

Optimal Solutions to Relaxation in Multiple Control Problems of Sobolev Type with Nonlocal Nonlinear Fractional Differential Equations

Amar Debbouche · Juan J. Nieto ·

Delfim F. M. Torres

Submitted: 26-Dec-2014 / Revised: 14-Apr-2015 / Accepted: 19-Apr-2015

Abstract We introduce the optimality question to the relaxation in multiple control problems described by Sobolev type nonlinear fractional differential equations with nonlocal control conditions in Banach spaces. Moreover, we consider the minimization problem of multi-integral functionals, with integrands that are not convex in the controls, of control systems with mixed nonconvex constraints on the controls. We prove, under appropriate conditions, that the relaxation problem admits optimal solutions. Furthermore, we show that those optimal solutions are in fact limits of minimizing sequences of systems with respect to the trajectory, multi-controls, and the functional in suitable topologies.

Keywords fractional optimal multiple control · relaxation · nonconvex constraints · nonlocal control conditions · Sobolev type equations

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010) 26A33 · 34B10 · 49J15 · 49J45

A. Debbouche

Department of Mathematics, Guelma University, Guelma 24000, Algeria

E-mail: amar_debbouche@yahoo.fr

J. J. Nieto

Departamento de Análisis Matemático, Universidad de Santiago de Compostela,

Santiago de Compostela 15782, Spain

and Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia

E-mail: juanjose.nieto.roig@usc.es

D. F. M. Torres ✉

Center for Research and Development in Mathematics and Applications (CIDMA),

Department of Mathematics, University of Aveiro, 3810-193 Aveiro, Portugal

E-mail: delfim@ua.pt

1 Introduction

The memory and hereditary properties of various materials and processes in electrical circuits, biology, biomechanics, etc., such as viscoelasticity, electrochemistry, control, porous media and electromagnetic processes, are widely recognized to be well predicted by using fractional differential operators [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6]. During the past decades, the subject of fractional calculus, and its potential applications, have gained an increase of importance, mainly because it has become a powerful tool with more accurate and successful results in modeling several complex phenomena in numerous seemingly diverse and widespread fields of science and engineering [7, 8, 9, 10].

There has been a significant development in nonlocal problems for (fractional) differential equations or inclusions (see, for instance, [11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17]). Indeed, nonlinear fractional differential equations have, in recent years, been object of an increasing interest because of their wide applicability in nonlinear oscillations of earthquakes, many physical phenomena such as seepage flow in porous media, and in fluid dynamic traffic model [18, 19, 20]. On the other hand, there could be no manufacturing, no vehicles, no computers, and no regulated environment, without control systems. Control systems are most often based on the principle of feedback, whereby the signal to be controlled is compared to a desired reference signal and the discrepancy used to compute corrective control actions [21]. Over the last years, one of the fields of science that has been well established is the fractional calculus of variations (see [22, 23, 24] and references therein). Moreover, a generalization of this area, namely the fractional optimal control, is a topic of research by many authors [25, 26].

The fractional optimal control of a distributed system is an optimal control problem for which the system dynamics is defined with partial fractional differential equations [27]. The calculus of variations with constraints being sets of solutions of control systems, allow us to justify, while performing numerical calculations, the passage from a nonconvex optimal control problem to the convexified optimal control problem. We then approximate the latter problem by a sequence of smooth and convex optimal control problems, for which the optimality conditions are known and methods of their numerical resolution are well developed.

Sobolev type semilinear equations serve as an abstract formulation of partial differential equations, which arise in various applications such as in the flow of fluid through fissured rocks, thermodynamics, and shear in second order fluids. Further, the fractional differential equations of Sobolev type appear in the theory of control of dynamical systems, when the controlled system and/or the controller is described by a fractional differential equation of Sobolev type. Furthermore, the mathematical modeling and simulations of systems and processes are based on the description of

their properties in terms of fractional differential equations of Sobolev type. These new models are more adequate than previously used integer order models, so fractional order differential equations of Sobolev type have been investigated by many researchers: see, for example, Fečkan, Wang and Zhou [28] and Li, Liang and Xu [29]. In our previous works [30,31], we have introduced the notion of nonlocal control condition and presented a new kind of Sobolev type condition that appears in terms of two linear operators. Kamocki [32] studied the existence of optimal solutions to fractional optimal control problems. Liu et al. [33] established the relaxation for nonconvex optimal control problems described by fractional differential equations. Motivated by the above facts and results, we introduce here a new kind of Sobolev type condition and another form of a nonlocal control condition for nonlinear fractional multiple control systems. The new Sobolev condition is given in terms of two linear operators and requires formulating two other characteristic solution operators and their properties, such as boundedness and compactness. Further, we consider an optimal control problem (P) of multi-integral functionals, with integrands that are not convex in the controls. We establish an interrelation between the solutions of problem (P) and the relaxation problem (RP) . Under certain assumptions, it is proved that (RP) has a solution and that for any solution of (RP) there is a minimizing sequence for (P) converging, in the appropriate topologies, to the solution of (RP) . The convergence takes place simultaneously with respect to the trajectory, the control and the functional. This property is usually called relaxation [34,35].

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we formulate and define the problems under study and we review some essential facts from fractional calculus [4,18], semigroup theory [36,37], and multi-valued analysis [38,39], which are used throughout the work. In Section 3, we prove some auxiliary results that are required for the proof of our main results. Section 4 deals with existence results for multiple control systems. The main results are given in Section 5. We end with Section 6 of conclusions.

2 Preliminaries

Consider the following nonlocal nonlinear fractional control system of Sobolev type:

$$L^C D_t^\alpha [Mx(t)] + Ex(t) = f(t, x(t), B_1(t)u_1(t), \dots, B_{r-1}(t)u_{r-1}(t)), \quad t \in I \quad (1)$$

$$x(0) + h(x(t), B_r(t)u_r(t)) = x_0, \quad (2)$$

with mixed nonconvex constraints on the controls

$$u_1(t), \dots, u_r(t) \in U(t, x(t)) \text{ a.e. on } I, \quad (3)$$

where ${}^C D_t^\alpha$ is the Caputo fractional derivative of order α , $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, and $t \in I := [0, a]$. Let X, Y and Z be three Banach spaces such that Z is densely and continuously embedded in X , the unknown function $x(\cdot)$ takes its values in X and $x_0 \in X$. We assume that the operators $E : D(E) \subset X \rightarrow Y$, $M : D(M) \subset X \rightarrow Z$, $L : D(L) \subset Z \rightarrow Y$, and $B_1, \dots, B_r : I \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(T, X)$ are linear and bounded from T into X . The space T is a separable reflexive Banach space modeling the control space. It is also assumed that $f : I \times X^r \rightarrow Y$ and $h : C(X^2, X) \rightarrow X$ are given abstract functions, to be specified later, and $U : I \times X \rightrightarrows 2^T \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ is a multivalued map with closed values, not necessarily convex. Let $\widehat{\mathbb{R}} :=]-\infty, +\infty]$. For functions $g_1, \dots, g_r : I \times X \times T \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{R}}$, we consider the problem

$$\max \left\{ J_1, \dots, J_r \left| \begin{array}{l} J_1(x, u_1) := \int_I g_1(t, x(t), u_1(t)) dt \\ \vdots \\ J_r(x, u_r) := \int_I g_r(t, x(t), u_r(t)) dt \end{array} \right. \right\} \longrightarrow \inf \quad (P)$$

on solutions of the control system (1)–(2) with constraint (3). Let $g_{1,U}, \dots, g_{r,U} : I \times X \times T \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{R}}$ be the functions defined by

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} g_{1,U}(t, x, u_1) := \begin{cases} g_1(t, x, u_1), & u_1 \in U(t, x), \\ +\infty, & u_1 \notin U(t, x), \end{cases} \\ \vdots \\ g_{r,U}(t, x, u_r) := \begin{cases} g_r(t, x, u_r), & u_r \in U(t, x), \\ +\infty, & u_r \notin U(t, x), \end{cases} \end{array} \right.$$

and $g_1^{**}(t, x, u_1), \dots, g_r^{**}(t, x, u_r)$ be the bipolar of $u_1 \rightarrow g_{1,U}(t, x, u_1), \dots, u_r \rightarrow g_{r,U}(t, x, u_r)$, respectively. Along with problem (P), we also consider the relaxation problem

$$\max \left\{ J_1^{**}, \dots, J_r^{**} \left| \begin{array}{l} J_1^{**}(x, u_1) = \int_I g_1^{**}(t, x(t), u_1(t)) dt \\ \vdots \\ J_r^{**}(x, u_r) = \int_I g_r^{**}(t, x(t), u_r(t)) dt \end{array} \right. \right\} \longrightarrow \inf \quad (RP)$$

on the solutions of control system (1)–(2) with the convexified constraints

$$u_1(t), \dots, u_r(t) \in \text{cl conv } U(t, x(t)) \quad \text{a.e. on } I \quad (4)$$

on the controls, where *conv* denote the convex hull and *cl* the closure. In our results, we will denote by \mathcal{R}_U and $\mathcal{T}r_U$, ($\mathcal{R}_{\text{cl conv } U}$ and $\mathcal{T}r_{\text{cl conv } U}$) the sets of all solutions and all trajectories of control system (1)–(3) (control system (1)–(2),(4), respectively).

Definition 2.1 The fractional integral of order $\alpha > 0$ of a function $f \in L^1([a, b], \mathbb{R})$ is given by

$$I_a^\alpha f(t) := \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_a^t (t-s)^{\alpha-1} f(s) ds,$$

where Γ is the classical gamma function.

If $a = 0$, then we can write $I^\alpha f(t) := (g_\alpha * f)(t)$, where

$$g_\alpha(t) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} t^{\alpha-1}, & t > 0, \\ 0, & t \leq 0 \end{cases}$$

and, as usual, $*$ denotes convolution. Moreover, $\lim_{\alpha \downarrow 0} g_\alpha(t) = \delta(t)$ with δ the delta Dirac function.

Definition 2.2 The Riemann–Liouville fractional derivative of order $\alpha > 0$, $n-1 < \alpha < n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is given by

$${}^L D^\alpha f(t) := \frac{1}{\Gamma(n-\alpha)} \frac{d^n}{dt^n} \int_0^t \frac{f(s)}{(t-s)^{\alpha+1-n}} ds, \quad t > 0,$$

where function f has absolutely continuous derivatives up to order $(n-1)$.

Definition 2.3 The Caputo fractional derivative of order $\alpha > 0$, $n-1 < \alpha < n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is given by

$${}^C D^\alpha f(t) := {}^L D^\alpha \left(f(t) - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{t^k}{k!} f^{(k)}(0) \right), \quad t > 0,$$

where function f has absolutely continuous derivatives up to order $(n-1)$.

If f is an abstract function with values in X , then the integrals that appear in Definitions 2.1 to 2.3 are taken in Bochner's sense.

Remark 2.1 Let $n-1 < \alpha < n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The following properties hold:

(i) If $f \in C^n([0, \infty[)$, then

$${}^C D^\alpha f(t) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(n-\alpha)} \int_0^t \frac{f^{(n)}(s)}{(t-s)^{\alpha+1-n}} ds = I^{n-\alpha} f^{(n)}(t), \quad t > 0;$$

- (ii) The Caputo derivative of a constant function is equal to zero;
 (iii) The Riemann–Liouville derivative of a constant function is given by

$${}^L D_{a+}^\alpha C = \frac{C}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} (t-a)^{-\alpha}, \quad 0 < \alpha < 1.$$

We make the following assumptions:

- (H₁) $L : D(L) \subset Z \rightarrow Y$ and $M : D(M) \subset X \rightarrow Z$ are linear operators, and $E : D(E) \subset X \rightarrow Y$ is closed.

