

**On a state-constrained PDE
optimal control problem arising
from ODE-PDE optimal control**

S. Wendl H.J. Pesch A. Rund

This article is a preprint. It was published in *Recent Advances in Optimization and its Applications in Engineering* by Springer Berlin Heidelberg. The version of record is available at https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-12598-0_37.

On a State-Constrained PDE Optimal Control Problem arising from ODE-PDE Optimal Control

S. Wendl, H. J. Pesch and A. Rund

Chair of Mathematics in Engineering Sciences, University of Bayreuth, Germany
stefan.wendl@uni-bayreuth.de, hans-josef.pesch@uni-bayreuth.de,
armin.rund@uni-bayreuth.de

Summary. The subject of this paper is an optimal control problem with ODE as well as PDE constraints. As it was inspired, on the one hand, by a recently investigated flight path optimization problem of a hypersonic aircraft and, on the other hand, by the so called "rocket car on a rail track"-problem from the pioneering days of ODE optimal control, we would like to call it "hypersonic rocket car problem". While it features essentially the same ODE-PDE coupling structure as the aircraft problem, the rocket car problem's level of complexity is significantly reduced. Due to this fact it is possible not just to obtain easily interpretable results but also a certain degree of insight into the structure of the adjoints. Therefore, the rocket car problem can be seen as a prototype of an ODE-PDE optimal control problem. The main objective of this paper is the derivation of first order necessary optimality conditions.

Key words: Optimal control of partial differential equations, ODE-PDE-constrained optimization, state constraints

1 Introduction

Realistic mathematical models for applications with a scientific or engineering background often have to consider different physical phenomena and therefore may lead to coupled systems of equations that include partial and ordinary differential equations. While each of the fields of optimal control of partial resp. ordinary differential equations has already been subject to thorough research, the optimal control of systems containing both has not been studied widely in literature, neither theoretically nor numerically.

One of the few examples was an optimal control problem recently studied by Chudej et. al. [5] and M. Wächter [11]. It describes the flight of a hypersonic aircraft under the objective of minimum fuel consumption. The flight trajectory is described, as usual, by a system of ordinary differential equations (ODE). Due to the hypersonic flight conditions a thermal protection system is indispensable and must therefore be taken into account in the model. This leads to a quasi-linear heat equation with non-linear boundary conditions which is coupled with the ODE. As it is the main objective of the optimization to limit the heating of the thermal protection system, one obtains a pointwise state constraint, which couples the PDE with the ODE reversely. However, anything beyond mere numerical analysis is prohibited by the considerable complexity of this problem. Therefore the present paper's focus is a model problem stripped of all unnecessary content while still including the key features of ODE-PDE optimal control, which will allow a clearer view on the structure of the problem and its solution.

This simplified model problem we would like to call the "hypersonic rocket car problem". To one part it consists of the classical "rocket car on a rail track problem" from the early days of ODE control, first studied by Bushaw [3]. The second part is a one dimensional heat equation with a source term depending on the speed of the car, denoting the heating due to friction.

In contrast to [9], which deals with the same ODE-PDE problem but from the ODE point of view, this paper is dedicated to a PDE optimal control approach.

2 The hypersonic rocket car problem

In the following, the ODE state variable w denotes the one-dimensional position of the car depending on time t with the terminal time t_f unspecified. The PDE state variable T stands for the temperature and depends on time as well as the spatial coordinate x describing the position within the car. The control u denotes the acceleration of the car. The PDE is controlled only indirectly via the velocity \dot{w} of the car.

The aim is to drive the car in minimal time from a given starting position and speed (w_0 resp. \dot{w}_0) to the origin of the phase plane while keeping its temperature below a certain threshold T_{\max} .

All in all, the hypersonic rocket car problem is given as follows:

$$\min_{u \in U} \left\{ t_f + \frac{1}{2} \lambda \int_0^{t_f} u^2 dt \right\}, \quad \lambda > 0, \quad (1a)$$

subject to

$$\ddot{w}(t) = u(t) \quad \text{in } (0, t_f), \quad (1b)$$

$$w(0) = w_0, \quad \dot{w}(0) = \dot{w}_0, \quad (1c)$$

$$w(t_f) = 0, \quad \dot{w}(t_f) = 0, \quad (1d)$$

$$U := \{u \in L^2(0, t_f) : |u(t)| \leq u_{\max} \text{ almost everywhere in } [0, t_f]\}, \quad (1e)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial T}{\partial t}(x, t) - \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial x^2}(x, t) = g(\dot{w}(t)) \text{ in } (0, l) \times (0, t_f), \quad (1f)$$

