HAL
open science

Approximation of Sweeping Processes and Controllability for a Set Valued Evolution

Alberto Bressan, Marco Mazzola, Khai T Nguyen

To cite this version:

Alberto Bressan, Marco Mazzola, Khai T Nguyen. Approximation of Sweeping Processes and Controllability for a Set Valued Evolution. SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 2019, 57 (4), pp.2487-2514. 10.1137/18M1189610 . hal-02966856

HAL Id: hal-02966856

https://hal.sorbonne-universite.fr/hal-02966856v1

Submitted on 14 Oct 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Approximation of Sweeping Processes and Controllability for a Set Valued Evolution

Alberto Bressan[(1)], Marco Mazzola[(2)], and Khai T. Nguyen[(3)]

[(1)] Department of Mathematics, Penn State University,
[(2)] IMJ-PRG, CNRS, Sorbonne Université,
[(3)] Department of Mathematics, North Carolina State University.

e-mails: axb62@psu.edu, marco.mazzola@imj-prg.fr, khai@math.ncsu.edu

May 23, 2018

Abstract

We consider a controlled evolution problem for a set $\Omega(t) \in I\!R^d$, originally motivated by a model where a dog controls a flock of sheep. Necessary conditions and sufficient conditions are given, in order that the evolution be completely controllable. Similar techniques are then applied to the approximation of a sweeping process. Under suitable assumptions, we prove that there exists a control function such that the corresponding evolution of the set $\Omega(t)$ is arbitrarily close to the one determined by the sweeping process.

1 Introduction

In this paper we consider a controllability problem for the evolution of a set $\Omega(t) \subset I\!R^d$. This was originally motivated by the model introduced in [4], describing the evolution of a flock of sheep, who tend to scatter around but also react to the presence of a dog. The region $\Omega(t) \subset I\!R^2$ occupied by the sheep is described as the reachable set for a differential inclusion, while the position of the dog is regarded as a control function. As in [4], we consider a "scare function" $\varphi = \varphi(r) > 0$, describing the speed at which sheep run away from the dog, depending on the distance r. Further results and extensions can be found in [9, 10]. For more general models of crowd dynamics we refer to [3]. A general theory of evolution problems in metric spaces, also describing the evolution of a set, was developed in [1, 11].

In the following we consider the evolution of a set in $I\!R^d$, and assume

(A1) *The function $r \mapsto \varphi(r)$ is continuously differentiable for $r > 0$, and satisfies*

$$\varphi' < 0, \qquad \lim_{r\to 0+} \varphi(r) = +\infty, \qquad \lim_{r\to+\infty} \varphi(r) = 0. \tag{1.1}$$

Given a function $t \mapsto \xi(t) \in I\!R^d$ describing the position of a repelling agent, we define the velocity field

$$\mathbf{v}(x,\xi) \;\doteq\; \varphi(|x-\xi|)\,\frac{x-\xi}{|x-\xi|}\,. \tag{1.2}$$

For a given initial set Ω_0, we denote by $\Omega^\xi(t)$ the set reached by trajectories of

$$\dot{x} \;\in\; \mathbf{v}(x,\xi(t))\,, \qquad\qquad x(0) \;\in \Omega_0\,. \tag{1.3}$$

In other words, for any $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega^\xi(t) \;\doteq\; \Big\{x(t)\,;\quad x(0)\in\Omega_0\,, \qquad & x(\cdot) \;\text{ is absolutely continuous,}\\ & \dot{x}(\tau) \;=\; \mathbf{v}\,(x(\tau),\,\xi(\tau)) \;\;\text{ for a.e. } \tau\in[0,t]\Big\}.\end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

Throughout the following we write $\partial\Omega$, $\overline{\Omega}$, and $int\,\Omega$, for the boundary, the closure, and the interior of a set $\Omega \subset I\!R^d$, respectively. By $B(\Omega,r)$ we denote the open neighborhood of radius r around the set Ω, while d_H denotes Hausdorff distance [2].

To avoid any difficulty about uniqueness of solutions of (1.2)-(1.3), we assume that the control $\xi(\cdot)$ is chosen so that

$$\inf_{t\in[0,\tau]}\; d(\xi(t),\Omega^\xi(t)) > 0 \qquad\qquad \text{for all } 0\leq\tau<T. \tag{1.5}$$

We wish to understand how the function φ affects the controllability properties of the evolution equation (1.3). Roughly speaking, given an initial set Ω_0 and a terminal set Ω_1, we seek a control $\xi(\cdot)$ such that, at the terminal time T, the set $\Omega^\xi(T)$ in (1.4) is arbitrary close to Ω_1.

