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1. Introduction

The aim of this work is to study optimal control problems associated with a linear elliptic equation and homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions. The control variable is the matrix of $L^1$-coefficients in the main part of elliptic operator. Existence or non-existence of $L^1$-optimal solutions heavily depends on the class of admissible controls. The main questions concern the appropriate space-setting for the optimal control problem with $L^1$-controls in the coefficients and the right choice of class of admissible solutions. Using the direct method...
in the Calculus of variations, we discuss the solvability of the above optimal control problems in the class of $H$-admissible solutions.

Note that optimal control problems in coefficients for elliptic equations are not new in the literature. As François Murat showed in 1970 (see [22, 23]), in general, such problems have no solution even if the original elliptic equation is non-degenerate. It turns out that this feature is typical for the majority of problems for optimal control in coefficients. Note that this topic has been widely studied by many authors in the case of non-degenerate weight function. We mainly could mention Allaire [1], Calvo-Jurado & Casado-Díaz [9], Haslinger & Neittaanmaki [13], Kapustyan & Kogut [14], Lions [18], Litvinov [19], Lurie [20], Murat [23], Murat & Tartar [25], Pironneau [28], Raytum [29], Sokolowski & Zolesio [30].

In this paper we deal with an optimal control problem in coefficients for the boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases}
-\text{div} B(x) \nabla y + y = f & \text{in } \Omega \\
y = 0 & \text{on } \partial \Omega,
\end{cases} \tag{1}$$

where $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ is a given function and $B$ is a non negative invertible matrix such that $B + B^{-1} \in L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{N \times N})$. Several physical phenomena related to equilibrium of continuous media are modeled by this elliptic problem. While the scalar situation discussed in this paper relates e.g. to conductivity problems, where $B(x)$ may represent a perfect conductor or a perfect insulator (see [11]), vector-valued analogues, which are under investigation, refer to problems in elasticity, where, in turn, $B(x)$ represents the elasticity tensor which may vanish for voids or damaged regions. In order to be able to handle such situations, we allow the matrix $B$ to vanish on thin sets in $\Omega$ or to be unbounded there.

In Section 4 we will further concentrate on matrices $B(x)$ that admit a decomposition $B(x) = \rho(x) A(x)$ where the scalar coefficient $\rho(x)$ may degenerate, but satisfies certain bound-constraints almost everywhere as well as a “volume-type” constraint. The classical SIMP-approach to topology optimization [2] is reminiscent of the optimal control problem handled in this paper. In the SIMP-approach the function $\rho(\cdot)$ is taken as a so-called pseudo-density. However, in contrast to the modeling in this paper, the pseudo-density is taken to satisfy a positive lower bound, which is not assumed here. In a sense, the problem handled here is more general. In the context of image registration degenerate problems of the kind discussed in this paper occur, if one considers an optimal masking of thin features represented by $\rho$.

Even though numerous papers (see, for instance, [8, 26, 27, 34] and references there) are devoted to variational and non variational approaches to problems related to (1), only few papers deal with optimal control problems for degenerate partial differential equations (see, for example, [4, 6, 7]). This can be explained by several reasons. Firstly, boundary value problem (1) for every locally in-
tegrable matrix $B$ exhibit the Lavrentieff phenomenon, the non-uniqueness of weak solutions, as well as other surprising consequences. So, in general, the mapping $B \mapsto y(B)$ can be multi-valued. Besides, the characteristic feature of this problem is the fact that for different admissible controls $B$ with properties prescribed above, the corresponding weak solutions of (1) belong to different weighted Sobolev spaces. In addition, even if the original elliptic equation is non-degenerate, i.e., admissible controls $B$ are such that

$$B(x) \geq \alpha I, \quad (B(x))^{-1} \geq \beta^{-1} I, \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega,$$

the majority of optimal control problems in coefficients have no solution.

Our paper is organized as follow: at the beginning we state the problem of optimal control in the coefficients and prescribe the class of admissible controls which includes some div-like conditions in weighted spaces. After that we discuss the classification of admissible solutions to the above optimal control problem. We show that one of the characteristic features of this problem is the following fact: for every admissible $L^1$-control the corresponding $H$-solution to the boundary value problem belongs to a weighted Sobolev space which essentially depends on the original control. So, the set of the so-called $H$-admissible solutions to the above problem can be viewed as a collection of pairs "control-state" in variable spaces each of which is embedded into $L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{N \times N} \times W^{1,1}_0(\Omega))$.

Further we deal with the existence of optimal solutions to the original problem. We begin with a refinement of the celebrated div-curl lemma of F. Murat and L.C. Tartar [24] to the case of variable weighted Sobolev spaces. After that we study the topological properties of the class of $H$-admissible solutions and show that this set possesses some compactness properties with respect to the appropriate convergence in variable spaces. In conclusion, using the direct method in the Calculus of variations, we prove the existence of the $H$-optimal solutions to the original problem.

2. Notation and Preliminaries

In this section we introduce some notation and preliminaries that will be useful later on.

Let $\Omega$ be a bounded open subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$ ($N \geq 1$) with a Lipschitz boundary. Let $\chi_E$ be the characteristic function of a subset $E \subseteq \Omega$, i.e., $\chi_E(x) = 1$ if $x \in E$, and $\chi_E(x) = 0$ if $x \notin E$. The space $W^{1,1}_0(\Omega)$ is the closure of $C^\infty_0(\Omega)$ in the classical Sobolev space $W^{1,1}(\Omega)$. For any subset $E \subset \Omega$ we denote by $|E|$ its $N$-dimensional Lebesgue measure $L^N(E)$. Let $M_0^\beta(\Omega)$ be the set of all matrices $A = [a_{ij}]$ in $L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{N \times N})$ such that

$$A(x) \geq \alpha I, \quad (A(x))^{-1} \geq \beta^{-1} I, \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega$$

(2)
for two fixed constants $\alpha$ and $\beta$ with $0 < \alpha \leq \beta < +\infty$. Here $I$ is the identity matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$, and inequalities (2) should be considered in the sense of the quadratic forms defined by $(A\xi, \xi)_{\mathbb{R}^N}$ for $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Note that (2) implies the inequality $|A(x)| \leq \beta$ a.e. in $\Omega$.

Hereinafter by a weight we mean a locally integrable function $\rho$ on $\mathbb{R}^N$ such that $\rho(x) > 0$ for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. As a matter of fact, every weight $\rho$ gives rise to a measure on the measurable subsets of $\mathbb{R}^N$ through integration. This measure will also be denoted by $\rho$. Thus $\rho(\mathcal{E}) = \int_{\mathcal{E}} \rho \, dx$ for measurable sets $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathbb{R}^N$. We will use the standard notation $L^2(\Omega, \rho \, dx)$ for the set of measurable functions $f$ on $\Omega$ such that $\|f\|_{L^2(\Omega, \rho \, dx)} = \left(\int_{\Omega} f^2 \rho \, dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < +\infty$.

**Definition 2.1.** We say that a weight function $\rho : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is degenerate on $\Omega$ if $\rho + \rho^{-1} \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, and the sum $\rho + \rho^{-1}$ does not belong to $L^\infty(\Omega)$.