$$T(x, 0) = T_0 \text{ on } (0, l), \quad (1g)$$

$$-\frac{\partial T}{\partial x}(0, t) = -(T(0, t) - T_0), \quad \frac{\partial T}{\partial x}(l, t) = -(T(l, t) - T_0) \text{ on } [0, t_f], \quad (1h)$$

and finally subject to a pointwise state constraint of type

$$T(x, t) \leq T_{\max} \text{ in } [0, l] \times [0, t_f]. \quad (1i)$$

The initial temperature T_0 of the car is in the following set to zero. In the numerical experiments the regularisation parameter λ is chosen as $\frac{1}{10}$, the length l of the car and the control constraint u_{\max} both as 1 and the function $g(\dot{w}(t))$ as $\dot{w}(t)^2$, which corresponds to Stokes friction.

3 The state-unconstrained problem and its associated temperature profile

For better illustration and to alleviate comparison with the numerical results of section 5 let us first have a brief look at the solution of the state unconstrained (i. e. only ODE) problem:




Fig. 1. Optimal trajectories of the regularized minimum-time problem in the phase plane (grey). The dotted black curve is the switching curve of the bang-bang counterpart of the ODE problem and serves here as the envelope curve. The black curves are the optimal solutions for the starting conditions $w_0 = -6$ and $\dot{w}_0 = 0$ resp. $w_0 = -6$ and $\dot{w}_0 = -6$.

Those two trajectories yield the following temperature profiles:




Fig. 2. Temperature profiles along state-unconstrained trajectories; cf. Figure 3. Data: $w_0 = -6$, $\dot{w}_0 = 0$ (left), resp. $\dot{w}_0 = -6$ (right).

4 Necessary optimality conditions: Interpretation as state-constrained PDE optimal control problem

It is possible to reformulate (1) as a PDE optimal control problem by eliminating the ODE-part:

$$\int_0^{t_f} \left(1 + \frac{\lambda}{2} u^2(t) \right) dt \stackrel{!}{=} \min_{|u| \leq u_{\max}} \quad (2a)$$

subject to

$$T_t(x, t) - T_{xx}(x, t) = \left(\dot{w}_0 + \int_0^t u(s) ds \right)^2 \quad \text{in } (0, l) \times (0, t_f), \quad (2b)$$

$$-T_x(0, t) + T(0, t) = 0, \quad T_x(l, t) + T(l, t) = 0 \quad \text{for } 0 < t < t_f, \quad (2c)$$

$$T(x, 0) = T_0(x) := 0 \quad \text{for } 0 \leq x \leq l, \quad (2d)$$

$$\int_0^{t_f} u(t) dt = -\dot{w}_0, \quad (2e)$$

$$\int_0^{t_f} \int_0^t u(s) ds dt = -w_0 - \dot{w}_0 t_f \quad \xrightarrow{\text{part. int.}} \quad \int_0^{t_f} t u(t) dt = w_0, \quad (2f)$$

$$T(x, t) \leq T_{\max} \quad \text{in } [0, l] \times [0, t_f]. \quad (2g)$$

Here the term $v(t) := \dot{w}_0 + \int_0^t u(s) ds$ plays the role of a “felt” control for the heat equation. The two isoperimetric conditions (2e, f) are caused by the two terminal conditions (1c) and comprehend the constraints (1b–d) of the ODE part.

While this reformulation will alleviate the derivation of first order necessary conditions, it nevertheless comes at a price, namely the nonstandard structure of (2e, f) and especially the source term in (2b).

The existence and uniqueness of the solution, the Fréchet-differentiability of the solution operator and the existence of a Lagrange multiplier $\bar{\mu} \in C([0, l] \times [0, t_f])^* = \mathcal{M}([0, l] \times [0, t_f])$, the set of regular Borel measures on $([0, l] \times [0, t_f])$ by means of a local Slater condition are proven in [8].

Thereby, we can establish the optimality conditions by means of the Lagrange technique. Furthermore it is easy to see, that for any given point of time the maximum of T with respect to space is right in the middle at $x = \frac{l}{2}$ (cf. Figure 2 (left), for a proof see [7]). This implies, that the active set \mathcal{A} is a subset of the line $\{x = l/2, 0 < t < t_f\} =: L$. Hence the state constraint can equivalently be replaced by $T \leq T_{\max}$ on L . Using this we define the Lagrange-function by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L} = & \int_0^{t_f} \left(1 + \frac{\lambda}{2} u^2(t) \right) dt - \int_0^{t_f} \int_0^l \left(T_t - T_{xx} - g(\dot{w}_0 + \int_0^t u(s) ds) \right) q dx dt \\
& - \int_0^{t_f} \left(-T_x(0, t) + T(0, t) \right) q(0, t) dt - \int_0^{t_f} \left(T_x(l, t) + T(l, t) \right) q(l, t) dt \\
& + \nu_1 \left(\int_0^{t_f} u(t) dt + \dot{w}_0 \right) + \nu_2 \left(\int_0^{t_f} t u(t) dt - w_0 \right) \\
& + \int_0^{t_f} \left(T\left(\frac{l}{2}, t\right) - T_{\max} \right) d\mu(t), \tag{3}
\end{aligned}$$

with $\mu(t) \in \mathcal{M}(0, t_f)$ and the multipliers q associated with the constraints (2b-d) respectively $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ associated with (2f,g).

