CONTINUITY OF PONTRYAGIN EXTREMALS WITH RESPECT TO DELAYS IN NONLINEAR OPTIMAL CONTROL
Riccardo Bonalli, Bruno Hérissé, Emmanuel Trélat

To cite this version:
Riccardo Bonalli, Bruno Hérissé, Emmanuel Trélat. CONTINUITY OF PONTRYAGIN EXTREMALS WITH RESPECT TO DELAYS IN NONLINEAR OPTIMAL CONTROL. 2018. hal-01802752v1

HAL Id: hal-01802752
https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01802752v1
Submitted on 29 May 2018 (v1), last revised 9 Nov 2018 (v2)
CONTINUITY OF PONTRYAGIN EXTREMALS WITH RESPECT TO DELAYS IN NONLINEAR OPTIMAL CONTROL

RICCARDO BONALLI∗, BRUNO HÉRISSÉ†, AND EMMANUEL TRÉLAT‡

Abstract. Consider a general nonlinear optimal control problem in finite dimension, with constant state and/or control delays. By the Pontryagin Maximum Principle, any optimal trajectory is the projection of a Pontryagin extremal. We establish that, under appropriate assumptions, Pontryagin extremals depend continuously on the parameter delays, for adequate topologies. The proof of the continuity of the trajectory and of the control is quite easy, however, for the adjoint vector, the proof requires a much finer analysis. The continuity property of the adjoint with respect to the parameter delay opens a new perspective for the numerical implementation of indirect methods, such as the shooting method. We also discuss the sharpness of our assumptions.
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1. Introduction. This paper is devoted to establishing continuity properties with respect to delays of Pontryagin extremals related to nonlinear optimal control problems with state and control constant delays. Pontryagin extremals (or just extremals) are obtained by applying the Pontryagin Maximum Principle to an optimal control problem, thus providing first-order conditions for optimality.

Historically, the Maximum Principle has been developed originally for optimal control problems without delays (see, e.g. [1]). The paper [2] was first to provide a Maximum Principle for optimal control problems with constant state delays while [3] obtains the same conditions by a simple substitution-like method. In [4] a similar result is achieved for control problems with pure control delays. In [5, 6], necessary conditions are obtained for optimal control problems with multiple constant delays in state and control variables. Moreover, [7, 8] derive Maximum Principles for control systems with either time- or state-dependent delays. Finally, [9, 10] give necessary conditions for optimal control problems with delays and mixed constraints.

When delays are considered, the Maximum Principle provides extremals satisfying adjoint equations, maximality condition and transversality conditions which depend directly on the value of the delay. Therefore, it seems legitimate to wonder which regularity these extremals show with respect to the parameter delay. In the present paper, we provide sufficient conditions for the continuity (under suitable topologies) of Pontryagin extremals with respect to delays. We focus straightforwardly on continuity properties because this may have useful numerical applications in solving optimal control problems with delays by shooting methods (as described in Section 2.4).

In the literature, to our knowledge, it seems that this topic has been little addressed. The main works studying the dependency of extremals (or just solutions) with respect to time lag variations develop sensibility analysis-type arguments (see, e.g. [11, 12, 13]). Our approach relies merely on topological reasonings without requiring any differentiability properties of the extremals. More precisely, the main
continuity result (see Theorem 2.1) is achieved by analyzing the geometric deformation of Pontryagin cones, i.e. the sets containing all the variation vectors, under small perturbations of the delays. However, this geometric analysis is a challenging step and requires a modified conic implicit function theorem which relies on the continuous dependence of parameters (represented here by delays).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall the Maximum Principle formulation for optimal control problems with delays, stating then, the main theorem for the continuity of Pontryagin extremals with respect to delays. Moreover, Section 2.4 contains an extension of such continuity property to implement robust shooting methods to solve optimal control problems with delays. In Section 3, we provide the proof of our main result, which goes in three steps. The controllability of problems with delays, for every positive delay sufficiently small, is inferred first. For this, we adapt the conclusions of implicit function theorems when parameters and restriction to dense subsets are considered. After that, the existence of solutions of optimal control problems with delays and their continuity with respect to the delay are established. As last step, we prove the continuity of the adjoint vectors which requires to show the geometric continuity of Pontryagin cones mentioned above. Finally, Section 4 summarizes conclusions and several perspectives.

2. Continuity of Pontryagin Extremals with Respect to Delays.

2.1. The Maximum Principle for Optimal Control Problems with Delays. Let \( n, m \) be positive integers, \( \Delta \) a positive real number, \( U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m \) a measurable subset and define an initial state function \( \phi^1(\cdot) \in C^0([\Delta, 0], \mathbb{R}^n) \) and an initial control function \( \phi^2(\cdot) \in L^\infty([\Delta, 0], U) \). For \( \tau = (\tau^0, \tau^1, \tau^2) \in [0, \Delta]^3 \) and \( t_f > 0 \), consider the following nonlinear control system on \( \mathbb{R}^n \) with constant delays

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x}(t) &= f(t, t - \tau^0, x(t), x(t - \tau^1), u(t), u(t - \tau^2)) \quad , \quad t \in [0, t_f] \\
x(t) &= \phi^1(t) \quad , \quad u(t) = \phi^2(t) \quad , \quad t \in [-\Delta, 0] \quad , \quad u(\cdot) \in L^\infty([-\Delta, t_f], U)
\end{align*}
\]

where \( f(t, s, x, y, u, v) \) is continuous and (at least) \( C^2 \) w.r.t. its second, third and fourth variables. Control systems (1) play an important role describing many relevant phenomena in physics, biology, engineering and economics (see, e.g. [14]).

Let \( M_f \) be a subset of \( \mathbb{R}^n \). Assume that \( M_f \) is reachable from \( \phi^1(\cdot) \) for the control system (1), that is, for every \( \tau = (\tau^0, \tau^1, \tau^2) \in [0, \Delta]^3 \), there exists a final time \( t_f \) and a control \( u(\cdot) \in L^\infty([-\Delta, t_f], U) \) such that the trajectory \( x(\cdot) \), solution of (1) in \([-\Delta, t_f]\), satisfies \( x(t_f) \in M_f \). Such a control is called admissible and we denote by \( \mathcal{U}_{t_f, R} \) the set of all admissible controls of (1) defined in \([-\Delta, t_f]\) taking their values in \( \mathbb{R}^m \), while \( \mathcal{U}_{t_f, U} \) denotes the set of all admissible controls of (1) defined in \([-\Delta, t_f]\) taking their values in \( U \). Therefore, \( \mathcal{U}_{R} = \bigcup_{t_f > 0} \mathcal{U}_{t_f, R} \) and \( \mathcal{U}_{U} = \bigcup_{t_f > 0} \mathcal{U}_{t_f, U} \).

Given a tuple \( \tau = (\tau^0, \tau^1, \tau^2) \in [0, \Delta]^3 \) of constant delays, we consider the Optimal Control Problem with Delays \((\text{OCP})_\tau\) consisting in steering the control system (1) to \( M_f \), while minimizing the cost function

\[
C_\tau(t_f, u) = \int_0^{t_f} f^0(t, t - \tau^0, x(t), x(t - \tau^1), u(t), u(t - \tau^2)) \ dt
\]

where \( f^0(t, s, x, y, u, v) \) is continuous and (at least) \( C^2 \) w.r.t. its second, third and fourth variables. We study either fixed or free final time problems \((\text{OCP})_\tau\).

In the context of the present work, we focus on two particular classes of problems. We say that we are in the case of problems \((\text{OCP})_\tau\) with pure state delays when \( f \)
and \( f^0 \) do not depend on \( v \), i.e., \( \frac{\partial f}{\partial v} = \frac{\partial f^0}{\partial v} = 0 \). Moreover, we say that the optimal control problem \((\text{OCP})_\tau\) is affine when \( f \) and \( f^0 \) are affine in \((u, v)\), i.e.,

\[
f(t, s, x, y, u, v) = f_0(t, s, x, y) + u \cdot f_1(t, s, x, y) + v \cdot f_2(t, s, x, y)
\]

\[
f^0(t, s, x, y, u, v) = f^0_0(t, s, x, y) + u \cdot f^0_1(t, s, x, y) + v \cdot f^0_2(t, s, x, y)
\]

Assume that \((x_\tau(\cdot), u_\tau(\cdot))\) is an optimal solution of \((\text{OCP})_\tau\) with related optimal final time \(t_\tau^*\) and define the Hamiltonian related to problem \((\text{OCP})_\tau\) by

\[
H(t, s, x, y, p, p^0, u, v) = \langle p, f(t, s, x, y, u, v) \rangle + p^0 f^0(t, s, x, y, u, v).
\]

The Maximum Principle (see, e.g., [10, 15]) states the existence of a nontrivial couple \((p_\tau(\cdot), p^0_\tau) \neq 0\), where \( p^0_\tau \leq 0 \) is constant and \( p_\tau : [0, t_\tau^*] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \) (named adjoint vector) is absolutely continuous, such that the so called extremal \((x_\tau(\cdot), p_\tau(\cdot), p^0_\tau, u_\tau(\cdot))\) satisfies, almost everywhere in \([0, t_\tau^*]\), the following adjoint equations

\[
\begin{aligned}
\dot{x}_\tau(t) &= \frac{\partial H}{\partial p}(\cdot, -\tau, x_\tau(\cdot), x_\tau(\cdot - \tau), p_\tau(\cdot), p^0_\tau, u_\tau(\cdot), u_\tau(\cdot - \tau^2))(t) \\
\dot{p}_\tau(t) &= -\frac{\partial H}{\partial x}(\cdot, -\tau, x_\tau(\cdot), x_\tau(\cdot - \tau), p_\tau(\cdot), p^0_\tau, u_\tau(\cdot), u_\tau(\cdot - \tau^2))(t) \\
&- \mathbb{1}_{[0,t_\tau^* - \tau]}(t) \frac{\partial H}{\partial y}(\cdot, -\tau, x_\tau(\cdot), x_\tau(\cdot - \tau), p_\tau(\cdot), p^0_\tau, u_\tau(\cdot), u_\tau(\cdot - \tau^2))(t + \tau^2)
\end{aligned}
\]

and the following maximality condition, for every \( u \in U \)

\[
\begin{aligned}
H(\cdot, -\tau, x_\tau(\cdot), x_\tau(\cdot - \tau), p_\tau(\cdot), p^0_\tau, u_\tau(\cdot), u_\tau(\cdot - \tau^2))(t) \\
+ \mathbb{1}_{[0,t_\tau^* - \tau]}(t) H(\cdot, -\tau, x_\tau(\cdot), x_\tau(\cdot - \tau), p_\tau(\cdot), p^0_\tau, u_\tau(\cdot), u_\tau(\cdot - \tau^2))(t + \tau^2) \\
\geq H(\cdot, -\tau, x_\tau(\cdot), x_\tau(\cdot - \tau), p_\tau(\cdot), p^0_\tau, u_\tau(\cdot), u_\tau(\cdot - \tau^2))(t) \\
+ \mathbb{1}_{[0,t_\tau^* - \tau]}(t) H(\cdot, -\tau, x_\tau(\cdot), x_\tau(\cdot - \tau), p_\tau(\cdot), p^0_\tau, u_\tau(\cdot), u)(t + \tau^2).
\end{aligned}
\]

Furthermore, if \( M_f \) is a submanifold of \( \mathbb{R}^n \), locally around \( x_\tau(t_\tau^*) \), then the adjoint vector can be built in order to satisfy

\[
p_\tau(t_\tau^*) \perp T_{x_\tau(t_\tau^*)} M_f
\]

and, moreover, if the final time \( t_\tau^* \) is free and both \( t_\tau^*, t_\tau^*-\tau^2 \) are points of continuity of \( u_\tau(\cdot) \), the extremal \((x_\tau(\cdot), p_\tau(\cdot), p^0_\tau, u_\tau(\cdot))\) satisfies the following final condition

\[
H(t_\tau^*, t_\tau^*-\tau^2, x_\tau(t_\tau^*-\tau^2), x_\tau(t_\tau^*), p_\tau(t_\tau^*), p^0_\tau, u_\tau(t_\tau^*), u_\tau(t_\tau^*-\tau^2)) = 0.
\]

Relation (6) can be generalized by using the concept of Lebesgue approximate continuity (see, e.g., [15]). The extremal \((x_\tau(\cdot), p_\tau(\cdot), p^0_\tau, u_\tau(\cdot))\) is said to be normal whenever \( p^0_\tau \neq 0 \), and in that case we set \( p^0_\tau = -1 \). Otherwise, it is said to be abnormal.

### 2.2. The Main Result: Continuity Properties of Pontryagin Extremals

Fix a constant delay \( \tau_0 = (\tau_0^0, \tau_0^1, \tau_0^2) \in [0, \Delta]^3 \) and let \((x_{\tau_0}(\cdot), p_{\tau_0}(\cdot), p^0_{\tau_0}, u_{\tau_0}(\cdot))\) be a Pontryagin extremal of \((\text{OCP})_{\tau_0}\) satisfying (3)-(6), where \((x_{\tau_0}(\cdot), u_{\tau_0}(\cdot))\) is an optimal solution of \((\text{OCP})_{\tau_0}\) in \([-\Delta, t_{\tau_0}^0]\). Our main result establishes that, under appropriate assumptions, extremals \((x_\tau(\cdot), p_\tau(\cdot), p^0_\tau, u_\tau(\cdot))\), as functions of the delay \( \tau \), are continuous at \( \tau_0 \) with respect to some appropriate topologies. The most challenging conclusion is the continuous dependence of the adjoint vectors with respect to \( \tau \). The
proof of this fact requires an accurate analysis of the continuity of Pontryagin cones related to the Maximum Principle formulation with delays with respect to \( \tau \).

We will treat separately the case in which the delay \( \tau^2 \) on the control variable appears from the one which considers only pure state delays. The context of control delays happens to be more complex, especially, for the existence of optimal controls (see Theorem 2.1). Indeed, a standard approach to prove existence would consider usual Assumptions (as in the classical reference [16]) which, in the case of control delays, must be extended. In particular, using the Guinn’s reduction (see, e.g. [3]), the control system with delays is equivalent to a non-delayed system with a larger number of variables depending on the value of \( \tau^2 \). Such extension was used in [17]. However, the usual assumption on the convexity of the epigraph of the extended dynamics is not sufficient to prove Lemma 2.1 in [17] (see also Section 3.3.2).

Throughout the paper, we make the following assumptions.

