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The article describes a successive-approximations method for finding the optimum programmed control for a linear system and demonstrates the convergence of this method.

1. Statement of the problem. Let us consider the system of ordinary differential equations

$$
\begin{equation*}
X^{\cdot}(t)=A(t) X(t)+\sum_{i=1}^{r} B_{i}(t) u_{i}(t)+F(t) \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

with the initial condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
X(0)=X_{0} \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $A(t)$ is an $n$-by-n matrix and $F(t), B_{i}(t), i=1, \ldots, r$, are $n-$ dimensional vectors. We shall assume that the elements of the matrix $A(t)$ and the components of the vectors $F(t), B_{i}(t)(i=1, \ldots, r)$ are continuous real functions, specified on $[0, T]$. Let $T$ be fixed.

We shall also assume that the control functions $u_{1}(t), \ldots, u_{r}(t)$ are real functions of time specified on $[0, T]$ and satisfy the inequalities

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|u_{i}(t)\right| \leqslant 1 \quad(i=1, \ldots, r) \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The entire class of such functions (we shall denote it by $U$ ) may be assumed to coincide with the totality of piecewise continuous functions or, in the general case, with the totality of measurable functions.

Let $X(t, u)$ be a solution of equation (1.1) with the initial conditions (1.2) for a specified $u(t)=u_{1}(t), \ldots, u_{r}(t)$, let $N(t)$ be a symmetric negative-definite square matrix with continuous coefficients, and let = denote transposition.

It is required to find $u(t) \in U$ such that the functional

$$
\begin{equation*}
J(u)=\int_{0}^{T} X^{*}(t, u) N(t) X(t, u) d t \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

takes on its minimum possible value.
We shall describe below a successive-approximations method for minimising the functional equation (1.4). The method is illustrated for the case in which the functional is of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
J(u)=\int_{0}^{T} X^{*}(t, u) X(t, u) d t \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

2. Solution of the auxiliary problem. Let $C(t)$ be an arbitrary continuous real n-dimensional vector function; it is required that we find among the control functions mentioned in Section 1, the one which will minimize the functional

$$
\begin{equation*}
J_{C}(u)=\int_{0}^{T} X^{*}(t, u) C(t) d t \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

If we know a fundamental system $Y(t)$ for the homogeneous part of equation (1.1), the solution of the system (1.1) with the initial conditions (1.2) is obtained by Cauchy's formula

$$
\begin{equation*}
X(t)=Y(t) X_{0}+\int_{0}^{t} \sum_{i=1}^{r} Y(t) Y^{-1}(\tau) B_{i}(\tau) u_{i}(\tau) d \tau+\int_{0}^{t} Y(t) Y^{-1}(\tau) F(\tau) d \tau \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

This means that for any choice of $u_{1}(t), \ldots, u_{r}(t)$ the value of the functional (2.1) can be calculated

$$
\begin{aligned}
J_{C}(u)= & \int_{0}^{T} C^{*}(t)\left[Y(t) X_{0}+\int_{0}^{t} Y(t) Y^{-1}(\tau) F(\tau) d \tau+\right. \\
& \left.+\int_{0}^{t} \sum_{i=1}^{r} Y(t) Y^{-1}(\tau) B_{i}(\tau) u_{i}(\tau) d \tau\right] d t
\end{aligned}
$$

Let us consider

$$
J_{i}=\int_{0}^{T} \int_{0}^{T} C^{*}(t)\left[Y(t) Y^{-1}(\tau) B_{i}(\tau)\right] u_{i}(\tau) d \tau d t \quad(i=1, \ldots, r)
$$

## We integrate by parts

$$
\begin{gathered}
J_{i}=\int_{0}^{T}[\omega(T)-\omega(t)]^{*}\left[Y^{-1}(t) B_{i}(t)\right] u_{i}(t) d t \\
\omega(t)=\int_{0}^{t} Y^{*}(\tau) c(\tau) d \tau, \quad \omega(T)-\omega(t)=\int_{t}^{T} Y^{*}(\tau) C(\tau) d \tau
\end{gathered}
$$

Since

$$
J_{C}(u)=\int_{0}^{T} C^{*}(t) Y(t) X_{0} d t+\sum_{i=1}^{r} J_{i}+\int_{0}^{T} C^{*}(t) \int_{0}^{t} Y(t) Y^{-1}(\tau) F(\tau) d \tau d t
$$

it follows that $J_{C}(u)$ will take on minimum value if and only if

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{i}(t)=-\operatorname{sign}\left\{\left[\int_{t}^{T} Y^{*}(\tau) C(\tau) d \tau\right]^{*}\left[Y^{-1}(t) B_{i}(t)\right]\right\} \quad(i=1, \ldots, r) \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\operatorname{sign} a=1 \quad(a>0), \quad \operatorname{sign} a=0 \quad(a=0), \quad \operatorname{sign} a=-1 \quad(a<0)
$$

