

Benamou-Brenier Formulation of Optimal Transport for Nonlinear Control Systems on \mathbb{R}^d

KARTHIK ELAMVAZHUTHI*

Department of Mechanical Engineering
University of California, Riverside
CA 92521, USA

Abstract

This is a note on the extension of the Benamou-Brenier formulation of optimal transport to nonlinear control affine systems on \mathbb{R}^d . They are the non-compact version of the author and collaborators' previous result on compact manifolds, stated here for the sake for completeness. Additionally, by using Bernard's Young measure based weak formulation of optimal transport, the results are established for cases not covered by previous works. Particularly, no assumptions are made on the non-existence of singular minimizing controls or the cost function being Lipschitz. Therefore, the existence of solutions to fluid formulation is established for general Sub-Riemmanian energy costs not covered by literature previously. The results also provide controllability of the continuity equation whenever the corresponding Kantorovich problem has a feasible solution, due to the established equivalence between the Kantorovich and Benamou-Brenier formulation.

1 The Optimal Transport Problem

Let $c : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ be a cost function. The optimal transport problem has two classical *static formulations*, known as the *Monge problem* and the *Kantorovich problem* [17]. Given probability measures μ_0 and μ_T , the Monge problem is the following,

$$C_{mon}(\mu_0, \mu_T) := \inf_{T: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d} \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} c(x, T(x)) dx \quad (1)$$

$$s.t. \quad T_{\#}\mu_0 = \mu_T \quad (2)$$

where $T_{\#}\mu$ is the measure defined by

$$(T_{\#}\mu)(\Omega) = \mu(T^{-1}(\Omega)), \quad (3)$$

for all Borel measurable sets $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$.

Additionally, one has the Kantorovich formulation,

$$C_{kan}(\mu_0, \mu_T) = \inf_{K \in \Pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} c(x, y) d\gamma(x, y) \quad (4)$$

where $\Pi = \{\eta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d) = \pi_{\#}^1 \eta = \mu_0, \pi_{\#}^2 \eta = \mu_T\}$ and $\pi^1 : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, $\pi^2 : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ are the projection maps into the first and second coordinate, respectively.

We are interested in situations where the cost $c(x, y)$ arise from optimal control problems. Suppose $f_i : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ are smooth vector fields for $i = 0, \dots, n$, with the interesting case being when $n < d$. Consider the following finite-dimensional control system on \mathbb{R}^d ,

$$\dot{\omega}(t) = f_0(\omega(t)) + \sum_{i=1}^n u_i(t) f_i(\omega(t)) \quad (5)$$

where $\omega(t)$ represents the state and $u(t) := [u_1(t), \dots, u_n(t)]^T$ are the control inputs of the system. Control systems of this type are said to be in control-affine form and are well-studied in control theory literature [3].

Let $T > 0$. Given $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, a standard instance of the optimal control problem for this system is to solve the following *fixed end-point Lagrange* problem,

$$c(x, y) = \inf_{\omega, u} J(\omega, u) := \int_0^T L(t, \omega(t), u(t)) dt \quad (6)$$

subject to (5) and the constraints

$$\omega(0) = x \quad \omega(T) = y \quad (7)$$

where $L : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the running cost. This problem has been addressed in [2, 14, 15, 10] under various class of assumptions on the dynamics (5) and regularity.

1.1 Fluid Dynamical Formulation of Optimal Transport

The optimal transport problem that we are interested in is a variation of the above problem where the initial and final condition of the state $\omega(t)$ are represented by probability densities $\rho_0 : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\rho_T : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that the controls u are given in *feedback form*, using functions $u(\omega(t), t)$ of the variable $\omega(t)$. Then given by the following system of equations,

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot (f_0 \rho) + \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla \cdot (u_i f_i \rho) = 0, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T] \\ \rho(0, \cdot) = \rho_0, \quad \rho(T, \cdot) = \rho_T & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Subject to these constraints, the optimal transport problem that we wish to solve is the following optimization problem,

$$\inf_{u, \rho} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} L(t, x, u(t, x)) \rho(t, x) dx dt \quad (9)$$

The advantage of this continuum formulation, over the Monge-Kantorovich formulation of the optimal transport problem, as demonstrated by Benamou-Brenier [6] for the single integrator case ($\dot{\omega}(t) = u$), is that for certain running costs $L(t, x, u)$ the problem can be convexified using a suitable change of variables. For example, if $L(t, x, u) = |u|^2$. Then considering the variables (m, ρ) , where $m = u\rho$, leads to a convex optimization problem,

$$\inf_{m, \rho} \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{2} \frac{|m(t, x)|^2}{\rho(t, x)} dx dt \quad (10)$$

subject to the linear constraints,

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot (f_0 \rho) + \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla \cdot (f_i m_i) = 0, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T] \\ \rho(0, \cdot) = \rho_0, \quad \rho(T, \cdot) = \rho_T & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d. \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

2 Notation and Assumptions

To address the problem of well-posedness of the optimal transport problem, instead of densities $\rho(t, x)$, we will work with measures that are not necessarily absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure.

Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be the control set. For notational convenience we will define the control-dependent vector-field $f : \mathbb{R}^d \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, given by,

$$f(x, u) = f_0(x) + \sum_{i=1}^n u_i f_i(x) \quad (12)$$

for each $(x, u) := (x, [u_1 \dots u_n]^T) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times U$.

We will need an appropriate notion of the solution of the continuity equation (8). Towards this end, given a topological space X , we will denote by $\mathcal{P}(X)$ the set of Borel probability measures on X . We will often use the *narrow topology* on the set $\mathcal{P}(X)$, which is the coarsest topology such that the maps $f \mapsto \int_X f(x) d\mu(x)$ are continuous for all $f \in C_b(X)$, where $C_b(X)$ is the set of bounded continuous functions on X . We will say that a sequence $\mu_n \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ is narrowly converging to $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ if $\int_X f(x) d\mu_n(x) \rightarrow \int_X f(x) d\mu(x)$ for all $f \in C_b(X)$. The solutions of the PDE (8) will be considered in the following sense. Let $I = [0, T]$ for $T > 0$. We will say that a narrowly continuous curve $\mu : I \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, i.e., continuous from I to the narrow topology on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, solves the PDE

$$\partial_t \mu + \nabla \cdot (f(\cdot, u) \mu) = 0, \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^d \times I \quad (13)$$

in a weak sense, with initial and terminal conditions, $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\mu_T \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ respectively, if the following holds,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_I \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} [\partial_t \phi + \partial_x \phi \cdot f(x, u(t, x))] d\mu_t(x) dt \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(T, x) d\mu_T(x) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(0, x) d\mu_0(x) \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

for all once differentiable functions $\phi \in C^1(I \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, where, $\partial_x \phi$ denotes the differential of ϕ . Therefore, the optimization problem of interest is the following,

$$\begin{aligned} C_{BB}(\mu_0, \mu_T) &:= \inf_{u_i, \mu} \int_I \int_M L(t, x, u(t, x)) d\mu_t(x) dt \\ &\text{subject to the constraint (14)} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

We will also need some assumptions on the running cost function $L(t, x, u)$. Following are the well-known as the *Tonelli conditions* on the Lagrangian $L(t, x, u)$ that are commonly used to establish existence of solutions of optimal control problems [11]. Similarly, they will also play key role in establishing existence of solutions of the optimal transport problem.

Assumption 2.1. The running cost function $L : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the following conditions,

1. **(Continuity)** The running cost $L(t, x, u)$ is continuous.
2. **(Coercivity)** The set U is closed and convex, and either one of the conditions hold.
 - (a) There exists $p > 1$, $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $L(t, x, u) \geq \alpha|u|^p + \beta$ for all $(t, x, u) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U$.
 - (b) The set U is compact.
3. **(Convexity)** The function $L(t, x, \cdot)$ is convex for each $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$.

Assumption 2.2. The drift and control vector fields satisfy the following assumption.

1. There vector fields f_i are $C^1(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ for each $i = 0, \dots, n$.
2. The vector fields f_i have sublinear growth for each $i = 0, \dots, n$. That is, there exists $M > 0$ such that

$$|f_i(x)| \leq M(|x| + 1)$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for $i = 0, \dots, n$.

In order to address the issue of existence of solutions to (14)-(15), we will first consider a *relaxed* version of the problem, where instead of looking for control laws that assign to each (t, x) a fixed control in U , we search instead for *Young measure* [18, 12] that assigns to each $t \in [0, T]$ a Borel probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^d \times U$. Towards this end, let X be a topological space and $\mathcal{B}(X)$, the Borel sigma algebra. We will need the projections maps $\pi^t : I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U \rightarrow I$, $\pi^x : I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\pi^u : I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U \rightarrow U$ defined by

$$\pi^t(t, x, u) = t, \quad \pi^x(t, x, u) = x, \quad \pi^u(t, x, u) = u$$

for all $(t, x, u) \in I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U$. We denote by $\mathcal{Y}(I; X) = \{K \in \mathcal{P}(I \times X); \pi_{\#}^t K = \text{leb}\}$, where leb is the Lebesgue measure on I . Note that given any $K \in \mathcal{P}(I \times X)$ with marginal $\pi_{\#}^t K = \text{leb}$, there exists a corresponding *disintegration* K_t such that

$$\int_{I \times X} f(t, x) dK(t, x) = \int_I \int_X f(t, x) dK_t(x) dt$$

for all functions $f \in C_b(I \times X)$. Therefore, when we make the abuse of notation K_t , we mean the disintegration of K with respect to the time variable evaluated at t . In this way, we can identify the subset of $\mathcal{Y}(I; X)$ with the set of measurable maps $I \ni t \mapsto K_t(\cdot) \in \mathcal{P}(X)$. By measurable, we mean that the function $t \mapsto K_t(A)$ is measurable for each Borel set $A \in \mathcal{B}(X)$. We will often use the narrow topology on $\mathcal{Y}(I; X)$, which is the smallest topology such that the functional $f \mapsto \int_0^T \int_X f(x) dK(t, x)$ is continuous for all $f \in C_b(X)$. We will say that a sequence $K^n \in \mathcal{Y}(I; X)$ is narrowly converging to a limit $K \in \mathcal{Y}(I; X)$ if $\int_{I \times X} f(t, x) dK^n(t, x) = \int_I \int_X f(t, x) dK_t^n(x) dt \rightarrow \int_{I \times X} f(t, x) dK(t, x) = \int_I \int_X f(t, x) dK_t(x)$ for all $f \in C_b(X)$.