**General assumptions:**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(A1)} & \quad U \text{ is compact and convex in } \mathbb{R}^m, \text{ while } M_f \text{ is a compact submanifold.} \\
\text{(A2)} & \quad \text{The optimal control problem with delays (OCP)}_{\tau_0} \text{ has a unique solution, denoted by } (x_{\tau_0}(\cdot), u_{\tau_0}(\cdot)), \text{ defined in an open neighborhood of } [-\Delta, t_{f}^{\tau_0}]. \\
\text{(A3)} & \quad \text{The optimal trajectory } x_{\tau_0}(\cdot) \text{ has a unique extremal lift} \quad \{\text{up to a multiplicative scalar}\} \text{ defined in } [0, t_{f}^{\tau_0}], \text{ which is normal, denoted } \\
& \quad \quad (x_{\tau_0}(\cdot), p_{\tau_0}(\cdot), -1, u_{\tau_0}(\cdot)), \text{ solution of the Maximum Principle.} \\
\text{(A4)} & \quad \text{There exists a positive real number } b \text{ such that, for every } \tau = (\tau^0, \tau^1, \tau^2) \in [0, \Delta]^3 \text{ and every } v(\cdot) \in U_f^\prime, \text{ denoting } x_{\tau, v}(\cdot) \text{ the related trajectory arising from dynamics (1) with final time } t_{f}^{\tau, v}, \text{ one has} \\
& \quad \quad \text{for every } t \in [-\Delta, t_{f}^{\tau, v}] \text{ there holds: } t_{f}^{\tau_0} + t_{f}^{\tau, v} + \|x_{\tau, v}(t)\| \leq b. 
\end{align*}
\]

**Assumptions in case of pure state delays:**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(B1)} & \quad \text{For every delay } \tau, \text{ every optimal control } u_{\tau}(\cdot) \text{ of (OCP)}_{\tau} \text{ is continuous.} \\
\text{(B2)} & \quad \text{The sets} \\
& \quad \quad \{\{f(t, s, x, y, u), f^0(t, s, x, y, u) + \gamma) : u \in U, \gamma \geq 0\} , \\
& \quad \quad \{\left(f(t, t, x, x, u), f^0(t, t, x, x, u) + \gamma, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(t, t, x, x, u), \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(t, t, x, x, u)\right) : u \in U, \gamma \geq 0\}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{are convex for every } t, s \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and every } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \text{ where we denote} \\
\quad \tilde{f}(t, s, x, y, u) = (f(t, s, x, y, u), f^0(t, s, x, y, u)) .
\]

**Assumptions in case of delays both in state and control variables:**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(C1)} & \quad \text{The considered optimal control problems are affine.} \\
\text{(C2)} & \quad \text{The considered optimal control problems have fixed final time } t_f. \\
\text{(C3)} & \quad \text{For every } \tau, \text{ either every optimal control } u_{\tau}(\cdot) \text{ of (OCP)}_{\tau} \text{ is continuous} \\
& \quad \quad \text{or the control } u_{\tau_0}(\cdot) \text{ takes its values at extremal points of } U, \text{ a.e.}
\end{align*}
\]

Several remarks are in order.

First of all, Assumptions \((A2)\) and \((A3)\) on the uniqueness of the solution of \((\text{OCP})_{\tau_0}\) and on the uniqueness of its extremal lift are related to the differentiability
properties of the value function (see, e.g. [18, 19, 20]). They are standard in optimization and are just made to keep a nice statement (see Theorem 2.1). These assumptions can be weakened as follows. If we replace \((A_2)\) and \((A_3)\) with the assumption "every extremal lift of every solution of \((\text{OCP})_{\tau_0}\) is normal", then, the conclusion provided in Theorem 2.1 below still holds, except that the continuity properties must be written in terms of closure points. The proof of this fact follows the same guideline used to prove Theorem 2.1, without complications (see Section 3.3 and [21, Remark 1.11]). Finally, asking that the unique extremal of \((\text{OCP})_{\tau_0}\) is moreover normal becomes crucial to prove the continuity of the adjoint vectors with respect to the delay.

Assumptions \((B_1)\) and \((C)\) play a complementary role in proving the continuity property for the adjoint vectors. In particular, Assumption \((C_1)\) becomes also crucial to ensure the continuity of optimal controls and trajectories when considering delays both in state and control variables (see Section 3.3.3). Without this assumption proving these last continuities becomes a hard task. The issue is related to the following fact. Let \(X, Y\) be Banach spaces and \(F : X \to Y\) be a continuous map. Suppose that \((x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq X\) is a sequence such that \(x_k \to x\) and \(F(x_k) \to F(\bar{x})\) for some \(x, \bar{x} \in X\). Therefore, in general, we cannot ensure that the two limits coincide, that is \(x = \bar{x}\), when \(F\) is not linear. On the other hand, Assumption \((C_2)\) becomes essential to correctly evaluate the continuity of Pontryagin cones when delays in the control variables appear (see Section 3.3.4) while the second statement in Assumption \((C_3)\) is not fundamental to obtain the main continuity properties, but it is useful to provide more regularity to continuities related to optimal controls (see Theorem 2.1 below). In particular, the counterexample of Section 2.3 shows that, when the optimal control of \((\text{OCP})_{\tau_0}\) does not take its values at extremal points of \(U\), strong convergences a.e. related to optimal controls may fail, and only the weak continuity is ensured.

In what follows, \(Q^k_{\tau}(p) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k\) denotes the open box centered at \(p\) of edge \(2\varepsilon\).

**Theorem 2.1.**

- **Optimal control problems with pure state delays:** Consider optimal control problems \((\text{OCP})_{\tau}\) with pure state delays. Under Assumptions \((A)\) and \((B)\):

  1. There exists \(\varepsilon_0 > 0\) such that, for every \((\tau^0, \tau^1) \in Q^2_{\varepsilon_0} (\tau_0)\), each problem \((\text{OCP})_{\tau}\) has at least one optimal solution \((x_{\tau}(\cdot), u_{\tau}(\cdot))\) defined in \([-\Delta, t^*_f]\), every extremal lift of which is normal. Moreover, if we work in fixed final time, then \(t^*_f = t^*_{\tau^0}\) for every \((\tau^0, \tau^1) \in Q^2_{\varepsilon_0} (\tau_0)\).

  2. Let \((x_{\tau}(\cdot), p_{\tau}(\cdot), -1, u_{\tau}(\cdot))\) be such a normal extremal. Considering continuous extensions in \([-\Delta, b]\), the mapping

\[
[0, \Delta]^2 \times \{0\} \to \mathbb{R}_+ \times (C^0([[-\Delta, b], \mathbb{R}^n])^2 : \tau \mapsto (t^*_f, x_{\tau}(\cdot), p_{\tau}(\cdot))
\]

is continuous at \(\tau_0\), where \(C^0\) is equipped with the strong topology.

  3. In addition, considering continuous extensions in \([-\Delta, b]\), the mapping

\[
[0, \Delta]^2 \times \{0\} \to (L^\infty([0, b], \mathbb{R}^n))^* : \tau \mapsto \dot{x}_{\tau}(\cdot)
\]

is continuous at \(\tau_0\), where \((L^\infty)^*\) is equipped with the weak star topology.

- **Optimal control problems with both state and control delays:** On the other hand, consider optimal control problems \((\text{OCP})_{\tau}\) with state and control delays. Under Assumptions \((A)\) and \((C)\):

  

1. There exists \( \varepsilon_0 > 0 \) such that, for every \( \tau \in Q^3_0(\tau_0) \), each problem \((OCP)_{\tau}\) has at least one optimal solution \((x_\tau(\cdot), u_\tau(\cdot))\) defined in \([-\Delta, t^0]\), every extremal lift of which is normal.

2. Let \((x_\tau(\cdot), p_\tau(\cdot), -1, u_\tau(\cdot))\) be such a normal extremal. Considering continuous extensions in \([-\Delta, b]\), the mapping 

\[
[0, \Delta] \rightarrow (C^0([-\Delta, b], \mathbb{R}^n))^2 : \tau \rightarrow (x_\tau(\cdot), p_\tau(\cdot))
\]

is continuous at \(\tau_0\), where \(C^0\) is equipped with the strong topology.

3. In addition, considering continuous extensions in \([-\Delta, b]\), the mapping 

\[
[0, \Delta] \rightarrow (L^2((0, b], \mathbb{R}^m))^2 : \tau \rightarrow (u_\tau(\cdot), u_\tau(\cdot) - \tau^2)
\]

is continuous at \(\tau_0\), where \(L^2\) is equipped with the weak topology. Moreover, if there holds that control \(u_{n_\tau}(\cdot)\) assumes its values at extremal points of \(U\), a.e. in \([-\Delta, t^f]\), as \(\tau\) tends to \(\tau_0\), one also has that controls \(u_\tau(\cdot), u_\tau(\cdot) - \tau\) converge to \(u_{n_\tau}(\cdot)\) almost everywhere in \([0, t^f]\).

4. Finally, in the case that no control delay \(\tau^2\) appears, the previous conclusions remain valid even if Assumption \((C_2)\) does not hold, i.e. the final time is free, in which case \(t^f\) converges to \(t^f_0\) as \(\tau\) tends to \(\tau_0\).

**Remark 2.2.** Theorem 2.1 can be extended to obtain the same continuity properties in the specific case of dynamics \(f\) that are affine in the two control variables, and of quadratic costs

\[
\int_0^{t_f} \left[ K_1 \|x(t)\|^2 + K_2 \|x(t - \tau^1)\|^2 + K_3 \|u(t)\|^2 + K_4 \|u(t - \tau^2)\|^2 \right] dt
\]

where \(K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4 \geq 0\) are constant. Indeed, considering Assumptions \((A)\) and either \((B)\) or \((C)\), the continuity properties established in Theorem 2.1 for \(x_\tau(\cdot)\) and \(p_\tau(\cdot)\) still hold and \(u_\tau(\cdot)\) converges to \(u_{n_\tau}(\cdot)\) in \(L^2\) for the weak topology, as \(\tau\) tends to \(\tau_0\). This fact is also true when \(U = \mathbb{R}^m\) and arises adapting the proof of Theorem 2.1 without particular complications (see Section 3.3 and the proof in [22, Theorem 1]).

### 2.3. Weak Continuity Versus Strong Continuity of Optimal Controls

When affine problems \((OCP)_{\tau}\) are considered, Theorem 2.1 ensures additionally the weak continuity in \(L^2\) with respect to \(\tau\) at \(\tau_0\) of optimal controls. Moreover, when the optimal control \(u_{n_\tau}(\cdot)\) takes its values at extremal points of \(U\) a.e., the weak convergence induced by the weak continuity in \(L^2\) becomes actually a strong convergence almost everywhere. In this section, we provide a counterexample showing that the weak convergence in \(L^2\) may not induce the strong convergence of the optimal controls when \(u_{n_\tau}(\cdot)\) does not take its values at extremal points of \(U\), almost everywhere.

Adapting arguments of [23], consider problem \((OCP)\), given by

\[
\begin{align*}
\min \int_0^{t_f} & 1 \, dt \quad , \quad (u^1(t))^2 + (u^2(t))^2 \leq 1 \\
\dot{x}^1(t) = & \ 1 - x^2(t) + \tau^0 u^2(t) g(x^1(t)) \quad , \quad x^1(0) = 0 \ , \ x^1(t_f) = 1 \\
\dot{x}^2(t) = & \ u^1(t) + \tau^0 u^2(t) h(x^1(t)) \quad , \quad x^2(0) = 0 \ , \ x^2(t_f) = 0 \\
\end{align*}
\]

where \(g\) and \(h\) are smooth functions, to be chosen. In this case neither state nor control delays appear, but only the component \(\tau^0\), i.e., the dynamics has the following form

\[
f(t, s, x, y, u, v) = \left( \begin{array}{c}
1 - (x^1)^2 + (t - s) u^2 g(x^1) \\
u^1 + (t - s) u^2 h(x^1)
\end{array} \right) .
\]
Taking $\tau_0 = 0$, under appropriate assumptions on $g$ and $h$, Theorem 2.1 applies with weak convergence in $L^2$ of controls, but no strong convergence of controls arises. The proof follows closely the arguments of [23], therefore, we just recall the main steps.

First of all, when $\tau^0 = 0$, problem (7) has the unique solution $(u^1, w^2)(t) = 0$ with unique extremal $(x^1, x^2, p^1, p^2, p^0, u^1, u^2)(t) = (t, 0, 1, 0, -1, 0, 0)$, where $t_f = 1$.

Remark that, in the case in which Theorem 2.1 applies, only the weak convergence in $L^2$ of optimal controls is ensured. The assumptions of Theorem 2.1 hold, in particular, every optimal control of $(\text{OCP})_\tau$ is continuous. Indeed, in [23] it is shown that, in the case $\tau^0 \neq 0$, under the assumption that function $g$ may only vanish on a subset of zero measure, the optimal controls related to problem (7) are

$$
\begin{align*}
 u^1_\tau(t) &= \frac{p^1_\tau(t)g(x^1_\tau(t)) + p^2_\tau(t)h(x^1_\tau(t))}{\sqrt{(p^2_\tau(t))^2 + (p^1_\tau(t)g(x^1_\tau(t)) + p^2_\tau(t)h(x^1_\tau(t)))^2}} \\
 u^2_\tau(t) &= \frac{p^2_\tau(t)}{\sqrt{(p^2_\tau(t))^2 + (p^1_\tau(t)g(x^1_\tau(t)) + p^2_\tau(t)h(x^1_\tau(t)))^2}}
\end{align*}
$$

and the adjoint coordinate $p^2_\tau$ may only vanish on subsets of zero measure. There follows that optimal controls (8) are continuous, and then, Theorem 2.1 applies.

Both $u^1_\tau$ and $u^2_\tau$ converge weakly to 0 as soon as $\tau^0$ tends to 0. However, in [23] it is also proved that specific choices of highly oscillating functions $g$ and $h$ provide that $u^1_\tau$ and $u^2_\tau$ cannot converge almost everywhere to 0 when $\tau^0$ tends to 0.

### 2.4. Application to Shooting Methods

In this section, we briefly discuss how the continuity properties of Pontryagin extremals stated in Theorem 2.1 may be exploited to solve optimal control problems with delays via shooting methods.

It is known that solving generic problems $(\text{OCP})_\tau$ via shooting methods can be difficult. Indeed, assuming that the optimal control $u_\tau(\cdot)$ is known as a function of $x_\tau(\cdot)$ and $p_\tau(\cdot)$ (by the maximality condition (4)), each iteration of a shooting method consists in solving the coupled dynamics (3), where a value of $p_\tau(t^*_\tau)$ is provided. This means that one has to solve a Differential-Difference Boundary Value Problem (DDBVP) where both forward and backward terms of time appear within mixed type differential equations. The difficulty is then the lack of global information which forbids a purely local integration by usual iterative methods for ODEs.

In order to initialize correctly a shooting method for (3), a guess of the final value of the adjoint vector $p_\tau(t^*_\tau)$ is not sufficient, but rather, a good numerical guess of the whole function $p_\tau(\cdot)$ must be provided to make the procedure converge. This represents an additional difficulty with respect to the usual shooting method and it requires a global discretization of the system of differential equations (3).

The result stated in Theorem 2.1 suggests that one may solve $(\text{OCP})_\tau$ numerically via shooting methods iteratively, starting from the solution of its non-delayed version $(\text{OCP}) = (\text{OCP})_{\tau=0}$, and this by means of homotopy procedures.

The basic idea of homotopy methods is to solve a difficult problem step by step, starting from a simpler problem, by parameter deformation. Theory and practice of homotopy methods are well known (see, e.g. [24]). Combined with the shooting problem derived from the Maximum Principle, a homotopy method consists in deforming the problem into a simpler one (that can be easily solved) and then in solving a series of shooting problems step by step to come back to the original problem.

In many situations, exploiting the non-delayed version of the Maximum Principle
mixed to other techniques (such as geometric control, dynamical system theory applied to mission design, etc., we refer the reader to [25] for a survey on these procedures), one is able to initialize efficiently a shooting method on the optimal control problem without delays \((OCP)\). Thus, it is legitimate to wonder if one may solve \((OCP)\) by shooting methods starting a homotopy procedure where \(\tau\) represents the deformation parameter and \((OCP)\) is taken as the starting problem. This approach is a way to address the flaw of shooting methods applied to \((OCP)\): on one hand, the global adjoint vector of \((OCP)\) could be used to initialize efficiently a shooting method on \((3)\) and, on the other hand, we could solve \((3)\) via usual iterative methods for ODEs (for example, by using the global state solution at the previous iteration).