(H₂) $D(M) \subset D(E)$, $\text{Im}(M) \subset D(L)$ and L and M are bijective.

(H₃) $L^{-1} : Y \rightarrow D(L) \subset Z$ and $M^{-1} : Z \rightarrow D(M) \subset X$ are linear, bounded and compact operators.

Note that (H₃) implies that L and M are closed. Indeed, if L^{-1} and M^{-1} are closed and injective, then their inverse are also closed. From (H₁)–(H₃) and the closed graph theorem, we obtain the boundedness of the linear operator $L^{-1}EM^{-1} : Z \rightarrow Z$. Consequently, $L^{-1}EM^{-1}$ generates a semigroup $\{Q(t), t \geq 0\}$, $Q(t) := e^{L^{-1}EM^{-1}t}$. We assume that $M_0 := \sup_{t \geq 0} \|Q(t)\| < \infty$ and, for short, we denote $C_1 := \|L^{-1}\|$ and $C_2 := \|M^{-1}\|$. According to previous definitions, it is suitable to rewrite problem (1)–(2) as the equivalent integral equation

$$\begin{aligned}
 Mx(t) &= Mx(0) \\
 &+ \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-s)^{\alpha-1} [-L^{-1}Ex(s) + L^{-1}f(s, x(s), B_1(s)u_1(s), \dots, B_{r-1}(s)u_{r-1}(s))] ds, \quad (5)
 \end{aligned}$$

provided the integral in (5) exists a.e. in $t \in J$. Before formulating the definition of mild solution of system (1)–(3), we first introduce some necessary notions. Let $I := [0, a]$ be a closed interval of the real line with the Lebesgue measure μ and the σ -algebra Σ of μ measurable sets. The norm of the space X (or T) will be denoted by $\|\cdot\|_X$ (or $\|\cdot\|_T$). We denote by $C(I, X)$ the space of all continuous functions from I into X with the supnorm given by $\|x\|_C := \sup_{t \in I} \|x(t)\|_X$ for $x \in C(I, X)$. For any Banach space V , the symbol ω - V stands for V equipped with the weak topology $\sigma(V, V^*)$. The same notation will be used for subsets of V . In all other cases, we assume that V and its subsets are equipped with the strong (normed) topology.

Throughout the paper, $A := -L^{-1}EM^{-1} : D(A) \subset Z \rightarrow Z$ is the infinitesimal generator of a compact analytic semigroup of uniformly bounded linear operators $Q(\cdot)$ in X . Then, there exists a constant $M_0 \geq 1$ such that $\|Q(t)\| \leq M_0$ for $t \geq 0$. The operators $B_i \in L^\infty(I, \mathcal{L}(T, X))$, and we let $\|B_i\|$ stand for $\|B_i\|_{L^\infty(I, \mathcal{L}(T, X))}$.

We now proceed with some basic definitions and results from multivalued analysis. For more details on multivalued analysis we refer to the books [38, 39]. We use the following symbols: $P_f(T)$ is the set of all nonempty closed subsets of T ; $P_{bf}(T)$ is the set of all nonempty, closed and bounded subsets of T . On $P_{bf}(T)$, we have a metric, known as the Hausdorff metric, defined by

$$d_H(A, B) := \max \left\{ \sup_{a \in A} d(a, B), \sup_{b \in B} d(b, A) \right\},$$

where $d(x, C)$ is the distance from a point x to a set C . We say that a multivalued map is H -continuous if it is continuous in the Hausdorff metric $d_H(\cdot, \cdot)$. Let $F : I \rightrightarrows 2^T \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ be a multifunction. For $1 \leq p \leq +\infty$, we define $S_F^p := \{f \in L^p(I, T) : f(t) \in F(t) \text{ a.e. on } I\}$. We say that a multivalued map $F : I \rightrightarrows P_f(T)$ is measurable if $F^{-1}(E) = \{t \in I : F(t) \cap E \neq \emptyset\} \in \Sigma$

for every closed set $E \subseteq T$. If $F : I \times T \rightarrow P_f(T)$, then the measurability of F means that $F^{-1}(E) \in \Sigma \otimes \mathcal{B}_T$, where $\Sigma \otimes \mathcal{B}_T$ is the σ -algebra of subsets in $I \times T$ generated by the sets $A \times B$, $A \in \Sigma$, $B \in \mathcal{B}_T$, and \mathcal{B}_T is the σ -algebra of the Borel sets in T .

Suppose that V_1 and V_2 are two Hausdorff topological spaces and $F : V_1 \rightarrow 2^{V_2} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$. We say that F is lower semicontinuous in the sense of Vietoris (l.s.c., for short) at a point $x_0 \in V_1$, if for any open set $W \subseteq V_2$, $F(x_0) \cap W \neq \emptyset$, there is a neighborhood $O(x_0)$ of x_0 such that $F(x) \cap W \neq \emptyset$ for all $x \in O(x_0)$. Similarly, F is said to be upper semicontinuous in the sense of Vietoris (u.s.c., for short) at a point $x_0 \in V_1$, if for any open set $W \subseteq V_2$, $F(x_0) \subseteq W$, there is a neighborhood $O(x_0)$ of x_0 such that $F(x) \subseteq W$ for all $x \in O(x_0)$. For more properties of l.s.c and u.s.c, we refer to the book [39]. Besides the standard norm on $L^q(I, T)$ (here, T is a separable reflexive Banach space), $1 < q < \infty$, we also consider the so called weak norm:

$$\|u_i(\cdot)\|_\omega := \sup_{0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq a} \left\| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} u_i(s) ds \right\|_T, \quad u_i \in L^q(I, T), \quad i = 1, \dots, r. \quad (6)$$

The space $L^q(I, T)$ furnished with this norm will be denoted by $L_\omega^q(I, T)$. The following result gives a relation between convergence in ω - $L^q(I, T)$ and convergence in $L_\omega^q(I, T)$.

Lemma 2.1 (see [40]) *If sequences $\{u_{1,n}\}_{n \geq 1}, \dots, \{u_{r,n}\}_{n \geq 1} \subseteq L^q(I, T)$ are bounded and converge to u_1, \dots, u_r in $L_\omega^q(I, T)$, respectively, then they converge to u_1, \dots, u_r in ω - $L^q(I, T)$, respectively.*

We make use of the following assumptions on the data of our problems.

(H1) The nonlinear function $f : I \times X^r \rightarrow Y$ satisfies the following:

- (1) $t \rightarrow f(t, x_1, \dots, x_r)$ is measurable for all $(x_1, \dots, x_r) \in X^r$;
- (2) $\|f(t, x_1, \dots, x_r) - f(t, y_1, \dots, y_r)\|_Y \leq k_1(t) \sum_{i=1}^r \|x_i - y_i\|_X$ a.e. on I , $k_1 \in L^\infty(I, \mathbb{R}^+)$;
- (3) there exists a constant $0 < \beta < \alpha$ such that $\|f(t, x_1, \dots, x_r)\|_Y \leq a_1(t) + c_1 \sum_{i=1}^r \|x_i\|_X$ a.e. in $t \in I$, where $a_1 \in L^{1/\beta}(I, \mathbb{R}^+)$ and $c_1 > 0$.

(H2) The nonlocal function $h : C(J : X, X) \rightarrow X$ satisfies the following:

- (1) $t \rightarrow h(x, y)$ is measurable for all $x, y \in X$;
- (2) $\|h(x_1, y_1) - h(x_2, y_2)\|_X \leq k_2(t) \{\|x_1 - x_2\|_X + \|y_1 - y_2\|_X\}$ a.e. on I , $k_2 \in L^\infty(I, \mathbb{R}^+)$;
- (3) there exists a constant $0 < \beta < \alpha$ such that $\|h(x, y)\|_X \leq a_2(t) + c_2 \{\|x\|_X + \|y\|_X\}$ a.e. in $t \in I$ and all $x, y \in X$, where $a_2 \in L^{1/\beta}(\mathbb{R}^+)$ and $c_2 > 0$.

(H3) The multivalued map $U : I \times X \rightrightarrows P_f(T)$ is such that:

- (1) $t \rightarrow U(t, x)$ is measurable for all $x \in X$;
- (2) $d_H(U(t, x), U(t, y)) \leq k_3(t) \|x - y\|_X$ a.e. on I , $k_3 \in L^\infty(I, \mathbb{R}^+)$;
- (3) there exists a constant $0 < \beta < \alpha$ such that

$$\|U(t, x)\|_T = \sup\{\|v\|_T : v \in U(t, x)\} \leq a_3(t) + c_3 \|x\|_X \quad \text{a.e. in } t \in I,$$

where $a_3 \in L^{1/\beta}(I, \mathbb{R}^+)$ and $c_3 > 0$.

(H4) Functions $g_i : I \times X \times T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, \dots, r$, are such that:

- (1) the map $t \rightarrow g_i(t, x, u_i)$ is measurable for all $(x, u_i) \in X \times T$;
- (2) $|g_i(t, x, u_i) - g_i(t, y, v_i)| \leq k'_4(t)\|x - y\|_X + k''_4\|u_i - v_i\|_T$ a.e., $k'_4 \in L^1(I, \mathbb{R}^+)$, $k''_4 > 0$;
- (3) $|g_i(t, x, u_i)| \leq a_4(t) + b_4(t)\|x\|_X + c_4\|u_i\|_T$ a.e. $t \in I$, $a_4, b_4 \in L^{1/\beta}(I, \mathbb{R}^+)$, $c_4 > 0$.

Definition 2.4 A solution of the control system (1)–(3) is defined to be a vector of functions $(x(\cdot), u_1(\cdot), \dots, u_r(\cdot))$ consisting of a trajectory $x \in C(I, X)$ and r multiple controls $u_1, \dots, u_r \in L^1(I, T)$ satisfying system (1)–(2) and the inclusion (3) almost everywhere.

A solution of control system (1)–(2), (4) can be defined similarly.

Definition 2.5 (see [17,30,41]) A vector of functions (x, u_1, \dots, u_r) is a mild solution of the control system (1)–(3) iff $x \in C(I, X)$ and there exist $u_1, \dots, u_r \in L^1(I, T)$ such that $u_1(t), \dots, u_r(t) \in U(t, x(t))$ a.e. in $t \in I$, $x(0) = x_0 - h(x(0), B_r(0)u_r(0))$, and the following integral equation is satisfied:

$$x(t) = S_\alpha(t)M[x_0 - h(x(t), B_r(t)u_r(t))] + \int_0^t (t-s)^{\alpha-1} T_\alpha(t-s) L^{-1} f(s, x(s), B_1(s)u_1(s), \dots, B_{r-1}(s)u_{r-1}(s)) ds,$$

where

$$S_\alpha(t) := \int_0^\infty M^{-1} \zeta_\alpha(\theta) Q(t^\alpha \theta) d\theta, \quad T_\alpha(t) := \alpha \int_0^\infty M^{-1} \theta \zeta_\alpha(\theta) Q(t^\alpha \theta) d\theta,$$

$$\zeta_\alpha(\theta) := \frac{1}{\alpha} \theta^{-1-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \varpi_\alpha(\theta^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}) \geq 0, \quad \varpi_\alpha(\theta) := \frac{1}{\pi} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{n-1} \theta^{-\alpha n-1} \frac{\Gamma(n\alpha+1)}{n!} \sin(n\pi\alpha), \quad \theta \in]0, \infty[,$$

with ζ_α the probability density function defined on $]0, \infty[$, that is, $\zeta_\alpha(\theta) \geq 0$, $\theta \in]0, \infty[$, and $\int_0^\infty \zeta_\alpha(\theta) d\theta = 1$.