With each of the degenerate weight functions $\rho$ we will associate two weighted Sobolev spaces $W_\rho = W(\Omega, \rho \, dx)$ and $H_\rho = H(\Omega, \rho \, dx)$, where $W_\rho$ is the set of functions $y \in W^{1,1}_0(\Omega)$ for which the norm $\|y\|_\rho = \left(\int_{\Omega} (y^2 + \rho |\nabla y|^2) \, dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is finite, and $H_\rho$ is the closure of $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ in the $W_\rho$-norm. Note that due to the compact embedding $W^{1,1}_0(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^1(\Omega)$ and estimates

$$\int_{\Omega} |y| \, dx \leq |\Omega| \left(\int_{\Omega} |y|^2 \, dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \sqrt{|\Omega|} \|y\|_\rho, \quad (3)$$

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla y| \, dx \leq \left(\int_{\Omega} |\nabla y|^2 \rho \, dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\Omega} \rho^{-1} \, dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C \|y\|_\rho, \quad (4)$$

we come to the following result (we refer to [34] for the details):

**Theorem 2.2.** Let $\rho : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be a degenerate weight on $\Omega$. Then

(i) the spaces $H_\rho$ and $W_\rho$ are complete with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_\rho$

(ii) $H_\rho \subseteq W_\rho$, and $W_\rho$, $H_\rho$ are Hilbert spaces

(iii) $H_\rho \subseteq W^{1,1}_0(\Omega)$, $W_\rho \subseteq W^{1,1}_0(\Omega)$, and the estimate

$$\|v\|_{W^{1,1}_0(\Omega)} \leq \left(\sqrt{|\Omega|} + \left(\int_{\Omega} \rho^{-1} \, dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \|v\|_\rho$$

is valid for every element $v \in W_\rho$

(iv) the embeddings $H_\rho \hookrightarrow L^1(\Omega)$ and $W_\rho \hookrightarrow L^1(\Omega)$ are compact.
If \( \rho \) is a non-degenerate weight function, that is, \( \rho \) is bounded between two positive constants, then it is easy to verify that \( W_\rho = H_\rho \). Note also that in the case when the weight function \( \rho \) belongs to the class of \( A_2 \) weights that was introduced by B. Muckenhoupt in the early 1970’s (see [21]), then \( W_\rho = H_\rho \) as well. However, for a “typical” degenerate weight \( \rho \) the space of smooth functions \( C_0^\infty(\Omega) \) is not dense in \( W_\rho \). Hence the identity \( W_\rho = H_\rho \) is not always valid (for the corresponding examples we refer to [10,31]).

3. Radon measures and convergence in variable spaces

We recall here the definition and main properties of convergence in variable \( L^2 \)-spaces with respect to Radon measures (see, for instance, [33]).

By a nonnegative Radon measure on \( \Omega \) we mean a nonnegative Borel measure which is finite on every compact subset of \( \Omega \). The space of all nonnegative Radon measures on \( \Omega \) will be denoted by \( \mathcal{M}_+(\Omega) \). If \( \mu \) is a nonnegative Radon measure on \( \Omega \), we will use \( L^r(\Omega, d\mu) \), \( 1 \leq r \leq \infty \), to denote the usual Lebesgue space with respect to the measure \( \mu \) with the corresponding norm

\[
\|f\|_{L^r(\Omega, d\mu)} = \left( \int_{\Omega} |f(x)|^r \, d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{r}}.
\]

Let \( \{\mu_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) be Radon measures such that \( \mu_k \rightharpoonup \mu \) in \( \mathcal{M}_+(\Omega) \), i.e.,

\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \int_{\Omega} \varphi \, d\mu_k = \int_{\Omega} \varphi \, d\mu \quad \forall \, \varphi \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^N),
\]

(5)

where \( C_0(\mathbb{R}^N) \) is the space of all compactly supported continuous functions. The typical example of such measures is

\[
d\mu_k = \rho_k(x) \, dx, \quad d\mu = \rho(x) \, dx, \quad \text{where } 0 \leq \rho_k \to \rho \text{ in } L^1(\Omega).
\]

1. A sequence \( \{v_k \in L^2(\Omega, d\mu_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) is called bounded if

\[
\limsup_{k \to \infty} \int_{\Omega} |v_k|^2 \, d\mu_k < +\infty.
\]

2. A bounded sequence \( \{v_k \in L^2(\Omega, d\mu_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) converges weakly to an element \( v \in L^2(\Omega, d\mu) \) if

\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \int_{\Omega} v_k \varphi \, d\mu_k = \int_{\Omega} v \varphi \, d\mu \quad \text{for any } \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega),
\]

which is denoted as \( v_k \rightharpoonup v \) in \( L^2(\Omega, d\mu_k) \).
3. Strong convergence $v_k \to v$ in $L^2(\Omega, d\mu_k)$ means that $v \in L^2(\Omega, d\mu)$ and
\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \int_{\Omega} v_k z_k \, d\mu_k = \int_{\Omega} vz \, d\mu \quad \text{as } z_k \rightharpoonup z \text{ in } L^2(\Omega, d\mu_k).
\]
The following convergence properties in variable spaces are well known:

(a) Compactness criterion: If the sequence is bounded in $L^2(\Omega, d\mu_k)$, then this sequence is compact w.r.t. the weak convergence in $L^2(\Omega, d\mu_k)$.

(b) Property of lower semicontinuity: If $v_k \rightharpoonup v$ in $L^2(\Omega, d\mu_k)$, then
\[
\liminf_{k \to \infty} \int_{\Omega} |v_k|^2 \, d\mu_k \geq \int_{\Omega} v^2 \, d\mu.
\]

(c) Criterion of strong convergence: $v_k \to v$ if and only if $v_k \rightharpoonup v$ in $L^2(\Omega, d\mu_k)$ and
\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \int_{\Omega} |v_k|^2 \, d\mu_k = \int_{\Omega} v^2 \, d\mu.
\]

In what follows, we make use the following results concerning the convergence in the variable space $L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx)$.

Lemma 3.1 ([33]). Let $\{\rho_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of non-negative functions of $L^1(\Omega)$ such that $\rho_k \to \rho$ in $L^1(\Omega)$. Then the following statements hold true:

(B1) If a sequence $\{v_k \in L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded, then weak convergence $v_k \rightharpoonup v$ in $L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx)$ is equivalent to weak convergence $\rho_k v_k \rightharpoonup \rho v$ in $L^1(\Omega)$.

(B2) If $a \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $v_k \rightharpoonup v$ in $L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx)$, then $av_k \rightharpoonup av$ in $L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx)$.

Throughout the paper we will often use the concepts of weak and strong convergence in $L^1(\Omega)$. Recall also several definitions and facts about convergence in the classical $L^1$-space. Let $\{a_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $L^1(\Omega)$. We recall that $\{a_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is called equi-integrable if for any $\delta > 0$ there is $\tau = \tau(\delta)$ such that $\int_S |a_k| \, dx < \delta$ for every measurable subset $S \subset \Omega$ of Lebesgue measure $|S| < \tau$.

Then the following assertions are equivalent:

(i) a sequence $\{a_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is weakly compact in $L^1(\Omega)$;
(ii) the sequence $\{a_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is equi-integrable;
(iii) given $\delta > 0$ there exists $\lambda = \lambda(\delta)$ such that $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \int_{|a_k| > 2\lambda} |a_k| \, dx < \delta$.

Theorem 3.2 (Lebesgue’s Theorem). If a sequence $\{a_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset L^1(\Omega)$ is equi-integrable and $a_k \rightharpoonup a$ almost everywhere in $\Omega$ then $a_k \to a$ in $L^1(\Omega)$.

4. Setting of the Optimal Control Problem

Let $\xi_1, \xi_2$ be given elements of $L^1(\Omega)$ satisfying the conditions
\[
0 < \xi_1(x) \leq \xi_2(x) \text{ a.e. in } \Omega, \quad \xi_1^{-1} \in L^1(\Omega).
\]
Let $m \in \mathbb{R}_+$ be a positive value such that $\|\xi_1\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq m \leq \|\xi_2\|_{L^1(\Omega)}$. Let $S$ be a nonempty compact subset of $L^1(\Omega)$ satisfying
\[ S \cap \{ g \in L^1(\Omega) : \xi_1(x) \leq g(x) \leq \xi_2(x) \text{ a.e. in } \Omega \} \neq \emptyset. \quad (7) \]

In order to introduce the class of admissible $L^1$-controls, we adopt the following concept:

**Definition 4.1.** For given $\rho \in L^1(\Omega)$ and $\vec{v} \in [L^2(\Omega, \rho\,dx)]^N$ we say that an element $g \in L^2(\Omega)$ is the divergence of the vector field $\vec{v}$ with respect to the weight $\rho$ (in symbols $g(x) = \text{div}_\rho(\vec{v}(x))$), if $\vec{v}$ and $g$ are related by the formula
\[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} g(x)\varphi(x)\rho(x)\,dx = -\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\vec{v}(x), \nabla \varphi(x))_\mathbb{R}^N \rho(x)\,dx \quad \forall \varphi \in C^\infty_0(\Omega). \quad (8) \]

