

ON IMPROVING GENERALIZATION IN A CLASS OF LEARNING PROBLEMS WITH THE METHOD OF SMALL PARAMETERS FOR WEAKLY-CONTROLLED OPTIMAL GRADIENT SYSTEMS

GETACHEW K. BEFEKADU

Abstract. In this paper, we provide a mathematical framework for improving generalization in a class of learning problems which is related to point estimations for modeling of high-dimensional nonlinear functions. In particular, we consider a variational problem for a weakly-controlled gradient system, whose control input enters into the system dynamics as a coefficient to a nonlinear term which is scaled by a small parameter. Here, the optimization problem consists of a cost functional, which is associated with how to gauge the quality of the estimated model parameters at a certain fixed final time w.r.t. the model validating dataset, while the weakly-controlled gradient system, whose time-evolution is guided by the model training dataset and its perturbed version with small random noise. Using the perturbation theory, we provide results that will allow us to solve a sequence of optimization problems, i.e., a set of decomposed optimization problems, so as to aggregate the corresponding approximate optimal solutions that are reasonably sufficient for improving generalization in such a class of learning problems. Moreover, we also provide an estimate for the rate of convergence for such approximate optimal solutions. Finally, we present some numerical results for a typical case of nonlinear regression problem.

Key words. Aggregation, decomposition, generalization, Hamiltonian function, learning problem, modeling of nonlinear functions, optimal control problem, perturbation theory, Pontryagin's maximum principle.

1. Statement of the problem. Consider the following optimal control problem (which is related to a weakly-controlled gradient optimal system with a small parameter)

$$J^\epsilon[u] = \Phi(\theta^\epsilon(T), \mathcal{Z}^{(2)}) \quad \rightarrow \quad \min_{u(t) \in U \text{ on } t \in [0, T]} \quad (1.1)$$

s.t.

$$\dot{\theta}^\epsilon(t) = -\nabla J_0(\theta^\epsilon(t), \mathcal{Z}^{(1)}) + \epsilon u(t)B(\theta^\epsilon(t), \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}), \quad \theta^\epsilon(0) = \theta_0, \quad (1.2)$$

where the statement of the problem consists of the following core concepts and general assumptions:

- (a). **Datasets:** We are given two datasets, i.e., $\mathcal{Z}^{(k)} = \{(x_i^{(k)}, y_i^{(k)})\}_{i=1}^{m_k}$, each with data size of m_k , for $k = 1, 2$. These datasets, i.e., $\mathcal{Z}^{(1)}$ and $\mathcal{Z}^{(2)}$, may be generated from a given original dataset $\mathcal{Z}^{(0)} = \{(x_i^{(0)}, y_i^{(0)})\}_{i=1}^{m_0}$ by means of bootstrapping with/without replacement. Here, we assume that the first dataset $\mathcal{Z}^{(1)} = \{(x_i^{(1)}, y_i^{(1)})\}_{i=1}^{m_1}$ will be used for model training purpose, while the second dataset $\mathcal{Z}^{(2)} = \{(x_i^{(2)}, y_i^{(2)})\}_{i=1}^{m_2}$ will be used for evaluating the quality of the estimated model parameter. Moreover, the dataset $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}$ (which is associated with the nonlinear term B in the system dynamics) is obtained by adding small random noise, i.e., $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)} = \{(x_i^{(1)}, \tilde{y}_i^{(1)})\}_{i=1}^{m_1}$, with $\tilde{y}_i^{(1)} = y_i^{(1)} + \varepsilon_i$ and $\varepsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ (with small variance σ^2).
- (b). **Learning via weakly-controlled gradient systems with a small parameter:** We are tasked to find for a parameter $\theta \in \Theta$, from a finite-dimensional parameter space \mathbb{R}^p (i.e., $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^p$), such that the function $h_\theta(x) \in \mathcal{H}$, i.e., from a given class of hypothesis function space \mathcal{H} , describes best the corresponding model training dataset as well as predicts well with reasonable expectation on a different model validating dataset. Here, the search for an optimal parameter $\theta^* \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ can be associated with the weakly controlled-gradient system of Equation (1.2), whose *time-evolution* is guided by the model training

dataset $\mathcal{Z}^{(1)}$ and its perturbed version $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}$, i.e.,

