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## 1. Constrained Optimization Problems

As an introdutory example, let us consider a two-dimensional constraint optimization problem

$$
\begin{align*}
& \min _{x \in \mathbb{R}^{2}} f(x)  \tag{1}\\
& \text { s.t. } g(x)=0
\end{align*}
$$

We introduce the Lagrangian $L(x, \lambda)=f(x)+\lambda g(x)$ and find the critical points of $L$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \nabla_{x} L=\nabla f(x)+\lambda \nabla g(x)=0, \\
& \partial_{\lambda} L=g(x)=0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

In the non-constrained case, where $x=\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right)$ is free to move in $\mathbb{R}^{2}$. The equation $g\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right)=0$ defines a curve and $x=x(t)$ can only move along this curve. Suppose $x_{0}=x(0)$ and $x^{\prime}(0) \neq 0$ is a local minimum. Then, we have:

$$
\left.\frac{\mathrm{d} f(x(t))}{\mathrm{d} t}\right|_{t=0}=\nabla f\left(x_{0}\right) \cdot x^{\prime}(0)=0
$$

Moreover, since $g(x(t))=0$ for all $t$ near 0 , taking derivative leads to

$$
\nabla g\left(x_{0}\right) \cdot x^{\prime}(0)=0
$$

Therefore it implies that $\nabla f\left(x_{0}\right)$ is parallel to $\nabla g\left(x_{0}\right)$, i.e., $\exists \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$
\nabla f\left(x_{0}\right)+\lambda \nabla g\left(x_{0}\right)=0
$$

See Fig. 1 for an illustration. When $\nabla g\left(x_{0}\right) \neq 0$, we can calculate $\lambda$ as follows:

$$
\lambda=-\frac{\left(\nabla f\left(x_{0}\right), \nabla g\left(x_{0}\right)\right)}{\left\|\nabla g\left(x_{0}\right)\right\|^{2}}
$$

By introducing a parameter $t$, we can transform the problem into a one-dimensional non-constrained problem.
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Figure 1. Minimization of function $f(x, y)$ subject to the constraint $g(x, y)=0$. At the constrained local optimum, the gradients of $f$ and $g$ are parallel, i.e., $\nabla f+\lambda \nabla g=0$.

## 2. Integral Constraint

We follow the book [1, Lecture 7] but simplify the presentation by introducing a parameterization. Given $L, G \in C^{2}\left(\bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}^{N} \times \mathbb{R}^{n N}\right), \rho \in C^{1}\left(\partial \Omega, \mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$, and

$$
\mathcal{M}=\left\{u \in C^{1}\left(\bar{\Omega}, \mathbb{R}^{N}\right)|u|_{\partial \Omega}=\rho\right\}
$$

consider the following constrained variational problem:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \min _{u \in \mathcal{M}} I(u), \quad I(u)=\int_{\Omega} L(x, u, \nabla u) \mathrm{d} x \\
& \text { s.t. } N(u)=0, \quad N(u)=\int_{\Omega} G(x, u, \nabla u) \mathrm{d} x \tag{2}
\end{align*}
$$

Let $u \in \mathcal{M} \cap N^{-1}(0)$ and $\phi \in H_{0}^{1}(\Omega)$. The variation $u+\varepsilon \phi$ may not satisfy the constraint. To address this, we introduce variation in another direction $u+\varepsilon \phi+\tau \psi$. With a slight abuse of notation, we define

$$
I(\varepsilon, \tau)=I(u+\varepsilon \phi+\tau \psi), \quad N(\varepsilon, \tau)=N(u+\varepsilon \phi+\tau \psi)
$$

Now we face a situation similar to the 2D example. The two variables $(\varepsilon, \tau)$ are not free to choose due to the constraint. To satisfy the constraint, we need to eliminate one variable.