**Definition 4.2.** We say that a matrix $B \in L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{N \times N})$ is an admissible control to the Dirichlet problem
\[ -\text{div} B(x)\nabla y + y = f \quad \text{in } \Omega \]
\[ y = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial \Omega. \quad (9) \]

(it is written as $B \in \mathcal{B}_{ad}$) if there is a matrix $A = [\vec{a}_1, \ldots, \vec{a}_N] \in L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{N \times N})$ and a weight $\rho \in L^1(\Omega)$ such that
\[ B(x) = A(x)\rho(x), \quad A \in M^2_\alpha(\Omega) \quad (11) \]
\[ |\text{div}_\rho \vec{a}_i| \leq \gamma_i \quad \rho\text{-a.e. in } \Omega, \quad \forall i = 1, \ldots, N \quad (12) \]
\[ \rho \in \mathcal{R}_{ad}. \quad (13) \]

Here
\[ \mathcal{R}_{ad} = \left\{ \rho \in S : \int_{\Omega} \rho\,dx = m, \quad \xi_1(x) \leq \rho(x) \leq \xi_2(x) \text{ a.e. in } \Omega \right\}, \quad (14) \]

$f \in L^2(\Omega)$, $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is a given positive vector, and elements $\text{div}_\rho \vec{a}_i \in L^2(\Omega, \rho\,dx)$ are defined by (8).

**Remark 4.3.** As an example of a compact subset $S$ of $L^1(\Omega)$, we have (see [12])
\[ S = \left\{ f \in L^1(\Omega) : \|f\|_{L^1(\Omega)} + \int_{\Omega} |Df| \leq C \right\}, \]
where the variation $\int_{\Omega} |Df|$ of a measure $Df$ is defined as follows
\[ \int_{\Omega} |Df| = \sup \left\{ \int_{\Omega} f \text{div} \varphi \,dx : \varphi = (\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_N) \in C^1_0(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N), |\varphi(x)| \leq 1 \text{ for } x \in \Omega \right\} \]
and $\text{div} \varphi = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial \varphi_i}{\partial x_i}$. 

Optimal $L^1$-Control in Coefficients
Remark 4.4. As follows from Definition 4.2 and properties (6)–(7), for every admissible control $B \in L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{N\times N})$ we deal with the boundary value problem for the degenerate elliptic equation

$$-\text{div} \left( \rho A(x) \nabla y \right) + y = f \quad \text{in} \ \Omega, \quad y \in W_0^{1,1}(\Omega). \quad (15)$$

It means that for some admissible matrices of coefficients $B \in \mathcal{B}_{ad}$ the boundary value problem (9)–(10) can exhibit the Lavrentieff phenomenon [31] as well as other surprising consequences.

The optimal control problem we consider in this paper is to minimize the difference between a given distribution $y_d \in L^2(\Omega)$ and the solution of the Dirichlet problem (9)–(10) by choosing an appropriate matrix of coefficients $B \in \mathcal{B}_{ad}$. More precisely, we are concerned with the following optimal control problem

$$\text{Minimize} \ \left\{ I(B, y) = \zeta \int_{\Omega} |y(x) - y_d(x)|^2 \, dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla y(x)|^2 \rho \, dx \right\}$$

subject to the constraints (11)–(13). \quad (16)

Here $\zeta > 0$ is a penalization parameter.

For our further analysis we make use the following observation. Let $B = A\rho \in \mathcal{B}_{ad}$ be an admissible control, and let $A$ be a symmetric matrix. Then the quadratic form $\Phi(y) = \int_{\Omega} A(x) \nabla y \cdot \nabla y \rho \, dx$ with domain $W_\rho \subset L^2(\Omega)$ is closed and corresponds to a non-negative self-adjoint operator $A_W = -\text{div} \rho A \nabla$ in $L^2(\Omega)$. At the same time this form will also be closed in $H_\rho \subset L^2(\Omega)$, which leads to another non-negative self-adjoint operator $A_H = -\text{div} \rho A \nabla$ in $L^2(\Omega)$. Thus, there exist at least two different problems

$$A_W y + y = f \quad \text{and} \quad A_H y + y = f, \quad (17)$$

relating to boundary value problem (9)–(10). As we will see later, each of the problem (17) is uniquely solvable. So, the mapping $B \mapsto y(B, f)$, where $y(B, f)$ is a solution to problem (9)–(10), is multivalued, in general.

5. Classification of optimal solutions

In view of the observation given above, we adopt the classification of the solutions to the boundary valued problem (9)–(10) following Pastukhova & Zhikov [34] (for more details and other types of solutions we refer to [3, 16, 33]).

Definition 5.1. We say that a function $y = y(B, f) = y(A, \rho, f) \in W_\rho$ is a weak solution to the boundary value problem (9)–(10) for a fixed control $B = A\rho \in \mathcal{B}_{ad}$ and a given function $f \in L^2(\Omega)$, if the integral identity

$$\int_{\Omega} \left( \left( A(x) \nabla y, \nabla \varphi \right) \rho(x) + y \varphi \right) \, dx = \int_{\Omega} f \varphi \, dx \quad (18)$$

holds for any $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$. 

**Definition 5.2.** Let $V_\rho$ be some intermediate space with $H_\rho \subseteq V_\rho \subseteq W_\rho$. We say that a function $y = y(B, f) = y(A, \rho, f) \in V_\rho$ is a $V_\rho$-solution or a variational solution to the boundary value problem (9)–(10) if the integral identity (18) holds for every test function $\varphi \in V_\rho$.

**Remark 5.3.** Note that for every fixed $B = A\rho \in B_{ad}$ the existence and uniqueness of a $V_\rho$-solution are the direct consequence of the Riesz Representation Theorem. At the same time, the variational solutions do not exhaust the entire set of the weak solutions to the above boundary value problem. Indeed, as follows from [34], a weak solution $y = y(B, f) \in W_\rho$ is a variational one if and only if the energy equality
\[
\int_\Omega \left( \left( A(x) \nabla y, \nabla y \right)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho + y^2 \right) \, dx = \int_\Omega f y \, dx \quad (19)
\]
holds true. Therefore, if $y_1(B, f), y_2(B, f) \in W$ are variational solutions with $y_1(B, f) \neq y_2(B, f)$ (hence they belong to the different intermediate spaces $V_{1,\rho}$ and $V_{2,\rho}$), then
\[
y = \frac{1}{2} (y_1(B, f) + y_2(B, f))
\]
is a weak solution to (9)–(10) but not variational one. Moreover, as follows from Definition 5.1 the set of weak solutions to the boundary value problem (9)–(10) for a fixed control $B = A\rho \in B_{ad}$ is convex and closed. Hence if $y_1(B, f), y_2(B, f) \in W$ are variational solutions such that $y_1(B, f) \neq y_2(B, f)$ then the corresponding set of the weak solutions is infinite.

It is obvious that for every fixed $B \in B_{ad}$, $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$, and $V_\rho(H_\rho \subseteq V_\rho \subseteq W_\rho)$ a variational solution is also a weak solution to the problem (9)–(10). However, the inverse assertion is not true in general. For a “typical” degenerate weight function $\rho$ the space of smooth functions $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ is not dense in $W_\rho$, and hence there is no uniqueness of the weak solutions (see, for instance, [17,33]). However, we can describe a case when the weak solution is unique.

**Lemma 5.4 ([27]).** Assume that the set $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ is dense in $W_\rho$. Then the two concepts of a solution to the boundary value problem (9)–(10), given by Definitions 5.1 and 5.2, coincide and hence the weak solution $y = y(B, f) = y(A, \rho, f) \in W_\rho$ is unique.

