International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis
IIASA
www.iiasa.ac.at

Local Invertibility of Set-Valued Maps

Frankowska, H.

IIASA Collaborative Paper
September 1985

LOCAL INVERTIBILITY OF SET-VALUED MAPS

Halina Frankowska*

September 1985
CP-85-43

*CEREMADE, Université Paris-Dauphine, Paris, France

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR APPLIED SYSTEMS ANALYSIS
A-2361 Laxenburg, Austria

LOCAL INVERTIBILITY OF SET-VALUED MAPS

Halina Frankowska
CEREMADE
Université Paris-Dauphine
France

ABSTRACT

We prove several equivalent versions of the inverse function theorem: an inverse function theorem for smooth maps on closed subsets, one for set-valued maps, a generalized implicit function theorem for set-valued maps. We provide applications of the above results to the problem of local controllability of differential inclusions.

I dedicate this paper to Professor Ky-Fan, who has greatly influenced me, in particular, when I met him in CEREMADE during the fall of 1982.

1. The Inverse Function Theorem

Let X be a Banach space, $K \subset X$ be a subset of X. We recall the definition of the *tangent cone* to a subset K at x_o introduced in Clarke [1975]:

$$C_K(x_o) := \{v \in X \mid \lim_{\substack{h \to o+ \\ x \to x_o \\ x \in K}} \frac{d(x+hv,K)}{h} = 0\} \quad .$$

We state now our basic result.

Theorem 1.1.

Let X be a Banach space, Y be a finite dimensional space, $K \subset X$ be a closed subset of X and x_o belong to K. Let A be a differentiable map from a neighborhood of K to Y. We assume that A' is continuous at x_o and that the following *surjectivity assumption* holds true

(1) $$A'(x_o)C_K(x_o) = Y \quad .$$

Then $A(x_o)$ belongs to the interior of A(K) and there exist constants ρ and ℓ such that, for all

(2) $$\begin{cases} y_1, y_2 \in A(x_o) + \rho B \text{ and any solution } x_1 \in K \text{ to the} \\ \text{equation } A(x_1) = y_1 \text{ satisfying } \|x_o - x_1\| \leq \ell\rho, \text{ there} \\ \text{exists a solution } x_2 \in K \text{ to the equation } A(x_2) = y_2 \\ \text{satisfying } \|x_1 - x_2\| \leq \ell\|y_1 - y_2\|. \quad \blacktriangle \end{cases}$$

We recall

Definition

A set-valued map G from Y to X is *pseudo-Lipschitz* around $(y_o, x_o) \in \text{Graph}(G)$ if there exist neighborhoods V of y_o and W of x_o and a constant ℓ such that

$$\begin{cases} \text{i)} \quad \forall y \in V, \; G(y) \neq \emptyset \\ \text{ii)} \quad \forall y_1, y_2 \in V, \; G(y_1) \cap W \subset G(y_2) + \ell\|y_1 - y_2\|B \quad . \quad \blacktriangle \end{cases}$$

The above definition was introduced in Aubin [1982], [1984]. (See also Rockafellar [to appear] d) for a thorough study of pseudo-Lipschitz maps.)

Hence, the second statement of Theorem 1.1 reads:

(2)' $$\begin{cases} \text{the map } y \to A^{-1}(y) \cap K \text{ is pseudo-Lipschitz around} \\ (Ax_o, x_o). \end{cases}$$

Remark

If x_o belongs to the interior of K, then $C_K(x_o) = X$. Then assumption (1) states that $A'(x_o)$ is surjective, and we obtain the usual "inverse function theorem", also called the "Liusternik theorem".

We deduce a characterization of the interior of a closed subset of a finite-dimensional space given by Clarke [1983]:

$$x_o \in \mathrm{Int}(K) \Leftrightarrow C_K(x_o) = X \quad .$$

(We take X = Y and A to be the identity). ▲

The proof of Theorem 2.1 is based on the Ekeland variational principle [1974] and is given in Aubin-Frankowska [1985].

Corollary 1.2.