We will first establish that, for given $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\mu_T \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, there exists a $K \in \mathcal{Y}(I; \mathbb{R}^d \times U)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U} [\partial_t \phi + \partial_x \phi \cdot f(x, u)] dK(t, x, u) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(T, x) d\mu_T(x) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(0, x) d\mu_0(x) \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

for all functions $\phi \in C_c^1(I \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, the set of all compactly supported once differentiable functions. Given $\mu_0, \mu_T \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\mathcal{Y}_{\mu_0}^{\mu_T}(I; \mathbb{R}^d \times U)$ we will denote the set of $K \in \mathcal{Y}(I; \mathbb{R}^d \times U)$ such that (16) holds.

Let $\Gamma = C([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$. We define the control set \mathcal{U} and the set of admissible trajectories Ω in the following way.

$$\mathcal{U} = \{u \in L^p(0, T; \mathbb{R}^n; u(t) \in U, \text{ for a.e } t \in [0, T]\}.$$

$$\Omega := \{\omega \in \Gamma; \omega \text{ satisfies (5) for some } u \in \mathcal{U}\}.$$

We define the set of optimal trajectories $G \subset \Omega \times \mathcal{U}$, defined by

$$G = \{(\omega, u) \in \omega \times \mathcal{U}; J(\omega, u) = c(\omega(0), \omega(1))\}$$

Given these definitions, we will first consider the following **Relaxed Benamou-Brenier** problem:

$$\inf_{K \in \mathcal{Y}_{\mu_0}^{\mu_T}(I; \mathbb{R}^d \times U)} \int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U} L(t, x, u) dK(t, x, u) dt \quad (17)$$

It can be seen that the above problem is a relaxation of the Benamou-Brenier problem (14)-(15) by noting that if μ_t is a weak solution of the PDE for the control $u : [0, T] \times M \rightarrow U$, then the Young measure K_t given by $K_t(A) = \int_A \delta_{u(t,x)}(A) d\mu_t(x)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d \times U)$, satisfies (16).

3 Analysis

Proposition 3.1. *Given Assumption 2 (Tonelli running cost) and 2.2 (vector-fields with sub-linear growth), the cost $c(x, y)$ is lower semicontinuous. Hence, a solution of the the Kantorovich problem (4) exists if the feasible set it non-empty.*

Proof. Let $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $(x_n, y_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence in $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ converging to $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $(c(x_n, y_n))_{n=1}^\infty$ is a Cauchy sequence converging to some $r \in \mathbb{R}$ that is finite. There exist optimal solutions (ω_n, u_n) corresponding to the costs $c(x_n, y_n)$ due standard existence results for optimal control problems [11, 23.11]. We know that $\int_0^T L(t, \omega_n(t), u_n(t)) dt$ is uniformly bounded. This implies that u is uniformly bounded in $L^p(0, T; \mathbb{R}^m)$. This implies that we can take a subsequence $(\omega_{n_m}, u_{n_m})_{m=1}^\infty$ such that ω_{n_m} is strongly converging to some ω in $C([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and u_{n_m} is weakly converging to u in \mathcal{U} as in proof of [11, Theorem 23.11]. We know that the functional J is lower semicontinuous, which gives us

$$r = \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} J(\omega_{n_m}, u_{n_m}) \geq J(\omega, u) \geq c(x, y)$$

This implies that the preimage of every set of the form $[-\infty, a)$ under the function c is closed for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, c is lower semicontinuous. The existence of solution now follows from classical results in optimal transport [16, Theorem 1.7]. \square

Using the same idea as in the previous Proposition we also have the following result.

Lemma 3.2. *Given Assumption 2 (Tonelli running cost) and 2 (vector-fields with sub-linear growth), the set of optimal trajectory control pairs G is closed in $\Omega \times \mathcal{U}$.*

In the following proposition we establish that the marginal of a Young measure can be associated with a curve on the set of probability measures.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $\eta \in \mathcal{Y}(I; \mathbb{R}^d \times U)$ be a controlled transport measure. There exists a continuous family $\mu : I \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, such that $\mu_t = \pi_{\#}^x \eta_t$ for all $t \in I$.*

