 3: Experimental order of convergence. Refinement in time for  $h_I = 2^{-9}$ .

$O(h + \tau^{1/2})$ . In this example, the observed order of convergence in  $\tau$  can be explained using the same technique of proof and taking into account the regularity of the optimal solution. Let us see how.

Using Theorem 2.1 and Assumption (A2), we have that, for all  $u \in U_{ad}$ ,  $\partial_t y_u + Ay_u \in L^\infty(Q)$ . Since  $y_0 = 0$ , using maximal parabolic regularity, see e.g. [25, Theorem 5.3], we have that

$$y_u \in W^{1,p}(0, T, L^p(\Omega)) \cap L^p(0, T; W^{2,p}(\Omega)) \text{ for all } p < +\infty.$$

Since the embedding  $W^{1,p}(Q) \hookrightarrow C^{1-2/p}(\bar{Q})$  holds, then  $y_u \in C^\beta(\bar{Q})$  for all  $\beta < 1$ . Using the same argument and observing that  $y_d \in L^\infty(Q)$ , we also deduce that  $\varphi_u \in C^\beta(\bar{Q})$  for all  $\beta < 1$ . Having this regularity for the state and the adjoint state, the proof of estimate (4.10) can be rewritten to obtain

$$\|\bar{u}_\sigma - \bar{u}\|_{L^1(Q)} + \|\bar{y}_\sigma - \bar{y}\|_{L^2(Q)} \leq C_\beta |\log h| \log \left( \frac{T}{\tau} \right)^2 (h + \tau)^\beta \quad \forall |\sigma| < |\sigma_0|.$$

To obtain this estimate, we notice that the term  $h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2}$  in estimate (4.10) comes from Lemma 4.3 and the finite element error estimate in the  $L^\infty(Q)$  norm for the state variable, estimate (3.4), and the adjoint state, Lemma 4.4.

In Lemma 4.3, the factor  $h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2}$  appears in estimate (4.7). Using the  $C^\beta(\bar{Q})$ -regularity of the optimal adjoint state, this estimate can be replaced by

$$\left| |\bar{\varphi}(x, t)| - \mu \right| = \left| |\bar{\varphi}(x, t)| - \mu - (|\bar{\varphi}(x^o, t^o)| - \mu) \right| = \left| |\bar{\varphi}(x, t)| - |\bar{\varphi}(x^o, t^o)| \right| \leq M_\beta (h + \tau)^\beta,$$



where  $M_\beta = \max\{1, \|\bar{\varphi}\|_{C^\beta(\bar{Q})}\}$ .

In Lemma 4.4 and estimate (3.4), the term  $h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2}$  corresponds respectively to the approximation errors  $\|y_u - I_\sigma y_u\|_{L^\infty(Q)}$  and  $\|\varphi^\sigma - I_\sigma \varphi^\sigma\|_{L^\infty(Q)}$ , where  $\varphi^\sigma$  is the solution of equation (4.9). Taking into account the  $C^\beta(\bar{Q})$ -regularity of both  $y_u$  and  $\varphi^\sigma$ , we have that

$$\|y_u - I_\sigma y_u\|_{L^\infty(Q)} + \|\varphi^\sigma - I_\sigma \varphi^\sigma\|_{L^\infty(Q)} \leq C_\beta (h + \tau)^\beta.$$

So, in this setting, the proof of Theorem 4.5 can be repeated verbatim replacing in all places  $h^\beta + \tau^{\beta/2}$  by  $(h + \tau)^\beta$  and the result follows.

## Funding

The authors were supported by MCIN/ AEI/10.13039/501100011033 under research project PID2020-114837GB-I00.

## References

- [1] Jöran Bergh and Jörgen Löfström. *Interpolation spaces. An introduction*. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, No. 223. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1976.
- [2] Susanne C. Brenner and L. Ridgway Scott. *The mathematical theory of finite element methods*, volume 15 of *Texts in Applied Mathematics*. Springer, New York, third edition, 2008.
- [3] Eduardo Casas. Pontryagin’s principle for state-constrained boundary control problems of semilinear parabolic equations. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 35(4):1297–1327, 1997.
- [4] Eduardo Casas. Second order analysis for bang-bang control problems of PDEs. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 50(4):2355–2372, 2012.
- [5] Eduardo Casas, Roland Herzog, and Gerd Wachsmuth. Optimality conditions and error analysis of semilinear elliptic control problems with  $L^1$  cost functional. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 22(3):795–820, 2012.
- [6] Eduardo Casas, Roland Herzog, and Gerd Wachsmuth. Analysis of spatio-temporally sparse optimal control problems of semilinear parabolic equations. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 23(1):263–295, 2017.
- [7] Eduardo Casas and Karl Kunisch. Parabolic control problems in space-time measure spaces. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 22(2):355–370, 2016.
- [8] Eduardo Casas and Karl Kunisch. Optimal control of semilinear parabolic equations with non-smooth pointwise-integral control constraints in time-space. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 85(1):Paper No. 12, 40, 2022.
- [9] Eduardo Casas, Karl Kunish, and Mariano Mateos. Error estimates for the numerical approximation of optimal control problems with non-smooth pointwise-integral control constraints. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, To appear, 2022.
- [10] Eduardo Casas and Mariano Mateos. Optimal control of partial differential equations. In *Computational mathematics, numerical analysis and applications*, volume 13 of *SEMA SIMAI Springer Ser.*, pages 3–59. Springer, Cham, 2017.