The previous homotopy procedure results to be well-posed and robustly convergent thanks to Theorem 2.1. Indeed, assuming that the delay \(\tau\) is small enough and one is able to represent optimal controls \(u(\cdot)\) as functions of \(x(\cdot)\) and \(p(\cdot)\) (even if, this may not be easy to accomplish), the continuity properties of the previous section applied at \(\tau = 0\) allow straightforwardly the homotopic path to converge correctly towards extremals related to \((OCP)\) when starting from the extremal of \((OCP)\).

Implementing homotopy methods combined with the Maximum Principle with delays, as shortly described above, however requires a number of considerations which cannot be done in the present paper. In a forthcoming and separate work, we will show that this approach indeed happens to be competitive with respect to other approaches (in particular, direct methods that are classically applied in this context, see, e.g. [9, 10]) and we will illustrate it on a nontrivial and nonacademic optimal control problem with missile launchers, a case of application where delays are the main obstacle to efficient embarked numerical approaches.

3. Proof of the Main Result.

Without loss of generality, we assume that \(\tau_0 = 0\), denoting by \((OCP)\) the problem without delays. Furthermore, we denote \(t_f = t_f(\tau), x(\cdot) = x(\tau)(\cdot), p(\cdot) = p(\tau)(\cdot)\) and \(u(\cdot) = u(\tau)(\cdot)\).

The proof of the convergence of extremals of \((OCP)\) towards the extremal of \((OCP)\), as \(\tau\) tends to 0, is organized in three steps. First, by using assumptions on the non-delayed version of the problem only, we infer the controllability of problems \((OCP)(\tau)\), for every positive \(\tau\) sufficiently small. The previous step requires some implicit function theorem involving parameters. This allows to proceed to the second part, which consists in showing the existence of solutions of \((OCP)(\tau)\), for \(\tau\) sufficiently small, and their convergences, as \(\tau\) tends to 0, towards solutions of \((OCP)\)(\(\tau = 0\)). In the case of both control and state delays, we will see the importance of considering affine systems throughout this step. Finally, we address the more difficult issue of establishing the convergence, as \(\tau\) tends to 0, of the adjoint vectors related to \((OCP)(\tau)\) towards the adjoint vector of \((OCP)(\tau = 0)\). For this step, a refined analysis on the convergence of Pontryagin cones is needed.

We recall in Section 3.1 the main steps of the proof related to the Maximum Principle for problems \((OCP)(\tau)\) with delays. To our knowledge, the proof of this result via needle-like variations does not appear explicitly in the literature, and for the comprehension of the whole proof, we report it. In a second time, Section 3.2 provides a useful conic version of the implicit function theorem, depending on parameters, which is a key element of the entire reasoning. Finally, in Section 3.3, we report the whole proof of the desired result, as detailed above.

3.1. Proof of the PMP Using Needle-Like Variations. In this section we sketch the proof of the Maximum Principle for \((OCP)(\tau)\) using needle-like variations. For this, we do not rely on the assumptions of Theorem 2.1, giving the result for a
larger class of control systems with constant delays. Our reasoning is not affected for problems with free final time, since, we do not employ the well known reduction to a fixed final time problem, but rather, we modify the Pontryagin cone to keep track of problems with free final time, since, we do not employ the well known reduction to a larger class of control systems with constant delays.

3.1.1. Preliminary Notations. Fix a constant delay $\tau = (\tau^0, \tau^1, \tau^2) \in [0, \Delta]^3$. Consider (OCP)$_\tau$ as given by formulation (1)-(2) and let $(x_\tau(\cdot), u_\tau(\cdot))$ be an optimal solution defined in $[-\Delta, t_f]$. For every positive final time $\bar{t}_f$, introduce the instantaneous cost function $x^0(\cdot)$ defined in $[-\Delta, \bar{t}_f]$ and solution of

$$\begin{cases}
\dot{x}^0(t) = f^0(t, t - \tau^0, x_\tau(t), x_\tau(t - \tau^1), u_\tau(t), u_\tau(t - \tau^2)), & t \in [0, \bar{t}_f] \\
x^0(0) = 0, & t \in [-\Delta, 0]
\end{cases}$$

such that cost (2) provides $C_{\tau}(\bar{t}_f, u_\tau) = x^0(\bar{t}_f)$. We defined the extended state $\hat{x} = (x, x^0)$ and the extended dynamics $\hat{f}(t, s, \hat{x}, \hat{y}, u, v) = (f(t, s, x, y, u, v), f^0(t, s, x, y, u, v))$, for which, we will often denote $\hat{f}(t, s, x, y, u, v) = \hat{f}(t, s, \hat{x}, \hat{y}, u, v)$. Therefore, consider the following extended dynamical problem in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$

$$\begin{cases}
\dot{\hat{x}}(t) = \hat{f}(t, t - \tau^0, \hat{x}(t), \hat{x}(t - \tau^1), u(t), u(t - \tau^2)), & t \in [0, \bar{t}_f] \\
|[-\Delta, 0]) = (\phi^0(t), 0), & \hat{x}(\bar{t}_f) \in M_f \times \mathbb{R} \\
u(\cdot) \in L^\infty([-\Delta, \bar{t}_f], U) , & u|[-\Delta, 0]) = \phi^2(t)
\end{cases}$$

As provided in Section 2.1, the set of all admissible controls of (9) defined in $[-\Delta, \bar{t}_f]$ taking their values in $\mathbb{R}^m$ is denoted by $\mathcal{U}_{\bar{t}_f, \mathbb{R}^m}$, while $\mathcal{U}_{\bar{t}_f, U}$ denotes the set of all admissible controls of (9) defined in $[-\Delta, \bar{t}_f]$ taking their values in $U$. From this

$$\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{R}^m}^{\tau} = \bigcup_{\bar{t}_f > 0} \mathcal{U}_{\bar{t}_f, \mathbb{R}^m}^{\tau}, \quad \mathcal{U}_{U}^{\tau} = \bigcup_{\bar{t}_f > 0} \mathcal{U}_{\bar{t}_f, U}^{\tau}.$$ 

The extended end-point mapping is defined as

$$\hat{E}_{\tau, \bar{t}_f} : \mathcal{U}_{\bar{t}_f, \mathbb{R}^m}^{\tau} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : u \mapsto \hat{x}(\bar{t}_f)$$

where $\hat{x}(\cdot)$ is the unique solution of problem (9), related to control $u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_{\bar{t}_f, \mathbb{R}^m}^{\tau}$. As standard facts (see, e.g. [26]), the set $\mathcal{U}_{\bar{t}_f, \mathbb{R}^m}^{\tau}$, endowed with the standard topology of $L^\infty([-\Delta, \bar{t}_f], \mathbb{R}^m)$, is open and the end-point mapping is smooth on $\mathcal{U}_{\bar{t}_f, \mathbb{R}^m}^{\tau}$.

For every $t \geq 0$, define the extended accessible set $\hat{A}_{\tau, U}(t)$ as the image of the extended end-point mapping $\hat{E}_{\tau, t}$ restricted to $\mathcal{U}_{t, U}^{\tau}$, where $\hat{A}_{\tau, U}(0) = \{(\phi^1(0), 0)\}$. The next fact is at the basis of the proof of the Maximum Principle (see, e.g. [27]).

**Lemma 3.1.** For every optimal solution $(x_\tau(\cdot), u_\tau(\cdot))$ of (OCP)$_\tau$ defined in the interval $[-\Delta, t_f]$, the point $\hat{x}_\tau(t_f)$ belongs to the boundary of the set $\hat{A}_{\tau, U}(t_f)$.

3.1.2. Needle-Like Variations and Pontryagin Cones. In what follows we consider (OCP)$_\tau$ with free final time, remarking that all the proposed results can be easily adapted for problems with fixed final time (see, e.g. [27]). Moreover, we suppose that the optimal final time $t_f^\tau$ is a Lebesgue point for the optimal control $u_\tau(\cdot)$ of (OCP)$_\tau$, and of $u_\tau(\cdot - \tau_2)$. Otherwise, we can extend all the conclusions that
follow by using closure points in neighborhoods of \( t^*_f \) (in the same way as in \([28, 29]\)).

For a tuple of delays \( \tau = (\tau^0, \tau^1, \tau^2) \in [0, \Delta]^3 \), let \((x_\tau(\cdot), u_\tau(\cdot))\) be a solution of \((\text{OCP})_\tau\) and, without loss of generality, extend \( u_\tau(\cdot) \) by some constant vector of \( U \) in \([t^*_f, t^*_f + \tau^2]\). Let \( p \geq 1 \) be an integer and consider \( 0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_p < t^*_f \) Lebesgue points respectively of \( u_\tau(\cdot), u_\tau(\cdot - \tau^0) \) and of \( u_\tau(\cdot + \tau^2) \). Choosing \( p \) arbitrary values \( u_i \in U \), for every \( \eta_i > 0 \) such that \(-\Delta \leq t_i - \eta_i\), the needle-like variation \( \pi = \{ t_1, \ldots, t_p, \eta_1, \ldots, \eta_p, u_1, \ldots, u_p \} \) of control \( u_\tau(\cdot) \) is defined by the modified control

\[
u_\pi^\tau(t) = \begin{cases} u_i & t \in (t_i - \eta_i, t_i], \\ u_\tau(t) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \]

Control \( u^\pi_\tau(\cdot) \) takes its values in \( U \) and, by continuity with respect to initial data, for every \( \eta_i > 0 \) small enough, \( u^\pi_\tau(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}^\pi_\tau \). Moreover, whenever \( \| (\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_p) \| \to 0 \), the trajectory \( x^\pi_\tau(\cdot) \) of solution of the dynamics of (9) related to control \( u^\pi_\tau(\cdot) \), converges uniformly to \( \hat{x}_\tau(\cdot) = (x^0_\tau(\cdot), x_\tau(\cdot)) \). For every value \( z \in U \) and appropriate Lebesgue point \( s \in (0, t^*_f) \), we define the vectors

\[
\omega^\tau_\pi(s) = \frac{\partial \hat{f}}{\partial x}(t, t - \tau^0, x_\tau(t), x_\tau(t - \tau^1), u_\tau(t), u_\tau(t - \tau^2))
\]

\[
\omega^\tau_\pi(s) = \frac{\partial \hat{f}}{\partial x}(t, t - \tau^0, x_\tau(t), x_\tau(t - \tau^1), u_\tau(t), u_\tau(t - \tau^2))
\]

and, given \( \xi \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \), we denote by \( \hat{\psi}_\tau^\pi(\cdot) \) the solution of the following linear system

\[
\hat{\psi}(t) = \frac{\partial \hat{f}}{\partial y}(t, t - \tau^0, x_\tau(t), x_\tau(t - \tau^1), u_\tau(t), u_\tau(t - \tau^2))\hat{\psi}(t) \]

\[
\hat{\psi}(s) = \hat{\psi}(t) = 0, \quad t \in (s - \tau^1, s)
\]

Vectors \( \hat{\psi}_\tau^\pi(\cdot) \) are usually called variations vectors. In what follows, for sake of clarity in the exposition, it is useful to denote \( \hat{\omega}_\tau^\pi(s) = \hat{\psi}_{s,\xi,\eta_\tau}(s) + \hat{\psi}_{s,\xi,\eta_\tau}(s) \).

**Definition 3.2.** For every \( t \in (0, t^*_f) \), the first Pontryagin cone \( K^\tau_1(t) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) at \( \hat{x}_\tau(t) \) for the extended system is defined as the closed convex cone containing vectors \( \hat{\omega}_\tau^\pi(\cdot) \) where \( z \in U \) and \( 0 < s < t \) is a Lebesgue point of \( u_\tau(\cdot), u_\tau(\cdot - \tau^2) \) and of \( u_\tau(\cdot + \tau^2) \). The augmented first Pontryagin cone \( K^\tau_1(t) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) at \( \hat{x}_\tau(t) \) for the extended system is defined as the closed convex cone containing \( \hat{\psi}_{s,\xi,\eta_\tau}(t) \) where \( z \in U \) and \( 0 < s < t \) is a Lebesgue point of \( u_\tau(\cdot), u_\tau(\cdot - \tau^2) \) and of \( u_\tau(\cdot + \tau^2) \). The first Pontryagin cone \( K^\tau(t) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \) and the augmented first Pontryagin cone \( K^\tau_1(t) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \) at \( x_\tau(t) \) for the non-augmented system are defined similarly, considering dynamics \( f \) instead of the extended dynamics \( \hat{f} \). Obviously, the cones \( K^\tau(t) \), \( K^\tau_1(t) \) are the projections onto \( \mathbb{R}^n \) of \( K^\tau(t) \), \( K^\tau_1(t) \), respectively.

**Remark 3.3.** In the case of optimal control problems without delays, that is \((\text{OCP})_{\tau = 0}\), the definition of first Pontryagin cones is slightly different from the one
obtained from Definition 3.2 with the substitution $\tau = 0$. Indeed, considering $\tilde{K}(t)$, vectors $\tilde{v}_{s,t}(t)$ are rather replaced by single variations $\tilde{v}_0(\omega_2(s))$ for which

$$\omega(z) = \tilde{f}(s, s, x_0(s), x_0(s), z, z) - \tilde{f}(s, s, x_0(s), x_0(s), 0, 0)$$

where $(x_0(\cdot), u_0(\cdot))$ is an optimal solution of $(\text{OCP})_{\tau = 0}$ (see, e.g. [1]).

The proof of the Maximum Principle is established on the following result.

**Lemma 3.4.** Let $(\delta, \eta_1, \ldots, \eta_p) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+^p$ small enough. For every $t_p < t \leq t_f^*$ Lebesgue point of $u_r(\cdot)$ and of $u_r(\cdot - \tau^2)$, the following variational expression holds

$$\ddot{x}_r(t + \delta) = \ddot{\tilde{x}}_r(t) + \delta \ddot{\tilde{f}}(t, t - \tau^1, x_r(t), x_r(t - \tau^1), u_r(t), u_r(t - \tau^2))$$

$$+ \sum_{i=1}^p \eta_i \left( \tilde{v}_{1, \omega_1^-(s)}(\tau_i) \dot{t} + \tilde{v}_{1+i+\tau^1, \omega_1^+(s)}(\tau_i) \dot{t} \right) + o \left( \delta + \sum_{i=1}^p \eta_i \right).$$

**Proof.** The proof goes by induction. We provide computations for $p = 1$. The inductive step develops in the same manner, as the standard case (see, e.g. [1]). For this, let $t_p < t \leq t_f^*$ Lebesgue point of $u_r(\cdot)$ and of $u_r(\cdot - \tau^2)$. First, let us show that

$$(13) \quad \ddot{x}_r(t) - \ddot{\tilde{x}}_r(t) = \eta_1 \dot{\tilde{w}}_{1,u_1}(t) + o(\eta_1) = \eta_1 \left( \dot{\tilde{v}}_{1, \omega_1^-(s)}(\tau_i) + \dot{\tilde{v}}_{1+i+\tau^1, \omega_1^+(s)}(\tau_i) \right) + o(\eta_1).$$

We consider directly the case $t \geq t_1 + \tau_2$ (the case $t < t_1 + \tau_2$ is similar, but easier).