Thus, if the fundamental matrix $Y(t)$ is known, the solution of the auxiliary problem is given by the formula (2.3).
3. The successive-approximation method. Let us take an arbitrary control function $u^{l}(t) \in U$. Let $X_{1}(t)$ be a solution of the system (1.1) with the initial condition (1.2) for $u(t)=u^{l}(t)$. We solve the auxiliary problem for $C(t)=X_{1}(t)$. Let $v^{1}(t)$ be the control function which yields a minimum value for the auxiliary problem, and let $X_{1}(t)$ be the solution corresponding to this control function. We set

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\int_{0}^{T} X_{n}^{*}(t) X_{n}(t) d t=\theta_{n}, & \int_{0}^{T} X_{n}^{*}(t) \chi_{n}(t) d t=\varphi_{n} \\
\int_{0}^{T} \chi_{n}^{*}(t) \chi_{n}(t) d t=\psi_{n}, \quad & \int_{0}^{T} X^{*}(t) X(t) d t=\theta
\end{array}
$$

Then $\varphi_{1} \leqslant \theta_{1}$. If the equality $\varphi_{1}=\theta_{1}$ holds, then $u^{1}(t)$ is already the optimal control function and the process is terminated. In the case $\varphi_{1}<\theta_{1}$ we proceed as follows
a) if $\psi_{1} \leqslant \varphi_{1}$, we set

$$
u^{2}(t)=v^{1}(t), \quad X_{2}(t)=\chi_{1}(t)
$$

b) if $\psi_{1}>\varphi_{1}$, we construct

$$
u(t)=\alpha u^{1}(t)+(1-\alpha) v^{1}(t) \quad(0<\alpha<1)
$$

In view of the linearity of the system (1.1), the corresponding solution is of the form

$$
X(t)=\alpha X_{1}(t)+(1-\alpha) \chi_{1}(t)
$$

Me select $\alpha$ such that $\theta$ takes on its minimum value (among all $\alpha \in(0,1))$. As is readily shown, this will be true for

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha=\frac{\psi_{1}-\varphi_{1}}{\theta_{1}-2 \varphi_{1}+\psi_{1}} \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

We take

$$
u^{2}(t)=\alpha u^{1}(t)+(1-\alpha) v^{1}(t), \quad X_{2}(t)=\alpha X_{1}(t)+(1-\alpha) \chi_{1}(t)
$$

where $\alpha$ is chosen by formula (3.1); then $\theta_{2}<\theta_{1}$, and so on.
Thus, we can always select $X_{2}(t)$ if $u^{1}(t)$ is not optimal. Solving the auxiliary problem for $C(t)=X_{2}(t)$, we obtain $X_{2}(t)$ and proceed thereafter as before. The resulting sequences $u^{1}(t), u^{2}(t), \ldots, X_{1}(t)$, $X_{2}(t), \ldots$, are such that $\theta_{m+1} \leqslant \theta_{m}$; if the equality holds in any of these cases, the optimal control function has been found and the process is terminated. The sequence $\theta_{m}$ is convergent. If $Q^{2}$ denotes the minimum possible value of the functional (1.5) - the lower bound of the functional (1.5) on $u(t) \in U$ is actually reached, as will be shown later - then

$$
\sigma_{m} \frac{\varphi_{m}^{2}}{\theta_{m}} \leqslant Q^{2} \leqslant \theta_{m}, \quad \sigma_{m}=1 \quad\left(\varphi_{m}>0\right), \quad \sigma_{m}=0 \quad\left(\varphi_{m} \leqslant 0\right)
$$

Thus, at each step we know the intervals in which the minimum of the functional occurs.
4. The fumamental theorem. The successive-approximations described in Section 3 monotonically reduce the values of the functional $J(u)$.