$$\dot{\theta}^\epsilon(t) = -\nabla J_0(\theta^\epsilon(t), \mathcal{Z}^{(1)}) + \epsilon u(t)B(\theta^\epsilon(t), \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}),$$

where $J_0(\theta, \mathcal{Z}^{(1)}) = \frac{1}{m_1} \sum_{i=1}^{m_1} \ell(h_\theta(x_i^{(1)}), y_i^{(1)})$, and ℓ is a suitable loss function that quantifies the lack-of-fit between the model and the datasets. Moreover, $u(t)$ is a real-valued admissible control function from a set U in one-dimensional space that enters into the system dynamics as a coefficient to the nonlinear term B .¹ The parameter ϵ is a small positive number and the nonlinear term B is given by

$$B(\theta, \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}) = \left[(\partial J_0(\theta, \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)})/\partial\theta_1)^2, (\partial J_0(\theta, \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)})/\partial\theta_2)^2, \dots, (\partial J_0(\theta, \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)})/\partial\theta_p)^2 \right]^T$$

Note that the small random noise $\varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ (with small variance σ^2) in the dataset $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}$ provides a *dithering effect*, i.e., causing some distortion to the model training dataset $\mathcal{Z}^{(1)}$ so that the control $u(t)$ will have more effect on the learning dynamics.²

- (c). **Variational problem:** For a given $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_{\max})$, determine an admissible optimal control $u^\epsilon(t)$, $t \in [0, T]$, that minimizes the following functional

$$J^\epsilon[u] = \Phi(\theta^\epsilon(T), \mathcal{Z}^{(2)}), \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \text{Equation (1.2)},$$

where $\Phi(\theta, \mathcal{Z}^{(2)})$ is a scalar function that depends on the model validating dataset $\mathcal{Z}^{(2)}$. Note that such a variational problem together with the above weakly-controlled gradient system provides a mathematical apparatus how to improve generalization in such a class of learning problems.³

- (d). **General assumptions:** Throughout the paper, we assume the following conditions: (i) the set U is compact in \mathbb{R} and the final time T is fixed, (ii) the function $\Phi(\theta, \mathcal{Z}^{(2)})$ is twice continuously differentiable w.r.t. the parameter θ , and (iii) for any $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_{\max})$ and all admissible bounded controls $u(t)$ from U , the solution $\theta^\epsilon(t)$ for $t \in [0, T]$ which corresponds to the weakly-controlled gradient system of Equation (1.2) starting from an initial condition $\theta^\epsilon(0) = \theta_0$, exists and bounded.⁴

In what follows, we assume that there exists an admissible optimal control $u^\epsilon(t)$ for all $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_{\max})$. Then, the necessary optimality conditions for the optimal control problem with weakly-controlled gradient system satisfy the following Euler-Lagrange critical point

¹Note that the control function $u(t)$ is admissible if it is measurable and $u(t) \in U$ for all $t \in [0, T]$.

²In Equation (1.2) above, the weakly controlled-gradient system can be expressed as follows:

$$\dot{\theta}_i^\epsilon(t) = -\partial J_0(\theta^\epsilon(t), \mathcal{Z}^{(1)})/\partial\theta_i + \epsilon u(t)(\partial J_0(\theta, \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)})/\partial\theta_i)^2, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, p,$$

where the control $u(t)$ enters into the system dynamics as a common coefficient to all nonlinear terms $(\partial J_0(\theta, \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)})/\partial\theta_i)^2, \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}, i = 1, 2, \dots, p$.

³In this paper, we consider the following function

$$\Phi(\theta^\epsilon(T), \mathcal{Z}^{(2)}) = (1/m_2) \sum_{i=1}^{m_2} \ell(h_{\theta^\epsilon(T)}(x_i^{(2)}), y_i^{(2)}), \quad \text{w.r.t. the dataset } \mathcal{Z}^{(2)},$$

as a cost functional $J^\epsilon[u]$ that serves as a measure for evaluating the quality of the estimated optimal parameter $\theta^* = \theta^\epsilon(T)$, i.e., when $\theta^\epsilon(t)$ is evaluated at a certain fixed time T .