Now it is clear that the mapping $B \mapsto y(B, f)$ can be viewed as multivalued in general, and this depends on the choice of the corresponding solutions space $V_\rho$. As a result, the variational formulation of the optimal control problem (11)–(13), (16) can be stated in different forms. Taking this fact into account, we restrict of our analysis to the two sets of admissible solutions for the original
optimal control problem. Namely, we indicate the following sets
\[ \Xi_H = \{(B, y) \mid B = A\rho \in B_{ad}, \ y \in H_\rho, \ (B, y) \text{ are related by } (19)\} , \]
\[ \Xi_W = \{(B, y) \mid B = A\rho \in B_{ad}, \ y \in W_\rho, \ (B, y) \text{ are related by } (19)\} . \]

As was mentioned above (see Remark 5.3), the sets \( \Xi_H \) and \( \Xi_W \) are always nonempty. Hence the corresponding minimization problems
\[ \left\langle \inf_{(B, y) \in \Xi_H} I(B, y) \right\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \left\langle \inf_{(B, y) \in \Xi_W} I(B, y) \right\rangle \] (20)
are regular. However, because of the Lavrentieff effect, it may happen that for some fixed control \( B = A\rho \in B_{ad} \) and a given \( f \in C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^N) \) the corresponding \( H_\rho \)-solution \( y_H(A, \rho, f) \) and \( W_\rho \)-solution \( y_W(A, \rho, f) \) to the boundary value problem (15) are not the same. This implies that the variational problems (20) are essentially different, in general. Hence, the minimizers to (20) can be different as well as \( \inf_{(B, y) \in \Xi_H} I(B, y) \neq \inf_{(B, y) \in \Xi_W} I(B, y) \).

Note that due to the estimates (3)–(4), we have the obvious inclusions
\[ \Xi_H \subset L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{N\times N}) \times W^{1,1}_0(\Omega), \quad \Xi_W \subset L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{N\times N}) \times W^{1,1}_0(\Omega). \]
Taking this fact into account, we adopt the following concept:

**Definition 5.5.** We say that a pair \((B^0, y^0) \in L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{N\times N}) \times W^{1,1}_0(\Omega)\) is an \( H \)-optimal solution to the problem (11)–(13), (16) if
\[ (B^0, y^0) \in \Xi_H \quad \text{and} \quad I(B^0, y^0) = \inf_{(B, y) \in \Xi_H} I(B, y). \]

**Definition 5.6.** We say that a pair \((B^0, y^0) \in L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{N\times N}) \times W^{1,1}_0(\Omega)\) is an \( W \)-optimal solution to the problem (11)–(13), (16) if
\[ (B^0, y^0) \in \Xi_W \quad \text{and} \quad I(B^0, y^0) = \inf_{(B, y) \in \Xi_W} I(B, y). \]

The main question for the optimal control problem (11)–(13), (16) to be answered in this paper is about its solvability in the class of \( H \)-solutions. It should be noted that to the best knowledge of the authors, the existence of optimal pairs to the above problem in the sense of Definition 5.5 has not been studied in the literature.

6. On Compensated Compactness in Weighted Sobolev Spaces

We begin this section with some auxiliary results that will be useful later. Let \( \{(B_k, y_k) = (A_k\rho_k, y_k) \in \Xi_H\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) be any sequence of \( H \)-admissible solutions. With every function \( \rho_k \in \mathcal{R}_{ad} \subset L^1(\Omega) \) we associate the space
\[ X(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx) = \left\{ \tilde{f} \in L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx)^N \mid \text{div}_\rho \tilde{f} \in L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx) \right\} \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N} \]
and endow it with the norm

$$
\|\vec{f}\|_{X(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx)} = \left( \|\vec{f}\|_{L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx)}^2 + \|\text{div}_{\rho_k} \vec{f}\|_{L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx)}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
$$

We say that a sequence \( \{\vec{f}_k \in X(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) is bounded if

$$
\sup_{k \to \infty} \|\vec{f}\|_{X(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx)} < +\infty.
$$

Lemma 6.1. Let \( \{\rho_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) be a sequence in \( \mathcal{R}_{ad} \) such that \( \rho_k \to \rho \) in \( L^1(\Omega) \) as \( k \to \infty \). Then \( \rho \in \mathcal{R}_{ad} \) and \( (\rho_k)^{-1} \to (\rho^{-1}) \) in the variable space \( L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx) \).

Proof. Let \( \rho \in L^1(\Omega) \) be a strong \( L^1 \)-limit of the sequence \( \{\rho_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \). Then the properties (6)–(7) and definition of the set \( \mathcal{R}_{ad} \) (see (14)) immediately lead to the conclusion \( \rho \in \mathcal{R}_{ad} \) and

$$
\int_{\Omega} |\rho_k^{-1}| \, dx \leq \int_{\Omega} |\xi_1^{-1}| \, dx \quad \forall \; k \in \mathbb{N},
$$

i.e., the sequence \( \{\rho_k^{-1}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) is equi-integrable on \( \Omega \). Since \( \xi_2^{-1} \leq \rho_k^{-1} \leq \xi_3^{-1} \) and \( \rho_k \to \rho \) a.e. in \( \Omega \), Lebesgue Theorem implies \( \rho_k^{-1} \to \rho^{-1} \) in \( L^1(\Omega) \). For the remaining part of the proof of this lemma we make use of the ideas of the paper [34]. Let \( \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega) \) be a fixed function. Then the equality

$$
\int_{\Omega} \rho_k^{-1} \varphi \, \rho_k \, dx \equiv \int_{\Omega} \varphi \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \rho^{-1} \varphi \, \rho \, dx \quad \forall \; k \in \mathbb{N}
$$

leads us to the weak convergence \( \rho_k^{-1} \to \rho^{-1} \) in \( L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx) \). It should be stressed here that \( \rho_k \, dx \rightharpoonup \rho \, dx \) in the space of Radon measures \( \mathcal{M}_+(\Omega) \) (see (5)). However, taking into account the strong convergence \( \rho_k^{-1} \to \rho^{-1} \) in \( L^1(\Omega) \) and the fact that \( \Omega \) is a bounded domain, we get

$$
\lim_{k \to \infty} \int_{\Omega} |\rho_k|^{-2} \rho_k \, dx \equiv \lim_{k \to \infty} \int_{\Omega} \rho_k^{-1} \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \rho^{-1} \, dx \equiv \int_{\Omega} |\rho|^{-2} \rho \, dx.
$$

Hence, by the criterium of the strong convergence in \( L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx) \), we come to the required conclusion. The proof is complete. \( \square \)

Further, for every \( k > 0 \) we define a cut-off operator \( T_k : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \) as follows

\( T_k(s) = \max\{\min\{s, k\}, -k\} \). By analogy with the well-known results for the classical Sobolev spaces (see [15]), it is easy to verify the following assertion:

Proposition 6.2. Let \( y \) be an arbitrary element of \( H_\rho \). Then

(i) \( T_k(y) \in H_\rho \) for every \( k > 0 \)

(ii) \( \nabla T_k(y) = \chi_{\{|y|<k\}} \nabla y \) almost everywhere in \( \Omega \)

(iii) \( T_k(y) \to y \) almost everywhere in \( \Omega \) and strongly in \( H_\rho \) as \( k \to \infty \).
Taking these facts into account, we have

**Proposition 6.3.** Let \( \{ \rho_k \}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) be a sequence in \( \mathcal{R}_{ad} \) such that \( \rho_k \to \rho \) in \( L^1(\Omega) \) as \( k \to \infty \). Let \( \{ g_k \in H_{\rho_k} \}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) be a bounded sequence and let \( g_k \to g \) in the variable space \( H_{\rho_k} = H(\Omega, \rho_k dx) \), i.e.,

\[
g_k \to g \text{ in } L^2(\Omega), \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla g_k \to \nabla g \text{ in } L^2(\Omega, \rho_k dx)^N \text{ as } k \to \infty. \tag{21}
\]

Then there exists a decreasing sequence of positive numbers \( \{ \ell_k \}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) such that \( \ell_k \to +\infty \) as \( k \to \infty \), and

\[
T_{\ell_k}(g_k) \to g \quad \text{strongly in } L^1(\Omega) \quad \text{as } k \to \infty. \tag{22}
\]