There holds

$$\|\ddot{x}_r(t) - \ddot{\tilde{x}}_r(t)\| \leq \|\ddot{x}_r(t_1 + \tau^2) - \ddot{\tilde{x}}_r(t_1 + \tau^2)\|$$

$$+ \left\| \int_{t_1 + \tau_2}^{t_1 + \tau_2} \left[ \tilde{f}(s, s - \tau^0, \ddot{\tilde{x}}_r(s), \ddot{x}_r(s - \tau^1), u_r(s), u_r(s - \tau^2)) - \tilde{f}(s, s - \tau^0, \ddot{\tilde{x}}_r(s), \ddot{x}_r(s - \tau^1), u_r(s), u_r(s - \tau^2)) \right] ds \right\|.$$

By exploiting the fact that $t_1$ is a Lebesgue point of $u_r(\cdot)$, $u_r(\cdot - \tau^2)$ and of $u_r(\cdot + \tau^2)$, and that $\ddot{x}_r(\cdot)$ converges uniformly to $\ddot{\tilde{x}}_r(\cdot)$, developing the extended dynamics until the second order, the first term of the expression above can be bounded as follows:

$$\|\ddot{x}_r(t_1 + \tau^2) - \ddot{\tilde{x}}_r(t_1 + \tau^2) - \eta_1 \dot{\tilde{w}}_{1,u_1}(t_1 + \tau^2)\|$$

$$\leq \left\| \int_{t_1 + \tau_2}^{t_1 + \tau_2} \left[ \tilde{f}(s, s - \tau^0, \ddot{x}_r(s), \ddot{x}_r(s - \tau^1), u_r(s), u_r(s - \tau^2)) - \tilde{f}(s, s - \tau^0, \ddot{x}_r(s), \ddot{x}_r(s - \tau^1), u_r(s), u_r(s - \tau^2)) \right] ds - \eta_1 \omega_1^{-1}(t_1) \right\|$$

$$+ \left\| \int_{t_1 + \tau_2}^{t_1 + \tau_2} \left[ \tilde{f}(s, s - \tau^0, \ddot{x}_r(s), \ddot{x}_r(s - \tau^1), u_r(s), u_r(s - \tau^2)) - \tilde{f}(s, s - \tau^0, \ddot{x}_r(s), \ddot{x}_r(s - \tau^1), u_r(s), u_r(s - \tau^2)) \right] ds \right\|$$

$$+ \left\| \int_{t_1 + \tau_2}^{t_1 + \tau_2} \left[ \tilde{f}(s, s - \tau^0, \ddot{x}_r(s), \ddot{x}_r(s - \tau^1), u_r(s), u_r(s - \tau^2)) - \tilde{f}(s, s - \tau^0, \ddot{x}_r(s), \ddot{x}_r(s - \tau^1), u_r(s), u_r(s - \tau^2)) \right] ds \right\| - \eta_1 \omega_1^{+1}(t_1) \right\|$$

$$\leq \left\| \int_{t_1 + \tau_2}^{t_1 + \tau_2} \left[ \tilde{f}(s, s - \tau^0, \ddot{x}_r(s), \ddot{x}_r(s - \tau^1), u_r(s), u_r(s - \tau^2)) - \tilde{f}(s, s - \tau^0, \ddot{x}_r(s), \ddot{x}_r(s - \tau^1), u_r(s), u_r(s - \tau^2)) \right] ds \right\|.$$
The principle argues by contradiction via the following classical result (see, e.g. [27, 30]).

\[
\eta_G \text{ is any variation of control } B \text{ is any variation of control}
\]

where \( \eta \) is any variation of control. Consequently, expression (13) follows straightforwardly. The conclusion follows from the continuity of \( G^\tau_0 \) and density arguments.

Therefore, by bounding the derivatives of the extended dynamics, we have

\[
\| \tilde{x}^\tau_0(t_1 + \tau^2) - \tilde{x}_G(t_1 + \tau^2) - \eta_1 \tilde{w}_{t_1, u_1}(t_1 + \tau^2) \| \leq \tilde{C}_1 \int_{t_1 + \tau^2}^{t_1 + \tau^2 - \eta_1} \| \tilde{x}^\tau_0(s) - \tilde{x}_G(s) - \eta_1 \tilde{w}_{t_1, u_1}(s) \| \, ds + o(\eta_1)
\]

where \( \tilde{C}_1 \geq 0 \) is an appropriate constant. Exactly with the same technique, we can bound the remaining term by the following expression

\[
\left\| \int_{t_1 + \tau^2}^t \left[ f(s, s - \tau^0, \tilde{x}^\tau_0(s), \tilde{x}^\tau_0(s - \tau^1), u_1, u_2(s - \tau^2)) - f(s, s - \tau^0, \tilde{x}_G(s), \tilde{x}_G(s - \tau^1), u_1, u_2(s - \tau^2)) \right. \right.
\]

\[
\left. \left. - \eta_1 \tilde{w}^\tau_{t_1, u_1}(s) \right\| \, ds \right\| \leq \tilde{C}_2 \int_{t_1 + \tau^2 - \tau^1}^{t_1 + \tau^2 - \eta_1} \| \tilde{x}^\tau_0(s) - \tilde{x}_G(s) - \eta_1 \tilde{w}_{t_1, u_1}(s) \| \, ds + o(\eta_1)
\]

where \( \tilde{C}_2 \geq 0 \) is another appropriate constant. Coupling the two last results with the Gronwall’s inequality, expression (13) follows straightforwardly. The conclusion comes from (13) and the fact that \( t \) is a Lebesgue point of \( u_\tau(\cdot) \) and of \( u_\tau(\cdot - \tau^2) \).}

\[ \square \]

**3.1.3. Proof of The Maximum Principle.** The proof of the Maximum Principle argues by contradiction via the following classical result (see, e.g. [27, 30]).

**Lemma 3.5 (Conic Implicit Function Theorem).** Let \( C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m \) be convex with non-empty interior, of vertex 0, and \( F : C \to \mathbb{R}^n \) be Lipschitz such that \( F(0) = 0 \) and \( F \) is Gâteaux differentiable at 0 along admissible directions of \( C \) (in the sense of [30, Lemma 46]). Assume that \( dF(0) \cdot \text{Cone}(C) = \mathbb{R}^n \), where \( \text{Cone}(C) \) stands for the convex cone of \( C \). Then, \( 0 \in \text{Int} F(V \cap C) \), for every neighborhood \( V \) of 0 in \( \mathbb{R}^m \).

Consider any integer \( p \geq 1 \) and a positive real number \( \varepsilon_p > 0 \). Define

\[
G^\tau_p : B_{\varepsilon_p}(0) \cap \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p_+ \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : (\delta, \eta_1, \ldots, \eta_p) \mapsto \tilde{x}^\tau(t^\tau_f + \delta) - \tilde{x}_G(t^\tau_f)
\]

where \( \pi \) is any variation of control \( u_\tau(\cdot) \) and \( \varepsilon_p \) is small enough such that \( G^\tau_p \) is well-defined (see Section 3.1.2). The following statements hold:

- \( G^\tau_p(0) = 0 \) and \( G^\tau_p \) is Lipschitz continuous.

- \( G^\tau_p \) is Gâteaux differentiable at 0 along admissible directions of the convex set \( B_{\varepsilon_p}(0) \cap \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p_+ \) (in the sense of [30, Lemma 46]), thanks to Lemma 3.4. The Lipschitz behavior of \( G^\tau_p \) is proved by a recursive use of needle-like variations at \( \eta_i - \eta_i \), \( 1 \leq i \leq p \) (for \( \eta_i \) small enough), Lebesgue points of \( u_\tau(\cdot) \), by making a recursive use of Lemma 3.4. Remark that, since \( \eta_i - \eta_i \) are Lebesgue points of \( u_\tau(\cdot) \) only for almost every \( \eta_i \), the recursive use of Lemma 3.4 can be done only almost everywhere. The conclusion follows from the continuity of \( G^\tau_p \) and density arguments.
The Maximum Principle is then established as follows. Suppose, by contradiction, that the augmented first Pontryagin cone $\tilde{K}^*_1(t_f)$ coincides with $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Then, by definition, there would exist an integer $p \geq 1$, a variation $\pi$ of $u_\tau(\cdot)$ and a positive real number $\varepsilon_p > 0$ such that

$$dG^*_p(0) \cdot (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p) = \tilde{K}^*_1(t_f) = \mathbb{R}^{n+1}.$$ 

In this case, Lemma 3.5 would imply that the point $\tilde{x}_\tau(t_f)$ belongs to the interior of the accessible set $\tilde{A}_{\tau,U}(t_f)$, which contradicts Lemma 3.1. The Hahn-Banach theorem provides therefore the following more general Lagrange multiplier rule.

**Lemma 3.6.** There exists $\tilde{\psi}_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus \{0\}$ (Lagrange multiplier) such that

$$\langle \tilde{\psi}_\tau, f(t_f', t_f' - \tau^0, x_\tau(t_f'), x_\tau(t_f' - \tau^1), u_\tau(t_f'), u_\tau(t_f' - \tau^2)) \rangle = 0,$$

$$\langle \tilde{\psi}_\tau, \tilde{v}_\tau \rangle \leq 0, \quad \forall \, \tilde{v}_\tau \in \tilde{K}^*_1(t_f).$$

The relations provided by Lemma 3.6 allow to derive the necessary conditions (3)-(6) given in Section 2.1 (we skip these computations, referring to [27, 30] for details). The relation between the adjoint vector satisfying (3) and the above Lagrange multiplier $\psi_\tau = (\psi_\tau, \psi_0^\pi)$ is that $(p_\tau(\cdot), p^0)$ is built so that $p_\tau(t_f') = \psi_\tau$, $p^0 = \psi_0^\pi$. We will make use of the result below, which follows from the previous considerations.

**Lemma 3.7.** Consider the free final time problem $(OCP)_{\tau=0} = (OCP)$. For any optimal trajectory $x(\cdot)$ of $(OCP)$, the following statements are equivalent:

- The trajectory $x(\cdot)$ has an unique extremal lift $(x(\cdot), p(\cdot), p^0, u(\cdot))$ whose adjoint $(p(\cdot), p^0)$ is unique up to a multiplicative scalar, which is normal.
- The cone $K^*_{1,0}(t_f)$ is a half-space of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and $K^*_{1,0}(0) = \mathbb{R}^n$.

### 3.2. Conic Implicit Function Theorem with Parameters

The main first step of the proof of Theorem 2.1 makes use of the procedure detailed in Section 3.1. More specifically, we need the needle-like variation formula and the conic implicit function theorem. However, Lemma 3.5 is not suited to this situation because we have to take into account the dependence with respect to the delay $\tau$. Indeed, the proof of Lemma 3.5 is based on the Brower’s fixed point theorem (see, e.g., [27]) which does not consider continuous dependence with respect to parameters (which, in our case, is represented by $\tau$). Therefore, in this section, we introduce a more general version of the conic implicit function theorem depending on parameters.

When considering the delay $\tau$ as a varying parameter, the variation formula provided by Lemma 3.4 holds only for almost every $\tau$, and this, because we need that each $t_i$ is a Lebesgue point of $u_\tau(\cdot), u_\tau(\cdot - \tau)$ and of $u_\tau(\cdot + \tau)$. This obliges to introduce a notion of conic implicit function theorem which, on one hand, ensures a continuous dependence with respect to parameters and, on the other hand, deals with quantities defined uniquely on dense subsets. The notion of differentiability that we need is the following. A function $f : C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is said almost everywhere strictly differentiable at some point $x_0 \in C$ whenever there exists a linear continuous mapping $df(x_0) : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$f(y) - f(x) = df(x_0) \cdot (y - x) + \|y - x\|g(x, y)$$

for almost every $x, y \in C$, where $g(x, y)$ tends to 0 as soon as $\|x - x_0\| + \|y - x_0\|$ $\overset{w.e.}{\to}$ 0.

One may remark that the notion of strictly differentiability and of conic implicit function theorem depending on parameters was already introduced by [31]. Nevertheless, in our framework, we need to adapt these results considering dense subsets.
Lemma 3.8 (Conic Implicit Function Theorem with Parameters). Let \( C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p \) be open and convex with non empty interior, of vertex 0, and \( F : \mathbb{R}^k \times C \to \mathbb{R}^n : (\varepsilon, x) \mapsto F(\varepsilon, x) \) be a continuous mapping, for which \( F(0, 0) = 0 \), satisfying the following:

- For almost every \( \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^k_+ \), \( F \) is almost everywhere strictly differentiable with respect to \( x \) at 0, and \( \partial F / \partial x(\varepsilon, 0) \) is continuous in \( \varepsilon \) on dense subsets.
- For almost every \( \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^k_+ \), the remainder satisfies \( g_\varepsilon(x, y) \to 0 \) as \( (x, y) \xrightarrow{\text{a.e.}} 0 \), uniformly with respect to \( \varepsilon \) on dense subsets.

There holds \( \partial F(0, 0) \cdot \text{Cone}(C) = \mathbb{R}^n \).

Therefore, there exists \( \varepsilon_0 > 0 \), a neighborhood \( \mathcal{V} \) of 0 in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) and a continuous function \( h : [0, \varepsilon_0]^k \times \mathcal{V} \to C, \) such that \( F(\varepsilon, h(\varepsilon, y)) = y \) for every \( \varepsilon \in [0, \varepsilon_0)^k \) and every \( y \in \mathcal{V} \).

Proof. We start by recalling the following standard result (see, e.g. [27]).

Let \( L : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}^p \) be a linear mapping such that \( L(\mathbb{R}^n_+) = \mathbb{R}^n \). The following hold:

- There holds \( p > n + 1 \) and the intersection \( (0, +\infty)^p \cap \ker L \) is nontrivial.
- There is a subspace \( S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p, \dim(S) = n \), so that \( L|_S : S \to \mathbb{R}^n \) is an isomorphism.

In our particular case, applying the previous result to the linear mapping \( L = \partial F / \partial x(0, 0) \) yields the existence of a nontrivial vector \( v \in (0, +\infty)^p \) such that \( L(v) = 0 \), and, of a \( n \)-dimensional subspace \( S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p \) such that \( L|_S : S \to \mathbb{R}^n \) is an isomorphism.