Definition 1. *We say that the set-valued evolution (1.3) satisfies the* **Global Approximate Confinement** *property* **(GAC)** *if the following holds. Let $\Omega_0,\Omega_1 \subset I\!R^d$ be any two compact domains, with Ω_1 simply connected and such that $\Omega_1 \subset int\,\Omega_0$. Then for any $T,\varepsilon>0$, there exists a Lipschitz continuous control $\xi : [0,T] \mapsto I\!R^d$ satisfying (1.5) and such that the set (1.4) satisfies*

$$\Omega_1 \;\subseteq\; \Omega^\xi(T) \;\subseteq\; B(\Omega_1,\varepsilon) \tag{1.6}$$

If there exists a locally Lipschitz control $\xi : [0,T[\mapsto I\!R^d$ satisfying (1.5) and such that

$$\Omega^\xi(T) \;=\; \Omega_1\,, \tag{1.7}$$

we then say that the set-valued evolution (1.3) satisfies the **Global Exact Confinement** *property* **(GEC)**.

The primary goal of this paper is to find conditions which are necessary, or sufficient, to achieve the **(GAC)** or **(GEC)** properties. Indeed, we will show that these properties are determined by the asymptotic behavior of the function φ as $r\to 0+$. Our first main result is

Theorem 1 (necessary condition). *Let φ satisfy* **(A1)**. *If the* **(GAC)** *property holds, then the function φ must satisfy*

$$\int_0^1 r^{d-2}\varphi(r)\,dr \;=\; +\infty\,. \tag{1.8}$$

To state a sufficient condition, we introduce the assumption

(A2) *For every $\kappa > 0$ one has*

$$\lim_{r\to 0+} \frac{r^{d/2}\cdot\varphi(\kappa r^{1/2})+1}{r^d\cdot\varphi(r)} \;=\; 0\,. \tag{1.9}$$

Theorem 2 (sufficient condition). *If the function φ satisfies* **(A1)-(A2)**, *then the* **(GAC)** *and* **(GEC)** *properties hold.*

This result applies, in particular, to the function $\varphi(r) = r^{-\beta}$ for any $\beta > d$.

A proof of Theorem 1 will be given in Section 2, while Theorem 2 will be proved in Section 3.

The controllability of the set-valued evolution (1.4) is closely related to a result on the approximation of a sweeping process. Indeed, let $t \mapsto V(t)$ describe a moving set in $I\!R^d$. We assume that each $V(t)$ is a compact set with nonempty interior and smooth boundary, smoothly depending on time. More precisely:

$$V(t) \;=\; \{x \in I\!R^d\,;\;\; \psi(t,x) \leq 0\}, \tag{1.10}$$

where $\psi : I\!R \times I\!R^d \mapsto I\!R$ has $\mathcal{C}^2$ regularity and satisfies the nondegeneracy condition

$$\psi(t,x) \;=\; 0 \qquad \Longrightarrow \qquad \nabla_x\psi(t,x) \;\neq\; 0. \tag{1.11}$$

As usual, we denote by $N_{V(t)}(x)$ the outer normal cone to $V(t)$ at a boundary point $x \in \partial V(t)$. In the case of an interior point $x \in intV(t)$, we simply define $N_{V(t)}(x) = \{0\}$. By the well known theory of sweeping processes [5, 6, 7, 8, 12], for any initial point $x_0 \in V(0)$, the differential inclusion

$$\dot{x}(t) \;\in\; -\,N_{V(t)}(x(t)), \qquad\qquad x(0) = x_0 \tag{1.12}$$

has a unique solution $t \mapsto x(t,x_0) \in V(t)$. In turn, for a given initial set $\Omega_0 \subset V(0)$, one can consider the sets

$$\Omega(t) \;\doteq\; \{x(t,x_0)\,;\;\; x_0 \in \Omega_0\}. \tag{1.13}$$

A natural question is whether there exists a control $\xi(\cdot)$ such that the corresponding sets $\Omega^\xi(t)$ in (1.4) remain uniformly close to the sets $\Omega(t)$, for all $t \in [0,T]$. It turns out that this is true, under an assumption which slightly strengthens **(A2)**, namely:

(A2′) *For some $\beta > 1/2$ one has*

$$\lim_{r\to 0+} \frac{r^{\beta d}\cdot\varphi(r^\beta)+1}{r^d\cdot\varphi(r)} \;=\; 0. \tag{1.14}$$

In the following, $t \mapsto x^\xi(t,x_0)$ denotes the solution to

$$\dot{x}(t) \;=\; \mathbf{v}(x(t),\xi(t)), \qquad\qquad x(0) = x_0\,, \tag{1.15}$$

with $\mathbf{v}$ as in (1.2), while $t \mapsto x(t,x_0)$ is the trajectory of the sweeping process (1.12), with the same initial condition.