Assuming we can find a parameterization $(\varepsilon(t), \tau(t))$ such that $N(\varepsilon(t), \tau(t))=0$ for $t$ near 0 , and the minimum is achieved at $t=0$ and $(\varepsilon(0), \tau(0))=(0,0)$, we then obtain a linear system:

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\left.\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} I(\varepsilon(t), \tau(t))\right|_{t=0}=\delta I(u, \phi) \varepsilon^{\prime}(0)+\delta I(u, \psi) \tau^{\prime}(0)=0  \tag{3}\\
\left.\frac{\mathrm{~d}}{\mathrm{~d} t} N(\varepsilon(t), \tau(t))\right|_{t=0}=\delta N(u, \phi) \varepsilon^{\prime}(0)+\delta N(u, \psi) \tau^{\prime}(0)=0
\end{array}\right.
$$

Assuming $\delta N(u, \psi) \neq 0$, we can solve $\tau^{\prime}(0)$ from the second equation and substitute it back into the first equation to obtain:

$$
\left[\delta I(u, \phi)-\frac{\delta I(u, \psi)}{\delta N(u, \psi)} \delta N(u, \phi)\right] \varepsilon^{\prime}(0)=0
$$

Assuming $\varepsilon^{\prime}(0) \neq 0$, this implies that

$$
\delta I(u, \phi)+\lambda \delta N(u, \phi)=0,
$$

where $\lambda=-\delta I(u, \psi) / \delta N(u, \psi)$.
Let us verify the assumption on the parameterization. We have $N(0,0)=0$ and $\partial_{\tau} N(0,0)=\delta N(u, \psi) \neq 0$. Therefore, by the implicit function theorem, locally, i.e. for $|\varepsilon|$ sufficiently small, we can find a function $\tau=\tau(\varepsilon)$ such that $\tau(0)=0$ and $N(\varepsilon, \tau(\varepsilon))=0$. The parameterization is given by $\varepsilon=t, \tau(t)=\tau(\varepsilon)$, and the derivative $\varepsilon^{\prime}(0)=1 \neq 0$.

Note that $\psi$ is fixed, while $\phi$ is arbitrary. Thus, we arrive at the following result:
Theorem 2.1. Suppose $N^{-1}(0) \cap \mathcal{M} \neq \emptyset$. Let $u \in \mathcal{M}$ be a weak minimum of $I(u)$ under the constraint $N(u)=0$, i.e.,

$$
I(u)=\min _{w \in \mathcal{M} \cap N^{-1}(0)} I(w) .
$$

If there exists $\psi \in H_{0}^{1}\left(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$ such that $\delta N(u, \psi) \neq 0$, then there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{1}$ satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta I(u, \phi)+\lambda \delta N(u, \phi)=0, \quad \forall \phi \in H_{0}^{1}\left(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^{N}\right) \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

The first order necessary condition (4) can be derived by introducing a Lagrangian with multiplier $\lambda$

$$
\mathcal{L}(u, \lambda)=L(x, u, \nabla u)+\lambda G(x, u, \nabla u)
$$

and consider the inf-sup problem

$$
\inf _{u \in \mathcal{M}} \sup _{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{L}(u, \lambda) \mathrm{d} x
$$

We include the existence result from Evan's book [2, Chapter 8]. Consider an integral constraint involving function only:

$$
N(w):=\int_{\Omega} G(w) d x=0
$$

where $G: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a given, smooth function. Let us introduce as well the appropriate admissible class

$$
\mathcal{A}:=\left\{w \in H_{0}^{1}(\Omega) \mid N(w)=0\right\}
$$

Theorem 2.2 (Existence of constrained minimizer). Assume that $L$ satisfies the coercivity inequality and is convex in the variable $p$. Assume the admissible set $\mathcal{A}$ is nonempty and the constraint satisfies

$$
\left|G^{\prime}(z)\right| \leq C(|z|+1)
$$

for some constant $C$. Then there exists $u \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfying

$$
I(u)=\min _{w \in \mathcal{A}} I(w) .
$$

Proof. We can choose a minimizing sequence $\left\{u_{k}\right\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathcal{A}$ with

$$
I\left[u_{k}\right] \rightarrow \inf _{w \in \mathcal{A}} I(w)
$$

Then extract a subsequence

$$
u_{k_{j}} \rightharpoonup u \text { weakly in } H_{0}^{1}(U), \quad u_{k_{j}} \rightarrow u \text { in } L^{2}(U) .
$$

The $H^{1}$-norm of $\left\{u_{k}\right\}$ is uniformly bounded and $I(u) \leq \inf _{w \in \mathcal{A}} I(w)=\liminf I\left(u_{k}\right)$.