The sequence of functions $X_{1}(t), X_{2}(t), \ldots$, converges on $[0, T]$ to a continuous vector function $C_{0}(t)$, and the sequence of values $\theta_{1}$. $\theta_{2}, \ldots$ converges to

$$
\min _{u \in U} \int_{0}^{T} X^{*}(t, u) X(t, u) d t
$$

An optimal control function exists. Moreover, for those $i$ for which the set $\Omega_{i}$ of the zeros of the function

$$
\Phi_{i}(t)=\left[\int_{i}^{T} Y^{*}(\tau) C_{0}(\tau) d \tau\right]^{*}\left[Y^{-1}(t) B_{i}(t)\right]
$$

is of the measure zero, the corresponding $u_{i}{ }^{m}(t)$ converge in measure to
a uniquely defined optimal control function $u_{i}(t)$.
Proof. It has already been established that

$$
\left\|X_{m}\right\|=\sqrt{\theta_{m}} \rightarrow C \quad \text { if } m \rightarrow \infty
$$

If $X_{0} \neq 0$, the $C>0$. We first show that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{m \rightarrow \infty}\left[\min _{u \in U} \int_{0}^{T} X^{*}(t, u) X_{m}(t) d t\right]=\inf \lim _{m \rightarrow \infty} \Psi_{m} \geqslant C^{2} \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let us assume that this is false, that is, that there exists an $r_{0}>0$, such that for every $N$ we can find an $m>N$ for which

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi_{m}=C^{2}-r_{m} \leqslant C^{2}-r_{0} \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

We shall consider only those $X_{m}(t)$ for which the inequality (4.2) holds. It should be noted in that case $\psi_{m}>\varphi_{m}$, since otherwise we would have $\psi_{m} \leqslant \theta_{m}$ by our rule for the selection of $X_{m+1}(t)=X_{m}(t)$; but for $X_{m}(t)$

$$
\varphi_{m} \leqslant \varphi_{m} \leqslant C^{2}-r_{0}<C^{2}
$$

which contradicts the statement that $\left\|X_{m}\right\|$ is a decreasing sequence with the limit $C$. Therefore $\Psi_{m}>\varphi_{m}$, so that

$$
X_{m+1}(t)=\alpha X_{m}(t)+(1-\alpha) \chi_{m}(t)
$$

where $\alpha$ is chosen by formula (3.1). Then

$$
\theta_{m+1}=\alpha^{2}\left[\theta_{m}-2 \varphi_{m}+\psi_{m}\right]_{l}+2 \alpha\left[\varphi_{m}-\psi_{m}\right]+\psi_{m}=\frac{\theta_{m} \psi_{m}-\varphi_{m}^{2}}{\theta_{m}-2 \varphi_{m}+\psi_{m}}
$$

Having selected m such that

$$
\theta_{m}=C^{2}+\varepsilon_{m}, \quad \varepsilon_{m} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text { if } \quad m \rightarrow \infty
$$

we have

$$
\theta_{m+1}=\frac{C^{2}\left[\psi_{m}+\psi_{m} \varepsilon_{m} / C^{2}-C^{2}+2 r_{m}-r_{m}^{2} / C^{2}\right]}{\psi_{m}+\varepsilon_{m}-C^{2}+2 r_{m}}<C^{2}
$$

since $\psi_{m}$ is bounded (by the properties of a linear system, each coordinate is bounded, so that the integral $\Psi_{m}$ is also bounded). But the inequality $\theta_{m+1}<C^{2}$ is impossible, since $\left\|X_{m}\right\|$ tends to $C$ from above. From this follows the inequality (4.1). But, since $\varphi_{m} \leqslant \theta_{m}$, it is true that $\varphi_{m} \rightarrow C^{2}$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$.

Let us now consider the sequence

$$
\begin{equation*}
X_{1}(t), X_{2}(t), \ldots \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

This is a sequence of vector functions which are differentiable on $[0, T]$. From the properties of linear systems it follows that the sequences of coordinates

$$
\left(x_{1}{ }^{1}(t), x_{2}{ }^{1}(t), \ldots\right), \quad\left(x_{1}{ }^{2}(t), x_{2}^{2}(t), \ldots\right), \ldots, \quad\left(x_{1}^{n}(t), x_{2}{ }^{n}(t), \ldots\right)
$$

are equicontinuous and uniformly bounded on $[0, T]$.
Then, by the Arzela-Ascoli theorem [1], we can select a convergent sub-sequence of vector functions such that their limit is also a continuous vector function. Let us assume that there are two sub-sequences

$$
\begin{array}{rrr}
X_{m_{1}}(t), & X_{m_{2}}(t), \ldots, & X_{m_{j}}(t) \xrightarrow[j \rightarrow \infty]{\longrightarrow} C_{0}(t) \\
X_{m_{1}}^{\prime}(t), & X_{m_{2}}^{\prime}(t), \ldots, & X_{m_{i}}^{\prime}(t) \xrightarrow[i \rightarrow \infty]{ } C_{0}^{\prime}(t) .
\end{array}
$$

and let

$$
C_{0}(t) \neq C_{0}^{\prime}(t), \quad\left\|C_{0}\right\|=\left\|C_{0}^{\prime}\right\|=C
$$