Theorem 3 (approximation of a sweeping process). *Assume that the function φ satisfies* **(A1)** *and* **(A2′)**. *As in (1.10)-(1.11), let $t \mapsto V(t)$ be a family of sets with $\mathcal{C}^2$ boundaries. Then, for any $T, \varepsilon > 0$ there exists a measurable control $t \mapsto \xi(t)$ such that*

$$|x^\xi(t, x_0) - x(t, x_0)| \;\leq\; \varepsilon \qquad \textit{for all } x_0 \in V(0), \quad t \in [0, T]. \tag{1.16}$$

An immediate consequence of (1.16) is that, for any initial subset $\Omega_0 \subseteq V(0)$, the corresponding sets $\Omega^\xi(t)$ in (1.4) and $\Omega(t)$ in (1.13) satisfy

$$d_H(\Omega^\xi(t),\, \Omega(t)) \;\leq\; \varepsilon \qquad \text{for all } t \in [0, T]. \tag{1.17}$$

A proof of Theorem 3 will be worked out in Section 4.

2 Proof of the necessary condition

In this section we give a proof of Theorem 1. The main idea is that, if (1.8) fails, then for any choice of the control $\xi(\cdot)$ the volume of the set Ω^ξ cannot shrink too fast. This puts a constraint on the sets that can be approximately reached at time T.

Let $t \mapsto \xi(t)$ be any admissible control. Fix any time $t \geq 0$ and let $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}(\cdot, \xi(t))$ be the vector field in (1.2). Then, calling $\delta \doteq d(\xi(t), \Omega^\xi(t))$, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\text{meas}\Big(\Omega^\xi(t)\Big) &= \int_{\Omega^\xi(t)\cap B(\xi(t),1)} \text{div}\,\mathbf{v}\,dx + \int_{\Omega^\xi(t)\setminus B(\xi(t),1)} \text{div}\,\mathbf{v}\,dx \\ &\geq\; \omega_{d-1}\int_\delta^1 r^{d-1}\varphi'(r)\,dr + \varphi'(1)\cdot\text{meas}(\Omega^\xi(t))\,. \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

Here and in the sequel ω_{d-1} denotes the $(d-1)$-dimensional measure of the surface of the unit ball in $I\!R^d$. An integration by parts yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\delta^1 r^{d-1}\varphi'(r)\,dr &= -\int_\delta^1 (d-1)r^{d-2}[\varphi(r)-\varphi(1)]\,dr - \delta^{d-1}[\varphi(\delta)-\varphi(1)] \\ &\geq\; -\int_\delta^1 (d-1)r^{d-2}\varphi(r)\,dr - \delta^{d-1}\varphi(\delta). \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

If (1.8) fails, then

$$\int_\delta^1 r^{d-2}\varphi(r)\;dr \;\leq\; M \;\doteq\; \int_0^1 r^{d-2}\varphi(r)dr \;<\; \infty\,.$$

Since φ is decreasing, one has

$$\delta^{d-1}\varphi(\delta) \;=\; \frac{1}{d-1}\cdot\int_0^\delta s^{d-2}\cdot\varphi(\delta)\;ds \;\leq\; \frac{1}{d-1}\cdot\int_0^\delta s^{d-2}\cdot\varphi(s)\;ds \;\leq\; \frac{M}{d-1}\,.$$

This implies that the right hand side of (2.2) is bounded below by a constant. Therefore, (2.1) yields

$$\frac{d}{dt}\text{meas}\Big(\Omega^\xi(t)\Big) \;\geq\; \varphi'(1)\cdot\text{meas}(\Omega^\xi(t)) - \frac{\omega_{d-1}Md}{d-1}. \tag{2.3}$$

By Gronwall's inequality, for all times $t \geq 0$ we conclude that

$$\text{meas}\Big(\Omega^\xi(t)\Big) \;\geq\; e^{\varphi'(1)\cdot t}\,\text{meas}(\Omega_0) - \frac{\omega_{d-1} M d}{d-1}\cdot t\,. \tag{2.4}$$

This a priori lower bound on the measure of the set $\Omega^\xi(t)$ shows that approximate controllability cannot be achieved. □

Remark. Assume that the divergence of the vector field $\mathbf{v}(\cdot,\xi)$ remains negative for x close to ξ, that is

$$\varphi'(r) + \frac{d-1}{r}\,\varphi(r) \;\leq\; 0 \qquad\qquad \text{for all } 0 < r < \bar r\,, \tag{2.5}$$

for some $\bar r > 0$. In this case, the Global Approximate Confinement property implies

$$\limsup_{r\to 0+}\; r^{d-1}\varphi(r) \;=\; +\infty. \tag{2.6}$$

Indeed, one can replace the estimate (2.1) with

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\text{meas}\Big(\Omega^\xi(t)\Big) \;&=\; \int_{\Omega^\xi(t)\cap B(\xi(t),\bar r)} \text{div}\,\mathbf{v}\,dx + \int_{\Omega^\xi(t)\setminus B(\xi(t),\bar r)} \text{div}\,\mathbf{v}\,dx \\
&\geq\; \int_{\delta<|x|<\bar r} \text{div}\,\mathbf{v}\,dx + \varphi'(\bar r)\cdot\text{meas}(\Omega^\xi(t)) \\
&=\; \omega_{d-1}\Big[\bar r^{d-1}\varphi(\bar r) - \delta^{d-1}\varphi(\delta)\Big] + \varphi'(\bar r)\cdot\text{meas}(\Omega^\xi(t)) \\
&\geq\; -\,\omega_{d-1}\delta^{d-1}\varphi(\delta) + \varphi'(\bar r)\cdot\text{meas}(\Omega^\xi(t))\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

If (2.6) fails, then

$$\frac{d}{dt}\text{meas}\Big(\Omega^\xi(t)\Big) \;\geq\; \varphi'(\bar r)\cdot\text{meas}(\Omega^\xi(t)) - C_1$$

for some constant C_1, and it leads again a priori lower bound on the measure of the set $\Omega^\xi(t)$.