A similar definition can be introduced for the control system (1)–(2),(4).

Remark 2.2 (see [41]) One has $\int_0^\infty \theta \zeta_\alpha(\theta) d\theta = \frac{1}{\Gamma(1+\alpha)}$.

Lemma 2.2 (see [41]) *The characteristic operators S_α and T_α have the following properties:*

(1) for any fixed $t \geq 0$, $S_\alpha(t)$ and $T_\alpha(t)$ are linear and bounded operators, i.e., for any $x \in X$,

$$\|S_\alpha(t)x\|_X \leq C_2 M_0 \|x\|_X, \quad \|T_\alpha(t)x\|_X \leq \frac{C_2 M_0}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \|x\|_X;$$

(2) $\{S_\alpha(t), t \geq 0\}$ and $\{T_\alpha(t), t \geq 0\}$ are strongly continuous;

(3) for every $t > 0$, $S_\alpha(t)$ and $T_\alpha(t)$ are compact operators.

Lemma 2.3 (see [42]) *Let $x(t)$ be continuous and non-negative on $[0, a]$. If*

$$x(t) \leq \psi(t) + \lambda \int_0^t \frac{x(s)}{(t-s)^\gamma} ds, \quad 0 \leq t \leq a,$$

where $0 \leq \gamma < 1$, $\psi(t)$ is a non-negative monotonic increasing continuous function on $[0, a]$, and λ is a positive constant, then

$$x(t) \leq \psi(t) E_{1-\gamma}(\lambda \Gamma(1-\gamma) t^{1-\gamma}), \quad 0 \leq t \leq a,$$

where $E_{1-\gamma}(z)$ is the Mittag-Leffler function defined for all $\gamma < 1$ by

$$E_{1-\gamma}(z) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{z^n}{\Gamma(n(1-\gamma) + 1)}.$$

3 Auxiliary Results

In this section we give some auxiliary results, which are required for the proof of our main results.

We begin with a prior estimation of the trajectory of the control system.

Lemma 3.1 *For any admissible trajectory x of the control system (1)–(2),(4), that is, for any $x \in \mathcal{T}r_{\text{cl conv } U}$, there is a constant L_0 such that*

$$\|x\|_C \leq L_0. \quad (7)$$

Proof From Definition 2.5, there exist $u_1(t), \dots, u_r(t) \in \text{cl conv } U(t, x(t))$ a.e. in $t \in I$ for any $x \in \mathcal{T}r_{\text{cl conv } U}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) &= S_\alpha(t) M [x_0 - h(x(t), B_r(t) u_r(t))] \\ &\quad + \int_0^t (t-s)^{\alpha-1} T_\alpha(t-s) L^{-1} f(s, x(s), B_1(s) u_1(s), \dots, B_{r-1}(s) u_{r-1}(s)) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by Lemma 2.2, (H1.3), (H2.3), (H3.3), and Hölder's inequality, one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \|x(t)\|_X &\leq C_2 M_0 \|M\| \{ \|x_0\|_X + a_2(t) + c_2 [\|x\|_X + \|B_r\| (a_3(t) + c_3 \|x\|_X)] \} \\ &\quad + \frac{C_1 C_2 M_0}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_0^t (t-s)^{\alpha-1} \left\{ a_1(s) + c_1 [\|x\|_X + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} \|B_i\| (a_3(s) + c_3 \|x\|_X)] \right\} ds \\ &\leq C_2 M_0 \|M\| \{ \|x_0\|_X + a_2(t) + c_2 [\|x\|_X + \|B_r\| (a_3(t) + c_3 \|x\|_X)] \} \\ &\quad + \frac{C_1 C_2 M_0}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \left[\frac{(1-\beta)}{\alpha-\beta} a^{\frac{\alpha-\beta}{1-\beta}} \right]^{1-\beta} \left[\|a_1\|_{L^{\frac{1}{\beta}}} + c_1 \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} \|B_i\| \|a_3\|_{L^{\frac{1}{\beta}}} \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{C_1 C_2 M_0}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \left(c_1 + c_1 c_3 \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} \|B_i\| \right) \int_0^t (t-s)^{\alpha-1} \|x\|_X ds. \end{aligned}$$

From the above inequality, using the well-known singular-version of Gronwall's inequality (see Lemma 2.3), we can deduce that the inequality (7) is satisfied, that is, there exists a constant $L_0 > 0$ such that $\|x\|_C \leq L_0$. \square

Let $\text{pr}_{L_0} : X \rightarrow X$ be a L_0 -radial retraction, that is,

$$\text{pr}_{L_0}(x) := \begin{cases} x, & \|x\|_X \leq L_0, \\ \frac{L_0 x}{\|x\|_X}, & \|x\|_X > L_0. \end{cases}$$

This map is Lipschitz continuous. We define $U_1(t, x) := U(t, \text{pr}_{L_0} x)$. Evidently, U_1 satisfies (H3.1) and (H3.2). Moreover, by the properties of pr_{L_0} , we have, a.e. in $t \in I$, all $x \in X$ and all $u_1, \dots, u_r \in U_1(t, x)$, that

$$\sup\{\|u_1\|_T, \dots, \|u_r\|_T\} \leq a_3(t) + c_3 L_0 \text{ and } \sup\{\|u_1\|_T, \dots, \|u_r\|_T\} \leq a_3(t) + c_3 \|x\|_X.$$

Hence, Lemma 3.1 is still valid with $U(t, x)$ substituted by $U_1(t, x)$. Consequently, without loss of generality, we assume that, a.e. in $t \in I$ and all $x \in X$,

$$\sup\{\|v\|_T : v \in U(t, x)\} \leq \varphi(t) = a_3(t) + c_3 L_0, \text{ with } \varphi \in L^{1/\beta}(I, \mathbb{R}^+). \quad (8)$$

Now we consider the following fractional nonlocal semilinear auxiliary problem of Sobolev type:

$$L^C D_t^\alpha [Mx(t)] + Ex(t) = f(t, x(t)), \quad t \in I, \quad (9)$$

$$x(0) = h(x(t)). \quad (10)$$

It is clear that, for every $f \in L^{1/\beta}(I \times X, Y)$, $h \in L^{1/\beta}(I : X, X)$, $0 < \beta < \alpha$, the problem (9)–(10) has a unique mild solution $H(f, h) \in C(I, X)$, which is given by

$$H(f, h)(t) = S_\alpha(t) M h(x(t)) + \int_0^t (t-s)^{\alpha-1} T_\alpha(t-s) L^{-1} f(s, x(s)) ds.$$

Let φ be defined by (8). We put

$$T_\varphi = \{u_i \in L^{1/\beta}(I, T) : \|u_i(t)\| \leq \varphi(t) \text{ a.e. } t \in I, i = 1, \dots, r\},$$

$$X_\varphi = \{f, h | f \in L^{1/\beta}(I \times X, Y), h \in L^{1/\beta}(I : X, X)\}.$$

The following lemma gives a property of the solution map $S : T_\varphi \rightarrow C(I, X)$ of (1)–(2), which is crucial in our investigation.

Lemma 3.2 *The solution map $S : T_\varphi \rightarrow C(I, X)$ is continuous from ω - T_φ into $C(I, X)$.*

Proof The operator $H : L^{1/\beta}(I \times X, Y) \times L^{1/\beta}(I : X, X) \rightarrow C(I, X)$ is linear. The estimation

$$\|H(f, h)\|_C \leq C_2 M_0 \|M\| \|h\|_{L^{\frac{1}{\beta}}} + \frac{C_1 C_2 M_0}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \left[\frac{(1-\beta)}{\alpha-\beta} a^{\frac{\alpha-\beta}{1-\beta}} \right]^{1-\beta} \|f\|_{L^{\frac{1}{\beta}}}$$

shows that H is continuous. Hence, H is also continuous from ω - $L^{1/\beta}(I \times X, Y) \times L^{1/\beta}(I : X, X)$ to ω - $C(I, X)$. Let $C \in P_b(L^{1/\beta}(J, X))$ and suppose that for any $f, h \in C$, $\|f\|_{L^{1/\beta}(I \times X, Y)} \leq K_1$ and $\|h\|_{L^{1/\beta}(I : X, X)} \leq K_2$ ($K_1, K_2 > 0$). Next we will show that H is completely continuous.

Step 1. From Lemma 3.1, we have that the map $\|H(f, h)(t)\|_X$ is uniformly bounded.

Step 2. H is equicontinuous on C . Let $0 \leq t_1 < t_2 \leq a$. For any $f, h \in C$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|H(f, h)(t_2) - H(f, h)(t_1)\|_X &\leq \| [S_\alpha(t_2) - S_\alpha(t_1)] Mh(x) \|_X \\ &+ \left\| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} (t_2 - s)^{\alpha-1} T_\alpha(t_2 - s) L^{-1} f(s, x(s)) ds \right\|_X \\ &+ \left\| \int_0^{t_1} \left[(t_2 - s)^{\alpha-1} - (t_1 - s)^{\alpha-1} \right] T_\alpha(t_2 - s) L^{-1} f(s, x(s)) ds \right\|_X \\ &+ \left\| \int_0^{t_1} (t_1 - s)^{\alpha-1} \left[T_\alpha(t_2 - s) - T_\alpha(t_1 - s) \right] L^{-1} f(s, x(s)) ds \right\|_X \\ &=: I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4. \end{aligned}$$

By using analogous arguments as in Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &\leq K_2 \|M\| \sup \|S_\alpha(t_2) - S_\alpha(t_1)\|, \\ I_2 &\leq \frac{C_1 C_2 M_0 K_1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \left[\frac{1-\beta}{\alpha-\beta} \right]^{1-\beta} (t_2 - t_1)^{\alpha-\beta}, \\ I_3 &\leq \frac{C_1 C_2 M_0 K_1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \left(\int_0^{t_1} ((t_1 - s)^{\alpha-1} - (t_2 - s)^{\alpha-1})^{1/(1-\beta)} ds \right)^{1-\beta} \\ &\leq \frac{C_1 C_2 M_0 K_1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \left(\int_0^{t_1} ((t_1 - s)^{\frac{\alpha-1}{1-\beta}} - (t_2 - s)^{\frac{\alpha-1}{1-\beta}}) ds \right)^{1-\beta} \\ &= \frac{C_1 C_2 M_0 K_1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \left[\frac{1-\beta}{\alpha-\beta} \right]^{1-\beta} \left(t_1^{\frac{\alpha-\beta}{1-\beta}} - t_2^{\frac{\alpha-\beta}{1-\beta}} + (t_2 - t_1)^{\frac{\alpha-\beta}{1-\beta}} \right)^{1-\beta} \\ &\leq \frac{C_1 C_2 M_0 K_1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \left[\frac{1-\beta}{\alpha-\beta} \right]^{1-\beta} (t_2 - t_1)^{\alpha-\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

For $t_1 = 0$ and $0 < t_2 \leq b$, it is easy to see that $I_4 = 0$. For $t_1 > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$ small enough,

$$\begin{aligned} I_4 &\leq \left\| \int_0^{t_1-\epsilon} (t_1 - s)^{\alpha-1} \left(T_\alpha(t_2 - s) - T_\alpha(t_1 - s) \right) L^{-1} f(s, x(s)) ds \right\|_X \\ &+ \left\| \int_{t_1-\epsilon}^{t_1} (t_1 - s)^{\alpha-1} \left(T_\alpha(t_2 - s) - T_\alpha(t_1 - s) \right) L^{-1} f(s, x(s)) ds \right\|_X \\ &\leq \sup_{s \in [0, t_1-\epsilon]} \|T_\alpha(t_2 - s) - T_\alpha(t_1 - s)\| C_1 K_1 \left[\frac{1-\beta}{\alpha-\beta} \right]^{1-\beta} \left(t_1^{\frac{\alpha-\beta}{1-\beta}} - \epsilon^{\frac{\alpha-\beta}{1-\beta}} \right)^{1-\beta} \\ &+ \frac{2C_1 C_2 M_0 K_1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \left[\frac{1-\beta}{\alpha-\beta} \right]^{1-\beta} \epsilon^{\alpha-\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the estimations for I_1 , I_2 , I_3 and I_4 , and letting $t_2 \rightarrow t_1$ and $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ in I_4 , we conclude that H is equicontinuous. For more details see [17].