⁴For such a variational problem, these assumptions are sufficient for the existence of a nonempty compact reachable set $\mathcal{R}(\theta_0) \subset \Theta$, for some admissible controls on $[0, T]$ that belongs to U , starting from an initial point $\theta^\epsilon(0) = \theta_0$ (e.g., see [1] for related discussions on the Filippov's theorem providing a sufficient condition for compactness of the reachable set).

equations

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\theta}^\epsilon(t) &= \frac{\partial H^\epsilon(\theta^\epsilon(t), p^\epsilon(t), u^\epsilon(t))}{\partial p}, \\ &= -\nabla J_0(\theta^\epsilon(t), \mathcal{Z}^{(1)}) + \epsilon u^\epsilon(t) B(\theta^\epsilon(t), \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}), \quad \theta^\epsilon(0) = \theta_0,\end{aligned}\quad (1.3)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{p}^\epsilon(t) &= -\frac{\partial H^\epsilon(\theta^\epsilon(t), p^\epsilon(t), u^\epsilon(t))}{\partial \theta}. \\ &= \nabla^2 J_0(\theta^\epsilon(t), \mathcal{Z}^{(1)}) p^\epsilon(t) - \epsilon u^\epsilon(t) (\nabla B(\theta^\epsilon(t), \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}))^T p^\epsilon(t), \\ p^\epsilon(T) &= -\nabla \Phi(\theta^\epsilon(T), \mathcal{Z}^{(2)}),\end{aligned}\quad (1.4)$$

$$u^\epsilon(t) = \arg \max H^\epsilon(\theta^\epsilon(t), p^\epsilon(t), u(t)), \quad u(t) \in U \text{ on } t \in [0, T], \quad (1.5)$$

where the Hamiltonian function H^ϵ is given by

$$H^\epsilon(\theta, p, u) = \langle p, -\nabla J_0(\theta, \mathcal{Z}^{(1)}) + \epsilon u B(\theta, \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}) \rangle \quad (1.6)$$

and such optimality conditions are the direct consequence of the *Pontryagin's maximum principle* (e.g., see [2] for additional discussions on the first-order necessary optimality conditions; see also [3] for related discussions in the context of learning).

In following section, using the perturbation theory (e.g., see [4], [5] or [6] for additional discussions), we provide approximation solutions for the variational problem related to the weakly-controlled gradient system with a small parameter. In particular, we provide results that will allow us to solve independently a sequence of optimization problems, i.e., a set of decomposed optimization problems, so as to aggregate the corresponding approximate optimal solutions that are reasonably sufficient for improving generalization in such a class of learning problems. Moreover, we also provide an estimate for its rate of convergence.

2. Main results. Assume that the solutions $\theta^\epsilon(t)$, $p^\epsilon(t)$ and $u^\epsilon(t)$ corresponding to the optimality conditions in Equations (1.3)-(1.5) can be expressed as a series in the small parameter ϵ as follows

$$\left. \begin{aligned}\theta^\epsilon(t) &= \theta^0(t) + \epsilon \theta^1(t) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2) \\ p^\epsilon(t) &= p^0(t) + \epsilon p^1(t) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2) \\ u^\epsilon(t) &= u^0(t) + \epsilon u^1(t) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)\end{aligned}\right\} \quad (2.1)$$

Then, the following proposition (whose proof is given in the Appendix section) characterizes the approximate solutions obtained by keeping only the first two terms (i.e., the zeroth and the first-order solutions).

PROPOSITION 2.1. *Let the optimal solutions $\theta^\epsilon(t)$, $p^\epsilon(t)$ and $u^\epsilon(t)$ be expressed as a series in the small parameter ϵ (i.e., as in Equation (2.1) above). Then, the optimal value for the variational problem, i.e.,*

$$J^\epsilon[u] = \Phi(\theta^\epsilon(T), \mathcal{Z}^{(2)}) \quad \rightarrow \quad \min_{u(t) \in U \text{ on } t \in [0, T]}, \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \text{Equation (1.2),}$$

satisfies the following condition

$$\begin{aligned}J^\epsilon[u^\epsilon] &= \Phi(\theta^0(T), \mathcal{Z}^{(2)}) + \epsilon \langle \nabla \Phi(\theta^0(T), \mathcal{Z}^{(2)}), \theta^1(T) \rangle + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2), \\ &= \Phi(\theta^0(T), \mathcal{Z}^{(2)}) - \epsilon \langle p^0(T), \theta^1(T) \rangle + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2),\end{aligned}\quad (2.2)$$