We only need to verify $N(u)=0$ so that $u \in \mathcal{A}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
|N(u)| & =\left|N(u)-N\left(u_{k}\right)\right| \leq \int_{\Omega}\left|G(u)-G\left(u_{k}\right)\right| \mathrm{d} x \\
& \leq C \int_{\Omega}\left|u-u_{k}\right|\left(1+|u|+\left|u_{k}\right|\right) \mathrm{d} x \\
& \rightarrow 0 \quad \text { as } k \rightarrow \infty
\end{aligned}
$$

## 3. Pointwise Constraints

Now we consider the pointwise constraint $N(u(x))=0$ for all $x \in \Omega$, where $u: \Omega \rightarrow$ $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ is a vector function and $N: \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function. We still consider the following constrained variational problem:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \min _{u \in \mathcal{M}} I(u), \quad I(u)=\int_{\Omega} L(x, u, \nabla u) \mathrm{d} x  \tag{5}\\
& \text { s.t. } N(u)=0, \quad N(u)=0
\end{align*}
$$

with the Dirichlet boundary condition

$$
\mathcal{M}=\left\{u \in C^{1}\left(\bar{\Omega}, \mathbb{R}^{N}\right)|u|_{\partial \Omega}=\rho\right\}
$$

Again we follow the book [1, Lecture 7] but simplify the presentation. Notice that $u$ is a vector function and $\nabla u$ is a matrix as illustrated below

$$
\left.\left.\begin{array}{r}
L\left(x,\left(\begin{array}{c}
u_{1} \\
u_{2} \\
\vdots \\
u_{n}
\end{array}\right)\right.
\end{array}\right),\left(\begin{array}{c}
-p_{1}- \\
-p_{2}- \\
\vdots \\
-p_{n}-
\end{array}\right)\right)
$$

Let $u \in \mathcal{M} \cap N^{-1}(0)$ and $\phi \in H_{0}^{1}(\Omega)$. We first consider the non-constraint case with the following variation

$$
\left(\begin{array}{c}
u_{1} \\
u_{2} \\
\vdots \\
u_{n}
\end{array}\right) \rightarrow u+\varepsilon \phi_{1} \vec{e}_{1}:=\left(\begin{array}{c}
u_{1}+\varepsilon \phi_{1} \\
u_{2} \\
\vdots \\
u_{n}
\end{array}\right)
$$

Then we compute the varation

$$
\left.\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{~d} \varepsilon} I\left(u+\varepsilon \phi_{1} \vec{e}_{1}\right)\right|_{\varepsilon=0}=\int_{\Omega} L_{u_{1}} \phi_{1}+L_{p_{1}} \cdot \nabla \phi_{1} \mathrm{~d} x=\int_{\Omega}\left(-\nabla \cdot L_{p_{1}}+L_{u_{1}}\right) \phi_{1} \mathrm{~d} x
$$

So $\left.\frac{d}{d \varepsilon} I\left(u+\varepsilon \phi_{1} \vec{e}_{1}\right)\right|_{\varepsilon=0}=0 \quad \forall \phi_{1} \in H_{0}^{1}$ implies the Euler-Lagrange equation in multidimensions

$$
-\nabla \cdot L_{p_{i}}+L_{u_{i}}=0, \quad i=1, \cdots, n
$$

where we change the index 1 to any index from $1: n$. It can be further simplified to

$$
-\nabla \cdot L_{p}+L_{u}=0
$$

where $L_{p}$ is a $n \times d$ matrix function and $L_{u}$ is $n \times 1$ vector function and the divergence operator is applied row-wise.

In the constraint case, the variation $u+\varepsilon \phi_{1} \vec{e}_{1}$ may not satisfy the constraint. To address this, we introduce a projection operator $P: H^{1}(\Omega) \rightarrow H^{1}(\Omega)$ s.t. $N(P(v))=0$ and $P(u)=u$ for $u \in \mathcal{M} \cap N^{-1}(0)$. Then we consider the first order condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{~d} \varepsilon} I\left(x, P(u+\varepsilon \phi), \nabla_{x} P(u+\varepsilon \phi)\right)\right|_{\varepsilon=0}=0 \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here we use $\nabla_{x}$ to denote the derivative w.r.t to $x$ and use $\nabla_{u}$ for the derivative w.r.t. $u$.
It remains to figure out the projection and its derivative. We assume the constraint is non-degenerate in the sense that $\nabla_{x} N(u(x)) \neq 0$, then locally one variable can be eliminated. More precisely, $\forall x_{0} \in \Omega$, there exists a ball $B_{r}\left(x_{0}\right) \subset \Omega$ such that