We posit the assumptions of Theorem 1.1. Let $M := A^{-1}(A(x_o)) \cap K$ be the set of solutions $x \in K$ to the equation $A(x) = A(x_o)$. Then there exist a neighborhood U of x_o and a constant ℓ such that

$$\forall x \in K \cap U, \; d(x,M) \le \ell \, \|A(x) - A(x_o)\| \quad .$$

Furthermore

$$C_K(x_o) \cap \mathrm{Ker}\, A'(x_o) \subset C_M(x_o) \quad . \quad ▲$$

We shall derive the extension to set-valued maps of the inverse function theorem. Let X,Y be Banach spaces and F be a map from X into the subsets of Y.

The *derivative* $CF(x_o,y_o)$ of F at $(x_o,y_o) \in \mathrm{Graph}\,(F)$ is the set-valued map from X to Y associating to any $u \in X$ elements $v \in Y$ such that (u,v) is tangent to Graph (F) at (x_o,y_o):

$$v \in CF(x_o,y_o)(u) \Leftrightarrow (u,v) \in C_{\mathrm{Graph}\,(F)}(x_o,y_o)$$

Theorem 1.3.

Let F be a set-valued map from a Banach space X to a finite dimensional space Y and (x_o,y_o) belong to the graph of F. If

graph F is closed and $CF\,(x_o,y_o)$ is surjective,

then F^{-1} is pseudo-Lipschitz around $(y_o,x_o) \in \mathrm{Graph}\,(F^{-1})$.

▲

Proof

We apply Theorem 1.1 when X is replaced by $X \times Y$, K is the graph of F and A is the projection from $X \times Y$ to Y. ■

Remark: A dual formulation.

Since the dimension of Y is finite, assumption (1) is equivalent to

$$A'(x_0)\, C_K(x_0) \text{ is dense in } Y$$

which can be translated as

$$\text{if } A'(x_0)^* q \text{ belongs to } C_K(x_0)^-, \text{ then } q = 0 \quad .$$

If F is a set-valued map from X to Y, we define the coderivative $CF(x_0,y_0)^*$ of F at $(x_0,y_0) \in \text{Graph }(F)$ as the "transpose" of $CF(x_0,y_0)$, from Y^* to X^* defined by

$$p \in CF(x_0,y_0)^*(q) \Leftrightarrow \sup_{(u,v) \in \text{Graph } CF(x_0,y_0)} (\langle p,u\rangle - \langle q,v\rangle) = 0 \quad .$$

Therefore, in Theorem 1.3, we can replace the surjectivity assumption by the "dual assumption"

$$CF(x_0,y_0)^{*-1}(0) = \{0\} \quad .$$

2. Applications to Local Controllability

Let us consider a set-valued map F from $\mathbb{R}^n$ into compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$. We associate with F the *differential inclusion*

(3) $\qquad x' \in F(x) \quad .$

A particular case of (3) is the parametrized system (also called a "control system")

(4) $\qquad x' = f(x,u(t)) \quad , \quad u(t) \in U$

where U is a given set of controls; then F is defined by

$$F(x) = \{f(x,u) : u \in U\} \quad .$$

Let $T > 0$. A function $x \in W^{1,1}(0,T)$ (Sobolev space) is called a *solution of differential inclusion* (3) if

$$x'(t) \in F(x(t)) \text{ a.e. in } [0,T] \quad .$$

For a point $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denote by $S_T(\xi)$ the set of solutions to (3) starting from ξ and defined on the time interval $[0,T]$. The *reachable set* for (3) at time T from ξ is denoted by $R(T,\xi)$, i.e.

$$R(T,\xi) = \{x(T) : x \in S_T(\xi)\} \quad .$$

The system (3) is called *locally controllable* around ξ if for some time $T > 0$

(5) $$\xi \in \text{Int } R(T,\xi) \quad .$$

The purpose of this section is to provide a sufficient condition for (5) when ξ is an equilibrium of F, i.e. $0 \in F(\xi)$.

We shall apply the results of Section 1. The set of solutions $S_T(\xi)$ is closed in $W^{1,1}(0,T)$ whenever Graph (F) is closed in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Consider the continuous linear operator A from the Banach space $W^{1,1}(0,T)$ into the finite dimensional space $\mathbb{R}^n$ defined by

$$A(x) = x(T) \text{ for all } x \in W^{1,1}(0,T) \quad .$$

Theorem 1.1 then states that if x_o denotes the constant trajectory $x_o(\cdot) \equiv \xi$ and $\{w(T) : w \in C_{S_T(\xi)}(x_o)\} = \mathbb{R}^n$ then the relation (5) holds true.