Proof. Define the map $\tilde{f} : I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U \rightarrow I \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ by

$$\tilde{f}(t, x, u) = (t, x, f(x, u))$$

for all $(t, x, u) \in I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U$. Let $\psi = \tilde{f}_{\#} \eta$. Then $\psi \in \mathcal{Y}(I; \mathbb{R}^{2d})$ satisfies,

$$\int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U} [\partial_t g + \nabla g \cdot v] d\psi(t, x, v) = 0 \quad (18)$$

for all compactly supported smooth functions $g \in C_c^1(I; \mathbb{R}^d)$. The result then follows from [7, Lemma 5], by noting that $\pi_{\#}^x \eta = \pi_{\#}^x \psi$. Particularly, one has that there exists a continuous family of $\mu_t : I \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, such that $\mu_t = \pi_{\#}^x \psi_t$ for all $t \in I$. Hence, it also follows that $\mu_t = \pi_{\#}^x \eta_t$ for all $t \in I$. \square

In the following result, we establish how one can construct a Young measure with given marginals, using feasible trajectories connecting states on \mathbb{R}^d .

Proposition 3.4. (Trajectories on \mathbb{R}^d to Trajectories on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$) *Let $\gamma \in \Pi$. Suppose $S : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \Omega \times \mathcal{U}$ is a measurable map defined γ almost everywhere on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ such that*

$$S_0^\omega(x, y) = x, \quad S_T^\omega(x, y) = y$$

for γ almost every $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Then there exists $\eta \in \mathcal{Y}_{\mu_0}^{\mu_T}(I; \mathbb{R}^d \times U)$.

Proof. We define the measure $\eta \in \mathcal{P}(I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U)$ by

$$\int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^d} f(t, x, u) d\eta(t, x, u) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \int_I f(t, S_t^\omega(x, y), S_t^u(x, y)) dt d\gamma(x, y). \quad (19)$$

for all $f \in C_b(I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U)$, where S_t^ω and S_t^u denote the first and second argument of $S(x, y)$ evaluated at t , respectively. Note that $\eta = F_{\#} \gamma$ is the pushforward of the measure γ through the map $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \ni (x, y) \mapsto F(x, y) := (t, S^\gamma(x, y), S_t^u(x, y)) \in I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U$.

We note that $\pi_{\#}^t \eta = \lambda$, the Lebesgue measure. To see this, we compute

$$\int_I f(t) d\pi_{\#}^t \eta(t) = \int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}} f(\pi_{\#}^t(t, x, v)) d\eta(t, x, v) \quad (20)$$

$$= \int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}} f(\pi_{\#}^t(t, S_t^\omega(x, y), S_t^u(x, y))) dt d\gamma(x, y) \quad (21)$$

$$= \int_I f(t) dt \quad (22)$$

This implies that there exists a disintegration $I \mapsto \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^2 \times U)$, given by $t \mapsto \eta_t$ such that $\eta_t \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d \times U)$ for λ almost every $t \in [0, T]$.

We know that

$$\frac{d}{dt}(g(t, S_t^\omega(x, y))) = \partial_t g(t, S_t^\omega(x, y)) + \partial_x g(t, S_t^\omega(x, y)) \cdot f(S_t^\omega(x, y), S_t^u(x, y)) \quad (23)$$

for almost every $t \in [0, T]$, γ almost every $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$. Therefore,

$$g(T, S_T^\omega(x, y)) - g(0, S_0^\omega(x, y)) \quad (24)$$

$$= \int_0^T \partial_t g(t, S_t^\omega(x, y)) + \partial_x g(t, S_t^\omega(x, y)) \cdot f(S_t^\omega(x, y), S_t^u(x, y)) dt \quad (25)$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$.

Integrating both sides with respect to the measure γ , we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g(T, x) d\mu_T - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g(0, x) d\mu_0 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \int_I [\partial_t g(t, x) + \partial_x g(t, x) \cdot f(x, u)] d\eta(t, x, u) \quad (26)$$

□

Using the above proposition we can establish that non-emptiness of the feasible set of the Kantorovich problem, implies non-emptiness of the feasible set of the Benamou-Brenier problem.

Proposition 3.5. *Given Assumption 2 (Tonelli running cost) and 2 (vector-fields with sub-linear growth). Let $\gamma \in \Pi$ be such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} c(x, y) d\gamma(x, y) < \infty$. Then there exists a controlled transport measure $\eta \in \mathcal{Y}_{\mu_1}^{\mu_0}(I; \mathbb{R}^d \times U)$ such that*

$$\int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U} L(t, x, u) d\eta(t, x, u) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} c(x, y) d\gamma(x, y) \quad (27)$$

Proof. Let $\Gamma \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ be defined by

$$\Gamma := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d; c(x, y) < \infty\}.$$