Step 3. The set $\Pi(t) := \{H(f, h)(t) : f, h \in C\}$ is relatively compact in X . Clearly, $\Pi(0)$ is compact. Hence, it is only necessary to consider $t > 0$. For each $g \in]0, t[$, $t \in]0, a]$, $f, h \in C$, and

$\delta > 0$ being arbitrary, we define $\Pi_{g,\delta}(t) := \{H_{g,\delta}(f, h)(t) : f, h \in C\}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} H_{g,\delta}(f, h)(t) &= \int_{\delta}^{\infty} M^{-1}\xi_{\alpha}(\theta)Q(t^{\alpha}\theta)Mh(x)d\theta \\ &\quad + \alpha \int_0^{t-g} \int_{\delta}^{\infty} \theta(t-s)^{\alpha-1}\xi_{\alpha}(\theta)Q((t-s)^{\alpha}\theta)L^{-1}f(s, x(s))d\theta ds \\ &= Q(g^{\alpha}\delta) \int_{\delta}^{\infty} M^{-1}\xi_{\alpha}(\theta)Q(t^{\alpha}\theta - g^{\alpha}\delta)Mh(x)d\theta \\ &\quad + \alpha Q(g^{\alpha}\delta) \int_0^{t-g} \int_{\delta}^{\infty} \theta(t-s)^{\alpha-1}\xi_{\alpha}(\theta)Q((t-s)^{\alpha}\theta - g^{\alpha}\delta)L^{-1}f(s, x(s))d\theta ds \\ &:= Q(g^{\alpha}\delta)y(t, g). \end{aligned}$$

Because $Q(g^{\alpha}\delta)$ is compact and $y(t, g)$ is bounded, we obtain that the set $\Pi_{g,\delta}(t)$ is relatively compact in X for any $g \in]0, t[$ and $\delta > 0$. Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|H(f, h)(t) - H_{g,\delta}(f, h)(t)\|_X &= \left\| \int_0^{\delta} M^{-1}\xi_{\alpha}(\theta)Q(t^{\alpha}\theta)Mh(x)d\theta \right. \\ &\quad + \alpha \int_0^t \int_0^{\delta} M^{-1}\theta(t-s)^{\alpha-1}\xi_{\alpha}(\theta)Q((t-s)^{\alpha}\theta)L^{-1}f(s, x(s))d\theta ds \\ &\quad + \alpha \int_0^t \int_{\delta}^{\infty} M^{-1}\theta(t-s)^{\alpha-1}\xi_{\alpha}(\theta)Q((t-s)^{\alpha}\theta)L^{-1}f(s, x(s))d\theta ds \\ &\quad \left. - \alpha \int_0^{t-g} \int_{\delta}^{\infty} M^{-1}\theta(t-s)^{\alpha-1}\xi_{\alpha}(\theta)Q((t-s)^{\alpha}\theta)L^{-1}f(s, x(s))d\theta ds \right\|_X \\ &\leq \left\| \int_0^{\delta} M^{-1}\xi_{\alpha}(\theta)Q(t^{\alpha}\theta)Mh(x)d\theta \right\|_X \\ &\quad + \alpha \left\| \int_0^t \int_0^{\delta} M^{-1}\theta(t-s)^{\alpha-1}\xi_{\alpha}(\theta)Q((t-s)^{\alpha}\theta)L^{-1}f(s, x(s))d\theta ds \right\|_X \\ &\quad + \alpha \left\| \int_{t-g}^t \int_{\delta}^{\infty} M^{-1}\theta(t-s)^{\alpha-1}\xi_{\alpha}(\theta)Q((t-s)^{\alpha}\theta)L^{-1}f(s, x(s))d\theta ds \right\|_X \\ &\leq C_2M_0 \int_0^{\delta} \xi_{\alpha}(\theta)d\theta \|M\| \|h(x)\|_{L^{1/\beta}} \\ &\quad + C_1C_2M_0\alpha \left(\int_0^t (t-s)^{\frac{\alpha-1}{1-\beta}} ds \right)^{1-\beta} \|f\|_{L^{1/\beta}} \int_0^{\delta} \theta\xi_{\alpha}(\theta)d\theta \\ &\quad + C_1C_2M_0\alpha \left(\int_{t-g}^t (t-s)^{\frac{\alpha-1}{1-\beta}} ds \right)^{1-\beta} \|f\|_{L^{1/\beta}} \int_{\delta}^{\infty} \theta\xi_{\alpha}(\theta)d\theta \\ &\leq C_2M_0\|M\|K_2 \int_0^{\delta} \xi_{\alpha}(\theta)d\theta \\ &\quad + C_1C_2M_0K_1\alpha \left[\frac{1-\beta}{\alpha-\beta} \right]^{1-\beta} \left(b^{\alpha-\beta} \int_0^{\delta} \theta\xi_{\alpha}(\theta)d\theta + \frac{1}{\Gamma(1+\alpha)}g^{\alpha-\beta} \right). \end{aligned}$$

From Definition 2.5 and Remark 2.2, we deduce that the right-hand side of the last inequality tends to zero as $g \rightarrow 0$ and $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, there are relatively compact sets arbitrarily close to the set $\Pi(t)$, $t > 0$. Hence, the set $\Pi(t)$, $t > 0$ is also relatively compact in X .

Since T_φ is a convex compact metrizable subset of $\omega\text{-}L^{1/\beta}(I, T)$, it suffices to prove the sequential continuity of the map S . Let $\{u_{1,n}\}_{n \geq 1}, \dots, \{u_{r,n}\}_{n \geq 1} \subseteq T_\varphi$ be such that

$$(u_{1,n}, \dots, u_{r,n}) \rightarrow (u_1, \dots, u_r) \text{ in } \omega\text{-}L^{1/\beta}(I, T), \quad u_1, \dots, u_r \in T_\varphi. \quad (11)$$

Set $f_n := f_n(\cdot, \cdot, B_1(\cdot)u_{1,n}(\cdot), \dots, B_{r-1}(\cdot)u_{r-1,n}(\cdot))$ and $h_n := h_n(\cdot, B_r(\cdot)u_{r,n}(\cdot))$. By the properties of the operator H together with (11), we have $H(f_n, h_n) \rightarrow H(f, h)$ in $\omega\text{-}C(I, X)$, where $(f_n, h_n) \rightarrow (f, h)$ in $\omega\text{-}L^{1/\beta}(I \times X^r, Y) \times L^{1/\beta}(X^2, X)$, and the limit functions are $f = f(\cdot, \cdot, B_1(\cdot)u_1(\cdot), \dots, B_{r-1}(\cdot)u_{r-1}(\cdot))$ and $h = h(\cdot, B_r(\cdot)u_r(\cdot))$. Since $\{f_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ and $\{h_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ are bounded, there are subsequences $\{f_{n_k}\}_{k \geq 1}$ and $\{h_{n_k}\}_{k \geq 1}$ of the sequences $\{f_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ and $\{h_n\}_{n \geq 1}$, respectively, such that $H(f_{n_k}, h_{n_k}) \rightarrow z$ in $C(I, X)$ for some $z \in C(I, X)$. From the fact that $H(f_n, h_n) \rightarrow H(f, h)$ in $\omega\text{-}C(I, X)$ and $H(f_{n_k}, h_{n_k}) \rightarrow z$ in $C(I, X)$, we obtain that $z = H(f, h)$ and $H(f_n, h_n) \rightarrow H(f, h)$ in $C(I, X)$. Based on the definitions of operators S and H , we know that $S(u_1, \dots, u_r)(t) = S_\alpha(t)Mx_0 + H(f, h)(t)$. According to the arguments above, we conclude that $S(u_{1,n}, \dots, u_{r,n})(t) \rightarrow S(u_1, \dots, u_r)(t)$ in $C(I, X)$. \square

Now, we consider the space $\overline{T} := T \times \mathbb{R}$. The elements of the space \overline{T} will be denoted by $\overline{u}_i := (u_i, \tau_i)$, such that $u_i \in T$, $\tau_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and $i = 1, \dots, r$. The space \overline{T} is endowed with the norm $\|\overline{u}\|_{\overline{T}} = \max\{\max(\|u_1\|_T, |\tau_1|), \dots, \max(\|u_r\|_T, |\tau_r|)\}$. Then \overline{T} is a separable reflexive Banach space. In view of (6), the norm on the space $L_\omega^q(I, \overline{T})$ becomes

$$\|\overline{u}\|_\omega = \sup_{0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq a} \left\{ \max \left\{ \max \left(\left\| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} u_1(s) ds \right\|_T, \left| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \tau_1(s) ds \right| \right), \dots, \max \left(\left\| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} u_r(s) ds \right\|_T, \left| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \tau_r(s) ds \right| \right) \right\} \right\}.$$

Let the multivalued map $F : I \times X \rightrightarrows \overline{T}$ be defined by

$$F(t, x) := \left\{ (u_i, \tau_i) \in \overline{T} \left| \begin{array}{l} u_1 \in U(t, x), \tau_1 = g_1(t, x, u_1) \\ \vdots \\ u_r \in U(t, x), \tau_r = g_r(t, x, u_r) \end{array} \right. \right\}. \quad (12)$$

Lemma 3.3 *The multivalued map F given by (12) has bounded closed values and satisfies:*

- (1) *the map $t \rightarrow F(t, x)$ is measurable;*
- (2) *$d_H(F(t, x), F(t, y)) \leq l(t)\|x - y\|_X$ a.e., with $l \in L^1(I, \mathbb{R}^+)$;*
- (3) *for any $\overline{u}_i = (u_i, \tau_i) \in F(t, x)$, we have $|\tau_i| \leq a_4(t) + b_4(t)\|x\|_X + c_4(a_3(t) + c_3\|x\|_X)$ and $\|u_i\|_T \leq a_3(t) + c_3\|x\|_X$, $i = 1, \dots, r$.*