Let B denote the closed unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^n$. We say that a set-valued map F is Lipschitzian (in the Hausdorff metric) on an open neighborhood V of ξ if for a constant $L \geq 0$ and all $x,y \in V$

$$F(x) \subset F(y) + L\|x-y\|B \quad .$$

Thanks to this property we can compute a subset of $C_{S_T(\xi)}(x_o)$:

Theorem 2.1. Assume that F has a closed graph and is Lipschitzian around the equilibrium ξ. Then every solution of the differential inclusion

$$(6)\qquad \begin{cases} w'(t) \in CF(\xi,0)\ w(t) & \text{a.e. in } [0,T] \\ w\ (0) = 0 \end{cases}$$

belongs to $C_{S_T(\xi)}(x_o)$. ▲

The proof of the last result is based on a Filippov Theorem [1967].

We say that the inclusion (6) is *controllable* if its reachable set at some time $T > 0$ is equal to the whole space.

Theorems 1.1 and 2.1 together imply

Theorem 2.2. Assume that F has a closed graph and is Lipschitzian around the equilibrium ξ. The inclusion (3) is locally controllable around ξ if the inclusion (6) is controllable. ▲

Remark. Actually the idea of the proof of Theorem 1.1 allows us to prove a stronger result: We denote by co $F(\xi)$ the closed convex hull of the set $F(\xi)$.

Theorem 2.3. Assume that F has a closed graph and is Lipschitzian around the equilibrium ξ. The inclusion (3) is locally controllable around ξ if the inclusion

$$(7)\qquad \begin{cases} w' \in \text{cl}\ [CF(\xi,0)w + C_{\text{co}F(\xi)}(0)] \\ w(0) = 0 \end{cases}$$

is controllable. ▲

The proof requires a very careful calculation of variations of solutions (see Frankowska [1984]).

A necessary condition for the controllability of the inclusions (6), (7) is

$$\text{Dom } CF\ (\xi,0) := \{w \in \mathbb{R}^n : CF\ (\xi,0)w \neq \emptyset\} = \mathbb{R}^n \quad .$$

Whenever it holds true the right-hand sides of (6), (7) are set-valued maps whose graphs are *closed convex cones*. Such maps, called "closed convex processes", are set-valued analogues of linear operators. The controllability of such differential inclusions is the subject of the next section.

First, we provide the following

Example. Using Theorem 2.3 one can obtain a classical result on local controllability of control system (4) without assuming too much regularity. Let U be a compact set in $\mathbb{R}^m$ and let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times U \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be a continuous function. Assume that for some $(\xi,\bar{u}) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times U$, $f(\xi,\bar{u}) = 0$ and for some $\beta > 0$, $L > 0$ and all $u \in U$; $x,y \in \xi + \beta B$

$$\begin{cases} \|f(x,u) - f(y,u)\| \le L\|x-y\| \\ \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(\cdot,\bar{u}) \text{ is continuous on } \xi + \beta B \end{cases} .$$

Theorem 2.4. If the sublinearized differential inclusion

$$\begin{cases} w' \in \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(\xi,\bar{u})w + C_{co\ f(\xi,U)}(0) \\ w(0) = 0 \end{cases}$$

is controllable, then the system (4) is locally controllable around ξ. ▲

3. Controllability of Convex Processes

A *convex process* A from $\mathbb{R}^n$ to itself is a set-valued map satisfying

$$\forall x, y \in \text{Dom } A\ ,\ \lambda,\mu \ge 0\ ,\ \lambda A(x) + \mu A(y) \subset A(\lambda x + \mu y)$$

or, equivalently, a set-valued map whose graph is a convex cone. Convex processes are the set-valued analogues of linear operators. We shall say that a convex process is *closed* if its graph is closed and that it is *strict* if its domain is the whole space. Convex processes were introduced and studied in

Rockafellar [1967], [1970], [1974] (see also Aubin-Ekeland [1984]). We associate with a strict closed convex process A the Cauchy problem for the differential inclusion

(8) $$\begin{cases} x'(t) \in A(x(t)) & \text{a.e.} \\ x(0) = 0 & . \end{cases}$$

We say that the differential inclusion (8) is controllable if the *reachable set*

$$R := \{x(t) : x \in W^{1,1}(0,t) \text{ is a solution of } (8),\ t \geq 0\}$$

is equal to the whole space $\mathbb{R}^n$.