Let P^G denote the set of all subsets of G . We define the multivalued mapping $\Psi : \Gamma \rightarrow P^G$

$$\Psi(x, y) = \{(\omega, u) \in G; \omega(0) = x, \omega(T) = y\} \quad (28)$$

for all $(x, y) \in \Gamma$. By [8, Theorem 6.9.13] there exists a map $S : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \Omega \times \mathcal{U}$ that is measurable (with respect to the Lebesgue σ -algebra on Ω and the Borel σ -algebra on Ω) such that

$$S(x, y) \in \Psi(x, y)$$

for all $x, y \in \Omega$. We can extend S to $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ such that it is defined γ everywhere. With an abuse of notation, we denote this extension by $S : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \Omega \times \mathcal{U}$. The

existence of $\eta \in \mathcal{Y}_{\mu_0}^{\mu_T}(I; \mathbb{R}^d \times U)$ follows from Proposition 3.4. Next, we compute $\int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U} L(t, x, u) d\eta(t, x, u)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U} L(t, x, u) d\eta(t, x, u) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \int_I L(t, S_t^\omega(x, y), S_t^u(x, y)) dt d\gamma(x, y) \\ &\quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} c(S_0^\omega(x, y), S_T^\omega(x, y)) d\gamma(x, y) \\ &\quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} c(x, y) d\gamma(x, y) \end{aligned}$$

□

Once one has feasibility, a standard approach to establish existence of solutions is to establish compactness of any minimizing sequence of solutions. Using the growth conditions of the vector-fields, the following Lemma provides some estimates that will be used to derive the compactness.

Lemma 3.6. *Given Assumption 2 (Tonelli running cost) and 2.2 (vector-fields with sub-linear growth). Let $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Suppose $\eta \in \mathcal{Y}_{\mu_1}^{\mu_0}(I; \mathbb{R}^d \times U)$ such that $\int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U} L(t, x, u) d\eta(t, x, u) \leq c$ for some constant $c > 0$. Then the curve $\mu : I \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ given in Proposition 3.3 satisfies the estimate,*

$$\sup_{t \in I} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^p d\mu_t(x) \leq (M + Mc + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^p d\mu_0(x)) e^{MT}. \quad (29)$$

Therefore, the set

$$\{\eta \in \mathcal{Y}_{\mu_1}^{\mu_0}(I; \mathbb{R}^d \times U); \int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U} L(t, x, u) d\eta(t, x, u) \leq c\} \quad (30)$$

is compact in $\mathcal{P}(I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U)$.

Proof. First we present a formal argument. Let $|x|^p$ be a test function. That is, we substitute of $g(t, x) = |x|^p$ in the definition (16). We get the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^p d\mu_t - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^p d\mu_0 &= \int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U} [\partial_t |x|^p + \partial_x |x|^p \cdot f(x, u)] d\eta(t, x, u) \\ &= p \int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U} [|x|^{p-1} \cdot f(x, u)] d\eta(t, x, u) \\ &\leq \int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U} M[|x|^{p-1} + |x|^p + |u||x|^{p-1}] d\eta(t, x, u) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times U} M \int_I [(|x|^{p-1} + |x|^p + \frac{|u|^p}{p} + \frac{(p-1)|x|^{p-1}}{p})] d\eta(t, x, u) \\ &\leq A + B \int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^d} |x|^p d\mu_t(x) \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

using Young's inequality and using the fact that $|x|^p \geq |x|^{p-1}$ outside the unit ball, and $A > 0$ and $B > 0$ only depend on c . Then by Gronwall's equality we get,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^p d\mu_t(x) \leq (A + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|^p d\mu_0(x)) e^{Bt} \quad (32)$$

for all $t \in I$. There are two issues with this argument. First, $|x|^p$ is not a compactly supported function. Second, it is not differentiable everywhere for all p . To make this argument rigorous, we can approximate $|x|^p$ using a smooth function g_ε such that $g_\varepsilon \uparrow |x|^p$ as in proof of Lemma 5.1 in [13], and then recover the estimate (32) by taking the limit.

Next, we establish the compactness of the set (30). The estimate (32) implies that $\int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U} |x|^p d\eta(t, x, u) \leq c'$ where $c' > 0$ depends only on c and μ_0 . The definition of the set (30) and the estimate (32) implies that $\int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U} (|x|^p + \alpha|u|^p - \beta) d\eta(t, x, u) \leq c' + c$ where $\alpha > 0$ and β are the constants in the assumption of coercivity of the running cost function 2. The function $(t, x, u) \mapsto (|x|^p + \alpha|u|^p - \beta)$ has compact level sets. Therefore, the set (30) is tight by [12, Corollary 3.61] \square

The next theorem establishes a *purification result* that given a measure value control law for the relaxed problem, one can construct a deterministic control law that achieves a lower cost.

Proposition 3.7. *Given Assumption 2 (Tonelli running cost) and 2 (vector-fields with sub-linear growth). Let $\eta \in \mathcal{Y}_{\mu_0}^{\mu_T}(I; \mathbb{R}^d \times U)$ be such that*

$$\int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U} L(t, x, u) d\eta(t, x, u) < \infty$$

there exists a measurable control $u : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow U$ such that

$$\int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U} [\partial_t g + \nabla_x g \cdot f(x, u)] d\eta(t, x, u) = \int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^d} [\partial_t g + \nabla_x g \cdot f(x, u(t, x))] d\mu_t(x)$$

for all $g \in C_c^\infty(I \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. Moreover,

$$\int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U} L(t, x, u) d\eta(t, x, u) \geq \int_I \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times U} L(t, x, u(t, x)) d\mu_t(x) dt \quad (33)$$