**Proof.** The key point of the proof is to show that up to a subsequence the element \( g \in L^2(\Omega, \rho \, dx) \) is the strong limit of \( \{ g_k \in H_{\rho_k} \}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) in \( L^1(\Omega) \)-topology. Indeed, properties (21) and estimates

\[
\int_{\Omega} |g_k| \, dx \leq \left( \int_{\Omega} g_k^2 \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{2}},
\]

\[
\int_{\Omega} |\nabla g_k|_{RN} \, dx \leq \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla g_k|_{RN}^2 \rho_k \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{\Omega} \rho_k^{-1} \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C \left( \int_{\Omega} \xi_1^{-1} \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},
\]

imply that the family \( \{ g_k \}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) is equi-integrable on \( \Omega \) and bounded in \( W^{1,1}(\Omega) \). Hence, by compact embedding \( W^{1,1}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^1(\Omega) \) this sequence is compact in \( L^1(\Omega) \) with respect to the strong topology. Passing to a subsequence if necessary, we can assume that there exists an element \( g^* \in L^1(\Omega) \) such that \( g_k \to g^* \) in \( L^1(\Omega) \) as \( k \to \infty \). Hence \( \lim_{k \to \infty} \int_{\Omega} \varphi g_k \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \varphi g^* \, dx \) for all \( \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega) \). On the other side the condition (21) means that

\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \int_{\Omega} \varphi g_k \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \varphi g \, dx \quad \forall \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega).
\]

Hence \( g = g^* \) almost everywhere in \( \Omega \). As a result, we have

\[
g_k \to g \quad \text{strongly in } L^1(\Omega) \quad \text{as } k \to \infty
\]

and by the compactness embedding \( H_{\rho_k} \hookrightarrow L^1(\Omega) \) and property (iii) of Proposition 6.2,

\[
T_{\ell}(g_k) \to g_k \quad \text{strongly in } L^1(\Omega) \quad \text{as } \ell \to +\infty \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.
\]

Hence, having used the diagonal trick, we just to the required conclusion. \( \square \)

Now we are in the position to give the main result of this section (for comparison we refer to the Compensated Compactness Lemma in [5, 24]).
Theorem 6.4. Let \( \{\rho_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \) be a sequence of weights with properties indicated in Lemma 6.1. Let \( \{f_k \in L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx)\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}, \{g_k \in H_{\rho_k}\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}, \vec{f} \in L^2(\Omega, \rho \, dx)^N, \) and \( g \in H_{\rho} \) be such that

(i) \( \{\vec{f}_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \) is bounded in the variable space \( X(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx) \), and \( \vec{f}_k \rightharpoonup \vec{f} \) in \( L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx)^N \) as \( k \to \infty \);

(ii) the sequence \( \{g_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \) is bounded in the variable spaces \( H(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx) \) and \( g_k \to g \) in \( L^2(\Omega), \) and \( \nabla g_k \to \nabla g \) in \( L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx)^N \) as \( k \to \infty \).

Then

\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \int_{\Omega} \varphi \left( \vec{f}_k, \nabla g_k \right)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_k \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \varphi \left( \vec{f}, \nabla g \right)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho \, dx, \quad \forall \varphi \in C^\infty_0(\Omega).
\]

Proof. We divide our proof into several steps. Our first step is to prove that

\[
\text{div}_{\rho_k} \vec{f}_k \rightharpoonup \text{div}_{\rho} \vec{f} \quad \text{in} \quad L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx) \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty.
\]

(23)

Indeed, since the sequence \( \{\text{div}_{\rho_k} \vec{f}_k \in L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx)\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \) is bounded, by the compactness criterium in the variable spaces, we can suppose that there exists an element \( \phi \in L^2(\Omega, \rho \, dx) \) such that \( \text{div}_{\rho_k} \vec{f}_k \rightharpoonup \phi \) in \( L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx) \) as \( k \to \infty \). Then passing to the limit in the relation

\[
\int_{\Omega} \left( \vec{f}_k, \nabla \varphi \right)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_k \, dx = -\int_{\Omega} \varphi \left( \text{div}_{\rho_k} \vec{f}_k \right) \rho_k \, dx \quad \forall \varphi \in C^\infty_0(\Omega)
\]

(24)

as \( k \to \infty \), we obtain

\[
\int_{\Omega} \left( \vec{f}, \nabla \varphi \right)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho \, dx = -\int_{\Omega} \varphi \phi \, dx \quad \forall \varphi \in C^\infty_0(\Omega).
\]

Therefore (see Definition 4.1), the element \( \phi \) is the anisotropic divergence of the vector field \( \vec{f} \in L^2(\Omega, \rho \, dx)^N \) with respect to the weight \( \rho \), i.e., \( \phi = \text{div}_{\rho} \vec{f} \in L^2(\Omega, \rho \, dx) \). So, (23) is valid.

The next step is to study the asymptotic behavior as \( k \to +\infty \) of the following numerical sequence \( \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \varphi \left( \vec{f}_k, \nabla g_k \right)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_k \, dx \right\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \).

To begin with, we note that as was shown in the proof of Proposition 6.3, up to a subsequence the element \( g \in L^2(\Omega, \rho \, dx) \) is the strong limit of \( \{g_k \in H_{\rho_k}\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \) in \( L^1(\Omega) \)-topology. So, we can suppose that

\[
g_k \to g \quad \text{a.e. in} \quad \Omega.
\]

(25)

In view of the estimates

\[
\left| \int_{\Omega} \left( \vec{f}_k, \nabla \varphi \right)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_k \, dx \right| \leq \left( \int_{\Omega} \left| \vec{f}_k \right|^2_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_k \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{\Omega} \left| \nabla \varphi \right|^2_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_k \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},
\]

\[
\left| \int_{\Omega} \varphi \left( \text{div}_{\rho_k} \vec{f}_k \right) \rho_k \, dx \right| \leq \left| \varphi \right|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \left( \int_{\Omega} \left| \text{div}_{\rho_k} \vec{f}_k \right| \rho_k \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}
\]

by the estimates in (24) and

\[
\left| \int_{\Omega} \varphi \left( \text{div}_{\rho_k} \vec{f}_k \right) \rho_k \, dx \right| \leq \left| \varphi \right|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \left( \int_{\Omega} \left( \text{div}_{\rho_k} \vec{f}_k \right)^2 \rho_k \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\]
and by the density of $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ in $H_{\rho_k}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the relation (24) can be extended to the functions $\varphi$ of $H_{\rho_k} \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$. Since $T_\ell(g_k) \in H_{\rho_k} \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, it follows that

$$
\int_{\Omega} \left( \vec{f}_k, \nabla (T_\ell(g_k) \varphi) \right)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_k \, dx = - \int_{\Omega} \left( \text{div}_{\rho_k} \vec{f}_k \right) \varphi T_\ell(g_k) \rho_k \, dx
$$

for all $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$. Due to this relation, we make use of the following equality

$$
\int_{\Omega} \varphi \left( \vec{f}_k, \nabla T_\ell(g_k) \right)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_k \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \left( \vec{f}_k, \nabla (T_\ell(g_k) \varphi) \right)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_k \, dx
$$

$$
- \int_{\Omega} T_\ell(g_k) \left( \vec{f}_k, \nabla \varphi \right)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_k \, dx = - \int_{\Omega} \left( \text{div}_{\rho_k} \vec{f}_k \right) \varphi T_\ell(g_k) \rho_k \, dx
$$

$$
- \int_{\Omega} T_\ell(g_k) \left( \vec{f}_k, \nabla \varphi \right)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_k \, dx = - I_{1,\ell}^k - I_{2,\ell}^k \quad \forall \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega). \quad (26)
$$

Our next intention is to study the asymptotic behavior of the integrals $I_{1,\ell}^k$ and $I_{2,\ell}^k$ as $k \to \infty$. Since the sequence $\{ \text{div}_{\rho_k} \vec{f}_k \in L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx) \}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded, the property (23) and Lemma 3.1 imply that

$$
\rho_k \text{div}_{\rho_k} \vec{f}_k \rightarrow \rho \text{div}_{\rho} \vec{f} \quad \text{in } L^1(\Omega). \quad (27)
$$