3 Proof of the sufficient condition

Aim of this section is to provide a proof of Theorem 2. As a preliminary, consider a bounded open set $\Omega \subset I\!R^d$ with $\mathcal{C}^2$ boundary $\Sigma = \partial\Omega$. On the complement $I\!R^d \setminus \Sigma$ we consider the vector field

$$\mathbf{v}(x) \;\doteq\; \int_\Sigma \varphi(|x-\xi|)\,\frac{x-\xi}{|x-\xi|}\,d\sigma(\xi), \tag{3.1}$$

where σ denotes the $(d-1)$-dimensional surface measure on Σ. Since Σ has $\mathcal{C}^2$ regularity, for every x sufficiently close to Σ there exists a unique perpendicular projection $y_x \in \Sigma$ such that

$$|x-y_x| \;=\; d(x,\Sigma) \;\doteq\; \min_{y\in\Sigma}|x-y|\,. \tag{3.2}$$

To fix the ideas, assume that this perpendicular projection $x \mapsto y_x$ is well defined whenever $d(x,\Sigma) < r_0$, for some curvature radius $r_0 > 0$. In the following, $\mathbf{n}_x = \frac{x-y_x}{|x-y_x|}$ denotes the unit normal to the surface Σ at the point y_x.

Lemma 1. *Let the function φ satisfy* **(A1)-(A2)**. *Then the vector field* $\mathbf{v}$ *in (3.1) satisfies*

$$\lim_{d(x,\Sigma)\to 0} \langle \mathbf{n}_x\,,\, \mathbf{v}(x)\rangle \;=\; +\infty. \tag{3.3}$$



Figure 1: The portion of Σ near the point y_x can be represented as the graph of a function f, as in (4.3).

Proof. 1. Consider any point x sufficiently close to Σ so that the perpendicular projection $y_x \doteq \pi(x)$ at (3.2) is well defined. Let V_x be the hyperplane tangent to Σ at y_x and let $\mathbf{n}_x$ be the unit normal vector. As shown in Fig. 1, in a neighborhood of y_x, the surface Σ can be expressed as the graph of a function $f : V_x \mapsto I\!R$. More precisely, call $\varepsilon = d(x,\Sigma) = |x - y_x|$. Without loss of generality, we can choose a system of coordinates such that $y_x = 0$. Notice that, by the regularity and compactness of the surface Σ, we can assume that the radius δ_0 of the ball where the function f is defined is independent of $y_x \in \Sigma$. Moreover, the $\mathcal{C}^2$ norm of f remains uniformly bounded. By construction we have

$$f(0) \;=\; 0, \qquad \nabla f(0) \;=\; 0, \qquad \|f\|_{\mathcal{C}^2(B(0,\delta_0))} \;\leq\; C_0, \tag{3.4}$$

for some uniform constant C_0. Defining the constant $\kappa = \sqrt{2/C_0} > 0$, by (3.4) one has the implication

$$|y - y_x| \;<\; \kappa|x - y_x|^{\frac{1}{2}} \qquad \Longrightarrow \qquad \langle \mathbf{n}_x\,,\; x - y - f(y)\mathbf{n}_x\rangle \;\geq\; 0. \tag{3.5}$$



Figure 2: The estimates (3.10)-(3.11).

2. Next, consider the decomposition $\Sigma = \Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2 \cup \Sigma_3$, where

$$\begin{cases} \Sigma_1 &= \{y + f(y)\mathbf{n}_x\,;\quad |y| \le \kappa|x|^{1/2}\}, \\ \Sigma_2 &= \{y + f(y)\mathbf{n}_x\,;\quad \kappa|x|^{1/2} < y < \delta_0\}, \\ \Sigma_3 &= \Sigma \setminus (\Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2). \end{cases} \tag{3.6}$$

Based on (3.6), we shall estimate the vector field $\mathbf{v}$ by splitting the integral in (3.1) in three parts:

$$\mathbf{v}_i(x) \;=\; \int_{\Sigma_i} \varphi(|x-\xi|)\,\frac{x-\xi}{|x-\xi|}\,d\sigma(\xi), \qquad\qquad i = 1,2,3, \tag{3.7}$$

so that

$$\mathbf{v}(x) \;=\; \mathbf{v}_1(x) + \mathbf{v}_2(x) + \mathbf{v}_3(x).$$

In the following, for $y \in V_x$, we use the bound $|f(y)| \;\le\; \frac{C_0}{2}|y|^2$ and the identities

$$|x| \;=\; \varepsilon\,, \qquad |y| \;=\; r\,, \qquad |x-y| \;=\; \sqrt{\varepsilon^2 + r^2}\,, \qquad \mathbf{n}_x \;=\; \frac{x}{|x|}\,. \tag{3.8}$$