Proof. Since $\pi_{\#}^x \eta_t = \mu_t$, there exists a disintegration of measure $I \times \mathbb{R}^d \ni (t, x) \mapsto \eta_{t,x} \in \mathcal{P}(U)$ such that

$$\int g(t, x, v) d\eta_t(x, v) = \int g(t, x, u) d\eta_{t,x}(u) d\mu_t(x) \quad (34)$$

for all compactly supported functions $g \in C^\infty(I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U)$. This implies

$$\int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U} [\partial_t g + \nabla_x g \cdot f(x, u)] d\eta(t, x, u) = \int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U} [\partial_t g + \nabla_x g \cdot f(x, u)] d\eta_{t,x}(u) d\mu_t(x) dt$$

Since $f(x, u)$ is affine with respect to u , we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U} [\partial_t g + \nabla_x g \cdot f(x, u)] d\eta(t, x, u) \\ &= \int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^d} [\partial_t g + \nabla_x g \cdot f(x, \int_U u d\eta_{t,x}(u))] d\mu_t(x) dt \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Defining $u(t, x) = \int_U u d\eta_{t,x}(u)$ for μ_t almost every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and Lebesgue almost every $t \in I$, we have the first part of our result. Next, by assumption $u \mapsto L(t, x, u)$ is convex for every $(t, x) \in I \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Then by Jensen's inequality we have that,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U} L(t, x, u) d\eta(t, x, u) &= \int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^d} \int_U L(t, x, u) d\eta_{t,x}(u) d\mu_t(x) dt \\ &\geq \int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^d} L(t, x, \int_U u d\eta_{t,x}(u)) d\mu_t(x) dt \\ &= \int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^d} L(t, x, u(t, x)) d\mu_t(x) dt \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Given the above result we can conclude the following corollary of constructing a feedback control that transports a given measure to a final one, based on controllability of the system (5).

Corollary 3.8. (Point-to-point controllability to Measure-to-measure controllability) *Let $\gamma \in \Pi$ such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} c(x, y) d\gamma(x, y) < \infty$. Suppose $S : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \Omega \times \mathcal{U}$ is a measurable map defined γ almost everywhere on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ such that*

$$S_0^\omega(x, y) = x, \quad S_T^\omega(x, y) = y$$

for γ almost every $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Then there exists a pair (μ, u) that solves the continuity equation (14), such that $\mu_0 = \pi_{\#}^1 \gamma$ and $\mu_T = \pi_{\#}^2 \gamma$, and $u(t, \cdot) \in L^p(\mu_t)$ for almost every $t \in [0, T]$.

Proof. The proof follows as in proof of 3.5 and then applying Proposition 3.7. \square

Next, we are able to use the compactness to establish existence of minimizers given that one assumes the feasible set is non-empty.

Theorem 3.9. (Feasibility implies existence) *Given Assumption 2 (Tonelli running cost) and 2 (vector-fields with sub-linear growth). Let $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\mu_T \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Suppose the relaxed Benamou-Brenier problem (17) is feasible. Then there exists a pair (μ, u) that solves the Benamou-Brenier formulation of optimal transport (15).*

Proof. Since the optimization problem (17) is feasible and the set of decision variables $\mathcal{Y}_{\mu_0}^{\mu_T}(I : \mathbb{R}^d \times U)$ is compact by Lemma 3.6. The running cost L is continuous and bounded from below. Hence, the map $\eta \mapsto \int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U} L(t, x, u) \eta(t, x, u)$ is lower semi-continuous by the Portmanteau theorem [5, Lemma 5.1.7]. Therefore, (17) has a minimizer. According to Proposition 3.7 there exists a pair (μ, u) that achieves a lower cost that

$$\int_{I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U} L(t, x, u) d\eta(t, x, u) \geq \int_I \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} L(t, x, u(t, x)) d\mu_t(x) dt \quad (37)$$

\square

The next result establishes an important equivalence between the Kantorovich problem and the Benamou-Brenier problem.

Theorem 3.10. (Equivalence of Kantorovich and Benamou-Brenier formulation) *Given Assumption 2 (Tonelli running cost) and 2 (vector-fields with sub-linear growth). Let $\mu_0, \mu_T \in \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The Kantorovich problem (4) and the Benamou-Brenier problem (15) are equivalent,*

$$C_{kan}(\mu_0, \mu_T) = C_{BB}(\mu_0, \mu_T)$$

Proof. Let (μ, u) be an optimal pair that minimizes (15). From the coercivity assumption on the running cost and we can infer that

$$\int_I \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|f(x, u(t, x))|}{1 + |x|} d\mu_t(x) dt \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} M(|u(t, x)|) d\mu_t(x) dt < \infty$$

for some $M > 0$, due to the assumptions on the running cost L . Since, μ solves the continuity equation, from the superposition principle [4, Theorem 3.4], we can infer that there exists a probability measure $\eta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \Gamma)$ such that $(e_t)_\# \eta = \mu_t$ for all $t \in [0, T]$, and

$$\dot{\omega} = f(\omega(t), u(t, \omega(t))).$$

Consider the map $(x, \omega) \mapsto E(x, \omega) := (e_0(\omega), e_T(\omega))$ and the measure $E_\# \eta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. Computing