$$
\nabla_{x}(N(u(x)))=\nabla_{u} M(u(x)) \cdot \nabla u(x) \neq 0, \quad \forall x \in B_{r}\left(x_{0}\right)
$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume $N_{u_{n}}(u(x)) \neq 0, \forall x \in B_{r}\left(x_{0}\right)$. where $U$ is a $C^{2}$ function and

$$
\begin{equation*}
N\left(u_{1}+\varepsilon \phi_{1}, u_{2}, \cdots, U\left(u_{1}+\varepsilon \phi_{1}, \cdots, u_{n-1}\right)\right)=0 \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Namely the projection $P$ is given by

$$
\begin{gathered}
P\left(\left(v_{1}, v_{2}, \ldots, v_{n}\right)\right)=\left(v_{1}, v_{2}, \ldots, v_{n-1}, U\left(v^{1}, \ldots, v^{n-1}\right)\right), \\
L\left(x,\left(\begin{array}{c}
u_{1}+\varepsilon \phi_{1} \\
u_{2} \\
\vdots \\
U\left(u_{1}+\varepsilon \phi_{1}, \cdots, u_{n-1}\right)
\end{array}\right),\left(\begin{array}{c}
\nabla_{x} u_{1}+\varepsilon \nabla_{x} \phi_{1} \\
\nabla_{x} u_{2} \\
\vdots \\
\nabla_{x} U\left(u_{1}+\varepsilon \phi_{1}, \cdots\right)
\end{array}\right)\right.
\end{gathered}
$$

The variation (6) is

$$
\begin{aligned}
& L_{u_{1}} \phi_{1}+L_{p_{1}} \nabla \phi_{1} \\
+ & L_{u_{n}} \partial_{u_{1}} U \phi_{1}+L_{p_{n}} \partial_{\varepsilon} \nabla_{x} U\left(u_{1}+\varepsilon \phi_{1}, \cdots\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

We can switch $\partial_{\varepsilon} \nabla_{x}$ to $\nabla_{x} \partial_{\varepsilon}$. So the last term is $L_{p_{n}} \cdot \nabla_{x}\left(\partial_{u_{1}} U \phi_{1}\right)$. Apply integration by parts, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\nabla \cdot L_{p_{1}}+L u_{1}+\left(L_{u_{n}}-\nabla \cdot L_{p_{n}}\right) \partial_{u_{1}} U=0 \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

What is the partial derivative $\partial_{u_{i}} U$ ? We take derivative of (7) and obtain

$$
N_{u_{1}}+N_{u_{n}} \partial_{u_{1}} U=0 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \partial_{u_{1}} U=-\frac{N_{u_{1}}}{N_{u_{n}}}
$$

Plugging back to (8) and let

$$
\lambda=\frac{1}{N_{u_{n}}}\left(\nabla \cdot L_{p_{n}}-L_{u_{n}}\right)
$$

we arrive the following theorem.
Theorem 3.1. Let $\bar{\Omega} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$ be a closed and bounded set. Let $L \in C^{2}\left(\bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}^{N} \times\right.$ $\left.\mathbb{R}^{n N}, \mathbb{R}^{1}\right), N \in C^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{N}, \mathbb{R}^{1}\right), \rho \in C^{1}\left(\partial \Omega, \mathbb{R}^{N}\right)$, and

$$
\mathcal{M}=\left\{u \in H^{1}\left(\bar{\Omega}, \mathbb{R}^{N}\right)|u|_{\partial \Omega}=\rho\right\}
$$

Suppose $u \in \mathcal{M}$ is a local minimum under the above constraint and it is $C^{2}$ outside finitely many $(n-1)$ dimensional piecewise $C^{1}$ hypersurfaces. If $\forall x \in \bar{\Omega}, \nabla N(u(x)) \neq 0$, then there exists a continuous function $\lambda \in C(\Omega)$ such that $u$ satisfies the $E$ - $L$ equation of the adjusted Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(u, \lambda)=L+\lambda N$ :

$$
-\nabla \cdot L_{p_{i}}+L_{u^{i}}+\lambda N_{u^{i}}=0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n .
$$
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