A particular case of (8) is a linear control system

(9) $$\begin{cases} x' = Fx + GU & u \in U \\ x(0) = 0 \end{cases}$$

where U is an m-dimensional space and $F \in L(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$, $G \in L(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^n)$ are linear operators.

We observe that the reachable set $R(T,0)$ of (8) at time T is convex. Since $0 \in A(0)$ the family $\{R(T,0)\}_{T>0}$ is increasing. Moreover, $R = \bigcup_{T>0} R(T,0)$. Hence (8) is controllable if and only if it is controllable at some time $T > 0$, i.e. $\exists\ T > 0$ such that

$$R(T,0) = \mathbb{R}^n \quad .$$

a) <u>The rank condition</u>

Let A be a strict closed convex process. Set $A^1(0) = A(0)$ and for all integer $i \geq 2$ set

$$A^i(0) = A(A^{i-1}(0)) \quad .$$

<u>Theorem 3.1</u>. The differential inclusion (8) is controllable if and only if

$$\text{for some } m \geq 1 \quad A^m(0) = (-A)^m(0) = \mathbb{R}^n \quad .$$

▲

In the case of system (9) for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ $Ax = Fx + \text{Im } G$. Thus

$$A^m(0) = (-A)^m(0) = \text{Im } G + F(\text{Im } G) + \ldots + F^{m-1}(\text{Im } G) \quad .$$

The Cayley-Hamilton theorem then implies the *Kalman rank condition* for the controllability of the linear system (9):

$$\text{rk}\,[G, FG, \ldots, F^{n-1}G] = n \quad .$$

Theorem 3.1 is a consequence of the following

b) <u>"Eigenvalue" criterion for controllability</u>

We say that a subspace P of $\mathbb{R}^n$ is *invariant* under a strict closed convex process A if $A(P) \subset P$.

A real number λ is called an eigenvalue of A if $\text{Im}(A-\lambda I) \neq \mathbb{R}^n$, where I denotes the identity operator.

<u>Theorem 3.2</u>. The differential inclusion (8) is controllable if and only if A has neither a proper invariant subspace nor eigenvalues. ▲

It is more convenient to write the above criterion in a *"dual form"*:

c) <u>"Eigenvector" criterion for controllability</u>

The convex processes can be transposed as linear operators. Let A be a convex process; we define its *transpose* A^* by

$$p \in A^*(q) \Leftrightarrow \forall (x,y) \in \text{Graph } A, \quad \langle p,x \rangle \leq \langle q,y \rangle \quad .$$

It can easily be shown that λ is an eigenvalue of A if and only if for some $q \in \text{Im}(A-\lambda I)^{\perp}$, $q \neq 0$

$$\lambda q \in A^* q \quad .$$

We call such a vector $q \neq 0$ an eigenvector of A^*. Theorem 3.2 is then equivalent to

<u>Theorem 3.3</u>. The differential inclusion (8) is controllable if and only if A^* has neither a proper invariant subspace nor eigenvectors. ▲

The proof of Theorem 3.3 is based on a separation theorem and the KY-FAN coincidence theorem [1972]. (See Aubin-Frankowska-Olech [1985]).

<u>Examples</u>: a) Let F be a linear operator from $\mathbb{R}^n$ to itself, L be a closed convex cone of controls and A be the strict closed convex process defined by

$$A(x) := Fx + L \quad .$$

Then its transpose is equal to

$$A^*(q) = \begin{cases} F^*q & \text{if } q \in L^+ \\ \emptyset & \text{if } q \notin L^+ \end{cases} \quad .$$

When $L = \{0\}$, i.e., when $A = F$, we deduce that $A^* = F^*$, so that transposition of convex processes is a legitimate extension of transposition of linear operators.

Consider the control system

$$(10) \qquad \begin{cases} x' = Ax + u, & u \in L \\ x(0) = 0 & . \end{cases}$$

<u>Corollary 3.4</u>.