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} c(x, y) dE_\# \eta(x, y) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \Gamma} c(\omega(0), \omega(T)) d\eta(x, \omega) \\ &\leq \int_I \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \Gamma} L(t, \omega(t), u(t, \omega(t))) d\eta(x, \omega) dt \\ &= \int_I \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} L(t, x, u(t, x)) d\mu_t(x) dt \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

This in combination with Proposition (3.5) imply that both the optimization problems achieve the same minimum. \square

In the following proposition we note that the optimal solutions are concentrated on optimal curves as in solutions of Benamou-Brenier for Euclidean costs. Though the proof is similar to that of the previous result, we state it here due to its importance.

Proposition 3.11. (Concentration of transport on optimal trajectories) *Given Assumption 2 (Tonelli running cost) and 2 (vector-fields with sub-linear growth). Let $\mu_0, \mu_T \in \mathcal{P}_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Suppose there exists an optimal pair (μ, u) solving the Benamou-Brenier problem (15). Then there exists a probability measure $\eta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \Gamma)$ such that $(e_t)_\# \eta = \mu_t$ for all $t \in [0, T]$, and*

$$\dot{\omega} = f(\omega(t), u(t, \omega(t)))$$

Moreover, the probability measure η satisfies, $\text{supp } \eta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \times \pi^\omega(G) := \{\omega; \text{s.t. } (\omega, u) \in G\}$.

Proof. The existence of η follows using an application of the superposition principle as in Theorem 3.10. For the concentration of the curves, we can once again define

the map $(x, \omega) \mapsto E(x, \omega) := (e_0(\omega), e_T(\omega))$ and the measure $E_{\#}\eta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. We know from Theorem 3.10 that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} c(x, y) dE_{\#}\eta(x, y) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \Gamma} c(\omega(0), \omega(T)) d\eta(x, \omega) \\ &= \int_I \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \Gamma} L(t, \omega(t), u(t, \omega(t))) d\eta(x, \omega) dt \end{aligned}$$

If ω is not optimal for η almost every x, ω , then the last equality would lead to a contradiction. \square

Next, we consider some special cases.

Let $\mathcal{V} = \{g_1, \dots, g_m\}$. Let $[f, g]$ denote the Lie bracket operation between two vector fields $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, given by where ∂_i denotes partial derivative with respect to coordinate i .

$$[f, g]_i = \sum_{j=1}^d f^j \partial_{x_j} g^i - g^j \partial_{x_j} f^i. \quad (39)$$

We define $\mathcal{V}^0 = \mathcal{V}$. For each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, we define in an iterative manner the set of vector fields $\mathcal{V}^i = \{[g, h]; g \in \mathcal{V}, h \in \mathcal{V}^{i-1}, j = 1, \dots, i\}$. We will assume that the collection of vector fields \mathcal{V} satisfies following condition the *Chow-Rashevsky* condition [1]. We will say that $\cup_{i=0}^r \mathcal{V}^i$ has rank d if $\text{span}\{g(x) \in \cup_{i=0}^r \mathcal{V}^i\} = \mathbb{R}^d$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Assumption 3.12. (Controllable driftless system/Hormander condition) Suppose $f_0 \equiv 0$ and $f_i \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^d)$ for each $i = 1, \dots, n$. The Lie algebra of step r generated by the vector fields \mathcal{V} , given by $\cup_{i=0}^r \mathcal{V}^i$, has rank d , for sufficiently large r .

Consider the *sub-Riemannian metric* $d : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$d(x, y) := \inf_{\omega, u} \int_0^T \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m u_i^2(t)} dt$$

subject to (5). (40)

We note the following equivalence between the sub-Riemannian energy cost and the optimal control problem with kinetic energy running cost.

Lemma 3.13. ([9]) *Suppose Assumption 3.12 holds. Then $d^2(x, y) = c(x, y)$ for all $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$, where the running cost is given by $L(t, x, u) = \sum_{i=1}^m |u_i|^2$ for all $(t, x, u) \in I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U$.*

Given this equivalence we can state the following result on the existence of solutions for the Benamou-Brenier problem for the Sub-Riemannian cost.

Corollary 3.14. (Sub-Riemannian energy) *Given Assumption 2. Suppose additionally that the system (5) is a controllable driftless system according to Assumption 3.12. Let $\mu_0, \mu_T \in \mathcal{P}_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be measures that are compactly supported. Let $L(t, x, u) = \sum_{i=1}^m |u_i|^2$ for all $(t, x, u) \in I \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U$. Then there exists a pair (μ, u) that solves the Benamou-Brenier formulation of optimal transport (15).*

Proof. It is known from to Assumption 3.12, $d(x, y)$ is well defined for all $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$, and continuous. See [1, Theorem 3.31].