As long as $|y| \le \delta_0$, the above implies

$$|x - y - f(y)\mathbf{n}_x|^2 \;\in\; \Big[\varepsilon^2 + (1 - C_0\varepsilon)r^2\,,\; \varepsilon^2 + (1 + C_0\varepsilon)r^2 + C_0^2 r^4/4\Big]. \tag{3.9}$$

Using (3.9) and the monotonicity of φ we obtain the estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{n}_x\,,\, \mathbf{v}_1(x)\rangle \;&\ge\; c_0 \int_0^{\kappa\varepsilon^{1/2}} r^{d-2}\Big(\varepsilon - \frac{C_0}{2}r^2\Big)\cdot \frac{\varphi\Big(\sqrt{(\varepsilon + C_0 r^2/2)^2 + r^2}\Big)}{\sqrt{(\varepsilon + C_0 r^2/2)^2 + r^2}}\,dr \\ &\ge\; c_0 \int_0^{\kappa\varepsilon^{1/2}} r^{d-2}\Big(\varepsilon - \frac{C_0}{2}r^2\Big)\cdot \frac{\varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2 + (1 + 2C_0\varepsilon)r^2}\Big)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon^2 + (1 + 2C_0\varepsilon)r^2}}\,dr \\ &\ge\; \frac{3}{4}c_0 \int_0^{\frac{\kappa\varepsilon^{1/2}}{2}} \varepsilon r^{d-2}\cdot \frac{\varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2 + (1 + 2C_0\varepsilon)r^2}\Big)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon^2 + (1 + 2C_0\varepsilon)r^2}}\,dr\,, \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \mathbf{n}_x\,,\, \mathbf{v}_2(x)\rangle| \;&\le\; c_0 \int_{\kappa\varepsilon^{1/2}}^{\delta_0} r^{d-2}\varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2 + (1 - C_0\varepsilon)r^2}\Big)\cdot \frac{\varepsilon + C_0 r^2/2}{\sqrt{\varepsilon^2 + (1 - C_0\varepsilon)r^2}}\,dr \\ &\le\; C_1 \cdot \int_{\kappa\varepsilon^{1/2}}^{\delta_0} \frac{\varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2 + (1 - C_0\varepsilon)r^2}\Big)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon^2 + (1 - C_0\varepsilon)r^2}}\cdot r^d\,dr\,, \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

$$|\langle \mathbf{n}_x\,,\, \mathbf{v}_3(x)\rangle| \;\le\; C\,, \tag{3.12}$$

for some constants $C, C_1, c_0 > 0$. Performing the change of variable $s = r\sqrt{1 + 2C_0\varepsilon}$ in (3.10), one finds

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{n}_x\,,\, \mathbf{v}_1(x)\rangle \;&\ge\; C_2 \cdot \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}\kappa\varepsilon^{1/2}} \varepsilon s^{d-2}\cdot \frac{\varphi\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2 + s^2}\right)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon^2 + s^2}}\,ds \\ &\ge\; \frac{4C_2}{\kappa^2}\cdot \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}\kappa\varepsilon^{1/2}} s^d \cdot \frac{\varphi\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2 + s^2}\right)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon^2 + s^2}}\,ds \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C_2 > 0$. Setting $t = \sqrt{\varepsilon^2 + s^2}$, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathbf{n}_x \,,\, \mathbf{v}_1(x) \rangle &\geq \frac{4C_2}{\kappa^2} \cdot \int_{\varepsilon}^{\sqrt{\varepsilon^2 + \frac{1}{4}\kappa^2\varepsilon}} \left(t^2 - \varepsilon^2\right)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} \cdot \varphi(t)\, dt \\
&\geq \frac{4C_2}{\kappa^2} \cdot \int_{2\varepsilon}^{\frac{1}{2}\kappa\varepsilon^{1/2}} \left(t^2 - \varepsilon^2\right)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} \cdot \varphi(t)\, dt \\
&\geq \frac{4C_2}{\kappa^2} \cdot \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} \cdot \int_{2\varepsilon}^{\frac{1}{2}\kappa\varepsilon^{1/2}} t^{d-1} \cdot \varphi(t)\, dt\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, using the variable $s = \sqrt{\varepsilon^2 + (1 - C_0\varepsilon)r^2}$ in (3.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\kappa\varepsilon^{1/2}}^{\delta_0} \frac{\varphi\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2 + (1 - C_0\varepsilon)r^2}\right)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon^2 + (1 - C_0\varepsilon)r^2}} \cdot r^d\, dr &= \frac{1}{1 - C_0\varepsilon} \cdot \int_{\sqrt{\varepsilon^2 + (1 - C_0\varepsilon)\kappa^2\varepsilon}}^{\sqrt{\delta^2 + \varepsilon(\varepsilon - C_0\delta^2)}} \varphi(s) \cdot r^{d-1}\, ds \\
&\leq \frac{1}{(1 - C_0\varepsilon)^{\frac{d+1}{2}}} \cdot \int_{\sqrt{\varepsilon^2 + (1 - C_0\varepsilon)\kappa^2\varepsilon}}^{\sqrt{\delta^2 + \varepsilon(\varepsilon - C_0\delta^2)}} \varphi(s) \cdot s^{d-1}\, ds\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, it holds