where the zeroth-order solutions $\theta^0(t)$, $p^0(t)$ and $u^0(t)$ satisfy the following critical conditions

$$\dot{\theta}^0(t) = -\nabla J_0(\theta^0(t), \mathcal{Z}^{(1)}), \quad \theta^0(0) = \theta_0, \quad (2.3)$$

$$\dot{p}^0(t) = \nabla^2 J_0(\theta^0(t), \mathcal{Z}^{(1)}), \quad p^0(T) = -\nabla \Phi(\theta^0(T), \mathcal{Z}^{(2)}), \quad (2.4)$$

$$u^0(t) = \arg \max \langle p^0(t), u(t)B(\theta^0(t), \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}) \rangle, \quad u(t) \in U \text{ on } t \in [0, T], \quad (2.5)$$

and the first-order solution $\theta^1(t)$ satisfies the following system dynamics equation

$$\dot{\theta}^1(t) = -\nabla^2 J_0(\theta^0(t), \mathcal{Z}^{(1)})\theta^1(t) + u^0(t)B(\theta^0(t), \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}), \quad \theta^1(0) = 0, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (2.6)$$

Moreover, the estimated optimal parameter θ^* is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^* &= \theta^\epsilon(T), \\ &= \theta^0(T) + \epsilon\theta^1(T) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2). \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

Here, we remark that $\theta^1(t)$ depends on the the zeroth-order solutions $\theta^0(t)$, $p^0(t)$ and $u^0(t)$, for $t \in [0, T]$, as well as on the datasets $\mathcal{Z}^{(1)}$, $\mathcal{Z}^{(2)}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}$ (where the latter is generated by adding random noise with small variance σ^2 in the model training dataset $\mathcal{Z}^{(1)}$). Note that the control $u^0(t)$, for $t \in [0, T]$, may not be unique, but it is measurable and belongs to U for all $t \in [0, T]$.⁵ Moreover, the improvements in the model training loss and that of the model validating loss are given by

$$\begin{aligned} &J_0(\theta^\epsilon(T), \mathcal{Z}^{(1)}) - J_0(\theta^0(T), \mathcal{Z}^{(1)}) \\ &= \frac{1}{m_1} \sum_{i=1}^{m_1} (\ell(h_{\theta^0(T)+\epsilon\theta^1(T)}(x_i^{(1)}), y_i^{(1)}) - \ell(h_{\theta^0(T)}(x_i^{(1)}), y_i^{(1)})) \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &J_0(\theta^\epsilon(T), \mathcal{Z}^{(2)}) - J_0(\theta^0(T), \mathcal{Z}^{(2)}) \\ &= \frac{1}{m_2} \sum_{i=1}^{m_2} (\ell(h_{\theta^0(T)+\epsilon\theta^1(T)}(x_i^{(2)}), y_i^{(2)}) - \ell(h_{\theta^0(T)}(x_i^{(2)}), y_i^{(2)})), \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

respectively.

Finally, the following proposition provides an estimate for the convergence rate (see the Appendix section for its proof).

PROPOSITION 2.2. *Suppose that Proposition 2.1 holds, then we have*

$$J^\epsilon[u^\epsilon] - J^\epsilon[u^0] = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2) \quad (2.10)$$

for the estimate of convergence rate.

⁵Note that if we are looking for an optimal control $u(t) \in U$, for $t \in [0, T]$, from a class of bounded functions $U = \{u \in \mathbb{R} : -1 \leq u \leq +1\}$. Then, the solution satisfying the extremum condition of Equation (2.5) takes values between -1 or $+1$, i.e., a *bang-bang control* with an interpretation of switching which is consistent with nonsmooth calculus of variations (see [7] or [8] for additional discussions).

Algorithm. Here, we present a generic algorithm for solving such approximate optimal solutions - based on the zeroth and the first-order solutions - for the optimal control problem in Equations (1.1) and (1.2).