Therefore, $c(x, y) = d^2(x, y)$ is continuous. This implies that the Kantorovich problem (4) has a feasible solution. That is, one can take the product measure $\gamma_{so} = \mu_0 \otimes \mu_T$ and we have that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} c(x, y) d\mu_0(x) d\mu_T(y) < \infty$. This implies that the relaxed Benamou-Brenier formulation (17) is feasible due to feasibility of the Kantorovich problem due to Proposition 3.5. Then the result follows from Theorem 3.9 and Theorem 3.10. \square

Next we consider the class of controllable linear systems.

Assumption 3.15. (Controllable linear time invariant system) Suppose $f_0(x) = Ax$ and $f_i(x) = b_i$ for $A \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$, and $b_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $(A, B) := (A, [b_1, \dots, b_m])$ satisfies the Kalman rank condition,

$$\text{rank} [B \ AB \ \dots \ A^{d-1}B] = d \quad (41)$$

Given this assumption, we can state the following result for the well known linear quadratic costs.

Corollary 3.16. (Linear quadratic cost) Let $\mu_0, \mu_T \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Suppose the control system (5) is a controllable LTI according to Assumption (3.15). Let the running cost be given by $L(t, x, u) = \langle x, Qx \rangle_2 + \langle u, Ru \rangle_2$ for some postive semidefinite matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and positive definite matrix $R \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. Then there exists a pair (μ, u) that solves the Benamou-Brenier formulation of optimal transport (15).

Proof. According to [14], there exists matrices $D, E, F \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that D and F are positive definite and E is invertible such that

$$c(x, y) = \langle x, Dx \rangle_2 - \langle x, Ey \rangle_2 + \langle y, Fy \rangle_2$$

for all $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Consider the product measure once again $\gamma_{so} = \mu_0 \otimes \mu_T$. We can see that

$$c(x, y) \leq C(|x|^2 + |y|^2)$$

for all $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ for some $C > 0$, that is independent of x and y . Since, $\mu_0, \mu_T \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we can infer that c is integrable with respect to γ_{so} and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} c(x, y) d\gamma_{so} < \infty.$$

This implies that the relaxed Benamou-Brenier formulation (17) is feasible due to feasibility of the Kantorovich problem due to Proposition 3.5. Then the result again follows from Theorem 3.9 and 3.10. \square

References

- [1] Andrei Agrachev, Davide Barilari, and Ugo Boscain. *A comprehensive introduction to sub-Riemannian geometry*, volume 181. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- [2] Andrei Agrachev and Paul Lee. Optimal transportation under nonholonomic constraints. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 361(11):6019–6047, 2009.

- [3] Andrei A Agrachev and Yuri Sachkov. *Control theory from the geometric viewpoint*, volume 87. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [4] Luigi Ambrosio and Gianluca Crippa. Continuity equations and ode flows with non-smooth velocity. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh Section A: Mathematics*, 144(6):1191–1244, 2014.
- [5] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Gigli, and Giuseppe Savaré. *Gradient flows: in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [6] Jean-David Benamou and Yann Brenier. A computational fluid mechanics solution to the Monge-Kantorovich mass transfer problem. *Numerische Mathematik*, 84(3):375–393, 2000.
- [7] Patrick Bernard. Young measures, superposition and transport. *Indiana University mathematics journal*, pages 247–275, 2008.
- [8] Vladimir Igorevich Bogachev and Maria Aparecida Soares Ruas. *Measure theory*, volume 1. Springer, 2007.
- [9] P Cannarsa and L Rifford. Semiconcavity results for optimal control problems admitting no singular minimizing controls. In *Annales de l’IHP Analyse non linéaire*, volume 25, pages 773–802, 2008.
- [10] Yongxin Chen, Tryphon T Georgiou, and Michele Pavon. Optimal transport over a linear dynamical system. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 62(5):2137–2152, 2016.
- [11] Francis Clarke. *Functional analysis, calculus of variations and optimal control*, volume 264. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [12] Liviu C Florescu and Christiane Godet-Thobie. *Young measures and compactness in measure spaces*. Walter de Gruyter, 2012.
- [13] Massimo Fornasier, Stefano Lisini, Carlo Orrieri, and Giuseppe Savaré. Mean-field optimal control as gamma-limit of finite agent controls. *European Journal of Applied Mathematics*, 30(6):1153–1186, 2019.
- [14] Ahed Hindawi, J-B Pomet, and Ludovic Rifford. Mass transportation with LQ cost functions. *Acta applicandae mathematicae*, 113(2):215–229, 2011.
- [15] Ludovic Rifford. *Sub-Riemannian geometry and optimal transport*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2014.
- [16] Filippo Santambrogio. Optimal transport for applied mathematicians. *Birkhäuser, NY*, 55(58-63):94, 2015.
- [17] Cédric Villani. *Topics in optimal transportation*. Number 58. American Mathematical Soc., 2003.
- [18] Laurence Chisholm Young. *Lectures on the calculus of variations and optimal control theory*, volume 304. American Mathematical Soc., 2000.