$$|\langle \mathbf{n}_x \,,\, \mathbf{v}_2(x) \rangle| \;\leq\; C_3 \cdot \int_{\frac{1}{2}\kappa\varepsilon^{1/2}}^{\delta_0} s^{d-1} \cdot \varphi(s)\, ds$$

for some constant $C_3 > 0$. Setting $\tilde{\varepsilon} = 2\varepsilon$ we obtain

$$\langle \mathbf{n}_x \,,\, \mathbf{v}_1(x) \rangle \;\geq\; C_4 \cdot \int_{\tilde{\varepsilon}}^{\kappa_1\tilde{\varepsilon}^{1/2}} s^{d-1} \cdot \varphi(s)\, ds \tag{3.13}$$

and

$$|\langle \mathbf{n}_x \,,\, \mathbf{v}_2(x) \rangle| \;\leq\; C_3 \cdot \int_{\kappa_1\tilde{\varepsilon}^{1/2}}^{\delta_0} s^{d-1} \cdot \varphi(s)\, ds\,, \tag{3.14}$$

for $\kappa_1 = \frac{\kappa}{2\sqrt{2}}$ and some constant $C_4 > 0$. In particular,

$$\frac{\langle \mathbf{n}_x \,,\, \mathbf{v}_1(x) \rangle}{|\langle \mathbf{n}_x \,,\, \mathbf{v}_2(x) \rangle|} \;\geq\; \frac{C_4}{C_3} \cdot \frac{\displaystyle\int_{\tilde{\varepsilon}}^{\kappa_1\tilde{\varepsilon}^{1/2}} s^{d-1} \cdot \varphi(s)\, ds}{\displaystyle\int_{\kappa_1\tilde{\varepsilon}^{1/2}}^{\delta_0} s^{d-1} \cdot \varphi(s)\, ds} \;=\; \frac{C_4}{C_3} \cdot \left[\frac{\displaystyle\int_{\tilde{\varepsilon}}^{\delta_0} s^{d-1} \cdot \varphi(s)\, ds}{\displaystyle\int_{\kappa_1\tilde{\varepsilon}^{1/2}}^{\delta_0} s^{d-1} \cdot \varphi(s)} - 1\right].$$

If the assumption **(A2)** holds, then one has

$$\limsup_{r \to 0+} \; r^d \cdot \varphi(r) \;=\; +\infty\,.$$

This implies

$$\lim_{r \to 0+} \int_r^{\delta_0} s^{d-1} \cdot \varphi(s)\, ds \;\geq\; \limsup_{r \to 0+} \int_r^{2r} s^{d-1} \cdot \varphi(s)\, ds \;\geq\; \frac{2^d - 1}{d2^d} \cdot \limsup_{r \to 0+} \; (2r)^d \cdot \varphi(2r) \;=\; +\infty\,.$$

Applying L'Hopital's rule and the assumption **(A2)**, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \to 0+} \frac{\displaystyle\int_{\kappa_1\tilde{\varepsilon}^{1/2}}^{\delta_0} s^{d-1} \cdot \varphi(s)\, ds}{\displaystyle\int_{\tilde{\varepsilon}}^{\delta_0} s^{d-1} \cdot \varphi(s)\, ds} &= \frac{\kappa_1^d}{2} \cdot \lim_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \to 0+} \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}^{d/2-1} \cdot \varphi(\kappa_1\tilde{\varepsilon}^{1/2})}{\tilde{\varepsilon}^{d-1}\varphi(\tilde{\varepsilon})} \\
&= \frac{\kappa_1^d}{2} \cdot \lim_{\tilde{\varepsilon} \to 0+} \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}^{d/2} \cdot \varphi(\kappa_1\tilde{\varepsilon}^{1/2})}{\tilde{\varepsilon}^{d}\varphi(\tilde{\varepsilon})} \;=\; 0.
\end{aligned}$$