For every \( \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^k_+ \) and every \( y, u \in \mathbb{R}^n \), set \( \Phi(\varepsilon, y, u) = u - F(\varepsilon, L|_S^{-1}(u)) + y \). This mapping is continuous and there holds \( \Phi(0, 0, 0) = 0 \). Fix \( \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^k_+ \) at which \( F \) is almost everywhere strictly differentiable. Then, for every \( y \in \mathbb{R}^n \), one has

\[
\Phi(\varepsilon, y, u_1) - \Phi(\varepsilon, y, u_2) = \left[ \text{Id} - \frac{\partial F}{\partial x}(\varepsilon, 0) \circ L|_S^{-1} \right] (u_1 - u_2) + \|u_1 - u_2\| G_\varepsilon(u_1, u_2)
\]

where \( G_\varepsilon(u_1, u_2) = g_\varepsilon(L|_S^{-1}(u_2), L|_S^{-1}(u_1)) \to 0 \) as soon as \( (u_1, u_2) \xrightarrow{\text{a.e.}} 0 \). From the continuity property of \( \frac{\partial F}{\partial x}(\varepsilon, 0) \) on dense subsets, there exists \( \varepsilon_0 \in \mathbb{R}^k_+ \) and a dense subset \( E \subseteq [0, \varepsilon_0)^k \), such that for every \( \varepsilon \in E \) there holds

\[
\left\| \text{Id} - \frac{\partial F}{\partial x}(\varepsilon, 0) \circ L|_S^{-1} \right\|_\ast \leq \frac{1}{4}
\]

and there exists \( r_\varepsilon > 0 \) such that

\[
\|G_\varepsilon(u_1, u_2)\| \leq \frac{1}{4} \quad \text{for almost all } u_1, u_2 \in B_{r_\varepsilon}(0).
\]

On the other hand, by assumption, the remainder in expression (14) converge to 0 uniformly with respect to \( \varepsilon \) on dense subsets. Therefore, up to reduce \( E \), gathering the previous results with (14), we infer the existence of \( r > 0 \) such that

\[
\|\Phi(\varepsilon, y, u_1) - \Phi(\varepsilon, y, u_2)\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|u_1 - u_2\| \quad \text{for almost every } \varepsilon \in E, \quad u_1, u_2 \in B_r(0).
\]

From this last result and the continuity of mapping \( F \), for every \( \varepsilon \in [0, \varepsilon_0]^k \) and \( y \in \mathbb{R}^n \), the mapping \( u \mapsto \Phi(\varepsilon, y, u) \) is \( \frac{1}{2} \)-Lipschitzian on an open neighborhood of 0.

At this step, for every \( \delta > 0 \), denote \( B_\delta = S \cap \overline{B}_\delta(0) \) and choose \( \delta > 0 \) small enough such that \( v + B_\delta \subseteq (0, +\infty)^p \). The set \( U_\delta = L(B_\delta) \) is a closed neighborhood of 0 in \( \mathbb{R}^n \). With the same argument as above, it is not difficult to show that, if \( \delta, \|\varepsilon\| \) and \( \|y\| \) are small enough, then, the mapping \( u \mapsto \Phi(\varepsilon, y, u) \) maps \( U_\delta \) into itself.

Lemma 3.8 follows from the application of the usual Banach fixed point theorem to the contraction mapping \( u \mapsto \Phi(\varepsilon, y, u) \) with parameters \( (\varepsilon, y) \).

\( \blacksquare \)
3.3. Proof of Theorem 2.1. From now on, assume that Assumptions (A) hold. We summon the other assumptions of Theorem 2.1 when they are needed. Moreover, \((x(\cdot), u(\cdot))\) will denote the (unique) solution of \((\text{OCP}) = (\text{OCP})_{\tau=0}\) and we assume that its related final time \(t_f\) is a Lebesgue point of \(u(\cdot)\) (if not, as pointed out in Section 3.1.2, we refer to the approach proposed by [28, 29]). Finally, without loss of generality, we consider free final time problems (otherwise, the proof is similar, but simpler), introducing later Assumption (C2) for \((\text{OCP})_{\tau}\) with control delays.

3.3.1. Controllability for \((\text{OCP})_{\tau}\). For any integer \(p \geq 1\), fix \(0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_p < t_f\) Lebesgue points of control \(u(\cdot)\) and \(p\) arbitrary values \(u_i \in U\). We denote \(v|_n\) the first \(n\) coordinates of a vector \(v \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}\). For an appropriate small positive real number \(\varepsilon_p > 0\), denoting by \(\tilde{x}(\varepsilon, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)(\cdot)\) the trajectory solution of (9) with delay \(\tau = (\varepsilon^0, \varepsilon^1, \varepsilon^2)\) and control \(u(\varepsilon, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)(\cdot)\), we define the mapping

\[
\Gamma : B_{\varepsilon_p}(0) \cap (\mathbb{R}_+^3 \times \mathbb{R}_+^p) \to \mathbb{R}^n : (\varepsilon^0, \varepsilon^1, \varepsilon^2, \delta, \eta_1, \ldots, \eta_p) \mapsto [\tilde{x}_i(\varepsilon, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)(t_f+\delta)-\tilde{x}(t_f)]_{n+1} + [\tilde{x}(\varepsilon, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)(t_f)-\tilde{x}(t_f)]_{n+1},
\]

Thanks to Assumption (A2) and by continuity with respect to initial data, \(\Gamma\) is well-defined and continuous. Moreover, \(\Gamma(0, \ldots, 0) = 0\) and we note that

\[
\Gamma(\varepsilon^0, \varepsilon^1, \varepsilon^2, \delta, \eta_1, \ldots, \eta_p) = [\tilde{x}_i(\varepsilon, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)(t_f+\delta)-\tilde{x}(\varepsilon, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)(t_f)]_{n+1} + [\tilde{x}(\varepsilon, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)(t_f)-\tilde{x}(t_f)]_{n+1},
\]

From Lemma 3.4 and a recursive use of the needle-like variation formula (as detailed in Section 3.1.3), for almost every \((\varepsilon^0, \varepsilon^1, \varepsilon^2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^3\) small enough, \(\Gamma\) is almost everywhere strictly differentiable w.r.t. \((\delta, \eta_1, \ldots, \eta_p)\) at \(0: \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial \delta, \eta_1, \ldots, \eta_p}(\varepsilon^0, \varepsilon^1, \varepsilon^2, 0)\) is continuous w.r.t. \((\varepsilon^0, \varepsilon^1, \varepsilon^2)\) on dense subsets and, moreover, the remainder of the related Taylor expansion converges to zero uniformly w.r.t. \((\varepsilon^0, \varepsilon^1, \varepsilon^2)\) on dense subsets.

From Assumption (A3), the unique extremal lift of \(x(\cdot)\) is normal, hence, it follows from Lemma 3.7 that \(\text{Int } K_{\tau=0}(t_f) = \text{Int } \mathbb{R}^n = \mathbb{R}^n\). We recall that we consider only either optimal control problems with pure state delays or affine optimal control problems. Therefore, thanks to Remark 3.3, it is straightforward to see that there exist a real number \(\delta\), an integer \(p \geq 1\) and a variation \(\pi = \{t_1, \ldots, t_p, \eta_1, \ldots, \eta_p, u_1, \ldots, u_p\}\) such that the associated mapping \(\Gamma\) satisfies

\[
\frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial \delta, \eta_1, \ldots, \eta_p}(0, 0, 0, 0) : (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+^p) = \text{Int } K_{\tau=0}(t_f) = \mathbb{R}^n.
\]

At this point, Lemma 3.8 implies the existence of a scalar delay \(\tau_0 > 0\) such that, for every \(\tau = (\tau^0, \tau^1, \tau^2) \in [0, \tau_0]^3\), there exist a real \(\delta(\tau)\) and positive reals \(\eta_1(\tau), \ldots, \eta_p(\tau)\) such that \(\Gamma(\tau^0, \tau^1, \tau^2, \delta(\tau), \eta_1(\tau), \ldots, \eta_p(\tau)) = 0\). Moreover, quantities \(\delta(\tau), \eta_1(\tau), \ldots, \eta_p(\tau)\) are continuous with respect to \(\tau\). From Assumption (A4), it follows that, for every \(\tau = (\tau^0, \tau^1, \tau^2) \in [0, \tau_0]^3\), the subset \(M_f\) is reachable for the dynamics of \((\text{OCP})_{\tau}\), in a final time \(t_f^\prime \in [0, \tau_0]^3\), by using control \(u_{\tau^0, \tau^1, \tau^2}(\cdot) \in L^\infty([0, t_f^\prime], U)\).

We have proved that, for every \(\tau = (\tau^0, \tau^1, \tau^2) \in (0, \tau_0)^3\), \((\text{OCP})_{\tau}\) is controllable. Remark that this argument still holds for \((\text{OCP})_{\tau}\) with pure state delays.

3.3.2. Existence of Optimal Controls for \((\text{OCP})_{\tau}\). We focus first on the existence of an optimal control for \((\text{OCP})_{\tau}\), for every \(\tau \in (0, \tau_0)^3\). No other assumptions but (A) and (C1) are considered. In particular, mappings \(f\) and \(f^0\) are affine in the two control variables. Thanks to this property, the existence can be achieved by using the arguments in [22, Theorem 2]. However, we prefer to develop the usual Filippov’s scheme [16] (following [32]) to highlight the difficulty in applying this procedure to more general systems (in particular, see Remark 3.9). Even if problems
(OCP), with control and state delays are considered, we assume to have free final time just to use the same approach for problem with pure state delays.

Fix $\tau = (\tau^0, \tau^1, \tau^2) \in (0, \tau_0)^3$ and let

$$\alpha = \inf_{u \in U(t, u)} C_\tau(t_f(u), u) = \int_0^{t_f(u)} f^0(t, t - \tau^0, x(t), x(t - \tau^1), u(t), u(t - \tau^2)) \, dt$$

Consider now a minimizing sequence of trajectories $x_k(\cdot)$ associated to $u_k(\cdot)$, that is $C_\tau(t_f(u_k), u_k) \to \alpha$ when $k \to \infty$ and define

$$\tilde{F}_k(t) = \tilde{f}(t, t - \tau^0, x_k(t), x_k(t - \tau^1), u_k(t), u_k(t - \tau^2))$$

for almost every $t \in [0, t_f(u_k)]$. By Assumption (A4), we can extend $\tilde{F}_k(\cdot)$ by zero on $(t_f(u_k), b)$ so that $(\tilde{F}_k(\cdot))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $L^\infty([0, b], \mathbb{R}^{n + 1})$. Therefore, up to some subsequence, $(\tilde{F}_k(\cdot))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to some $\tilde{F}(\cdot) = (F(\cdot), F^0(\cdot)) \in L^\infty([0, b], \mathbb{R}^{n + 1})$ for the weak star topology of $L^\infty$. On the other hand, up to some subsequence, the sequence $(t_f(u_k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to some $t_f^* \geq 0$. Then, for every $t \in [-\Delta, t_f^*]$, define

$$x_\tau(t) = \phi^1(t) I_{[-\Delta, 0]}(t) + I_{(0, t_f^*]}(t) \left[ \phi^1(0) + \int_0^t F(s) \, ds \right]$$

Clearly, $x_\tau(\cdot)$ is absolutely continuous and, up to continuous extensions, $(x_k(\cdot))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges pointwise to $x_\tau(\cdot)$ within $[-\Delta, t_f^*]$. Moreover, by Assumptions (A1), (A4) and the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem, up to some subsequence, $x_k(\cdot)$ converges to $x_\tau(\cdot)$, uniformly in $[-\Delta, t_f^*]$. From the compactness of $M_f$, there holds $x_\tau(t_f^*) \in M_f$.

In the next paragraph, we show that $x_\tau(\cdot)$ comes from a control in $U_{t_f^*, \tau}[U]$. For almost every $t \in [0, t_f(u_k)]$, set

$$\tilde{H}_k(t) = \tilde{f}(t, t - \tau^0, x_\tau(t), x_\tau(t - \tau^1), u_k(t), u_k(t - \tau^2))$$

and, if $t_f(u_k) + \tau^2 < t_f^*$, extend it by 0 in $(t_f(u_k), b)$. At this step, we need to introduce several structures to deal with the presence of the control delay $\tau^2$. First, let

$$\beta = \max \left\{ \| f^0(t, s, x, y, u, v) \| : -\Delta \leq t \leq s \leq b, \| (x, y) \| \leq b, \| (u, v) \| \leq U^2 \right\} > 0$$

and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $N \tau^2 \leq t_f^* < (N + 1)\tau^2$. By taking continuous extensions, we clearly see that $x_\tau(\cdot)$ is well-defined in $[-\Delta, (N + 1)\tau^2]$. Therefore, we define

$$G(t, u^1, \ldots, u^{N + 1}, \gamma^1, \ldots, \gamma^{N + 1}) = \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
 f(t, t - \tau^0, x_r(t), x_r(t - \tau^1), u^1, \phi^2(t - \tau^2) + \gamma^1) \\
 f(t + \tau^2, t + \tau^2 - \tau^0, x_r(t + \tau^2), x_r(t + \tau^2 - \tau^1), u^2, \phi^1(t + \tau^2 - \tau^1) + \gamma^2) \\
 f(t + N \tau^2, t + N \tau^2 - \tau^0, x_r(t + N \tau^2), x_r(t + N \tau^2 - \tau^1), u^N + 1, u^N + \gamma^N + 1) \\
 f(t + N \tau^2, t + N \tau^2 - \tau^0, x_r(t + N \tau^2), x_r(t + N \tau^2 - \tau^1), u^N + 1, u^N + \gamma^N + 1) \\
 \end{array} \right\}$$

almost everywhere in $[0, \tau^2]$, and

$$V_{\gamma}(t) = \left\{ G(t, u^1, \ldots, u^{N + 1}, \gamma^1, \ldots, \gamma^{N + 1}) : (u^1, \ldots, u^{N + 1}) \in U^{N + 1}, \forall i = 1, \ldots, N + 1 : \gamma^i \geq 0, \right. \left. \| f^0(t, t - \tau^0, x_\tau(t), x_\tau(t - \tau^1), u^1, \phi^2(t - \tau^2) + \gamma^1) \| \leq \beta \right\} \forall i = 1, \ldots, N : \| f^0(t + i \tau^2, t + i \tau^2 - \tau^0, x_\tau(t + i \tau^2), x_\tau(t + i \tau^2 - \tau^1), u^i + 1, u^i + \gamma^i + 1) \| \leq \beta.$$


Thanks to Assumption (A1), \( \hat{V}_\beta(t) \) is compact for the standard topology of \( \mathbb{R}^{(n+1)(N+1)} \).
Moreover, it is not difficult to see that Assumptions (A1) and (C1) ensure that \( \hat{V}_\beta(t) \) is convex for the same topology (remark the importance of (C1)). We then introduce

\[
\hat{V} = \left\{ \hat{G}(\cdot) \in L^2([0, \tau^2], \mathbb{R}^{(n+1)(N+1)}) : \hat{G}(t) \in \hat{V}_\beta(t), \text{ a.e. } [0, \tau^2] \right\}.
\]

One checks easily that \( \hat{V} \) is convex and closed in \( L^2([0, \tau^2], \mathbb{R}^{(n+1)(N+1)}) \) for the strong topology of \( L^2 \), and therefore, it is convex and closed in \( L^2([0, \tau^2], \mathbb{R}^{(n+1)(N+1)}) \) for the weak topology of \( L^2 \). At this step, for every \( i = 0, \ldots, N \), denote

\[
\hat{G}^i(t) = \hat{G}_k^i(t) = (\hat{G}_k^i(t), \ldots, \hat{G}_k^{N+1}(t)).
\]

Therefore \( \hat{G}_k(\cdot) \in \hat{V} \) for every \( k \in \mathbb{N} \). Moreover, since \( (\hat{G}_k(\cdot))_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) is bounded in \( L^2([0, \tau^2], \mathbb{R}^{(n+1)(N+1)}) \), up to some subsequence, it converges for the weak topology of \( L^2 \) to a function \( \hat{G}(\cdot) \) that necessarily belongs to \( \hat{V} \). Therefore, for almost every \( t \in [0, \tau^2] \) and \( i = 1, \ldots, N + 1 \), there exist points \( u^i_+ \in U \), and scalar \( \gamma^i_+ \geq 0 \) such that

\[
\hat{G}^1(t) = \begin{pmatrix}
    f(t, t - \tau^0, x_\tau(t), x_\tau(t - \tau^1), u^1_+(t), \phi^2(t - \tau^2)) \\
    f^0(t, t - \tau^0, x_\tau(t), x_\tau(t - \tau^1), u^1_+(t), \phi^2(t - \tau^2) + \gamma^1_+(t))
\end{pmatrix}
\]

and, for every \( i = 1, \ldots, N \),

\[
\hat{G}^{i+1}(t) = \begin{pmatrix}
    f(t + i \tau^2, t + i \tau^2 - \tau^0, x_\tau(t + i \tau^2), x_\tau(t + i \tau^2 - \tau^1), u^{i+1}_+(t), u^i_+(t)) \\
    f^0(t + i \tau^2, t + i \tau^2 - \tau^0, x_\tau(t + i \tau^2), x_\tau(t + i \tau^2 - \tau^1), u^{i+1}_+(t), u^i_+(t) + \gamma^{i+1}_+(t))
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

Moreover, since \( U \) is compact, functions \( u^i_+ \), \( \gamma^i_+ \) can be chosen to be measurable on \([0, \tau^2]\) using a measurable selection lemma (see, e.g. [28, Lemma 3A, page 161]).