The following conditions are equivalent.

a) the system (10) is controllable

b) For some $m \geqslant 1$ $L + F(L) + \ldots + F^m(L) = L - F(L) + \ldots + (-1)^m F^m(L) = \mathbb{R}^n$ (see Korobov [1980]).

c) F has neither a proper invariant subspace containing L nor an eigenvalue λ satisfying $\mathcal{I}m(F-\lambda I) + L \neq \mathbb{R}^n$.

d) F^* has neither a proper invariant subspace contained in L^+ nor an eigenvector in L^+.

e) the subspace spanned by L, $F(L), \ldots, F^{n-1}(L)$ is equal to $\mathbb{R}^n$ and F^* has no eigenvector in L^+ (see Brammer [1972]) ▲

b) Consider the control system with feedback in $\mathbb{R}^2$:

$$(11)\quad \begin{cases} x' = xv + y + u + xu & u,w \in U = [0,1] \\ y' = -x + w & v \in V(x) = \begin{cases} +1 & x \geq 0 \\ -1 & x < 0 \end{cases} \\ x(0) = y(0) = 0 & \end{cases} .$$

Set $F(x,y) = \{(xv + y + u + xu, -x + w) : (u,w,v) \in U \times U \times V(x)\}$.

Then $0 \in F(0)$, i.e. zero is a point of equilibrium. Direct computation gives

$$CF(0,0)(x,y) = (|x| + y + \mathbb{R}_+ , -x + \mathbb{R}_+) .$$

Set $A(x,y) = CF(0,0)(x,y)$. Then

$$A(0) = \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ ;\ -A(0) = \mathbb{R}_- \times \mathbb{R}_-$$

$$A^2(0) = \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} ;\ (-A)^2(0) = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_-$$

$$A^3(0) = \mathbb{R}^2 \quad ;\ (-A)^3(0) = \mathbb{R}^2 .$$

Thus by Theorem 2.2 and 3.1 the control system (11) is locally controllable around zero.

REFERENCES

Aubin J.P.

[1982] Comportement Lipschitzien des solutions de problèmes de minimisation convexes. CRAS 295, 235-238.

[1984] Lipschitz behavior of solutions to convex minimization problems. Math. Op. Res. 9, 87-111.

Aubin, J.P. and A. Cellina

[1984] Differential Inclusions, Springer Verlag.

Aubin, J.P. and I. Ekeland

[1984] Applied Nonlinear Analysis, Wiley Interscience, New York.

Aubin, J.P. and H. Frankowska

[1985] On inverse function theorems for set-valued maps. J. Math. Pure. Appl. (to appear).

Aubin, J.P., H. Frankowska and C. Olech

[1985] Controllability of convex processes. SIAM J. of Control (to appear).

Brammer, R.F.

[1972] Controllability in linear autonomous systems with positive controllers. SIAM J. Control, 10, 339-353.

Clarke, F.H.

[1975] Generalized Gradient and Applications. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 205:247-262.

[1983] Optimization and Nonsmooth Analysis. Wiley Interscience.

Ekeland, I.

[1974] On the Variational Princiople. J. Math. Anal. Appl. 47, 324-353.

Fan, Ky

[1972] A minimax inequality and applications. In Inequalities III, O. Sisha Ed. Academic Press 103-113.

Filippov, A.F.

[1967] Classical solutions of differential equations with multivalued right-hand side. English translation: SIAM J. Control, 5, 609-621.

Frankowska, H.

[1984] Local controllability and infinitesimal generators of semi-groups of set-valued maps (to appear).

Ioffe, A.E.

[to appear] On the local surjection property.

Korobov,V.I.

[1980] A geometric criterion of local controllability of dynamical systems in the presence of constraints on the control. Diff. Eqs., 15, No. 9, 1136-1142.

Rockafellar, R.T.

[1967] Monotone processes of convex and concave type. Mem. of Ann. Math. Soc. 77.

[1970] Convex Analysis. Princeton University Press.

[1974] Convex algebra and duality in dynamic models of production. In Mathematical models in Economics, Łoś (Ed.), North-Holland.

[to appear] a) Lagrange multipliers and subderivatives of optimal value functions in nonlinear programming. Math. Prog. Study No. 5, R. Wets (ed).

b) Extensions of subgradient calculus with applications to optimization.

c) Maximal monotone relations and the generalized second derivatives of non-smooth functions.

d) Lipschitzian properties of multifunctions.

Saperstone S.M. and J.A. Yorke

[1971] Controllability of linear oscillatory systems using positive controls. SIAM J. Control 9, 253-262.