By partial integration and differentiation of (3) we find the necessary conditions of first order:

Adjoint equation:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^{t_f^*} \int_0^l q_t \psi - q_x \psi_x dx dt - \int_0^{t_f^*} q(0, t) \psi(0, t) dt - \int_0^{t_f^*} q(l, t) \psi(l, t) dt \\
& + \int_0^{t_f} \psi\left(\frac{l}{2}, t\right) d\mu(t) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \psi \in W(0, t_f^*), \tag{4a}
\end{aligned}$$

$$q(x, t_f^*) = 0 \quad \text{for almost all } x \in [0, l], \tag{4b}$$

$$\text{Variational inequality:} \tag{4c}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^{t_f^*} (\lambda u^*(t) + \nu_1 + \nu_2 t) (u(t) - u^*(t)) dt \\
& + \int_0^{t_f^*} g'(\dot{w}_0 + \int_0^t u^*(r) dr) \left(\int_0^t u(s) - u^*(s) ds \right) \left(\int_0^l q(x, t) dx \right) dt \geq 0 \\
\Rightarrow & \int_0^{t_f^*} \left[\lambda u^*(t) + \nu_1 + \nu_2 t + \int_t^{t_f^*} g'(\dot{w}_0 + \int_0^s u^*(r) dr) \left(\int_0^l q(x, s) dx \right) ds \right] \\
& (u(t) - u^*(t)) dt \geq 0, \quad \text{for all } u \in U, \tag{4d}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Complementarity condition:} \tag{4e}$$

$$\mu \geq 0, \quad \int_0^{t_f} \left(T\left(\frac{l}{2}, t\right) - T_{\max} \right) d\mu(t) = 0. \tag{4f}$$

The optimality system is completed by a condition for the free terminal time t_f and two conditions that give the switching times $t_{\text{on}}, t_{\text{off}}$. As the derivation

of these condition would exceed the scope of this paper they will be published in subsequent papers [7] and [8].

Equations (4a, b) represent the weak formulation of the adjoint equation, which is retrograde in time, and can be formally understood as

$$-q_t(x, t) - q_{xx}(x, t) = \mu(t) \delta(x - \frac{l}{2}) \text{ in } (0, l) \times (0, t_f^*), \quad (5a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} -q_x(0, t) = -q(0, t), \quad q_x(l, t) = -q(l, t) \text{ on } [0, t_f^*] \quad \text{and} \\ q(x, t_f^*) = 0 \text{ on } [0, l]. \end{aligned} \quad (5b)$$

Since the adjoints can be interpreted as shadow prices, the line $\{\frac{l}{2}\} \times (t_{\text{on}}, t_{\text{off}})$ indicates from where the temperature exerts an influence on the objective functional. This result corresponds to the structure of the solution of the initial-boundary value problem to be expected from (4a, b), in particular $q(x, t) \equiv 0$ for $t_{\text{off}} \leq t \leq t_f$.

A key condition is the optimality condition (4c) by which the optimal control is to be determined. It is a complicated integro-variational inequality with a kernel depending on all values of u^* on the interval $[0, t_f]$, forward in time, as well as on all values of q on $[t, t_f]$, backward in time. Instead (4c), we can determine the optimal control by an integro-projection formula,

$$u^*(t) = P_{[-u_{\max}, u_{\max}]} \left\{ -\frac{1}{\lambda} \left(\nu_1 + \nu_2 t + \int_t^{t_f^*} g'(v^*(s)) \left(\int_0^l q(x, s) dx \right) ds \right) \right\}. \quad (6)$$

5 Numerical results

The numerical calculations were conducted with the interior point solver IPOPT [6],[10] by A. Wächter and Biegler in combination with the modelling software AMPL [1], with the latter featuring automatic differentiation. The "first discretize, then optimize"-approach was chosen, because even the ostensibly simple and handsome problem (1) proves to be a "redoubtable opponent" for a "first optimize, then discretize"-method due to the rather special structure of its adjoints.