- [11] Eduardo Casas and Mariano Mateos. Critical cones for sufficient second order conditions in PDE constrained optimization. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 30(1):585–603, 2020.
- [12] Eduardo Casas and Mariano Mateos. State error estimates for the numerical approximation of sparse distributed control problems in the absence of Tikhonov regularization. *Vietnam J. Math.*, 49(3):713–738, 2021.
- [13] Eduardo Casas and Mariano Mateos. Corrigendum: Critical cones for sufficient second order conditions in PDE constrained optimization. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 32(1):319–320, 2022.
- [14] Eduardo Casas, Mariano Mateos, and Arnd Rösch. Finite element approximation of sparse parabolic control problems. *Math. Control Relat. Fields*, 7(3):393–417, 2017.
- [15] Eduardo Casas, Mariano Mateos, and Arnd Rösch. Improved approximation rates for a parabolic control problem with an objective promoting directional sparsity. *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, 70(1):239–266, 2018.
- [16] Eduardo Casas, Mariano Mateos, and Arnd Rösch. Error estimates for semilinear parabolic control problems in the absence of Tikhonov term. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 57(4):2515–2540, 2019.
- [17] Eduardo Casas, Christopher Ryll, and Fredi Tröltzsch. Second order and stability analysis for optimal sparse control of the FitzHugh-Nagumo equation. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 53(4):2168–2202, 2015.
- [18] Eduardo Casas and Fredi Tröltzsch. Second order analysis for optimal control problems: improving results expected from abstract theory. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 22(1):261–279, 2012.
- [19] Eduardo Casas and Fredi Tröltzsch. Second-order optimality conditions for weak and strong local solutions of parabolic optimal control problems. *Vietnam J. Math.*, 44(1):181–202, 2016.
- [20] Eduardo Casas and Daniel Wachsmuth. A note on existence of solutions to control problems of semilinear partial differential equations. *arXiv*, 2022.
- [21] Eduardo Casas, Daniel Wachsmuth, and Gerd Wachsmuth. Second-order analysis and numerical approximation for bang-bang bilinear control problems. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 56(6):4203–4227, 2018.
- [22] P.G. Ciarlet. Basic error estimates for elliptic problems. In P.G. Ciarlet and J.L. Lions, editors, *Handbook of Numerical Analysis*, volume II. Finite Element Methods (Part 1), pages 17–352. North-Holland, 1991.
- [23] K. Deckelnick and M. Hinze. A note on the approximation of elliptic control problems with bang-bang controls. *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, 51(2):931–939, 2012.
- [24] E. Di Benedetto. On the local behaviour of solutions of degenerate parabolic equations with measurable coefficients. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4)*, 13(3):487–535, 1986.
- [25] Johannes Elschner, Joachim Rehberg, and Gunther Schmidt. Optimal regularity for elliptic transmission problems including  $C^1$  interfaces. *Interfaces Free Bound.*, 9(2):233–252, 2007.
- [26] Kazufumi Ito and Karl Kunisch. On a semi-smooth Newton method and its globalization. *Math. Program.*, 118(2, Ser. A):347–370, 2009.
- [27] O.A. Ladyzhenskaya, V.A. Solonnikov, and N.N. Ural'tseva. *Linear and Quasilinear Equations of Parabolic Type*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1988.

- [28] Mariano Mateos. Sparse Dirichlet optimal control problems. *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, 80(1):271–300, 2021.
- [29] Dominik Meidner and Boris Vexler. Optimal error estimates for fully discrete Galerkin approximations of semilinear parabolic equations. *ESAIM: M2AN*, 52:2307–2325, 2018.
- [30] Frank Pörner and Daniel Wachsmuth. Tikhonov regularization of optimal control problems governed by semi-linear partial differential equations. *Mathematical Control and Related Fields*, 8(1):315–335, March 2018.