This yields

$$\left|\frac{\langle \mathbf{n}_x\,,\,\mathbf{v}_2(x)\rangle}{\langle \mathbf{n}_x\,,\,\mathbf{v}_1(x)\rangle}\right| \;\leq\; \frac{C_3}{C_4}\cdot\frac{\displaystyle\int_{\kappa_1\tilde{\varepsilon}^{1/2}}^{\delta_0} s^{d-1}\cdot\varphi(s)\;ds}{\displaystyle\int_{\tilde{\varepsilon}}^{\kappa_1\tilde{\varepsilon}^{1/2}} s^{d-1}\cdot\varphi(s)\;ds} \;\to\; 0 \qquad \text{as} \qquad \varepsilon\;\to\;0\,.$$

Finally, observing that

$$|\langle \mathbf{n}_x\,,\,\mathbf{v}_3(x)\rangle| \;\leq\; C,$$

the limit behavior (3.3) is clear. This achieves the proof, because the constants C_0, δ_0, κ are independent of the point $y_x \in \Sigma$. □

In the following, for $x \notin \Sigma(t)$ we denote by $\pi(t,x)$ the perpendicular projection of x on $\Sigma(t)$, and call

$$\mathbf{n}(t,x) \;\doteq\; \frac{x-\pi(t,x)}{|x-\pi(t,x)|} \tag{3.15}$$

the unit normal vector.

Corollary 1. *Consider a family of compact $\mathcal{C}^2$ surfaces $\Sigma(t)$, continuously depending on $t\in[0,T]$, with uniformly bounded curvature. Define the vector fields*

$$\mathbf{v}(t,x) \;\doteq\; \int_{\Sigma(t)} \varphi(|x-\xi|)\,\frac{x-\xi}{|x-\xi|}\,d\sigma(\xi). \tag{3.16}$$

Then for any N there exists $\delta>0$ such that, for all $t\in[0,T]$,

$$d(x,\Sigma(t))<\delta \qquad\Longrightarrow\qquad \langle \mathbf{n}(t,x)\,,\,\mathbf{v}(t,x)\rangle \;\geq\; N. \tag{3.17}$$

Indeed, this follows from Lemma 1, observing that the limit in (3.3) is uniform over all surfaces $\Sigma(t)$.

Proof of Theorem 2.

1. Let the compact sets $\Omega_1 \subset int\,\Omega_0$ be given, with Ω_1 simply connected. To fix the ideas, assume

$$B(\Omega_1,\rho) \;\subset\; \Omega_0\,, \tag{3.18}$$

for some radius $\rho>0$. Given $T>0$ and $0<\varepsilon<\rho$, we can find a decreasing family of compact sets $t\mapsto V(t)$ with $\mathcal{C}^2$ boundary, as in (1.10)-(1.11), such that

$$B(\Omega_0,\varepsilon) \;\subset\; V(0), \qquad\qquad B(\Omega_1,\varepsilon/2) \;\subset\; V(T) \;\subset\; B(\Omega_1,3\varepsilon/4). \tag{3.19}$$

Call $\Sigma(t)\doteq\partial V(t)$ the boundaries of these sets and define the vector fields

$$\mathbf{w}(t,x) \;\doteq\; \delta_0\cdot\int_{\Sigma(t)} \varphi(|x-\xi|)\,\frac{x-\xi}{|x-\xi|}\,d\sigma(\xi). \tag{3.20}$$

Here the constant $\delta_0>0$ is chosen small enough so that

$$\delta_0\cdot\int_{\Sigma(t)} d\sigma \;\leq\; 1 \qquad\qquad \text{for all } t\in[0,T], \tag{3.21}$$

$$|\mathbf{w}(t,x)| \;<\; \frac{\varepsilon}{8T} \qquad \text{for all } x \in B(\Omega_1, \varepsilon/2), \quad t \in [0,T]. \tag{3.22}$$

2. For any point $x_0 \in \Omega_0$, denote by $t \mapsto x(t, x_0)$ the solution of

$$\dot{x}(t) \;=\; \mathbf{w}(t, x(t)), \qquad\qquad x(0) = x_0\,. \tag{3.23}$$

We claim that

$$x(t, x_0) \;\in\; int\, V(t) \qquad\qquad \text{for all } t \in [0,T]. \tag{3.24}$$

To prove (3.24), let L be a Lipschitz constant for the multifunction $t \mapsto \Sigma(t)$, so that the Hausdorff distance between the two boundaries satisfies

$$d_H\Big(\Sigma(s),\, \Sigma(t)\Big) \;\leq\; L\,(t-s) \qquad \text{for any} \quad 0 < s < t < T. \tag{3.25}$$

For any trajectory $t \mapsto x(t)$ of (3.23), (3.20), consider the distance

$$d(t) \;=\; \text{dist}\Big(x(t)\,,\; \Sigma(t)\Big)$$

of $x(t)$ from the boundary $\Sigma(t) = \partial V(t)$. By Corollary 1 there is a constant $\varepsilon_1 \in]0, \varepsilon]$ such that, for any $x \in int\, V(t)$ with $\text{dist}(x, \Sigma(t)) \leq \varepsilon_1$, one has

$$\left\langle \mathbf{n}(t,x), \int_{\Sigma(t)} \varphi(|x-\xi|)\, \frac{x-\xi}{|x-\xi|}\, d\sigma(\xi) \right\rangle \;>\; \frac{L}{\delta_0}\,. \tag{3.26}$$