After a time transformations $\tau := \frac{t}{t_f}$ to problem with fixed terminal time (at the cost of spawning an additional optimization variable t_f), applying a quadrature formula to (1a), discretizing the ODE with the implicit midpoint rule and the PDE with the Crank-Nicolson scheme, one obtains a nonlinear program to be solved with IPOPT. The results are shown in Figure 3. Figure 4 depicts the adjoint q of the temperature obtained from IPOPT ¹.

¹ Note that IPOPT delivers estimates for the adjoint variables with opposite sign compared to our notation.




Fig. 3. Temperature $T(x, t)$ (left) and cross-section $T(\frac{1}{2}, t)$ (right) along a state-constrained trajectory. Data: $w_0 = -6$, $\dot{w}_0 = 0$ and $T_{\max} = 1.5$, cf. Figures 1 and 2 (left).




Fig. 4. Adjoint state q of the temperature T .

With a closer look at q one can observe a jump discontinuity of its derivative in spatial direction along the relative interior of \mathcal{A} . This corresponds to the known jump conditions for adjoints on interior line segments in state-

constrained elliptic optimal control [2]. Furthermore one can notice two Dirac-measures as parts of the multiplier μ at the entry and exit points of \mathcal{A} in analogy to the behaviour of isolated active points [4]. On the other hand the multiplier μ contains a smooth part in the relative interior of \mathcal{A} reminiscent of the common behaviour in ODE optimal control.

6 Conclusion

In this paper we studied a prototype of an ODE-PDE optimal control problem. As it is of relatively simple structure, it allows an unobstructed view on its adjoints and optimality system. However an adjoint based method even for such a seemingly simple model problem still remains a formidable task, leaving a direct method as a much more convenient way to go. This of course results in the downside that one has to content oneself with the discrete estimates of the problems adjoints.

Transforming the ODE-PDE problem into an only PDE problem, as it has been done in this paper is not the only possibility of tackling it. As it is also viable to transform it into an only ODE problem, which will of course also be pretty nonstandard, an interesting opportunity to compare concepts of ODE and PDE optimal control may arise here.

However this is beyond the limited scope of the present paper but can be found in [8].

References

1. THE AMPL COMPANY, <http://www.ampl.com/>, 2007.
2. BERGOUNIOUX, M., KUNISCH, K., *On the Structure of the Lagrange Multiplier for State-constrained Optimal Control Problems*, Systems and Control Letters, Vol. 48, 16–176, 2002.
3. BUSHAW, D. W., PhD Thesis, supervised by Solomon Lefschetz, Department of Mathematics, Princeton University, 1952, published as D. W. BUSHAW, *Differential Equations with a Discontinuous Forcing Term*. Experimental Towing Tank, Stevens Institute of Technology, Report No. 469, January 1953.
4. CASAS, E., *Pontryagin's principle for state-constrained boundary control problems of semilinear elliptic equations*, SIAM J. Control and Optimization, 35:1297-1327, 1997.
5. CHUDEJ, K., PESCH, H. J., WÄCHTER, M., SACHS, G., LE BRAS, F., *Instationary Heat Constrained Trajectory Optimization of a Hypersonic Space Vehicle*, to appear in: Proc. of 47th Workshop Variational Analysis and Aerospace Engineering, International School of Mathematics „Guido Stampacchia“, Erice, Italy, 8.9.–16.9.2007.
6. LAIRD, C. AND WÄCHTER, A., www.coin-or.org/Ipopt/; for a documentation including a bibliography see www.coin-or.org/Ipopt/documentation/, 2007.
7. PESCH, H. J., RUND, A., VON WAHL, W., WENDL, S., *On a Prototype Class of ODE-PDE State-constrained Optimal Control Problems. Part 1: Analysis of the State-unconstrained Problems*, in preparation.
8. PESCH, H. J., RUND, A., VON WAHL, W., WENDL, S., *On a Prototype Class of ODE-PDE State-constrained Optimal Control Problems. Part 2: the State-constrained Problems*, in preparation.
9. PESCH, H. J., RUND, A., VON WAHL, W., WENDL, S., *On some new phenomena in state-constrained optimal control if ODEs as well as PDEs are involved*, to appear in Control and Cybernetics.
10. WÄCHTER, A., BIEGLER, L. T., *On the Implementation of an Interior-point Filterline-search Algorithm for Large Scale Nonlinear Programming*, Mathematical Programming, Vol. 106, 25–57, 2006.
11. WÄCHTER, M., *Optimalflugbahnen im Hyperschall unter Berücksichtigung der instationären Aufheizung*, PhD Thesis, Technische Universität München, Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, Munich, Germany, 2004.