Proof From (H3.3) and (H4.3), we have the boundedness of $F(t, x)$. Moreover, item (3) also follows. Since the graphs of functions $u_1 \rightarrow g_1(t, x, u_1), \dots, u_r \rightarrow g_r(t, x, u_r)$ are closed on the set $U(t, x)$, we obtain the closedness of $F(t, x)$. The measurability of the multivalued map is concluded and extended from [43, 44]. To prove item (2), we consider $x, y \in X$, such that $x \neq y$, and any arbitrary $\epsilon_i > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, r$. Then, for each $u_i \in U(t, x)$, there exists $v_i \in U(t, y)$ satisfying $\|u_i - v_i\|_T \leq (k_3(t) + \epsilon_i)\|x - y\|_X$ and $|g_i(t, x, u_i) - g_i(t, y, v_i)| \leq k_4(t)\|x - y\|_X + k'_4((k_3(t) + \epsilon_i)\|x - y\|_X)$. From above, we get

$$\max \left\{ \sup d \left((u_1, g_1(t, x, u_1)), F(t, y) \right), \dots, \sup d \left((u_r, g_r(t, x, u_r)), F(t, y) \right) \right\} \leq l(t)\|x - y\|_X,$$

where $l(t) := \max\{k_3(t), k_4(t) + k'_4 k_3\}$. Similarly, we can get

$$\max \left\{ \sup d \left((v_1, g_1(t, y, v_1)), F(t, x) \right), \dots, \sup d \left((v_r, g_r(t, y, v_r)), F(t, x) \right) \right\} \leq l(t)\|x - y\|_X.$$

We apply max between the two last max-sets, to get our result. \square

Let $\text{Eff}^{**}(t, x)$ be the effective set, and $\text{Epi}^{**}(t, x)$ the epigraph of functions $u_1 \rightarrow g_1^{**}(t, x, u_1), \dots, u_r \rightarrow g_r^{**}(t, x, u_r)$, that is,

- (1) $\text{Eff}^{**}(t, x) := \{u_i \in T : \max\{g_1^{**}(t, x, u_1), \dots, g_r^{**}(t, x, u_r)\} < +\infty\}$,
- (2) $\text{Epi}^{**}(t, x) := \{(u_i, \tau_i) \in \overline{T} : g_1^{**}(t, x, u_1) \leq \tau_1, \dots, g_r^{**}(t, x, u_r) \leq \tau_r\}$.

Now, we present some properties of functions $g_i^{**}(t, x, u_i)$ via the following lemma.

Lemma 3.4 *For a.e. in $t \in I$, one has:*

- (1) $\text{Eff}^{**}(t, x) = \text{cl conv } U(t, x(t))$;
- (2) $g_1^{**}(t, x, u_1) + \dots + g_r^{**}(t, x, u_r) = \min\{\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_r \in \mathbb{R} : (u_i, \tau_i) \in \text{cl conv } F(t, x)\}$ for every $u_1, \dots, u_r \in \text{Eff}^{**}(t, x)$ and hence $(u_i, g_i^{**}(t, x, u_i)) \in \text{cl conv } F(t, x)$ when $u_i \in \text{cl conv } U(t, x)$ and $x \in X$;
- (3) for any $\epsilon_i > 0$, there exist closed sets $I_{\epsilon_i} \subseteq I$, $\mu(I \setminus I_{\epsilon_i}) \leq \epsilon_i$, such that $(t, x, u_i) \rightarrow g_i^{**}(t, x, u_i)$ are l.s.c. on $I_{\epsilon_i} \times X \times T$, $i = 1, \dots, r$.

Proof It is well known that the bipolar $g_1^{**}(t, x, u_1), \dots, g_r^{**}(t, x, u_r)$ are the Γ -regularization of $u_1 \rightarrow g_{1,U}(t, x, u_1), \dots, u_r \rightarrow g_{r,U}(t, x, u_r)$, respectively. Let $x \in I$ a.e. be arbitrary. By (H4.3), each function of $u_1 \rightarrow g_{1,U}(t, x, u_1), \dots, u_r \rightarrow g_{r,U}(t, x, u_r)$ has an affine continuous minorant. Then,

$$\text{Epi}^{**}(t, x) = \text{cl conv} \bigcup_{i=1}^r \text{Epi}_{g_{i,U}}(t, x). \quad (13)$$

Therefore, items (1) and (2) follow from (13) and (11) (for more details see [45]). Using Corollary 2.1 of [44] and items (1) and (2) of Lemma 3.3, for every $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_r > 0$, there are closed sets $I_{\epsilon_1}, \dots, I_{\epsilon_r} \subseteq I$ with $\mu(I \setminus I_{\epsilon_1}) \leq \epsilon_1, \dots, \mu(I \setminus I_{\epsilon_r}) \leq \epsilon_r$ such that the map $\text{cl conv } F(t, x)$, restricted to $I_{\epsilon_1} \times X, \dots, I_{\epsilon_r} \times X$, has a closed graph in $I \times X \times \overline{T}$. To show item (3), let us consider $(t_n, x_n, u_{i,n})_{n \geq 1} \in I_{\epsilon_i} \times X \times T$, such that $(t_n, x_n, u_{i,n}) \rightarrow (t, x, u_i)$. If $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_i^{**}(t_n, x_n, u_{i,n}) = +\infty$, then $g_i^{**}(t, x, u_i)$ are l.s.c. at points (t, x, u_i) , $i = 1, \dots, r$. If $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_i^{**}(t_n, x_n, u_{i,n}) = \lambda_i$, with $\lambda_i \neq +\infty$, then by using (H4.3), we get $\lambda_i \neq -\infty$. Hence, we can assume, without loss of generality, that $g_i^{**}(t_n, x_n, u_{i,n}) < +\infty$. Then we have $(u_{i,n}, g_i^{**}(t_n, x_n, u_{i,n})) \in \text{cl conv } F(t_n, x_n)$. From the last formula, and based on the above, the map $\text{cl conv } F(t, x)$ restricted to $I_{\epsilon_1} \times X, \dots, I_{\epsilon_r} \times X$ has a closed graph in $I \times X \times \overline{T}$. We obtain that $(u_i, \lambda_i) \in \text{cl conv } F(t, x)$. By the second item of this lemma, we have $g_i^{**}(t, x, u_i) \leq \lambda_i = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_i^{**}(t_n, x_n, u_{i,n})$. Consequently, the maps $(t, x, u_i) \rightarrow g_i^{**}(t, x, u_i)$ are l.s.c. on $I_{\epsilon_i} \times X \times T$. \square

4 Existence for Multiple Control Systems

In this section, we shall prove existence of solutions for the multiple control systems (1)–(3) and (1)–(2),(4). Let $\Lambda := S(T_\varphi)$. From Lemma 3.2, we have that Λ is a compact subset of $C(I, X)$. It follows from (8) and the definitions of T_φ and X_φ that $\mathcal{T}r_U \subseteq \mathcal{T}r_{\text{cl conv } U} \subseteq \Lambda$. Let the set-valued map $\overline{U} : C(I, X) \rightrightarrows 2^{L^{1/\beta}(I, T)}$ be defined by

$$\overline{U}(x) := \{\theta_i : I \rightarrow T \text{ measurable} : \theta_i(t) \in U(t, x(t)) \text{ a.e.}, i = 1, \dots, r\}, \quad x \in C(I, X).$$

Theorem 4.1 *The set \mathcal{R}_U is nonempty and the set $\mathcal{R}_{\text{cl conv } U}$ is a compact subset of the space $C(I, X) \times \omega\text{-}L^{1/\beta}(I, T)$.*

Proof By hypotheses (H3.1) and (H3.2), we have that for any measurable function $x : I \rightarrow X$, the map $t \rightarrow U(t, x(t))$ is measurable and has closed values [39, Proposition 2.7.9]. Therefore, it has measurable selectors [43]. So the operator \overline{U} is well defined and its values are closed decomposable subsets of $L^{1/\beta}(I, T)$. We claim that $x \rightarrow \overline{U}(x)$ is l.s.c. Let $x_* \in C(I, X)$, $\theta_{i,*} \in \overline{U}(x_*)$, $i = 1, \dots, r$, and let $\{x_n\}_{n \geq 1} \subseteq C(I, X)$ be a sequence converging to x_* . It follows from [46, Lemma 3.2] that there are sequences $\theta_{i,n} \in \overline{U}(x_n)$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^r \|\theta_{i,*}(t) - \theta_{i,n}(t)\|_T \leq \sum_{i=1}^r \left\{ d_T(\theta_{i,*}(t), U(t, x_n(t))) + \frac{1}{in} \right\}, \quad \text{a.e. } t \in I. \quad (14)$$

Since the map $y \rightarrow U(t, y)$ is H -continuous a.e. in $t \in I$ (by (H3.2)), then a.e. in $t \in I$, the map $y \rightarrow U(t, y)$ is l.s.c. [39, Proposition 1.2.66]. Hence, each function $y \rightarrow d_T(\theta_{i,*}(t), U(t, y))$ is u.s.c.

for a.e. $t \in I$. It follows from (14) that, a.e. in $t \in I$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^r \|\theta_{i,*}(t) - \theta_{i,n}(t)\|_T &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^r \sup d_T(\theta_{i,*}(t), U(t, x_n(t))) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^r d_T(\theta_{i,*}(t), U(t, x_*(t))) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality together with (8) imply that $\theta_{i,n} \rightarrow \theta_{i,*}$ in $L^{1/\beta}(I, T)$, $i = 1, \dots, r$. Therefore, the map $x \rightarrow \bar{U}(x)$ is l.s.c. By [47] (see also [39, Theorem 2.8.7]), there exists a continuous function $m : \Lambda \rightarrow L^{1/\beta}(I, T)$ such that $m(x) \in \bar{U}(x)$ for all $x \in \Lambda$. Consider the map $\mathcal{P} : L^{1/\beta}(I, T) \rightarrow L^{1/\beta}(I, T)$ defined by $\mathcal{P}(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r) := m(S(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r))$. According to (8) and the definition of T_φ , $\mathcal{P}(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r) \in T_\varphi$ for every $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r \in T_\varphi$. Due to Lemma 3.2 and the continuity of m , the map $\mathcal{P} : \omega\text{-}T_\varphi \rightarrow \omega\text{-}T_\varphi$ is continuous. Since $\omega\text{-}T_\varphi$ is a convex metrizable compact set in $\omega\text{-}L^{1/\beta}(I, T)$, by applying Schauder's fixed point theorem, we deduce that this map has a fixed point $(\theta_{1,*}, \dots, \theta_{r,*}) \in T_\varphi^r$, that is, $(\theta_{1,*}, \dots, \theta_{r,*}) = \mathcal{P}(\theta_{1,*}, \dots, \theta_{r,*}) = m(S(\theta_{1,*}, \dots, \theta_{r,*}))$. Let $(u_{1,*}, \dots, u_{r,*}) := (\theta_{1,*}, \dots, \theta_{r,*})$ and $x_* := S(\theta_{1,*}, \dots, \theta_{r,*})$. Then, $(u_{1,*}, \dots, u_{r,*}) = m(x_*)$ and $x_* = S(u_{1,*}, \dots, u_{r,*})$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} x_*(t) &= S(u_{1,*}, \dots, u_{r,*})(t) = S_\alpha(t)M[x_0 - h(x_*(t), B_r(t)u_{r,*}(t))] \\ &\quad + \int_0^t (t-s)^{\alpha-1} T_\alpha(t-s) L^{-1} f(s, x_*(s), B_1(s)u_{1,*}(s), \dots, B_{r-1}(s)u_{r-1,*}(s)) ds, \end{aligned}$$