At this step, we come back to the whole interval \([-\tau^2, t^*_f] \). For this set

\[
u_\tau(t) = \begin{cases}
    \phi^2(t) & t \in [-\tau^2, 0], \\
    u^{i+1}_+(t - i \tau^2) & t \in [i \tau^2, (i + 1) \tau^2], \; i = 0, \ldots, N.
\end{cases}
\]

\[
\gamma_\tau(t) = \gamma^{i+1}_+(t - i \tau^2) \quad t \in [i \tau^2, (i + 1) \tau^2], \; i = 0, \ldots, N
\]

which are measurable functions in \([-\tau^2, t^*_f] \), and let

\[
\hat{H}(t) = \begin{pmatrix}
    f(t, t - \tau^0, x_\tau(t), x_\tau(t - \tau^1), u_\tau(t), u_\tau(t - \tau^2)) \\
    f^0(t, t - \tau^0, x_\tau(t), x_\tau(t - \tau^1), u_\tau(t), u_\tau(t - \tau^2) + \gamma_\tau(t))
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

From the weak star convergence in \( L^\infty \) of \( (\hat{G}_k(\cdot))_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) towards \( \hat{G}(\cdot) \), it follows immediately that \( (\hat{H}_k(\cdot))_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) converges to \( \hat{H}(\cdot) \) for the weak topology of \( L^2 \). Furthermore, from the differentiability of \( f \) w.r.t. \((x, y)\), the compactness of \( U \) and the dominated convergence theorem, there holds

\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \int_0^{t^*_f} \left( \hat{F}_k(t) - \hat{H}_k(t) \right) \cdot \phi(t) \; dt = 0
\]

for every map \( \phi(\cdot) \in L^2([0, t^*_f], \mathbb{R}^{n+1}) \), from which \( \hat{H} = \hat{F} \) almost everywhere in \([0, t^*_f] \).

Combining (15) with all the previous results, we obtain

\[
x_\tau(t) = \phi^1(t) \mathbb{I}_{(-\Delta, 0)}(t) + \mathbb{I}_{[0, t^*_f]}(t) \left[ \phi^0(0) + \int_0^t f(t, t - \tau^0, x_\tau(t), x_\tau(t - \tau^1), u_\tau(t), u_\tau(t - \tau^2)) \; ds \right]
\]
which proves that the measurable function $u_r(\cdot)$ is an admissible control for $(\text{OCP})_r$.

It remains to show that control $u_r(\cdot)$ is optimal for $(\text{OCP})_r$. For this, from what we showed above and by definition of weak star convergence, we have

$$C_r(t_f(u_k), u_k) \rightarrow \int_0^{t_f} \left( f^0(t, t - \tau^0, x_r(t), x_r(t - \tau^1), u_r(t), u_r(t - \tau^2)) + \gamma_r(t) \right) dt.$$ 

Since $\gamma_r(\cdot)$ takes only non-negative values, there holds

$$\int_0^{t_f} f^0(t, t - \tau^0, x_r(t), x_r(t - \tau^1), u_r(t), u_r(t - \tau^2)) dt \leq \alpha \leq C_r(t_f(v), v)$$

for every $v(\cdot) \in \mathcal{U}_f^*$. Therefore, $\gamma_r(\cdot)$ is necessarily zero and the conclusion follows.

Now, we consider problems $(\text{OCP})_r$ with pure state delays. It is clear that, if Assumption $(B_2)$ holds, one can proceed with the same procedure as above (which is nothing else but the usual Filippov’s scheme [16]) for the existence of optimal controls. Of course, Guinn’s reduction (16) is not needed.

**Remark 3.9.** Guinn’s reduction (16) converts the dynamics with control delays into a new dynamics without control delays but with a larger number of variables. It is clear, from the context, that the natural assumption to provide the existence of optimal controls for generic nonlinear dynamics is the convexity of system (16) for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$ (since the delay varies), which is a very strong assumption. From this, we ascertain that the proof of Lemma 2.1 in [17] does not work under the weaker assumption of convexity of the epigraph of the extended dynamics.

### 3.3.3. Convergence of Optimal Controls and Trajectories for $(\text{OCP})_r$.

We start by considering problems $(\text{OCP})_r$ with pure state delays, by assuming that Assumption $(B_2)$ holds. In this case, the classical way to proceed consists in reproducing and adapting the convexity Filippov’s scheme used in the previous section for the existence of optimal controls (see, e.g. [21]).

Let $(\tau_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} = ((t^0_k, \tau^1_k, 0))_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq (0, \tau_0)^2 \times \{0\}$ an arbitrary sequence converging to 0 as $k$ tends to $\infty$ and let $(x_{\tau_k}(\cdot), u_{\tau_k}(\cdot))$ be an optimal solution of $(\text{OCP})_{\tau_k}$ with final time $t_f^{\tau_k}(u_{\tau_k})$. Since $t_f^{\tau_k}(u_{\tau_k}) \in [0, b]$, up to some subsequence, the sequence $(t_f^{\tau_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}} = (t_f^{\tau_k}(u_{\tau_k}))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to some $t_f \in [0, b]$. Since $M_f$ is compact, up to some subsequence, the sequence $(x_{\tau_k}(t_f^{\tau_k}))_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq M_f$ converges to some point in $M_f$.

For every integer $k$ and almost every $t \in [0, t_f^{\tau_k})$, set

$$\tilde{G}_k(t) = \left( \tilde{f}(t, t - \tau^0_k, x_{\tau_k}(t), x_{\tau_k}(t - \tau^1_k), u_{\tau_k}(t)), \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial x}(t, t - \tau^0_k, x_{\tau_k}(t), x_{\tau_k}(t - \tau^1_k), u_{\tau_k}(t)), \right.$$ 

$$\left. \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial y}(t, t - \tau^0_k, x_{\tau_k}(t), x_{\tau_k}(t - \tau^1_k), u_{\tau_k}(t)) \right).$$

Thanks to Assumption $(A_4)$, we extend $\tilde{G}_k(\cdot)$ by zero on $(t_f^{\tau_k}, b]$. Assumptions $(A_1)$ and $(A_4)$ imply that the sequence $(\tilde{G}_k(\cdot))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $L^\infty$, then, up to some subsequence, it converges to some $\tilde{G}(\cdot) = (G(\cdot), G^0(\cdot), G_x(\cdot), G_y(\cdot)) \in L^\infty([0, b], \mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ for the weak star topology of $L^\infty$. Exploiting the weak star convergence of $L^\infty$ (and
using \( \mathbb{1}_{[\ell_f, b]} \bar{G} \) as test function), we get that \( \bar{G}(t) = 0 \) for almost every \( t \in [\ell_f, b] \). From this, for every \( t \in [0, \bar{t}_f] \), denote
\[
\bar{x}(t) = \phi^1(t)\mathbb{1}_{[-\Delta, 0]}(t) + \mathbb{1}_{[0, \bar{t}_f]}(t) \left[ \phi^1(0) + \int_0^t G(s) \, ds \right].
\]

Clearly, \( \bar{x}(\cdot) \) is absolutely continuous and \( \bar{x}(t) = \lim_{k \to \infty} x_{\tau_k}(t) \) pointwise in \([\Delta, \bar{t}_f] \).

Moreover, by Assumptions (A_1), (A_4) and the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem, up to some subsequence, \( x_{\tau_k}(\cdot) \) converges to \( \bar{x}(\cdot) \), uniformly in \([-\Delta, \bar{t}_f] \), and there holds \( \bar{x}(\bar{t}_f) \in M_f \).

In the next paragraph, we prove that there exists a control \( \bar{u}(\cdot) \in L^\infty([0, \bar{t}_f], U) \) such that \( \bar{x}(\cdot) \) is an admissible trajectory of (OCP) associated with this control \( \bar{u}(\cdot) \).

Using the definition of \( \beta \) given in Section 3.3.2, for \( t \in [0, \bar{t}_f] \), consider the set
\[
\bar{Z}_\beta(t) = \left\{ \left( f(t, t, \bar{x}(t), \bar{x}(t), u), f^0(t, t, \bar{x}(t), \bar{x}(t), u) + \gamma \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(t, t, \bar{x}(t), \bar{x}(t), u), \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(t, t, \bar{x}(t), \bar{x}(t), u) \right) : \right. \\
\left. u \in U, \gamma \geq 0, |f^0(t, t, \bar{x}(t), \bar{x}(t), u) + \gamma| \leq \beta \right\}.
\]
Thanks to Assumption (B_2), the set \( \bar{Z}_\beta(t) \) is compact and convex for the standard topology of \( \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \). Therefore, we have the following statements.

- For every \( \delta > 0 \) and \( t \in [0, \bar{t}_f] \), \( \bar{Z}_\delta(t) = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : d(x, \bar{Z}_\beta(t)) \leq \delta \right\} \), where \( d(x, A) = \inf_{y \in A} \|x - y\| \)

is convex and compact for the standard topology of \( \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \). This fact is evident.

- For every \( \delta > 0 \), the set
\[
\bar{Z}_\delta = \left\{ \bar{F}(\cdot) \in L^2([0, \bar{t}_f], \mathbb{R}^{n+1}) : \bar{F}(t) \in \bar{Z}_\delta(t) \text{ for almost every } t \in [0, \bar{t}_f] \right\}
\]
is convex and closed in \( L^2([0, \bar{t}_f], \mathbb{R}^{n+1}) \) for the strong topology of \( L^2 \). Then, we have that it is closed in \( L^2([0, \bar{t}_f], \mathbb{R}^{n+1}) \) for the weak topology of \( L^2 \).

Convexity is obvious from the previous statement. Let \( (\bar{F}_k(\cdot))_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in \bar{Z}_\delta \) such that \( \bar{F}_k(\cdot) \xrightarrow{L^2} \bar{F}(\cdot) \). Therefore, \( \bar{F}(\cdot) \in L^2([0, \bar{t}_f], \mathbb{R}^{n+1}) \) and there exists a subsequence such that \( \bar{F}_{k_m}(\cdot) \xrightarrow{a.e} \bar{F}(\cdot) \). Since \( \bar{Z}_\delta(t) \) is closed for the standard topology of \( \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \), a.e. in \( t \in [0, \bar{t}_f] \), there holds \( \bar{F}(t) = \lim_{m \to \infty} \bar{F}_{k_m}(t) \in \bar{Z}_\delta(t) \)

and the statement follows.

- For every \( \delta > 0 \), there exists \( k_\delta \in \mathbb{N} \) such that, if \( k \geq k_\delta \), then \( \bar{G}_k(\cdot) \in \bar{Z}_\delta \).

Indeed, thanks to Assumptions (A_1), (A_4), mappings \( f \), \( f^0 \) are globally Lipschitz within \([-\Delta, \bar{t}_f]^2 \times \bar{B}_\delta^2(0) \times U \) and, by using the mean value theorem, for almost every \( t \in [0, \bar{t}_f] \), we obtain
\[
\inf_{z \in \bar{Z}_\delta(t)} \| \bar{G}_k(t) - z \| \leq \hat{C} \left[ \| x_{\tau_k}(t) - \bar{x}(t) \| + \| x_{\tau_k}(t - \tau_k^1) - \bar{x}(t) \| + \tau_k^0 \right]
\]
where \( \hat{C} > 0 \) is a suitable constant, which is independent from \( t \). The conclusion follows from the uniform convergence of \( (x_{\tau_k}(\cdot))_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) towards \( \bar{x}(\cdot) \).

Using the closeness of \( \bar{Z}_\delta \) with respect to the weak topology of \( L^2 \), we infer that \( \bar{G}(\cdot) \in \bar{Z}_\delta \) for every \( \delta > 0 \). It is not difficult to see that this implies \( \bar{G}(\cdot) \in \cap_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \bar{Z}_{1/j} \subseteq \bar{Z}_0 \).
We have obtained that, a.e. in \( t \in [0, \bar{t}_f] \), there exist \( \bar{u}(t) \in U \), \( \bar{\gamma}(t) \geq 0 \) such that
\[
(18) \quad \bar{G}(t) = \left( f(t, t, \bar{x}(t), \bar{x}(t), \bar{u}(t)) , \ f^0(t, t, \bar{x}(t), \bar{x}(t), \bar{u}(t)) + \bar{\gamma}(t) , \
\frac{\partial \bar{f}}{\partial x}(t, t, \bar{x}(t), \bar{x}(t), \bar{u}(t)) , \ \frac{\partial \bar{f}}{\partial y}(t, t, \bar{x}(t), \bar{x}(t), \bar{u}(t)) \right).
\]
Moreover, since \( U \) is compact, functions \( \bar{u}(-) \), \( \bar{\gamma}(-) \) can be chosen to be measurable on \([0, \bar{t}_f] \) using a measurable selection lemma (see, e.g. [28, Lemma 3A, page 161]). Combining (18) with (17) provides
\[
\bar{x}(t) = \phi^1(t) \mathbb{I}_{[-\Delta, 0]}(t) + \mathbb{I}_{[0, \bar{t}_f]}(t) \left[ \phi^1(0) + \int_0^t f(s, s, \bar{x}(s), \bar{x}(s), \bar{u}(s)) \, ds \right]
\]
which proves that the function \( \bar{u}(-) \) is an admissible control for \((\text{OCP})_{\bar{t}_f = 0} = (\text{OCP})\).

In order to conclude, it remains to show that \( \bar{t}_f = t_f \), \( \bar{u}(-) = u(-) \) and \( \bar{x}(-) = x(-) \).

First, the previous argument shows that
\[
C_{\tau_k}(t^*_f, u_{\tau_k}) \to C_0(\bar{t}_f, \bar{u}) + \int_0^{\bar{t}_f} \bar{\gamma}(t) \, dt.
\]
Thanks to the construction of the mapping \( \Gamma \) provided in Section 3.3.1, for every integer \( k \), there exists a sequence \((t^*_f, v_k(-), y_k(-))\), respectively of final times, of admissible controls and of trajectories for \((\text{OCP})_{\tau_k}\), which converges to \((t_f, u(-), x(-))\) (for the evident topologies) as \( k \) tends to \( \infty \). Thanks to the optimality of each \( u_{\tau_k}(-) \), there holds \( C_{\tau_k}(t^*_f, u_{\tau_k}) \leq C_{\tau_k}(t^*_f, v_k) \) and, since \( \bar{\gamma}(t) \geq 0 \), passing to the limit gives \( C_0(\bar{t}_f, \bar{u}) \leq C_0(t_f, u) \). From Assumption \((A_2)\) we infer \( \bar{t}_f = t_f \), \( \bar{u}(-) = u(-) \), \( \bar{x}(-) = x(-) \).