Then

$$
\int_{0}^{T} C_{0}^{*}(t) C_{0}^{\prime}(t) d t \leqslant C^{2}-\rho_{0}, \quad \rho_{0}>0 \quad \int_{0}^{T}\left[C_{0}(t)-C_{0^{\prime}}(t)\right]^{8} d t>0
$$

(the last inequality holds by virtue of the fact that $C_{0}(t)$ and $C_{0}{ }^{\prime}(t)$ are continuous vector functions and do not coincide identically). Then

$$
\int_{0}^{T} C_{0}{ }^{*}(t) C_{0}{ }^{\prime}(t) d t<\frac{1}{2}\left[\int_{0}^{T} C_{0}^{2}(t) d t+\int_{0}^{T} C_{0}{ }^{2}(t) d t\right]=C^{2}
$$

 we obtain

$$
\int_{0}^{T} X_{m_{i}}^{* *}(t) X_{m_{j}}(t) d t \leqslant C^{2}-\rho_{0}+\varepsilon<C^{2}
$$

since $E$ can be made arbitrarily saall. But in that case

$$
\min _{u \in U} \int_{0}^{T} X_{m_{j}}^{*}(t) X(t, u) d t \leqslant \int_{0}^{T} X_{m_{j}}^{*}(t) X_{m_{i}}^{\prime}(t) d t<C^{2}
$$

which contradicts the inequality (4.1). Hence the sequence of functions (4.3) converges to some continuous vector function $C_{0}(t)$.

Let us show that

Construction of an integral-optimal programmed control function

$$
\theta_{m} \rightarrow \min _{u \in U} \int_{0}^{T} X^{*}(t, u) X(t, u) d t \quad \text { as } m \rightarrow \infty
$$

Suppose this is false: that is, suppose that there exists some $w(t) \in U$ such that

$$
\int_{0}^{T} X^{*}(t, w) X(t, w) d t<C^{2}
$$

Then, having selected $X_{m}(t)$ close to $C_{0}(t)$, we obtain

$$
\int_{0}^{T} X_{m}^{*}(t) X(t, w) d t<C^{2}
$$

Then we also have

$$
\min _{u \in U} \int_{0}^{T} X_{m}^{*}(t) X(t, u) d t \leqslant \int_{0}^{T} X_{m}^{*}(t) X(t, w) d t<C^{2}
$$

which contradicts the inequality (4, 1). Thus

$$
\theta_{m} \rightarrow \min _{u \in U} \int_{0}^{\mathbf{r}} X^{*}(t, u) X(t, u) d t \quad \text { as } \quad m \rightarrow \infty
$$

but in that case we also have

$$
\int_{0}^{T} X_{m}^{*}(t) C_{0}(t) d t \rightarrow \min _{u \in U} \int_{0}^{T} X^{*}(t, u) C_{0}(t) d t \quad \text { as } m \rightarrow \infty
$$

and, by Section 2, for those $i$ for which the set $\Omega_{i}$ of the zeros of the functions

$$
\Phi_{i}(t)=\left[\int_{0}^{T} Y^{*}(\tau) C_{0}(r) d \tau\right]^{*}\left[Y^{-1}(t) B_{i}(t)\right]
$$

is of measure zero, the corresponding $u_{i}{ }^{m}(t)$ converge in measure to a uniquely defined optimal control function

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{i}^{*}(t)=-\operatorname{sign} \Phi_{i}(t) \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

We have thus proved that such an optimal control function exists.
In $[2$, pp. 146,147$]$ it is, in fact, proved that in an arbitrary case (independently of the measure of the sets $\Omega_{i}$ ) an optimal control function exists. On the sets $[0, T]-\Omega_{i}$ the corresponding optimal control
function $u_{i}(t)$ is uniquely defined and coincides with (4.4).
The optimal solution (trajectory) $X(t)$ is uniquely defined, as has already been shown. The vector function $X(t)$ has a uniquely defined derivative, but this is not enough to prove the uniqueness of the optimal control function, since the equation

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{r} B_{i}(t) u_{i}(t)=X^{\circ}(t)-A(t) X(t)-F(t) \quad(t \in[0, T])
$$

may be satisfied by several control functions $u(t) \in U$ (here $X(t)$ is assumed to be a known vector function).
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