$$u_{1,*}, \dots, u_{r,*} \in U(t, x_*(t)) \text{ a.e. } t \in I,$$

which imply that $(x_*(\cdot), u_{1,*}(\cdot), \dots, u_{r,*}(\cdot))$ is a solution of the control system (1)–(3). Hence, \mathcal{R}_U is nonempty. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{R}_{\text{cl conv } U} \subseteq \Lambda \times T_\varphi$. Since Λ is compact in $C(I, X)$ and T_φ is metrizable convex compact in $\omega\text{-}L^{1/\beta}(I, T)$, we have that $\mathcal{R}_{\text{cl conv } U}$ is relatively compact in $C(I, X) \times \omega\text{-}L^{1/\beta}(I, T)$. Hence, to complete the proof of this theorem, it is sufficient to prove that $\mathcal{R}_{\text{cl conv } U}$ is sequentially closed in $C(I, X) \times \omega\text{-}L^{1/\beta}(I, T)$. Let $\{(x_n(\cdot), u_{1,n}(\cdot), \dots, u_{r,n}(\cdot))\}_{n \geq 1} \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\text{cl conv } U}$ be a sequence converging to $(x(\cdot), u_1(\cdot), \dots, u_r(\cdot))$ in the space $C(I, X) \times \omega\text{-}L^{1/\beta}(I, T)$. Then we have $x_n = S(u_{1,n}, \dots, u_{r,n})$ and $(u_{1,n}, \dots, u_{r,n}) \rightarrow (u_1, \dots, u_r)$ in $\omega\text{-}L^{1/\beta}(I, T)$. Denote $z := S(u_1, \dots, u_r)$. From Lemma 3.2, we obtain that $z = x$, that is, x is a solution of (9)–(10) corresponding to u_1, \dots, u_r . Hence, to prove that $(x(\cdot), u_1(\cdot), \dots, u_r(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{cl conv } U}$, we only need to verify that $u_1, \dots, u_r \in \text{cl conv } U(t, x(t))$ a.e. in $t \in I$. Since $u_{1,n} \rightarrow u_1, \dots, u_{r,n} \rightarrow u_r$ in $\omega\text{-}L^{1/\beta}(I, T)$, by Mazur's theorem, we have

$$u_1(t) \in \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{cl conv} \left(\bigcup_{k=n}^{\infty} u_{1,k}(t) \right), \dots, u_r(t) \in \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{cl conv} \left(\bigcup_{k=n}^{\infty} u_{r,k}(t) \right) \text{ for a.e. } t \in I. \quad (15)$$

From hypothesis (H3.2) and the fact that $d_H(\text{cl conv } A, \text{cl conv } B) \leq d_H(A, B)$ for sets A, B , the map $x \rightarrow \text{cl conv } U(t, x)$ is H -continuous. Then, from Proposition 1.2.86 in [39], we conclude that the map $x \rightarrow \text{cl conv } U(t, x)$ has property Q . Therefore, we have

$$\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{cl conv} \left(\bigcup_{k=n}^{\infty} \text{cl conv } U(t, x_k(t)) \right) \subseteq \text{cl conv } U(t, x(t)) \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in I. \quad (16)$$

By (15) and (16), we obtain that $u_1(t), \dots, u_r(t) \in \text{cl conv } U(t, x(t))$ a.e. in $t \in I$. This means that $\mathcal{R}_{\text{cl conv } U}$ is compact in $C(I, X) \times \omega\text{-}L^{1/\beta}(I, T)$. \square

5 Main Results

In order to state and prove our main results, we firstly show the following helpful lemma.

Lemma 5.1 *For any function $x_* \in C(I, X)$ and any measurable selectors $u_{1,*}, \dots, u_{r,*}$ of the map $t \rightarrow \text{cl conv } U(t, x_*(t))$, there are sequences $u_{1,n}(t), \dots, u_{r,n}(t)$, $n \geq 1$, of measurable selectors of the map $t \rightarrow U(t, x_*(t))$, such that*

$$\sup_{0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq a} \sum_{i=1}^r \left\| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} (u_{i,*}(s) - u_{i,n}(s)) ds \right\|_T \leq \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{1}{in}, \quad (17)$$

$$\sup_{0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq a} \sum_{i=1}^r \left| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} (g_i^{**}(s, x_*(s), u_{i,*}(s)) - g_i(s, x_*(s), u_{i,n}(s))) ds \right| \leq \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{1}{in}. \quad (18)$$

The sequences $u_{i,n}$ converge to $u_{i,*}$ in $\omega\text{-}L^{1/\beta}(I, T)$.

Proof Let $\bar{u}_{i,*}(t) := (u_{i,*}, g_i^{**}(t, x_*(t), u_{i,*}(t)))$, $i = 1, \dots, r$. According to Lemma 3.4, we know that $\bar{u}_{i,*}(t)$ are measurable selectors of the map $t \rightarrow \text{cl conv } F(t, x_*(t))$. From Lemma 3.3, the map $t \rightarrow F(t, x_*(t))$ is measurable and integrally bounded. Hence, by using [47, Theorem 2.2], we have that, for any $n \geq 1$, there exist measurable selections $\bar{u}_{1,n}(t), \dots, \bar{u}_{r,n}(t)$ of the map $t \rightarrow F(t, x_*(t))$ such that

$$\sup_{0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq a} \left\| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} (\bar{u}_{i,*}(s) - \bar{u}_{i,n}(s)) ds \right\|_{\bar{T}} \leq \frac{1}{in}, \quad i = 1, \dots, r.$$

The definitions of F and the weak norm on $L^{1/\beta}(I, \bar{T})$ give $\bar{u}_{i,n}(t) = (u_{i,n}, g_i(t, x_*(t), u_{i,n}(t)))$ and $u_{i,n} \in U(t, x_*(t))$, $i = 1, \dots, r$, a.e. Then formulas (17) and (18) follow. Hence, from Lemma 2.1, $u_{i,n} \rightarrow u_{i,*}$ in $\omega\text{-}L^{1/\beta}(I, T)$. \square

Theorem 5.1 *Let any $(x_*(\cdot), u_{1,*}(\cdot), \dots, u_{r,*}(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{cl conv } U}$. Then there exists a sequence*

$$(x_n(\cdot), u_{1,n}(\cdot), \dots, u_{r,n}(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{R}_U, \quad n \geq 1,$$

such that

$$x_n \rightarrow x_* \text{ in } C(I, X), \quad (19)$$

$$u_{i,n} \rightarrow u_{i,*} \text{ in } L_{\omega}^{\frac{1}{\beta}}(I, T) \text{ and } \omega\text{-}L^{\frac{1}{\beta}}(I, T), \quad (20)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq a} \sum_{i=1}^r \left| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} (g_i^{**}(s, x_*(s), u_{i,*}(s)) - g_i(s, x_n(s), u_{i,n}(s))) ds \right| = 0. \quad (21)$$

Proof Let $(x_*(\cdot), u_{1,*}(\cdot), \dots, u_{r,*}(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{cl conv } U}$. From Lemma 5.1, for any $n \geq 1$, there are measurable selectors $v_{1,n}(t), \dots, v_{r,n}(t)$ of the multivalued map $t \rightrightarrows U(t, x_*(t))$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq a} \sum_{i=1}^r \left\| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} (u_{i,*}(s) - v_{i,n}(s)) ds \right\|_T &\leq \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{1}{in}, \\ \sup_{0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq a} \sum_{i=1}^r \left| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} (g_i^{**}(s, x_*(s), u_{i,*}(s)) - g_i(s, x_*(s), v_{i,n}(s))) ds \right| &\leq \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{1}{in}. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

The sequences $v_{i,n} \rightarrow u_{i,*}$ in $\omega\text{-}L^{\frac{1}{\beta}}(I, T)$, $i = 1, \dots, r$. For each fixed $n \geq 1$, by (H3.2), we have that, for any $x \in X$ and a.e. in $t \in I$, there exist $v_i \in U(t, x)$, $i = 1, \dots, r$, such that

$$\|v_{i,n}(t) - v_i\|_T < k_i(t) \|x_*(t) - x\|_X + \frac{1}{in}. \quad (23)$$

Let the map $\mathcal{Y}_n : I \times X \rightarrow 2^T$ be defined by

$$\mathcal{Y}_n(t, x) := \{v_i \in T : v_i, i = 1, \dots, r, \text{ satisfy inequality (23)}\}. \quad (24)$$

It follows from (23) that $\mathcal{Y}_n(t, x)$ is well defined a.e. on I and all $x \in X$, and its values are open sets. Using [44, Corollary 2.1] (since we can assume, without loss of generality, that $U(t, x)$ is $\Sigma \otimes \mathcal{B}_X$ measurable, see [39, Proposition 2.7.9]), we obtain that, for any $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_r > 0$, there are compact sets $I_{\epsilon_1}, \dots, I_{\epsilon_r} \subseteq I$ with $\mu(I \setminus I_{\epsilon_1}) \leq \epsilon_1, \dots, \mu(I \setminus I_{\epsilon_r}) \leq \epsilon_r$, such that the restrictions of $U(t, x)$ to $I_{\epsilon_1} \times X, \dots, I_{\epsilon_r} \times X$ are l.s.c and the restrictions of $v_{1,n}(t), \dots, v_{r,n}(t)$ and $k_1(t), \dots, k_r(t)$ to $I_{\epsilon_1}, \dots, I_{\epsilon_r}$, respectively, are continuous. It means that (23) and (24) imply that the graphs of the restrictions of $\mathcal{Y}_n(t, x)$ to $I_{\epsilon_i} \times X$ are open sets in $I_{\epsilon_i} \times X \times T$, $i = 1, \dots, r$, respectively. Let the map $\mathcal{Y} : I \times X \rightarrow 2^T$ be defined by $\mathcal{Y}(t, x) := \mathcal{Y}_n(t, x) \cap U(t, x)$. Clearly, a.e. in $t \in I$ and all $x \in X$, $\mathcal{Y}(t, x) \neq \emptyset$. Due to the arguments above and Proposition 1.2.47 in [39], we know that the restrictions of $\mathcal{Y}(t, x)$ to $J_{\epsilon_i} \times X$ are l.s.c. and so does $\overline{\mathcal{Y}}(t, x) = \overline{\mathcal{Y}(t, x)}$. Here the bar stands for the closure of a set in T . Now consider the system (1)–(2) with the constraint on the controls

$$u_1(t), \dots, u_r(t) \in \overline{\mathcal{Y}}(t, x(t)) \quad \text{a.e. on } I. \quad (25)$$

Since $\overline{\mathcal{Y}}(t, x) \subseteq U(t, x)$, the estimate of Lemma 3.1 also holds in this matter. Repeating the proof of Theorem 4.1, we obtain that there is a solution $(x_n(\cdot), u_{1,n}(\cdot), \dots, u_{r,n}(\cdot))$ of the control system (1)–(2), (25). The definition of $\overline{\mathcal{Y}}$ implies that $(x_n(\cdot), u_{1,n}(\cdot), \dots, u_{r,n}(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{R}_U$ and

$$\|v_{i,n}(t) - u_{i,n}(t)\|_T \leq k_i(t) \|x_*(t) - x_n(t)\|_X + \frac{1}{in}, \quad i = 1, \dots, r. \quad (26)$$