Remark that, from the previous argument, the following weak convergences hold
\[
(19) \quad \begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial \bar{f}}{\partial x}(\cdot, - \tau^0_k, x_{\tau_k}(-), x_{\tau_k}(-, \tau^1_k), u_{\tau_k}(-)) \overset{L^\infty}{\rightharpoonup} & \frac{\partial \bar{f}}{\partial x}(\cdot, - x(-), x(-), u(-)) \\
\frac{\partial \bar{f}}{\partial y}(\cdot, - \tau^0_k, x_{\tau_k}(-), x_{\tau_k}(-, \tau^1_k), u_{\tau_k}(-)) \overset{L^\infty}{\rightharpoonup} & \frac{\partial \bar{f}}{\partial y}(\cdot, - x(-), x(-), u(-))
\end{aligned}
\]

Let now consider problems \((\text{OCP})_{\bar{t}_f}\) with control and state delays satisfying Assumption \((C_1)\). Thanks to the affine behavior of the considered mappings, the previous argument simplifies considerably, because we can transpose the weak convergence directly on controls. Adapting these proofs to very general systems turns out to be very challenging. We adopt free final time to show that, for this step, no problems arise if Assumption \((C_2)\) does not hold.

Let \((\tau_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} = ((\tau^0_k, \tau^1_k, \tau^2_k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in (0, \tau_0)^3 \) an arbitrary sequence of delays converging to 0 as \( k \) tends to \( \infty \) and let \((x_{\tau_k}(-), u_{\tau_k}(-)) \) be an optimal solution of \((\text{OCP})_{\tau_k}\) with final time \( t^*_f(u_{\tau_k}) \). Since \( t^*_f(u_{\tau_k}) \in [0, b] \), up to some subsequence, the sequence of final times \((t^*_f)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} = (t^*_f(u_{\tau_k}))_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) converges to some \( \bar{t}_f \in [0, b] \). Since \( M_f \) is compact, up to some subsequence, the sequence \((x_{\tau_k}(t^*_f))_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq M_f \) converges to a point in \( M_f \).

On the other hand, thanks to Assumption \((A_1)\), the sequence \((u_{\tau_k}(-))_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) is bounded in \( L^2([-\Delta, \bar{t}_f], \mathbb{R}^m) \). Therefore, up to some subsequence, \((u_{\tau_k}(-))_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) converges to some \( \bar{u}(-) \in L^2([-\Delta, \bar{t}_f], \mathbb{R}^m) \) for the weak topology of \( L^2 \). More precisely,
there holds \( \tilde{u}(\cdot) \in L^\infty([-\Delta, \bar{t}_f], U) \). Indeed, \((u_{n_k}(\cdot))_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq L^2([-\Delta, \bar{t}_f], U)\) and, thanks to Assumption (A1), the set \(L^2([-\Delta, \bar{t}_f], U)\) is closed and convex for the strong topology of \(L^2\). Therefore, it is closed and convex for the weak topology of \(L^2\), from which \(\tilde{u}(\cdot) \in L^2([-\Delta, \bar{t}_f], U) \subseteq L^\infty([-\Delta, \bar{t}_f], U)\) (the last inclusion still follows from (A1)).

At this step, one crucial result is the weak convergence in \(L^2\) of the sequence \((u_{n_k}(\cdot - \tau_k^2))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}\) towards control \(\bar{u}(\cdot)\). To see this, consider the shift operator

\[
S_{\tau^2} : L^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^m) \to L^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^m) : \left( t \mapsto \phi(t) \right) \mapsto \left( t \mapsto \phi(t - \tau^2) \right).
\]

Using the dominated convergence theorem, it is clear that, for every \(\phi(\cdot) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^m)\), there holds \(\|S_{\tau^2}\phi - \phi\|_{L^2} \to 0\) as soon as \(\tau^2 \to 0\). At this point, extend \(u_{n_k}(\cdot), u_{n_k}(\cdot - \tau_k^2)\) and \(\bar{u}(\cdot)\) by zero out \([-\Delta, \bar{t}_f]\). For every \(\varphi(\cdot) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^m)\), one obtains

\[
\int_0^{\bar{t}_f} (u_{n_k}(t - \tau_k) - \bar{u}(t)) \cdot \varphi(t) \, dt = \int_\mathbb{R} (u_{n_k}(t) - \bar{u}(t)) \cdot (S_{\tau^2_k} \varphi)(t) \, dt + \int_\mathbb{R} (S_{\tau^2_k} \bar{u} - \bar{u})(t) \cdot \varphi(t) \, dt
\]

(20)

which converges to 0, providing the weak convergence in \(L^2\) of \((u_{n_k}(\cdot - \tau_k^2))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}\) to \(\bar{u}(\cdot)\).

We can now show that, under Assumption (C1), the trajectory arising from control \(\tilde{u}(\cdot)\) is admissible for problem \((\text{OCP})_{\tau = 0} = (\text{OCP})\), proceeding as follows. First, remark that, up to continuous extensions, for every \(k\), there holds

\[
x_{n_k}(t) = \phi^1(t) \mathbb{1}_{[-\Delta, 0]}(t) + \mathbb{1}_{[0, \bar{t}_f]}(t) \left[ \phi^1(0) + \int_0^{\bar{t}_f} f(s, s - \tau_k, x_{n_k}(s), x_{n_k}(s - \tau_k), u_{n_k}(s), u_{n_k}(s - \tau_k)) \, ds \right].
\]

From this, Assumptions (A1), (A4) ensure that \((x_{n_k}(\cdot))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}\) is bounded in \(H^1\), and then, it converges to some \(\bar{x}(\cdot) \in H^1([-\Delta, \bar{t}_f], \mathbb{R}^n)\) for the weak topology of \(H^1\). Since the immersion of \(H^1\) into \(C^0\) is compact, up to a subsequence, \((x_{n_k}(\cdot))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}\) converges to \(\bar{x}(\cdot) \in C^0([-\Delta, \bar{t}_f], \mathbb{R}^n)\) uniformly in \([-\Delta, \bar{t}_f]\). Passing to the limit in (21) gives

\[
\bar{x}(t) = \phi^1(t) \mathbb{1}_{[-\Delta, 0]}(t) + \mathbb{1}_{[0, \bar{t}_f]}(t) \left[ \phi^1(0) + \int_0^{\bar{t}_f} f(s, \bar{x}(s), \bar{x}(s), \bar{u}(s), \bar{u}(s)) \, ds \right].
\]

In particular, there holds \(\bar{x}(\bar{t}_f) \in M_f\), then, \(\bar{u}(\cdot)\) is admissible for \((\text{OCP})\).

Similarly to the previous case, thanks to the achieved convergences and Assumption (C1), one easily proves that \(C_0(\bar{t}_f, \bar{u}) \leq C_0(t_f, u)\). Therefore, from Assumption (A2), we infer that \(\bar{t}_f = t_f, \bar{u}(\cdot) = u(\cdot)\) and \(\bar{x}(\cdot) = x(\cdot)\) and the conclusion follows.

In this case, not only we have weak convergence of the dynamics and of their derivatives, but also of optimal controls (under appropriate topologies).

The convergence almost everywhere of the optimal controls can be achieved when the second option of Assumption (C3) holds, and more specifically, when control \(u(\cdot)\) assumes its values at extremal points of \(U\), almost everywhere in \([-\Delta, t_f]\).

We proceed as follows. The previous computations provide that \((u_{n_k}(\cdot))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}\) converges to \(u(\cdot)\) for the weak topology of \(L^2\). At this step, the fact that control \(u(\cdot)\) assumes its values at extremal points of \(U\), almost everywhere in \([-\Delta, t_f]\), implies that \((u_{n_k}(\cdot))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}\) converges to \(u(\cdot)\) for the strong topology of \(L^1\) [see [33, Corollary 1]]. Therefore, up to some subsequence, \((u_{n_k}(\cdot))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}\) converges to \(u(\cdot)\), a.e. in \([-\Delta, t_f]\).

Remark 3.10. Up to some subsequence, thanks to the computations in (20), both \((u_{n_k}(\cdot - \tau_k^2))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}\) and \((u_{n_k}(\cdot + \tau_k^2))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}\) converges to \(u(\cdot)\), almost everywhere in \([-\Delta, t_f]\).
Resuming all the previous results, for every considered case, we have shown that \((t_f, x(\cdot), u(\cdot))\) (substituted by \((t_f, x(\cdot), \dot{x}(\cdot))\) for the case of pure state delays) is the unique closure point (for the topologies used above) of \((t^k, x_{\tau_k}(\cdot), u_{\tau_k}(\cdot))\) for the cases of pure state delays), for any \((\text{sub})\text{sequence of delays} (\tau_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}\) converging to 0. Then, the convergence holds as well for the whole family \((t^k, x_{\tau}(\cdot), u_{\tau}(\cdot))\) for the cases of pure state delays)

3.3.4. Convergence of Optimal Adjoint Vectors for (OCP). In what follows, \((x_{\tau}(\cdot), u_{\tau}(\cdot))\) will denote an optimal solution of \((\text{OCP})_\tau\) defined in the interval \([-\Delta, t_f]\) such that, if needed, it is extended continuously in \([-\Delta, t_f]\). From the Maximum Principle related to \((\text{OCP})_\tau\), the trajectory \(x_{\tau}(\cdot)\) is the projection of an extremal \((x_{\tau}(\cdot), p_{\tau}(\cdot), \dot{p}_{\tau}^0, u_{\tau}(\cdot))\) which satisfies equations (3). From now on, we consider implicitly that either Assumptions (B) or Assumptions (C) are satisfied, depending on whether we consider pure state delays or not. The main step of this part consists in showing the convergence of the Pontryagin cone of \((\text{OCP})_\tau\) towards the Pontryagin cone of \((\text{OCP})\). Since the definition of variation vectors relies on Lebesgue points of optimal controls, we need first a set of converging Lebesgue points. Finally, for sake of conciseness, we do not consider final conditions on the state. Recovering the desired convergence results equipped with transversality conditions can be easily done by traveling back the arguments that follow, and using Assumption (A1).

**Lemma 3.11.** Consider \((\text{OCP})_\tau\) with pure state delays and assume that Assumption (B1) holds. For every \(s \in (0, t_f)\), Lebesgue point of function \(\tilde{f}(\cdot, x(\cdot), x(\cdot), u(\cdot))\), there exists a family \((s_{\tau}(\tau, \alpha, \beta) \in (0, \tau_0) \subseteq s, t_f)\), which are Lebesgue points of function \(\tilde{f}(\cdot, -\tau^0, x_{\tau}(\cdot), x_{\tau}(\cdot), -\tau^1)\), \((\cdot, u_{\tau}(\cdot), u_{\tau}(\cdot))\), such that

\[
\tilde{f}(s_{\tau}, s_{\tau} - \tau^0, x_{\tau}(s_{\tau}), x_{\tau}(s_{\tau} - \tau^1), u_{\tau}(s_{\tau})) \xrightarrow{\tau \rightarrow 0} \tilde{f}(s, s, x(s), x(s), u(s)) \quad \text{for} \quad s_{\tau} \xrightarrow{\tau \rightarrow 0} s.
\]

Conversely, consider \((\text{OCP})_\tau\) with general delays \(\tau = (\tau^0, \tau^1, \tau^2) \in (0, \tau_0)^3\) and assume that Assumption (C3) holds. For every \(s \in (0, t_f)\), Lebesgue point of \(u(\cdot)\), there exists a family \((s_{\tau}(\tau, \alpha, \beta) \in (0, \tau_0) \subseteq s, t_f)\), which are Lebesgue points of \(u_{\tau}(\cdot)\), of \(u_{\tau}(-\tau^2)\) and of \(u_{\tau}(-\tau^3)\), such that

\[
u_{\tau}(s_{\tau}) \xrightarrow{\tau \rightarrow 0} u(s) \quad \text{and} \quad u_{\tau}(s_{\tau} - \tau^2) \xrightarrow{\tau \rightarrow 0} u(s) \quad \text{and} \quad u_{\tau}(s_{\tau} + \tau^2) \xrightarrow{\tau \rightarrow 0} u(s) \quad \text{for} \quad s_{\tau} \xrightarrow{\tau \rightarrow 0} s.
\]

**Proof of Lemma 3.11.** We start by proving the first assertion. For this, denote

\[
h^\tau(t) = (h_1^\tau(t), \ldots, h_{n+1}^\tau(t)) = \tilde{f}(t, t - \tau^0, x_{\tau}(t), x_{\tau}(t - \tau^1), u_{\tau}(t))
\]

\[
h(t) = (h_1(t), \ldots, h_{n+1}(t)) = \tilde{f}(t, t, x(t), x(t), u(t)).
\]

We prove that, for \(s \in (0, t_f)\) Lebesgue point of \(h(\cdot)\), for every \(\beta > 0, \alpha_s > 0\) (such that \(s + \alpha_s < t_f\)), there exists \(\tau_{\gamma_s, \alpha_s, \beta} > 0\) such that, for every \((\tau^0, \tau^1) \in (0, \gamma_s, \alpha_s, \beta)^2\), there exists \(s_{\tau} \in [s, s + \alpha_s]\) Lebesgue point of \(h(\cdot)\) for which \(\|h^\tau(s_{\tau}) - h(s)\| < \beta\). By contradiction, suppose that there exists \(s \in (0, t_f)\) Lebesgue point of \(h(\cdot), \alpha_s > 0, \beta > 0\) such that, for every integer \(k\), there exists \(\tau_k \in (0, 1/k) \times (0)\) and \(i_k \in \{1, \ldots, n+1\}\) for which, for \(t \in [s, s + \alpha_s]\) Lebesgue point of \(h^\tau(\cdot)\), there holds \(h^\tau_{i_k}(t) - h_{i_k}(s) \geq \beta\).

From the previous results, the family \((h^\tau(\cdot))_{\tau \in (0, \tau_0)^2 \times (0)}\) converges to \(h(\cdot)\) in \(L^\infty(\text{for the weak star topology})\). Therefore, for every \(0 < \delta \leq 1\), there exists an integer \(k_\delta\) such that, for every \(k \geq k_\delta\), there holds

\[
\frac{1}{\delta \alpha_s} \int_s^{s+\delta \alpha_s} h^\tau_i(t) \, dt - \int_s^{s+\delta \alpha_s} h_i(t) \, dt < \frac{\beta}{3}.
\]
for every \( i \in \{1, \ldots, n+1 \} \). We exploit this fact to bound \(|h^i_{\tau_k}(t) - h_{\iota_2}(s)|\) by \( \beta \).

