

# AN ABSTRACT FRAMEWORK FOR THE THEORY OF PROCESS OPTIMIZATION<sup>1</sup>

BY HUBERT HALKIN

Communicated by V. Klee, March 7, 1966

**Introduction.** Ten years ago the development of a maximum principle as a necessary condition for optimality of some control problems began a new era for optimization theory. Since that time different maximum principles have been proposed and proved for a great variety of optimization problems. All these maximum principles and their proofs have a similar structure. The aim of the present paper is to give this unique structure independently of the particular characteristics of any one of these problems.

The present paper is a further addition to the trend started in Gamkrelidze [1] and [2], Halkin [3] and [4], Neustadt [5].

**1. Optimization problem.** We are given a set  $L$ , a mapping  $f = (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_k)$  from  $L$  into  $E^k$  and an integer  $m$  with  $1 \leq m \leq k$ . The problem is to find an  $\hat{x} \in L$  which maximizes  $f_1(\hat{x})$  subject to the constraints  $f_i(\hat{x}) \geq 0$  if  $i = 2, 3, \dots, m$  and  $f_i(\hat{x}) = 0$  if  $i = m+1, \dots, k$ .

**2. Some assumptions.** The set  $L$  is a subset of a linear space  $X$ . There is a set  $M \subset X$  which is an approximation of  $L$  around  $\hat{x}$  and a mapping  $h = (h_1, \dots, h_k): X \rightarrow E^k$  which is an approximation of  $f$  around  $\hat{x}$ . We shall require that

(i) the set  $M$  is convex and  $\hat{x} \in M$ .

(ii) the functionals  $h_i$  are convex for  $i = 1, \dots, m$  and linear-plus-a-constant for  $i = m+1, \dots, k$ .

(iii) for any set  $S = \text{co}\{\hat{x}, x_1, \dots, x_l\} \subset M$  there is a mapping  $\zeta: M \rightarrow L$  such that the mappings  $f \circ \zeta$  and  $h$  are continuous over  $S$  (with respect to the usual finite dimensional topology on  $S$ ) and "tangent at  $\hat{x}$  over  $S$ " which means that for any  $\epsilon > 0$  there is an  $\eta \in (0, 1]$  with the property that  $|f(\zeta(x)) - h(x)| \leq \epsilon \delta$  if  $\delta \in (0, \eta]$  and  $x \in \text{co}\{\hat{x}, \hat{x} + \delta(x_1 - \hat{x}), \dots, \hat{x} + \delta(x_l - \hat{x})\}$ .

**3. Maximum principle.** The purpose of the present paper is to prove that there exists real numbers  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_k$  such that

<sup>1</sup> This research was supported by the Air Force Scientific Research Office of Aerospace Research, United States Air Force under AFOSR Grant 1039-66.

$$(\alpha) \quad \sum_{i=1}^k |\lambda_i| > 0,$$

$$(\beta) \quad \lambda_i \geq 0 \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, m,$$

$$(\gamma) \quad \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i h_i(\hat{x}) \geq \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i h_i(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in M.$$

**4. Proof of the maximum principle.** There is no loss of generality by assuming that  $\hat{x}=0$  and that  $f(0)=0$ . Let  $K = \{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) : \alpha_i > 0, i = 1, \dots, m; \alpha_i = 0, i = m+1, \dots, k\}$ . We have  $K \cap f(L) = \emptyset$ . We want to prove that  $K$  and  $h(M)$  are separated. We shall assume that  $K$  and  $h(M)$  are not separated and show that this leads to  $K \cap f(L) \neq \emptyset$ . If the sets  $h(M)$  and  $K$  are not separated then, Step I, there exists a set  $S = \text{co}\{0, x_1, \dots, x_l\} \subset M$  such that

(i)  $h(S)$  and  $K$  are not separated,

(ii)  $l = k - m + 1$ ,

(iii)  $h_j(x_i) > 0$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$  and  $i = 1, \dots, l$ .

Let  $S^0 = S \sim \{0\}$ . Then, Step II, there exists a  $\sigma > 0$  such that  $h(S^0) \subset \{\rho(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) : \rho \in (0, 1], \sigma \leq \alpha_i \leq 1/\sigma, i = 1, \dots, m; -1/\sigma \leq \alpha_i \leq 1/\sigma, i = m+1, \dots, k\}$ . For every  $\delta \in (0, 1]$  let  $S_\delta^0 = \{\delta x : x \in S \sim \{0\}\}$ . Then, Step III, there exists a  $\beta \in (0, 1]$  such that  $f_i(\zeta(x)) > 0$  if  $i = 1, \dots, m$  and  $x \in S_\beta^0$  where  $\zeta$  is the mapping from  $S$  into  $L$  given by the definition of  $M$ . Then, Step IV,  $f(\zeta(S)) \cap K \neq \emptyset$  which implies  $f(L) \cap K \neq \emptyset$ . This concludes the proof of the Maximum Principle. Steps I, II and III correspond to elementary properties of convex sets and convex functions in a finite dimensional Euclidean space. Step IV is a consequence of Brouwer fixed point theorem.

#### REFERENCES

1. R. V. Gamkrelidze, *On the theory of the first variation*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **161** (1965), 23–26 = Soviet Math. **6** (1965), 345–348.
2. ———, *On some extremal problems in the theory of differential equations with applications to the theory of optimal control*, SIAM J. Control, **3** (1965), 106–128.
3. H. Halkin, *Finite convexity in infinite dimensional spaces*, Proceedings of the Colloquium on Convexity, Copenhagen, 1965 (to appear).
4. ———, *On the necessary condition for optimal control of nonlinear systems*, J. Analyse Math., **12** (1964), 1–82.
5. L. W. Neustadt, *Optimal control problems as extremal problems in a Banach space*, Proceedings of the Symposium on System Theory, Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, 1965 (to appear).

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LA JOLLA