ALGORITHM:

1. **The zeroth-order solutions:** Solve the forward and backward-equations w.r.t. the system dynamics of Equations (2.3) and (2.4), i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\theta}^0(t) &= -\nabla J_0(\theta^0(t), \mathcal{Z}^{(1)}), & \theta^0(0) &= \theta_0, \\ \dot{p}^0(t) &= \nabla^2 J_0(\theta^0(t), \mathcal{Z}^{(1)}), & p^0(T) &= -\nabla \Phi(\theta^0(T), \mathcal{Z}^{(2)}).\end{aligned}$$

2. Compute the admissible control $u^{(0)}(t) \in U$ for $t \in [0, T]$ using Equation (2.5), i.e.,

$$u^{(0)}(t) = \arg \max \langle p^0(t), u(t)B(\theta^0(t), \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}) \rangle, \quad u(t) \in U \text{ on } t \in [0, T].$$

3. **The first-order solutions:** Using $\theta^0(t)$, $p^0(t)$ and $u^{(0)}(t)$, for $t \in [0, T]$, solve the forward system equation corresponding to Equation (2.6), i.e.,

$$\dot{\theta}^1(t) = -\nabla^2 J_0(\theta^0(t), \mathcal{Z}^{(1)})\theta^1(t) + u^{(0)}(t)B(\theta^0(t), \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}), \quad \theta^1(0) = 0, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

4. **Output:** Return the estimated optimal parameter value $\theta^* = \theta^0(T) + \epsilon\theta^1(T)$.

Here, it is worth remarking that the above generic algorithm allows us to determine the zeroth and the first-order solutions, corresponding to a sequence of decomposed optimization problems, and their aggregations are reasonable approximate optimal solutions to the optimal control problem in Equations (1.1) and (1.2).

3. Numerical results and discussions. In this section, we presented some numerical results for a simple polynomial interpolation problem modeling the thermophysical properties of saturated water (in liquid state), where the dataset (which is given in Table 3.3 of the Appendix section) is taken from (see [9, p. 1003]). Here, we only considered the problem of point estimation for modeling of (i) the density ρ , (ii) the specific heat c_p , and (iii) the thermal conductivity k , where the mathematical model relating each of these thermophysical properties as a function of the temperature T (in Kelvin [K], in the range $273.15 \text{ K} \leq T \leq 373.15 \text{ K}$), is assumed to obey a second-order polynomial function of the form $h_\theta(T) = \theta_1 + \theta_2 T + \theta_3 T^2$, with $\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3)$ is the model parameter.⁶

For the numerical simulation result, we first partitioned the original dataset $\mathcal{Z}^{(0)}$ of size $m_0 = 22$ into two data subsets, i.e., model training dataset $\mathcal{Z}^{(1)}$ and model validating dataset $\mathcal{Z}^{(2)}$, of sizes $m_1 = 18$ and $m_2 = 6$, respectively. Moreover, for the dataset $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}$, which is associated with the nonlinear term B in the system dynamics, we added random noises with distortion levels of 1% and 5% corresponding to the sample variance of the original dataset and with a value of small parameter $\epsilon = 0.001$. Tables 3.1 and 3.2 show the estimated optimal parameters $\theta_i^* = \theta_i^0(T) + \epsilon\theta_i^1(T)$, for $i = 1, 2, 3$, with fixed final time T , and the sample standard deviation for the residual errors ε^{res} . Note that we computed the residual errors w.r.t. the original dataset $\mathcal{Z}^{(0)}$ based on $\varepsilon_i^{\text{res}} = y_i - h_{\theta^*}(T_i)$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, 22$. Finally, Figures 3.1-3.3 show the model training loss versus that of the model testing loss for different levels of random noise distortions.

⁶The notation for the temperature T is different from that of the fixed final time T which is part of the problem statement.




Fig. 3.1: Plot for model training loss versus model testing loss for different levels of random noise distortions (Density ρ).




Fig. 3.2: Plot for model training loss versus model testing loss for different levels of random noise distortions (Specific heat c_p).




Fig. 3.3: Plot for model training loss versus model testing loss for different levels of random noise distortions (Thermal conductivity k).