Firstly, since \( s \) is a Lebesgue point of \( h(\cdot) \), there exists \( 0 < \delta_{s,\alpha} \leq 1 \) such that

\[
| h_i(s) - \frac{1}{\delta_{s,\alpha} \alpha_s} \int_s^{s+\delta_{s,\alpha} \alpha_s} h_i(t) \, dt | < \frac{\beta}{3}
\]

for every \( i \in \{1, \ldots, n+1 \} \). On the other hand, from what said above, there exists an integer \( k_{\delta_{s,\alpha}} \) such that

\[
\frac{1}{\delta_{s,\alpha} \alpha_s} \int_s^{s+\delta_{s,\alpha} \alpha_s} h^i_{\tau_k}(t) \, dt - \int_s^{s+\delta_{s,\alpha} \alpha_s} h_i(t) \, dt < \frac{\beta}{3}
\]

for every \( k \geq k_{\delta_{s,\alpha}} \) and every \( i \in \{1, \ldots, n+1 \} \). Finally, by assumption, we have that \( h^\tau(\cdot) \) is continuous for \( \tau^0, \tau^1 > 0 \), and then, for every \( k \geq k_{\delta_{s,\alpha}} \) and every \( i \in \{1, \ldots, n+1 \} \), there exists \( \tau_{k,i} \in [s, s+\delta_{s,\alpha} \alpha_s] \subseteq [s, s+\alpha_s] \) such that

\[
| h^i_{\tau_k}(\tau_{k,i}) - \frac{1}{\delta_{s,\alpha} \alpha_s} \int_s^{s+\delta_{s,\alpha} \alpha_s} h^i_{\tau_k}(t) \, dt | < \frac{\beta}{3}
\]

Resuming, for every \( \tau_k \in \left(0, \frac{1}{k_{\delta_{s,\alpha}}} \right)^2 \times \{0\} \) and \( i \in \{1, \ldots, n+1 \} \) there exists \( \tau_{k,i} \in [s, s+\alpha_s] \) Lebesgue point of \( h^\tau(\cdot) \) such that \( |h^i_{\tau_k}(\tau_{k,i}) - h_i(s)| < \beta \), contradiction.

Now, we consider the second statement. The case for which Assumption \((C_3)\) ensures that, for every delay \( \tau \), every optimal control \( u_\tau(\cdot) \) of \((\text{OCP})_\tau\) is continuous, is treated as above because of the weak convergence in \( L^2 \) of \( u_\cdot \), of \( u_\cdot(-\tau^2) \) and of \( u_\cdot(\cdot+\tau^2) \). Therefore, suppose that control \( u(\cdot) \) assumes its values at extremal points of \( U \), almost everywhere in \([\Delta, t_f]\). Without loss of generality, we extend \( u_\tau(\cdot) \) by some constant vector of \( U \) in \([t_f, b]\). Denote

\[
h^\tau(t) = (h^1(t), \ldots, h^m(t)) = \left( u_\tau(t), u_\tau(t-\tau^2), u_\tau(t+\tau^2) \right)
\]

\[
h(t) = (h_1(t), \ldots, h_3m(t)) = \left( u(t), u(t), u(t) \right)
\]

and fix \( s \in (0, t_f) \), Lebesgue point of \( h(\cdot) \). By contradiction, suppose that there exist \( \beta > 0 \) and \( \alpha > 0 \) such that, for every integer \( k \), there exist \( \tau_k = (\tau^0_k, \tau^1_k, \tau^2_k) \in (0,1/k)^3 \) and \( \iota_k \in \{1, \ldots, 3m\} \) for which, for every \( r \in [s, s+\alpha] \) Lebesgue point of \( h^\tau(\cdot) \), there holds \( | h^r_{\tau_k}(r) - h_{\iota_k}(s) | \geq \beta \). From the arguments of the previous sections, up to some extension, the family of controls \( (u_\tau(\cdot))_{\tau \in (0,\tau_0)^3} \) converges to \( u(\cdot) \) almost everywhere in \([0, t_f]\) and the same holds true for \( (u_\tau(\cdot-\tau^2))_{\tau \in (0,\tau_0)^3} \) and \( (u_\tau(\cdot+\tau^2))_{\tau \in (0,\tau_0)^3} \), thanks to Remark 3.10. Then, \( (h^r_{\tau_k}(\cdot))_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) converges a.e. to \( h_r(\cdot) \), raising a contradiction. \( \square \)

Lemma 3.11 allows to prove the following property for Pontryagin cones.

**Lemma 3.12.** For every \( \tilde{v} \in \tilde{K}^0(t_f) \) and every \( \tau = (\tau^0, \tau^1, \tau^2) \in (0, \tau_0)^3 \) (as well as \( \tau = (\tau^0, \tau^1, 0) \in (0, \tau_0)^2 \times \{0\} \) in the case of pure state delays), there exists \( \tilde{\omega}_\tau \in \tilde{K}^\tau(t_f) \) such that the family \( (\tilde{\omega}_\tau)_{\tau \in (0,\tau_0)^3} \) converges to \( \tilde{v} \) as \( \tau \) tends to 0.

**Proof of Lemma 3.12.** We prove the statement for problems \((\text{OCP})_\tau\) with general state and control delays \( \tau = (\tau^0, \tau^1, \tau^2) \). If pure state delay problems \((\text{OCP})_\tau\) are considered, the same guideline can be employed by using Lemma 3.11 and (19).
Suppose first that \( \tilde{v} = \tilde{v}^0_{\omega_z(s)}(t_f) \), where \( z \in U \) and \( 0 < s < t_f \) is a Lebesgue point of \( u(\cdot) \) (recall Remark 3.3). By definition, \( \tilde{v}^0_{\omega_z(s)}(\cdot) \) is the solution of

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{\psi}(t) &= \left( \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial x}(t, t, x(t), x(t), u(t), u(t)) + \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial y}(t, t, x(t), x(t), u(t), u(t)) \right) \psi(t) , \\
\psi(s) &= \tilde{f}(s, s, x(s), x(s), z, z) - \tilde{f}(s, s, x(s), x(s), u(s), u(s))
\end{align*}
\]

(22)

From Lemma 3.11, there exists a family \((\sigma_\tau)_{\tau \in (0, \tau_0)^3} \subseteq [s, t_f)\), which are Lebesgue points of \( u_\tau(\cdot) \), of \( u_\tau(\cdot - \tau^2) \) and of \( u_\tau(\cdot + \tau^2) \), such that

\[
u_\tau(s_\tau) \xrightarrow{\tau \to 0} u(s) , \quad u_\tau(s_\tau - \tau^2) \xrightarrow{\tau \to 0} u(s) , \quad u_\tau(s_\tau + \tau^2) \xrightarrow{\tau \to 0} u(s) , \quad s_\tau \xrightarrow{\tau \to 0} s.
\]

This allows to consider \( \tilde{v}^\tau_{s_\tau, \omega^\tau_z(s_\tau)}(\cdot) \) and \( \tilde{v}^\tau_{s_\tau + \tau^2, \omega^\tau_z(s_\tau)}(\cdot) \), solutions of (12) with initial data provided respectively by (10) and (11). We denote

\[
\tilde{w}^\tau_{s_\tau, z}(t) = \tilde{v}^\tau_{s_\tau, \omega^\tau_z(s_\tau)}(t) + \tilde{v}^\tau_{s_\tau + \tau^2, \omega^\tau_z(s_\tau)}(t).
\]

Since we are in this case of affine problems \((OCP)_\tau\), Lemma 3.11 easily gives

\[
\lim_{\tau \to 0} \left( \omega^\tau_z(s_\tau) + \omega^\tau_z(s_\tau) \right) = \tilde{f}(s, s, x(s), x(s), z, z) - \tilde{f}(s, s, x(s), x(s), u(s), u(s)).
\]

Moreover, from the results of the previous sections, there holds in particular

\[
\frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial x}(\cdot, - \tau^0, x_\tau(\cdot), x_\tau(\cdot - \tau^1), u_\tau(\cdot), u_\tau(\cdot - \tau^2)) \xrightarrow{t_\tau^2} \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial x}(\cdot, \cdot, x(\cdot), x(\cdot), u(\cdot), u(\cdot))
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial y}(\cdot, - \tau^0, x_\tau(\cdot), x_\tau(\cdot - \tau^1), u_\tau(\cdot), u_\tau(\cdot - \tau^2)) \xrightarrow{t_\tau^2} \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial y}(\cdot, \cdot, x(\cdot), x(\cdot), u(\cdot), u(\cdot)).
\]

By the continuous dependence w.r.t initial data for dynamical systems and since \( t\tau_f \) converges to \( t_f \), the family \( (\tilde{w}^\tau_{s_\tau, z}(t_f))_{\tau \in (0, \tau_0)^3} \) converges to \( \tilde{v} \) as \( \tau \to 0 \).

Take now \( \tilde{v} \in \text{Int} \tilde{K}^0(t_f) \). In this case, the conclusion follows straightforwardly by combining the previous case with the Carathéodory’s lemma. Lastly, in the case of generic \( \tilde{v} \in \tilde{K}^0(t_f) \), we proceed by closure points in \( \text{Int} \tilde{K}^\tau(t_f) \) thanks to Assumptions \((A_1)\) and \((A_4)\), which, from the continuous dependence with respect to the initial data, provides that related \( \tilde{w}^\tau_{s_\tau, z}(t_f) \) are uniformly bounded. The conclusion follows.

For the last part of the proof, an iterative use of Lemma 3.12 is done. It is at this step that, for problems with general delays \( \tau = (\tau^0, \tau^1, \tau^2) \), Assumption \((C_2)\) of fixed final time becomes fundamental to correctly derive the convergence related to adjoint vectors. Indeed, problems arise when one tries to make the final condition on the Hamiltonian (6) converge to the transversality condition related to problem \((OCP)_\tau\). For sake of concision, in this context, we focus only on problems \((OCP)_\tau\) with general delays \( \tau = (\tau^0, \tau^1, \tau^2) \). The case of pure state delays is similar (we refer to [21, Proposition 2.15] for details). Assumptions \((B)\) and \((C)\) are implicitly used.

We first prove that the following statements hold true:

- For every \( \tau = (\tau^0, \tau^1, \tau^2) \in (0, \tau_0)^3 \), every extremal lift \( (x_\tau(\cdot), p_\tau(\cdot), p_\tau^0, u_\tau(\cdot)) \) of any solution of \((OCP)_\tau\) is normal.
- The set of final adjoint vectors \( \{p_\tau(t_f) : \tau \in (0, \tau_0)^3\} \) is bounded.
We consider the first statement proceeding by contradiction. Assume that, for every integer $k$, there exist $\tau_k = (\tau_k^0, \tau_k^1, \tau_k^2) \in (0,1/k)^3$ and a solution $(x_{\tau_k}(\cdot), p_{\tau_k}(\cdot), u_{\tau_k}(\cdot))$ of $(\text{OCP})_{\tau_k}$ having an abnormal extremal lift $(x_{\tau_k}(\cdot), p_{\tau_k}(\cdot), 0, u_{\tau_k}(\cdot))$. Set $\psi_{\tau_k} = \frac{p_{\tau_k}(t)}{\|p_{\tau_k}(t)\|}$ for every integer $k$. Therefore, there holds $\langle (\psi_{\tau_k}, 0), \tilde{v}_{\tau_k} \rangle \leq 0$, for every $\tilde{v}_{\tau_k} \in \bar{K}^{\tau_k}(t_f)$ and every integer $k$. Up to a subsequence, the sequence $(\psi_{\tau_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq S^{n-1}$ converges to some unit vector $\psi \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Passing to the limit, by using the previous results, we infer that $\langle (\psi, 0), \tilde{v} \rangle \leq 0$ for every $\tilde{v} \in \bar{K}^0(t_f)$. Thanks to Assumption (C2), $(x(\cdot), u(\cdot))$ has an abnormal extremal lift. This contradicts Assumption (A3).

For the second statement, again by contradiction, assume that there exists a sequence $(\tau_k = (\tau_k^0, \tau_k^1, \tau_k^2))_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq (0, \tau_0)^3$ converging to $0$ such that $\|p_{\tau_k}(t_f)\|$ tends to $+\infty$. Since the sequence $\left( \frac{p_{\tau_k}(t)}{\|p_{\tau_k}(t)\|} \right)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ belongs to $S^{n-1}$, up to some subsequence, it converges to some unit vector $\psi$. On the other hand, by construction, the following inequality $\langle (p_{\tau_k}(t_f), -1), \tilde{v}_{\tau_k} \rangle \leq 0$ holds for every $\tilde{v}_{\tau_k} \in \bar{K}^{\tau_k}(t_f)$ and every integer $k$. Dividing by $\|p_{\tau_k}(t_f)\|$ and passing to the limit, it follows that the solution $(x(\cdot), u(\cdot))$ has an abnormal extremal lift, which again contradicts Assumption (A3).

Now, let $\psi$ be a closure point of $\{p_\tau(t_f) : \tau \in (0, \tau_0)^3\}$ and $\tau_k = (\tau_k^0, \tau_k^1, \tau_k^2))_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq (0, \tau_0)^3$ a sequence converging to $0$ such that $p_{\tau_k}(t_f)$ tends to $\psi$. Using the continuous dependence w.r.t. initial data and the established convergence properties, we infer that $(p_{\tau_k}(\cdot))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges uniformly to the solution $z(\cdot)$ of the Cauchy problem

$$\begin{cases}
\dot{z}(t) = -\frac{\partial h}{\partial x}(t, t, x(t), x(t), z(t), -1, u(t), u(t)) - \frac{\partial h}{\partial y}(t, t, x(t), x(t), z(t), -1, u(t), u(t)) \\
z(t_f) = \psi
\end{cases}$$

Moreover, since $\langle (p_{\tau_k}(t_f), -1), \tilde{v}_{\tau_k} \rangle \leq 0$, for every $\tilde{v}_{\tau_k} \in \bar{K}^{\tau_k}(t_f)$ and every integer $k$, passing to the limit, thanks to the previous results, we obtain $\langle (\psi, -1), \tilde{v} \rangle \leq 0$, for every $\tilde{v} \in \bar{K}^0(t_f)$. By definition, it follows that $(x(\cdot), z(\cdot), -1, u(\cdot))$ is a normal extremal lift of $(\text{OCP})$. Using Assumption (A3), we finally obtain $z(\cdot) = p(\cdot)$ in $[0, t_f]$.

Theorem 2.1 is proved.

4. Conclusions and Perspectives. In this paper, we provided sufficient conditions under which Pontryagin extremals related to nonlinear optimal control problems with delays are continuous (under appropriate topologies) with respect to delays. It would be interesting to extend this result to problems with more general constraints, such as, control and state constraints. This would require to analyze the proof of the Maximum Principle with state and control constraints via sliding or $\nu$-variations (see, e.g. [34]), to exploit the continuous dependence with respect to parameters of implicit function theorems (Ekeland-type approaches prone to fail because this continuous dependence does not arise). Furthermore, in the case of control and state delays, the proof that we provided needs to consider affine dynamics/costs and fixed final time. The extension to more general systems is an interesting challenge.

Furthermore, in this paper we have considered constant delays. One could consider more general delays that are functions of time and state. This is motivated by the fact that, in the case of delays depending on the time and the state, Maximum Principle formulations still exist (see, e.g. [8]). Therefore, extending our main result...
requires to consider the $C^0$-topology on the delay function $t \mapsto \tau(t, x(t))$.

Finally, as shortly explained in Section 2.4, our main result is in particular motivated by numerical implementations of the shooting method, in combination with homotopies on the delay parameters, thus providing an interesting alternative to classically used direct methods. Numerical issues are however a different subject which requires a separate treatment. We will address this issue in a forthcoming paper.
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