Hence the family $\{ \rho_k \text{div}_{\rho_k} \vec{f}_k \}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is equi-integrable on $\Omega$. Therefore, because of the boundedness of $\{ T_\ell(g_k) - T_\ell(g) \}$ the sequence $\{ \rho_k (T_\ell(g_k) - T_\ell(g)) \text{div}_{\rho_k} \vec{f}_k \}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is equi-integrable on $\Omega$ as well. Using the property (25), we have $T_\ell(g_k) \rightarrow T_\ell(g)$ a.e. in $\Omega$ for every $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Then Lebesgue’s Theorem implies

$$
\rho_k (T_\ell(g_k) - T_\ell(g)) \text{div}_{\rho_k} \vec{f}_k \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } L^1(\Omega) \quad \text{as } k \to \infty.
$$

Moreover, by (27), we get

$$
T_\ell(g) \rho_k \text{div}_{\rho_k} \vec{f}_k \rightarrow T_\ell(g) \rho \text{div}_{\rho} \vec{f} \quad \text{in } L^1(\Omega) \quad \text{as } k \to \infty.
$$

Combining these results, we obtain

$$
\rho_k T_\ell(g_k) \text{div}_{\rho_k} \vec{f}_k = \rho_k (T_\ell(g_k) - T_\ell(g)) \text{div}_{\rho_k} \vec{f}_k + \rho_k T_\ell(g) \text{div}_{\rho_k} \vec{f}_k
$$

$$
\rightarrow \rho T_\ell(g) \text{div}_{\rho} \vec{f} \quad \text{in } L^1(\Omega). \quad (28)
$$

On the other hand, the inequality

$$
\left\| T_\ell(g_k) \text{div}_{\rho_k} \vec{f}_k \right\|_{L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx)} \leq \left\| T_\ell(g_k) \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \left\| \text{div}_{\rho_k} \vec{f}_k \right\|_{L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx)} \leq C,
$$

immediately yields that the sequence $\{ T_\ell(g_k) \text{div}_{\rho_k} \vec{f}_k \}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in variable space $L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx)$ for every $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, by the compactness criterion there
exists an element \( \eta^f \in L^2(\Omega, \rho \, dx) \) such that \( T_\ell(g_k) \text{div}_{\rho_k} \tilde{f}_k \to \eta^f \) in \( L^2(\Omega, \rho \, dx) \), that is, \( T_\ell(g_k) \rho_k \text{div}_{\rho_k} \tilde{f}_k \to \eta^f \rho \) in \( L^1(\Omega) \) (by Lemma 3.1). Then, in view of (28), we get \( \eta^f = T_\ell(g) \text{div}_{\rho} \tilde{f} \) (\( \rho \)-almost everywhere in \( \Omega \)). As a result, we come to the relation

\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} T_{1,\ell}^k = \int_\Omega T_\ell(g) \varphi \text{div}_{\rho} \tilde{f} \rho \, dx.
\]

Using similar arguments, we can prove that

\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} T_{2,\ell}^k = \int_\Omega T_\ell(g) \left( \tilde{f}, \nabla \varphi \right)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho \, dx.
\]

Thus, the passage to the limit in (26) leads us to the relation

\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \int_\Omega \varphi \left( \tilde{f}_k, \nabla T_\ell(g_k) \right)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_k \, dx
= - \int_\Omega T_\ell(g) \varphi \text{div}_{\rho} \tilde{f} \rho \, dx - \int_\Omega T_\ell(g) \left( \tilde{f}, \nabla \varphi \right)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho \, dx
= \int_\Omega \left( \tilde{f}, \nabla (T_\ell(g)) \varphi \right)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho \, dx - \int_\Omega T_\ell(g) \left( \tilde{f}, \nabla \varphi \right)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho \, dx
= \int_\Omega \varphi \left( \tilde{f}, \nabla T_\ell(g) \right)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho \, dx \quad \forall \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega),
\]

which holds true for every \( \ell \in \mathbb{N} \).

Let \( \{ T_{\ell_k}(g_k) \in H_{\rho_k} \}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) be a sequence with property (22) which is ensured by Proposition 6.3. Then for any \( \delta > 0 \) there exists a value \( k^* \in \mathbb{N} \) such that

\[
\| T_{\ell_k}(g_k) - g_k \|_{\rho_k} \leq \delta \quad \forall k > k^* \quad \text{(by Proposition 6.2)}.
\]

By Cauchy-Bunyakovskii inequality we have the estimate

\[
L = \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \left| \int_\Omega \varphi \left( \tilde{f}_k, \nabla T_{\ell_k}(g_k) - g_k \right)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_k \, dx \right| \leq \delta \| \varphi \|_{C(\overline{\Omega})} \| \tilde{f}_k \|_{L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx)} \leq C\delta. \quad (30)
\]

Taking into account that \( \chi_{\{|g_k| < \ell_k\}} \to \chi_\Omega \) strongly in \( L^\infty(\Omega) \), it finally follows that

\[
\left| \lim_{k \to \infty} \int_\Omega \varphi \left( \tilde{f}_k, \nabla g_k \right)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_k \, dx - \int_\Omega \varphi \left( \tilde{f}, \nabla g \right)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho \, dx \right|
\leq \left| \lim_{k \to \infty} \int_\Omega \varphi \left( \tilde{f}_k, \nabla T_{\ell_k}(g_k) \right)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_k \, dx - \int_\Omega \varphi \left( \tilde{f}, \nabla g \right)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho \, dx \right| + C\delta \quad \text{(by (30))}
\leq \left| \lim_{k \to \infty} \int_\Omega \chi_{\{|g_k| < \ell_k\}} \varphi \left( \tilde{f}_k, \nabla g \right)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho \, dx - \int_\Omega \varphi \left( \tilde{f}, \nabla g \right)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho \, dx \right| + C\delta \quad \text{(by (29))}
= C\delta. \quad \text{(by Proposition 6.2)}
\]

Since \( \delta > 0 \) is arbitrary, this concludes the proof. \( \square \)
Remark 6.5. The key point of the proof of this lemma is the fact that the space of smooth functions $C^\infty_0(\Omega)$ is dense in the weighted spaces $H_{\rho_k} = H(\Omega, \rho_k dx)$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. So, in general, Lemma 6.4 does not hold for the case when $\{g_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a bounded sequence in the variable space $W_{\rho_k}$.

7. Existence Theorem for $H$-optimal solutions

Our prime interest in this section deals with the solvability of optimal control problem (11)–(13), (16) in the class of $H$-solutions. To begin with, we consider the topological properties of the set of $H$-admissible solutions $\Xi_H$ to the problem (11)–(13), (16). To do so, we introduce the following concepts:

Definition 7.1. We say that a sequence $\{(B_k, y_k) = (A_k \rho_k, y_k) \in \Xi_H\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded if

$$\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \left[\|A_k\|_{L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{N \times N})} + \|\rho_k\|_{L^1(\Omega)} + \|y_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla y_k\|_{L^2(\Omega, \rho_k dx)^N}\right] < +\infty.$$

Definition 7.2. We say that a bounded sequence of $H$-admissible solutions $\{(B_k, y_k) = (A_k \rho_k, y_k) \in \Xi_H\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ $\tau$-converges to a pair $(B, y) \in L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}) \times W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ if

(a) $B = A \rho$, where $A \in L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{N \times N})$ and $\rho \in L^1(\Omega)$

(b) $A_k \rightharpoonup A$ in $L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{N \times N})$

(c) $\rho_k \to \rho$ in $L^1(\Omega)$

(d) $y_k \to y$ in $L^2(\Omega)$

(e) $\nabla y_k \to \nabla y \in L^2(\Omega, \rho dx)^N$ in the variable space $L^2(\Omega, \rho_k dx)^N$.

Theorem 7.3. For every $f \in C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^N)$ the set $\Xi_H$ is closed with respect to the $\tau$-convergence.

Proof. Let $\{(B_k, y_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \Xi_H$ be a bounded $\tau$-convergent sequence of $H$-admissible pairs to the optimal control problem (11)–(13), (16). Let $(B_0, y_0) = (A_0 \rho_0, y_0)$ be its $\tau$-limit. Our aim is to prove that $(B_0, y_0) \in \Xi_H$.