Since $(x_n(\cdot), u_{1,n}(\cdot), \dots, u_{r,n}(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{R}_U$, $n \geq 1$, and $(x_*(\cdot), u_{1,*}(\cdot), \dots, u_{r,*}(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{cl conv } U}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} x_*(t) &= S_\alpha(t)M[x_0 - h(x_*(t), B_r(t)u_{r,*}(t))] \\ &\quad + \int_0^t (t-s)^{\alpha-1} T_\alpha(t-s)L^{-1}f(s, x_*(s), B_1(s)u_{1,*}(s), \dots, B_{r-1}(s)u_{r-1,*}(s))ds \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} x_n(t) &= S_\alpha(t)M[x_0 - h(x_n(t), B_r(t)u_{r,n}(t))] \\ &\quad + \int_0^t (t-s)^{\alpha-1} T_\alpha(t-s)L^{-1}f(s, x_n(s), B_1(s)u_{1,n}(s), \dots, B_{r-1}(s)u_{r-1,n}(s))ds. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Theorem 4.1 and $\{(x_n(\cdot), u_{1,n}(\cdot), \dots, u_{r,n}(\cdot))\}_{n \geq 1} \subseteq \mathcal{R}_U \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\text{cl conv } U}$ imply that we can assume, possibly up to a subsequence, that $(x_n(\cdot), u_{1,n}(\cdot), \dots, u_{r,n}(\cdot)) \rightarrow (\bar{x}(\cdot), \bar{u}_1(\cdot), \dots, \bar{u}_r(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{cl conv } U}$ in $C(I, X) \times \omega\text{-}L^{1/\beta}(I, T)$. Subtracting (28) from (27), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|x_*(t) - x_n(t)\|_X \\ &\leq \|S_\alpha(t)M[h(x_*(t), B_r(t)u_{r,*}(t)) - h(x_*(t), B_r(t)v_{r,n}(t))]\|_X \\ &\quad + \|S_\alpha(t)M[h(x_*(t), B_r(t)v_{r,n}(t)) - h(x_n(t), B_r(t)u_{r,n}(t))]\|_X \\ &\quad + \left\| \int_0^t (t-s)^{\alpha-1} T_\alpha(t-s)L^{-1}[f(s, x_*(s), B_1(s)u_{1,*}(s), \dots, B_{r-1}(s)u_{r-1,*}(s)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - f(s, x_*(s), B_1(s)v_{1,n}(s), \dots, B_{r-1}(s)v_{r-1,n}(s))]ds \right\|_X \\ &\quad + \left\| \int_0^t (t-s)^{\alpha-1} T_\alpha(t-s)L^{-1}[f(s, x_*(s), B_1(s)v_{1,n}(s), \dots, B_{r-1}(s)v_{r-1,n}(s)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - f(s, x_n(s), B_1(s)u_{1,n}(s), \dots, B_{r-1}(s)u_{r-1,n}(s))]ds \right\|_X. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

We use the previous estimations of our sufficient set of conditions, together with the property of the operator \mathcal{T} defined in the proof of Lemma 3.2, and since $v_{i,n} \rightarrow u_{i,*}$, $i = 1, \dots, r$, in $\omega\text{-}L^{\frac{1}{\beta}}(I, T)$ and $x_n \rightarrow \bar{x}$ in $C(I, X)$, then by letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (29) and realizing Lemma 2.3, we get $x_* = \bar{x}$, that is, $x_n \rightarrow x_*$ in $C(I, X)$. Hence, from (26), we have $(v_{i,n} - u_{i,n}) \rightarrow 0$ in $L^{\frac{1}{\beta}}(I, T)$. Thus, $u_{i,n} = (u_{i,n} - v_{i,n}) + v_{i,n} \rightarrow u_{i,*}$ in $\omega\text{-}L^{\frac{1}{\beta}}(I, T)$ and in $L_\omega^{\frac{1}{\beta}}(I, T)$. Hence, (19) and (20) hold. Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq a} \sum_{i=1}^r \left| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} (g_i^{**}(s, x_*(s), u_{i,*}(s)) - g_i(s, x_n(s), u_{i,n}(s)))ds \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq a} \sum_{i=1}^r \left| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} (g_i^{**}(s, x_*(s), u_{i,*}(s)) - g_i(s, x_*(s), v_{i,n}(s)))ds \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq a} \sum_{i=1}^r \left| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} (g_i(s, x_*(s), v_{i,n}(s)) - g_i(s, x_n(s), u_{i,n}(s)))ds \right| \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

and assumption (H4.2) and (26) give

$$|g_i(t, x_*(t), v_{i,n}(t)) - g_i(t, x_n(t), u_{i,n}(t))| \leq (k_4'(t) + k_4''k_i(t))\|x_*(t) - x_n(t)\|_X + \frac{k_4''}{in}.$$

Therefore, the last inequality together with (22) and (30) imply that (21) holds. \square

Theorem 5.2 *Problem (RP) has a solution and*

$$\min_{(x, u_i) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{cl conv } U}} J_i^{**}(x, u_i) = \inf_{(x, u_i) \in \mathcal{R}_U} J_i(x, u_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, r. \quad (31)$$

For any solution $(x_*, u_{1,*}, \dots, u_{r,*})$ of problem (RP), there exists a minimizing sequence

$$(x_n, u_{1,n}, \dots, u_{r,n}) \in \mathcal{R}_U, \quad n \geq 1,$$

for problem (P), which converges to $(x_*, u_{1,*}, \dots, u_{r,*})$ in the spaces $C(I, X) \times \omega\text{-}L^{\frac{1}{\beta}}(I, T)$ and in $C(I, X) \times L^{\frac{1}{\beta}}(I, T)$, and the following formula holds:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq a} \sum_{i=1}^r \left| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} (g_i^{**}(s, x_*(s), u_{i,*}(s)) - g_i(s, x_n(s), u_{i,n}(s))) ds \right| = 0. \quad (32)$$

Conversely, if $(x_n, u_{1,n}, \dots, u_{r,n})$, $n \geq 1$, is a minimizing sequence for problem (P), then there is a subsequence $(x_{n_k}, u_{1,n_k}, \dots, u_{r,n_k})$, $k \geq 1$, of the sequence $(x_n, u_{1,n}, \dots, u_{r,n})$, $n \geq 1$, and a solution $(x_*, u_{1,*}, \dots, u_{r,*})$ of problem (RP) such that the subsequence $(x_{n_k}, u_{1,n_k}, \dots, u_{r,n_k})$, $k \geq 1$, converges to $(x_*, u_{1,*}, \dots, u_{r,*})$ in $C(I, X) \times \omega\text{-}L^{\frac{1}{\beta}}(I, T)$ and relation (32) holds for this subsequence $(x_{n_k}, u_{1,n_k}, \dots, u_{r,n_k})$, $k \geq 1$.

Proof By definition of functions $g_{i,U}(t, x, u_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, r$, (H3.3), (H4.3), and the boundedness of the trajectories $\mathcal{T}r_{\text{cl conv } U}$ of the control system (1)–(2), (4) (Lemma 3.1), we can get functions $m_i \in L^1(I, \mathbb{R}^+)$ such that

$$-m_i(t) = -[a_4(t) + b_4(t)L_0 + c_4(a_3(t) + c_3L_0)] \leq g_{i,U}(t, x, u_i), \quad \text{a.e. } t \in I, \quad (33)$$

with all $x \in Q = \{g \in X : \|g\|_X \leq L_0\}$, $u_i \in U(t, x)$, $i = 1, \dots, r$.

Inequality (33) and the properties of the bipolar (see [34]) directly imply that

$$-m_i(t) \leq g_i^{**}(t, x, u_i) \leq g_{i,U}(t, x, u_i), \quad \text{a.e. } t \in I, \quad x \in Q, \quad u_i \in T. \quad (34)$$

Hence, from item (3) of Lemma 3.4, (34), and [48, Theorem 2.1], the functional J_i^{**} , $i = 1, \dots, r$, are lower semicontinuous on $\mathcal{R}_{\text{cl conv } U} \subseteq C(I, X) \times \omega\text{-}L^{\frac{1}{\beta}}(I, T)$. Theorem 4.1 implies that $\mathcal{R}_{\text{cl conv } U}$ is compact in $C(I, X) \times \omega\text{-}L^{\frac{1}{\beta}}(I, T)$. Therefore, problem (RP) has a solution $(x_*, u_{1,*}, \dots, u_{r,*})$. By item (1) of Lemma 3.4, we have

$$J_i^{**}(x_*, u_{i,*}) \leq \inf_{(x, u_i) \in \mathcal{R}_U} J_i(x, u_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, r. \quad (35)$$

Now, for every solution $(x_*, u_{1,*}, \dots, u_{r,*})$ of problem (RP) , by using Theorem 5.1, we obtain that there exists a sequence $(x_n, u_{1,n}, \dots, u_{r,n}) \in \mathcal{R}_U$, $n \geq 1$, such that (19)–(21) hold. Since

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^r \left| \int_I (g_i^{**}(s, x_*(s), u_{i,*}(s)) - g_i(s, x_n(s), u_{i,n}(s))) ds \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq a} \sum_{i=1}^r \left| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} (g_i^{**}(s, x_*(s), u_{i,*}(s)) - g_i(s, x_n(s), u_{i,n}(s))) ds \right|, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

by formulas (21), (35) and (36), we get that (31), (32) hold and $(x_n(\cdot), u_{1,n}(\cdot), \dots, u_{r,n}(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{R}_U$, $n \geq 1$, is a minimizing sequence for problem (P) . Let $(x_n(\cdot), u_{1,n}(\cdot), \dots, u_{r,n}(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{R}_U$, $n \geq 1$, be a minimizing sequence for problem (P) . According to Theorem 4.1, without loss of generality, we can assume that $(x_n, u_{1,n}, \dots, u_{r,n}) \rightarrow (x_*, u_{1,*}, \dots, u_{r,*}) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{cl conv } U}$ in $C(I, X) \times \omega\text{-}L^{\frac{1}{p}}(I, T)$ and

$$\min(RP) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^r \int_I g_i(s, x_n(s), u_{i,n}(s)) ds. \quad (37)$$

It follows from (34) and the properties of function $g_i^{**}(t, x, u_i)$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_I g_i^{**}(s, x_*(s), u_{i,*}(s)) ds & \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_I g_i^{**}(s, x_n(s), u_{i,n}(s)) ds \\ & \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_I g_i(s, x_n(s), u_{i,n}(s)) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

From (37) and (38), we obtain that

$$\min(RP) = \sum_{i=1}^r \int_I g_i^{**}(s, x_*(s), u_{i,*}(s)) ds = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^r \int_I g_i(s, x_n(s), u_{i,n}(s)) ds. \quad (39)$$

Hence, $(x_*(\cdot), u_{1,*}(\cdot), \dots, u_{r,*}(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{cl conv } U}$ is a solution of problem (RP) . Hypotheses (H3.3) and (H4.3) and Lemma 3.1, imply that $\{g_i(s, x_n(s), u_{i,n}(s))\}_{n \geq 1}$ is uniformly integrable. Therefore, by the Dunford–Pettis theorem, we have that there exists a subsequence $\{g_i(s, x_{n_k}(s), u_{i,n_k}(s))\}_{k \geq 1}$ of the sequence $\{g_i(s, x_n(s), u_{i,n}(s))\}_{n \geq 1}$ converging to certain functions $\lambda_i(t)$ in the topology of the space $\omega\text{-}L^1(I, \mathbb{R})$. Since $(u_{i,n_k}(s), g_i(s, x_{n_k}(s), u_{i,n_k}(s))) \in F(s, x_{n_k}(s))$ a.e. in $s \in I$, Lemma 3.3 implies that $(u_{i,*}, \lambda_i(s)) \in \text{cl conv } F(s, x_*(s))$, a.e. $s \in I$. From Lemma 3.4 we obtain that

$$g_i^{**}(s, x_*(s), u_{i,*}(s)) \leq \lambda_i(s), \text{ a.e. } s \in I. \quad (40)$$

Hence,

$$\sum_{i=1}^r \int_0^t g_i^{**}(s, x_*(s), u_{i,*}(s)) ds \leq \sum_{i=1}^r \int_0^t \lambda_i(s) ds = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^r \int_0^t g_i(s, x_{n_k}(s), u_{i,n_k}(s)) ds \quad (41)$$

for any $t \in I$. Now we can obtain from (39)–(41) that $g_i^{**}(t, x_*(t), u_{i,*}(t)) = \lambda_i(t)$, a.e. $t \in I$.