Table 3.1: The estimated optimal parameters with a level of 1% random noise distortion

$h_\theta(T)$	θ_1^*	θ_2^*	θ_3^*	Sample standard deviation for the residual errors e^{res}
ρ	763.1823	1.8221	-3.4862×10^{-3}	0.5693
c_p	5.5944	-8.8978×10^{-3}	1.3982×10^{-5}	0.0038
k	-0.4338	0.0056	-6.9164×10^{-6}	0.0010

Table 3.2: The estimated optimal parameters with a level of 5% random noise distortion

$h_\theta(T)$	θ_1^*	θ_2^*	θ_3^*	Sample standard deviation for the residual errors e^{res}
ρ	759.7205	1.8512	-3.5432×10^{-3}	0.6221
c_p	5.6124	-9.0082×10^{-3}	1.4148×10^{-5}	0.0038
k	-0.4769	0.0058	-7.3308×10^{-6}	0.0011

A. Appendix. Proof of Proposition 2.1. Clearly, if the expansions of Equation (2.1) in the small parameter ϵ converge and satisfy the Euler-Lagrange critical point equations of Equations (1.3)-(1.5). Then, with direct substitutions, we have the following relations

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\theta}^0(t) + \epsilon \dot{\theta}^1(t) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2) = & -\nabla J_0(\theta^0(t), \mathcal{Z}^{(1)}) - \epsilon \nabla^2 J_0(\theta^0(t), \mathcal{Z}^{(1)}) \theta^1(t) \\ & + \epsilon u^0(t) B(\theta^0(t), \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2), \quad \theta^0(0) = \theta_0 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{p}^0(t) + \epsilon \dot{p}^1(t) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2) &= \nabla^2 J_0(\theta^0(t), \mathcal{Z}^{(1)}) p^0(t) + \epsilon \nabla^2 J_0(\theta^0(t), \mathcal{Z}^{(1)}) p^1(t), \\ &\quad - \epsilon u^0(t) (\nabla B(\theta^0(t), \tilde{\mathcal{Z}})^T p^1(t) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)), \\ p^0(T) &= -\nabla \Phi(\theta^0(T), \mathcal{Z}^{(2)}). \end{aligned}$$

where the admissible control $u^0(t) \in U$, for $t \in [0, T]$, is an extremum solution of

$$u^0(t) = \arg \max \langle p^0(t), u(t) B(\theta^0(t), \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}) \rangle, \quad u(t) \in U \quad \text{on } t \in [0, T].$$

Note that if we equate equal powers of ϵ and only retaining the zeroth and first-order solutions. Then, we will arrive to Equations (2.3) and (2.4). Moreover, the optimal estimated parameter $\theta^* = \theta^\epsilon(T)$ can be recovered from the following relation

$$\theta^\epsilon(T) = \theta^0(T) + \epsilon \theta^1(T) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2).$$

This completes the proof of Proposition 2.1. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.2. Note that, for any admissible control $u(t) \in U$, for $t \in [0, T]$, we have the following

$$\begin{aligned} J^\epsilon[u] &= \Phi(\theta^0(T), \mathcal{Z}^{(2)}) + \epsilon \langle \nabla \Phi(\theta^0(T), \mathcal{Z}^{(2)}), \theta^1(T) \rangle + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2), \\ &= \Phi(\theta^0(T), \mathcal{Z}^{(2)}) - \epsilon \langle p^0(T), \theta_u^1(T) \rangle + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2), \end{aligned}$$

which is uniform w.r.t. $u(t)$ and $p^0(T)$, where $\theta_u^1(T)$ is the solution of

$$\dot{\theta}_u^1(t) = -\nabla^2 J_0(\theta^0(t), \mathcal{Z}^{(1)}) \theta_u^1(t) + u(t) B(\theta^0(t), \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}), \quad \text{with } \theta_u^1(0) = 0$$

evaluated at $t = T$, and $\theta^0(T)$ is the solution of Equation (2.3) evaluated at $t = T$, while $p^0(T) = -\nabla \Phi(\theta^0(T), \mathcal{Z}^{(2)})$.