In view of the initial assumptions (11)–(12) we have:

$$A_k = [\vec{a}_{1k}, \ldots, \vec{a}_{Nk}] \in M^2(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad |\text{div}_{\rho_k} \vec{a}_{ik}| \leq \gamma_i \rho_k \text{ d.a.e. in } \Omega \quad \forall i = 1, \ldots, N, \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$  

Hence, the sequences $\{\text{div}_{\rho_k} \vec{a}_{ik} \in L^2(\Omega, \rho_k dx)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, N$ are uniformly bounded. The compactness criterium in variable $L^2(\Omega, \rho_k dx)$-spaces and the fact that $\rho_k \to \rho_0$ in $L^1(\Omega)$ imply the existence of $\{\phi_i \in L^2(\Omega, \rho_0 dx)\}_{i=1}^N$ such that

$$\text{div}_{\rho_k} \vec{a}_{ik} \rightharpoonup \phi_i \quad \text{in } L^2(\Omega, \rho_k dx) \quad \text{as } k \to \infty \quad \forall i = 1, \ldots, N.$$
Then passing to the limit as $k \rightarrow \infty$ in the relations

$$
\int_\Omega (\bar{a}_{i k}, \nabla \varphi)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_k \, dx = - \int_\Omega \varphi \, \text{div}_\rho \bar{a}_{i k} \, \rho_k \, dx \\
\forall \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega), \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}, \forall k \in \mathbb{N},
$$

$$
-\gamma_i \int_\Omega \varphi \rho_k \, dx \leq \int_\Omega \varphi \, \text{div}_\rho \bar{a}_{i k} \, \rho \, dx \leq \gamma_i \int_\Omega \varphi \rho_k \, dx \\
\forall i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}, \forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \forall \varphi \geq 0,
$$

$$
A_k = [\bar{a}_{i k}, \ldots, \bar{a}_{N k}] \in M_\alpha^\beta(\Omega),
$$

we come to the conclusion:

$$
\text{div}_\rho \bar{a}_{i k} \rightarrow \phi_i = \text{div}_\rho \bar{a}_{i 0} \quad \text{in} \quad L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx) \quad \text{as} \quad k \rightarrow \infty, \quad (31)
$$

$$
|\text{div}_\rho \bar{a}_{i 0}| \leq \gamma_i \quad \rho\text{-a.e. in} \quad \Omega \quad \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}, \quad (32)
$$

$$
A_k \rightharpoonup A_0 = [\bar{a}_{1 0}, \ldots, \bar{a}_{N 0}] \in M_\alpha^\beta(\Omega). \quad (33)
$$

Combining these results with the property $\rho_k \rightarrow \rho_0$ in $L^1(\Omega)$, we deduce

$$
\rho_0 \in S : \int_\Omega \rho_0 \, dx = m, \quad \xi_1(x) \leq \rho_0(x) \leq \xi_2(x) \quad \text{a.e. in} \quad \Omega,
$$

i.e., $\rho_0 \in \mathcal{R}_{ad}$ and hence the limit matrix $B_0 = A_0 \rho_0$ is an admissible control to the problem (11)–(13), (16).

It remains to show that the pair $(B_0, y_0)$ is related by the energy equality (19). We will do it in several steps.

**Step 1.** To begin with, we note that, by the initial assumptions there exists of a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$
\|y_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C, \quad \|\nabla y_k\|_{L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx)} \leq C \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.
$$

Hence

$$
y_k \rightharpoonup y_0 \quad \text{weakly in the variable Sobolev space} \quad H_\rho, \quad (36)
$$

$$
y_k \rightarrow y_0 \quad \text{in} \quad W_0^{1,1}(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad y_k \rightarrow y_0 \quad \text{in} \quad L^1(\Omega)
$$

(for the details see the proof of Proposition 6.3). Further, we note that the sequence $\{A_k \nabla y_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx)^N$. Hence passing to a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that there exists a vector-function $\vec{\eta} \in L^2(\Omega, \rho_0 \, dx)^N$ such that

$$
A_k \nabla y_k =: \vec{\eta}_k \rightharpoonup \vec{\eta} \quad \text{in} \quad L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx)^N. \quad (34)
$$

Taking these facts into account, we can pass to the limit in the integral identity

$$
\int_\Omega \left( (A_k \nabla y_k, \nabla \varphi)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_k + y_k \varphi \right) \, dx = \int_\Omega f \varphi \, dx \quad \forall \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega) \quad (35)
$$
as \( k \to \infty \). As a result, we get

\[
\int_{\Omega} (（i\eta, \nabla \varphi）_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_0 + y_0 \varphi) \, dx = \int_{\Omega} f \varphi \, dx \quad \forall \varphi \in C^\infty_0(\Omega) \tag{36}
\]

or

\[-\text{div} (\rho_0 \eta) = f - y_0 \]

in the sense of distributions.

**Step 2.** Here we show that \( \eta = A_0 \nabla y_0 \). To do so, we introduce the following scalar function

\[
v(x) = (z, x)_{\mathbb{R}^N}, \tag{37}
\]

where \( z \) is a fixed element of \( \mathbb{R}^N \). By the initial assumptions, we have

\[
\int_{\Omega} \varphi (A_k (\nabla y_k - \nabla v), \nabla y_k - \nabla v)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_k \, dx \geq 0, \quad \forall \varphi \geq 0
\]

or, in view of (37), this inequality can be rewritten as

\[
\int_{\Omega} \varphi (A_k (\nabla y_k - z), \nabla y_k - z)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_k \, dx \geq 0. \tag{38}
\]

Our next intention is to pass to the limit in (38) as \( k \to \infty \) using Theorem 6.4. As follows from the initial assumptions, the sequence \( \{\rho_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) is admissible for Theorem 6.4. Having put in the statement of this lemma:

\[
f_k = A_k \nabla (y_k - v),
\]

and

\[
g_k = y_k - v \quad \text{for all} \quad k \in \mathbb{N},
\]

we see that the sequence \( \{g_k = y_k - v\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) satisfies all assumptions of Theorem 6.4.

In view of (34) and (33), we have

\[
\tilde{f}_k = A_k \nabla (y_k - v) = A_k (\nabla y_k - \tilde{z}) \to \eta - A_0 \tilde{z} \quad \text{in} \quad L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx)^N. \tag{39}
\]

It remains to show that the sequence \( \{\tilde{f}_k = A_k \nabla (y_k - v)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) is bounded in \( X(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx) \). Indeed, from integral identity (35), we get

\[
-\int_{\Omega} \text{div}_{\rho_k} (A_k \nabla y_k) \varphi \rho_k \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \varphi (f - y_k) \, dx \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.
\]

Since \( (f - y_k) \to (f - y_0) = \rho_0^{-1} (f - y_0) \rho_0 \) in \( L^2(\Omega) \), it follows that the sequence \( \{\text{div}_{\rho_k} (A_k \nabla y_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) is weakly compact in \( L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx) \), and

\[
\text{div}_{\rho_k} (A_k \nabla y_k) \to \rho_0^{-1} y_0 - \rho_0^{-1} f \quad \text{in} \quad L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx). \tag{40}
\]

To apply Theorem 6.4 we have to show that the sequence \( \{\text{div}_{\rho_k} (A_k \tilde{z})\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) is also weakly convergent in \( L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx) \), where the elements \( \text{div}_{\rho_k} (A_k \tilde{z}) \) are defined as

\[
\int_{\Omega} (A_k \tilde{z}, \nabla \varphi)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_k \, dx = -\int_{\Omega} \varphi \text{div}_{\rho_k} (A_k \tilde{z}) \rho_k \, dx \quad \forall \varphi \in C^\infty_0(\Omega), \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.
\]
Indeed, for every test function $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, we have

$$\int_{\Omega} (A_k \tilde{z}, \nabla \varphi)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_k \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} a_{i,j}^k(x) \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i} z_j \rho_k \, dx$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{N} z_j \int_{\Omega} (\tilde{a}_{j,k}(x), \nabla \varphi)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_k \, dx$$

$$= -\sum_{j=1}^{N} z_j \int_{\Omega} \varphi \text{div} \rho_k \tilde{a}_{j,k} \rho_k \, dx$$

$$= J_k.$$ \hfill (41)