Hence the subsequence $g_i(s, x_{n_k}(s), u_{i,n_k}(s)) \rightarrow g_i^{**}(s, x_*(s), u_{i,*}(s))$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, in $\omega\text{-}L^1(I, \mathbb{R})$.

This implies that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq a} \sum_{i=1}^r \left| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} (g_i^{**}(s, x_*(s), u_{i,*}(s)) - g_i(s, x_{n_k}(s), u_{i,n_k}(s))) ds \right| = 0.$$

Hence, we proved that (32) holds for the subsequence (x_{n_k}, u_{i,n_k}) , $k \geq 1$. \square

6 Conclusions

We studied optimality and relaxation of multiple control problems, described by Sobolev type nonlinear fractional differential equations with nonlocal control conditions in Banach spaces. The optimization problems were defined by multi-integral functionals with integrands that are not convex in the controls, subject to control systems with mixed nonconvex constraints on the controls. We proved appropriate sufficient conditions assuring existence of optimal solutions for the relaxed problems. Moreover, we have shown, in suitable topologies, that the optimal solutions are limits of minimizing sequences of systems with respect to the trajectory, multi-controls, and the functional.

Acknowledgements This research was initiated during a visit of Debbouche and Torres to the Department of Mathematical Analysis of the University of Santiago of Compostela, Spain, followed by a visit of Debbouche to the Department of Mathematics of University of Aveiro, Portugal. The hospitality and the financial support provided by the host institutions in Spain and Portugal are here gratefully acknowledged. Nieto has been partially supported by the Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad of Spain under grants MTM2010–15314 and MTM2013–43014–P, Xunta de Galicia under grant R2014/002, and co-financed by the European Community fund FEDER. Torres was supported by funds through The Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT), within CIDMA project UID/MAT/04106/2013 and OCHERA project PTDC/EEI-AUT/1450/2012, co-financed by FEDER under POFC-QREN with COMPETE reference FCOMP-01-0124-FEDER-028894.

References

1. Baleanu, D., Tenreiro Machado, J.A., Luo, A.C.J.: *Fractional Dynamics and Control*. Springer, New York (2012)
2. Diethelm, K.: *The Analysis of Fractional Differential Equations*. Springer, Berlin (2010)
3. Miller, K.S., Ross, B.: *An Introduction to the Fractional Calculus and Fractional Differential Equations*. A Wiley-Interscience Publication, Wiley, New York (1993)
4. Podlubny, I.: *Fractional Differential Equations*. Academic Press, San Diego, CA (1999)
5. Tarasov, V.E.: *Fractional Dynamics*. Springer, Heidelberg (2010)
6. Zhou, Y.: *Basic Theory of Fractional Differential Equations*. World Scientific, Singapore (2014)
7. Agarwal, R.P., Lakshmikantham, V., Nieto, J.J.: On the concept of solution for fractional differential equations with uncertainty. *Nonlinear Anal.* 72, 2859–2862 (2010)
8. El-Sayed, A.M.A.: Fractional-order diffusion-wave equation. *Internat. J. Theoret. Phys.* 35, 311–322 (1996)
9. Nieto, J.J.: Maximum principles for fractional differential equations derived from Mittag-Leffler functions. *Appl. Math. Lett.* 23, 1248–1251 (2010)
10. Shen, Y., Yang, S., Sui, C.: Analysis on limit cycle of fractional-order van der Pol oscillator. *Chaos Solitons Fractals* 67, 94–102 (2014)
11. Benchohra, M., Gatsori, E.P., Ntouyas, S.K.: Controllability results for semilinear evolution inclusions with nonlocal conditions. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* 118, 493–513 (2003)

12. Debbouche, A., Baleanu, D.: Controllability of fractional evolution nonlocal impulsive quasilinear delay integro-differential systems. *Comput. Math. Appl.* 62, 1442–1450 (2011)
13. Debbouche, A., Baleanu, D., Agarwal, R.P.: Nonlocal nonlinear integrodifferential equations of fractional orders. *Bound. Value Probl.* 2012:78, 10 pp (2012)
14. Debbouche, A., Torres, D.F.M.: Approximate controllability of fractional nonlocal delay semilinear systems in Hilbert spaces. *Internat. J. Control* 86, 1577–1585 (2013) [arXiv:1304.0082](#)
15. N'Guérékata, G.M.: A Cauchy problem for some fractional abstract differential equation with non local conditions. *Nonlinear Anal.* 70, 1873–1876 (2009)
16. Wang, J., Zhou, Y., Wei, W., Xu, H.: Nonlocal problems for fractional integrodifferential equations via fractional operators and optimal controls. *Comput. Math. Appl.* 62, 1427–1441 (2011)
17. Zhou, Y., Jiao, F.: Nonlocal Cauchy problem for fractional evolution equations. *Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl.* 11, 4465–4475 (2010)
18. Kilbas, A.A., Srivastava, H.M., Trujillo, J.J.: *Theory and Applications of Fractional Differential Equations.* Elsevier, Amsterdam (2006)
19. Lakshmikantham, V.: Theory of fractional functional differential equations. *Nonlinear Anal.* 69, 3337–3343 (2008)
20. Lakshmikantham, V., Vatsala, A.S.: Basic theory of fractional differential equations. *Nonlinear Anal.* 69, 2677–2682 (2008)
21. Franklin, G.F., Da Powell, J., Emami-Naeini, A.: *Feedback Control of Dynamic Systems.* Prentice Hall, Reading (2014)
22. Malinowska, A.B., Torres, D.F.M.: *Introduction to the Fractional Calculus of Variations.* Imp. Coll. Press, London (2012)
23. Almeida, R., Pooseh, S., Torres, D.F.M.: *Computational Methods in the Fractional Calculus of Variations.* Imp. Coll. Press, London (2015)
24. Malinowska, A.B., Odziejewicz, T., Torres, D.F.M.: *Advanced Methods in the Fractional Calculus of Variations.* Springer Briefs in Applied Sciences and Technology, Springer, Cham (2015)
25. Agrawal, O.P.: A general formulation and solution scheme for fractional optimal control problems. *Nonlinear Dynam.* 38, 323–337 (2004)
26. Frederico, G.S.F., Torres, D.F.M.: Fractional conservation laws in optimal control theory. *Nonlinear Dynam.* 53, 215–222 (2008) [arXiv:0711.0609](#)
27. Özdemir, N., Karadeniz, D., İskender, B.B.: Fractional optimal control problem of a distributed system in cylindrical coordinates. *Phys. Lett. A* 373, 221–226 (2009)
28. Fečkan, M., Wang, J., Zhou, Y.: Controllability of fractional functional evolution equations of Sobolev type via characteristic solution operators. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* 156, 79–95 (2013)
29. Li, F., Liang, J., Xu, H.-K.: Existence of mild solutions for fractional integrodifferential equations of Sobolev type with nonlocal conditions. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 391, 510–525 (2012)
30. Debbouche, A., Nieto, J.J.: Sobolev type fractional abstract evolution equations with nonlocal conditions and optimal multi-controls. *Appl. Math. Comput.* 245, 74–85 (2014)
31. Debbouche, A., Torres, D.F.M.: Approximate controllability of fractional delay dynamic inclusions with nonlocal control conditions. *Appl. Math. Comput.* 243, 161–175 (2014) [arXiv:1405.6591](#)
32. Kamocki, R.: On the existence of optimal solutions to fractional optimal control problems. *Appl. Math. Comput.* 235, 94–104 (2014)

33. Liu, X., Liu, Z., Fu, X.: Relaxation in nonconvex optimal control problems described by fractional differential equations. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 409, 446–458 (2014)
34. Ekeland, I., Temam, R.: *Convex Analysis and Variational Problems*. North-Holland, Amsterdam (1976)
35. Mainardi, F.: Fractional relaxation-oscillation and fractional diffusion-wave phenomena. *Chaos Solitons Fractals* 7, 1461–1477 (1996)
36. Pazy, A.: *Semigroups of Linear Operators and Applications to Partial Differential Equations*. Springer, New York (1983)
37. Zaidman, S.D.: *Abstract Differential Equations*. Pitman, Boston, MA (1979)
38. Aubin, J.-P., Cellina, A.: *Differential Inclusions*. Springer, Berlin (1984)
39. Hu, S., Papageorgiou, N.S.: *Handbook of Multivalued Analysis, Vol. I*. Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht (1997)
40. Tolstonogov, A.A.: Relaxation in nonconvex optimal control problems described by first-order evolution equations. *Sb. Math.* 190, 1689–1714 (1999)
41. Zhou, Y., Jiao, F.: Existence of mild solutions for fractional neutral evolution equations. *Comput. Math. Appl.* 59, 1063–1077 (2010)
42. Dixon, J., McKee, S.: Weakly singular discrete Gronwall inequalities. *Z. Angew. Math. Mech.* 66, 535–544 (1986)
43. Himmelberg, C.J.: Measurable relations. *Fund. Math.* 87, 53–72 (1975)
44. Tolstonogov, A.A.: On the Scorza-Draconi theorem for multivalued mappings with a variable domain. *Math. Notes* 48, 1151–1158 (1990)
45. De Blasi, F.S., Pianigiani, G., Tolstonogov, A.A.: A Bogolyubov-type theorem with a nonconvex constraint in Banach spaces. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* 43, 466–476 (2004)
46. Zhu, Q.J.: On the solution set of differential inclusions in Banach space. *J. Differential Equations* 93, 213–237 (1991)
47. Tolstonogov, A.A., Tolstonogov, D.A.: L_p -continuous extreme selectors of multifunctions with decomposable values: relaxation theorems. *Set-Valued Anal.* 4, 237–269 (1996)
48. Balder, E.J.: Necessary and sufficient conditions for L_1 -strong-weak lower semicontinuity of integral functionals. *Nonlinear Anal.* 11, 1399–1404 (1987)