As a result, we have the following relation, w.r.t. $u^\epsilon(t)$ and $u^0(t)$ for $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} J^\epsilon[u^\epsilon] - J^\epsilon[u^0] &= \epsilon \langle p^0(T), \theta_{u^0}^1(T) - \theta_{u^\epsilon}^1(T) \rangle + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2), \\ &= \epsilon \int_0^T \langle \dot{p}^0(t), \theta_{u^0}^1(t) - \theta_{u^\epsilon}^1(t) \rangle dt \\ &\quad + \epsilon \int_0^T \langle p^0(t), \dot{\theta}_{u^0}^1(t) - \dot{\theta}_{u^\epsilon}^1(t) \rangle dt + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if we substitute the following two system equations

$$\dot{p}^0(t) = \nabla^2 J_0(\theta^0(t), \mathcal{Z}^{(1)})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\theta}_{u^0}^1(t) - \dot{\theta}_{u^\epsilon}^1(t) &= -\nabla^2 J_0(\theta^0(t), \mathcal{Z}^{(1)}) (\theta_{u^0}^1(t) - \theta_{u^\epsilon}^1(t)) \\ &\quad + (u^0(t) - u^\epsilon(t)) B(\theta^0(t), \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}) \end{aligned}$$

in the equation of $J^\epsilon[u^\epsilon] - J^\epsilon[u^0]$ above. Then, we have the following relation

$$J^\epsilon[u^\epsilon] - J^\epsilon[u^0] = \epsilon (u^0(t) - u^\epsilon(t)) B(\theta^0(t), \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2).$$

Furthermore, noting that $(u^0(t) - u^\epsilon(t)) = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ (cf. Equation (2.1)), then we will arrive to

$$J^\epsilon[u^\epsilon] - J^\epsilon[u^0] = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2).$$

for the estimate of convergence rate. This completes the proof of Proposition 2.2. \square

B. Appendix.

Table 3.3: Thermophysical properties of saturated water (Liquid).

T (K)	ρ (kg/m ³)	c_p (kJ/kg · K)	$\mu \times 10^6$ (N · s/m ²)	k (W/m · K)	$\beta \times 10^6$ (K ⁻¹)
273.15	1000	4.217	1750	0.569	-68.05
273	1000	4.211	1652	0.574	-32.74
280	1000	4.198	1422	0.582	46.04
285	1000	4.189	1225	0.590	114.1
290	999	4.184	1080	0.598	174.0
295	998	4.181	959	0.606	227.5
300	997	4.179	855	0.613	276.1
305	995	4.178	769	0.620	320.6
310	993	4.178	695	0.628	361.9
315	991	4.179	631	0.634	400.4
320	989	4.180	577	0.640	436.7
325	987	4.182	528	0.645	471.2
330	984	4.184	489	0.650	504.0
335	982	4.186	453	0.656	535.5
340	979	4.188	420	0.660	566.0
345	977	4.191	389	0.664	595.4
350	974	4.195	365	0.668	624.2
355	971	4.199	343	0.671	652.3
360	967	4.203	324	0.674	679.9
365	963	4.209	306	0.677	707.1
370	961	4.214	289	0.679	728.7
373.15	958	4.217	279	0.680	750.1
400	937	4.256	217	0.688	896
450	890	4.40	152	0.678	
500	831	4.66	118	0.642	
550	756	5.24	97	0.580	
600	649	7.00	81	0.497	
647.3	315	0	45	0.238	

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Liberzon. *Calculus of variations and optimal control theory*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2012.
- [2] L.S. Pontryagin, V. Boltianski, R. Gamkrelidze, & E. Mitchtchenko. *The mathematical theory of optimal processes*. John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1962.
- [3] G.K. Befekadu. A successive approximation method in functional spaces for hierarchical optimal control problems and its application to learning. *arXiv:2410.20617 [math.OC]*, 2024. Available at <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2410.20617>
- [4] C.M. Bender & S.a. Orszag. *Advanced mathematical methods for scientists and engineers I: Asymptotic methods and perturbation theory*. Springer, New York, 1999.
- [5] J. Kevorkian & J.D. Cole. *Perturbation methods in applied mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1989.
- [6] R.E. O'Malley. *Singular perturbation methods for ordinary differential equations*. Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, 1991.
- [7] F.H. Clarke. *Optimization and nonsmooth analysis*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 1990.
- [8] F.H. Clarke. *Functional analysis, calculus of variations and optimal control*. Springer-Verlag, London, 2013.
- [9] T.L. Bergman, S.A. Lavine, F.P. Incropera & D.P. Dewitt. *Fundamentals of heat and mass transfer*. 7th Edition, John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, 2011.