Then using (31), we get

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} J_k = -\sum_{j=1}^{N} z_j \lim_{k \to \infty} \int_{\Omega} \varphi \text{div} \rho_k \tilde{a}_{j,k} \rho_k \, dx = -\sum_{j=1}^{N} z_j \int_{\Omega} \varphi \text{div} \rho_0 \tilde{a}_{j,0} \rho_0 \, dx. \hfill (42)$$

Applying the converse transformations with (42) as we did it in (41), we arrive at

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \int_{\Omega} \varphi \text{div} \rho_k (A_k \tilde{z}) \rho_k \, dx = -\lim_{k \to \infty} \int_{\Omega} (A_k \tilde{z}, \nabla \varphi)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_k \, dx$$

$$= -\int_{\Omega} (A_0 \tilde{z}, \nabla \varphi)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_0 \, dx$$

$$= \int_{\Omega} \varphi \text{div} \rho_0 (A_0 \tilde{z}) \rho_0 \, dx \quad \forall \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega). \hfill (43)$$

Thus, from (40) and (43) it finally follows that

$$\text{div} \rho_k (A_k (\nabla y_k - \tilde{z})) \to \rho_0^{-1}(y_0 - f) - \text{div} \rho_0 (A_0 \tilde{z}) \quad \text{in} \ L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx). \hfill (44)$$

As a result, combining properties (34), (44), (39) and the fact that $\nabla (y_k - v) \rightharpoonup \nabla (y_0 - v)$ in $L^2(\Omega, \rho_k \, dx)^N$, we see that all suppositions of Theorem 6.4 are fulfilled. So, passing to the limit in inequality (38) as $k \to \infty$, we get

$$\int_{\Omega} \varphi(x) (\tilde{\eta} - A_0 \tilde{z}, \nabla y_0 - \tilde{z})_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_0 \, dx \geq 0, \quad \forall \tilde{z} \in \mathbb{R}^N$$

for all positive $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$. After localization, we have $\rho_0(\tilde{\eta} - A_0 \tilde{z}, \nabla y_0 - \tilde{z})_{\mathbb{R}^N} \geq 0$ for all $\tilde{z} \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Hence

$$\tilde{\eta} = A_0 \nabla y_0 \quad \rho_0 \, dx$$-almost everywhere in $\Omega$. \hfill (45)
Step 3. Taking (45) into account, we can represent the integral identity (36) in the form
\[ \int_{\Omega} ((A_0 \nabla y_0, \nabla \varphi)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_0 + y_0 \varphi) \, dx = \int_{\Omega} f \varphi \, dx \quad \forall \varphi \in C^0_0(\Omega), \] (46)
or $-\text{div} (\rho_0 A_0 \nabla y_0) + y_0 = f$ in the sense of distributions. Since $C^0_0(\Omega)$ dense in $H_{\rho_0}$, this relation remains true for all $\varphi \in H_{\rho_0}$. Hence, taking $\varphi = y_0$ as a test function in (46), we arrive at the energy equality
\[ \int_{\Omega} ((A_0 \nabla y_0, \nabla y_0)_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_0 + y_0^2) \, dx = \int_{\Omega} f y_0 \, dx \quad \forall \varphi \in C^0_0(\Omega) \]
Thus, the $\tau$-limit pair $(B_0, y_0)$ belongs to $\Xi_H$, and this concludes the proof. \qed

Now we are in a position to state the existence of $H$-optimal pairs to the problem (11)–(13), (16).

**Theorem 7.4.** Let $\xi_1$, $\xi_2$ be given elements of $L^1(\Omega)$ satisfying the conditions (6) and
\[ \int_{\Omega} \xi_1 \, dx \leq m \leq \int_{\Omega} \xi_2 \, dx. \]
Let $S$ be a compact subset of $L^1(\Omega)$ with the property (7), and let also $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $y_d \in L^2(\Omega)$ be given functions. Then the optimal control problem (11)–(13), (16) admits at least one $H$-solution
\[ (B^{opt}, y^{opt}) \in \Xi_H \subset L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}) \times W_0^{1,1}(\Omega). \]

**Proof.** First of all we note that for the given function $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ and every admissible control $B = A\rho \in B_{ad}$, the Riesz Representation Theorem ensures the existence and uniqueness of an $H$-solution $y = y(B, f) \in H_{\rho}$ such that energy equality (19) holds true. Let $\{(B_k, y_k) = (A_k \rho_k, y_k) \in \Xi_H\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an $H$-minimizing sequence to the problem (11)–(13), (16). Then as follows from the inequality
\[ \inf_{(B,y) \in \Xi_H} I(B,y) = \lim_{k \to \infty} \left[ \int_{\Omega} |y_k(x) - y_d(x)|^2 \, dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla y_k(x)|^2_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_k \, dx \right] < +\infty, \]
there is a constant $C > 0$ such that
\[ \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|y_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C, \quad \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|
abla y_k\|_{L^2(\Omega, \rho_k dx)} \leq C. \]
Hence, in view of the definition of the class of admissible controls $B_{ad}$, we may assume that, within a subsequence, there exist functions $\rho^* \in S$, $y^* \in L^2(\Omega)$, $\bar{g} \in L^2(\Omega, \rho^* dx)^N$, and a matrix $A^* \in L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{N \times N})$ such that
\[ A_k \rightharpoonup A^* \text{ in } L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}), \quad \rho_k \to \rho^* \text{ in } L^1(\Omega), \quad y_k \to y^* \text{ in } L^2(\Omega), \quad \nabla y_k \to \bar{g} \text{ in } L^2(\Omega, \rho_k dx)^N. \] (47) (48)
Using the arguments of the proof of Theorem 7.3, it can be shown that the matrix $B^* = A^*\rho^* \in L^1(\Omega, R^{N \times N})$ is admissible control to the problem (11)--(13), (16). Let us prove that the equality $\nabla y^* = \vec{g}$ holds true. To do so, it is enough to show that

$$y_k \to y^* \text{ in } L^1(\Omega) \text{ and } \nabla y_k \to \vec{g} \text{ in } L^1(\Omega)^N. \quad (49)$$

The validity of the first assertion in (49) immediately follows from the first relation in (48). Further we note that by estimate

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla y_k|_{\mathbb{R}^N} dx \leq \left( \int_{\Omega} |\nabla y_k|_{\mathbb{R}^N}^2 \rho_k dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{\Omega} \rho_k^{-1} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C \left( \int_{\Omega} \rho_k^{-1} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

the sequence $\{\nabla y_k \in L^2(\Omega, \rho_k dx)^N\}$ is equi-integrable, and hence this one is weakly compact in $L^1(\Omega)^N$. By Lemma 6.1 and properties of the strong convergence in $L^2(\Omega, \rho_k dx)^N$, we immediately obtain $\lim_{k \to \infty} \int_{\Omega}(\nabla y_k, \vec{\varphi})_{\mathbb{R}^N} dx = \lim_{k \to \infty} \int_{\Omega} \rho_k^{-1}(\nabla y_k, \vec{\varphi})_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_k dx = \int_{\Omega} (\rho^*)^{-1}(\vec{g}, \vec{\varphi})_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho^* dx = \int_{\Omega} (\vec{g}, \vec{\varphi})_{\mathbb{R}^N} dx$. Thus $\nabla y_k \to \vec{g}$ in $L^1(\Omega)$ and $y_k \to y^*$ in $L^1(\Omega)$. As a result, the equality $\nabla y^* = \vec{g}$ follows from the completeness of normed space $W^{1,1}_0(\Omega)$.

Combining these results, we obtain: the pair $(B^*, y^*)$ is the $\tau$-limit of the $H$-minimizing sequence $\{(B_k, y_k) \in \Xi_H\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. Then, by Theorem 7.3, this pair is an $H$-admissible to the problem (11)--(13), (16). Since the cost functional $I$ is lower $\tau$-semicontinuous, we get

$$I(B^*, y^*) \leq \liminf_{k \to \infty} I(B_k, y_k) = \inf_{(B, y) \in \Xi_H} I(B, y).$$

Hence $(B^*, y^*)$ is an $H$-optimal pair, and this concludes the proof. \qed
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