In view of (3.26) and (3.25), if $d(x(t), \Sigma(t)) \leq \varepsilon_1$, then the time derivative of the distance $d(t)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{d}(t) \;&\geq\; -L + \Big\langle \mathbf{n}(t, x(t)),\, \mathbf{w}(t, x(t)) \Big\rangle \\ &=\; -L + \left\langle \mathbf{n}(t, x(t)),\, \delta_0 \cdot \int_{\Sigma(t)} \varphi(|x(t)-\xi|)\, \frac{x(t)-\xi}{|x(t)-\xi|}\, d\sigma(\xi) \right\rangle \\ &>\; -L + \delta_0 \cdot \frac{L}{\delta_0} \;=\; 0\,. \end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

If $x(t)$ is a trajectory starting inside Ω_0, then $d(0) \geq \varepsilon \geq \varepsilon_1$. By (3.27) we thus have $d(t) \geq \varepsilon_1$ for all $t \in [0,T]$.

We conclude this step by observing that, for every $x_0 \in \overline{B}(\Omega_1, \varepsilon/4)$, by (3.22) the corresponding trajectory satisfies

$$|x(t, x_0) - x_0| \;\leq\; \frac{\varepsilon t}{8T} \qquad\qquad \text{for all } t \in [0,T]. \tag{3.28}$$

3. Relying on the approximation procedure developed in [4], we claim that there exists a Lipschitz control $t \mapsto \xi(t)$ for (1.2)-(1.3) that produces almost the same trajectories as (3.23). More precisely, calling $t \mapsto x^\xi(t, x_0)$ the solution to

$$\dot{x} \;=\; \mathbf{v}(x, \xi(t)), \qquad\qquad x(0) = x_0\,, \tag{3.29}$$

for every $t \in [0,T]$ and $x_0 \in \Omega_0$ one has

$$|x^\xi(t, x_0) - x(t, x_0)| \;<\; \frac{\varepsilon}{8}\,. \tag{3.30}$$

Toward this goal, for any $t \in [0,T]$, define μ^t to be the $(d-1)$-dimensional measure supported on $\Sigma(t)$, so that

$$\mu^t(A) \;=\; \int_{A\cap\Sigma(t)} d\sigma$$

for every open set $A \subset I\!R^d$. By (3.21) it follows

$$\delta_0\,\mu^t(I\!R^d) \;=\; \delta_0 \cdot [\text{surface area of } \Sigma(t)] \;\leq\; 1 \qquad\qquad \text{for all } t \in [0,T].$$

We now choose a point $\bar{x} \in I\!R^d$ very far from the origin and define the probability measure

$$\tilde{\mu}^t \;=\; \delta_0\mu^t + \Big(1 - \delta_0\,\mu^t(I\!R^d)\Big) m_{\bar{x}}$$

where $m_{\bar{x}}$ denotes a unit Dirac mass at $\bar{x}$.

Notice that, as $|\bar{x}| \to +\infty$, by the second limit in (1.1) the vector

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}(t,x) \;\doteq\; \int \varphi(|x-\xi|)\,\frac{x-\xi}{|x-\xi|}\,d\tilde{\mu}^t(\xi) \tag{3.31}$$

approaches $\delta_0\mathbf{w}(t,x)$, uniformly on compact subsets of $I\!R^d \setminus \Sigma(t)$.

Given an integer $n \geq 1$, we split the interval $[0,T]$ into n equal subintervals, inserting the points $t_i \;=\; iT/n$, $i = 0,1,\ldots,n$. For each i, the probability measure $\tilde{\mu}^{t_i}$ can now be approximated by the sum of N equal masses, say located at $\xi_{i1},\ldots,\xi_{iN}$. Defining the time step $h \doteq \frac{T}{n\,N}$, we then consider the control function

$$\xi(t) \;=\; \xi_{ij} \qquad \text{if} \quad t_i + (j-1)h < t \;\leq\; t_i + jh\,. \tag{3.32}$$

The same arguments used in [4] now show that, as $n, N \to \infty$, by suitably choosing the points ξ_{ij}, trajectories of the ODE (1.3), (3.32) converge to the corresponding trajectories of $\dot{x} = \tilde{\mathbf{v}}(t,x)$. Moreover, the convergence is uniform for all initial data in the compact set $\Omega_0 \subset I\!R^d \setminus \Sigma(0)$.

Finally, we can replace the piecewise constant function $\xi(\cdot)$ by a Lipschitz function $\widetilde{\xi}(\cdot)$. If $\|\widetilde{\xi} - \xi\|_{\mathbf{L}^1}$ is sufficiently small, the corresponding trajectories still satisfy the same estimate (3.30).

4. Recalling that

$$x(T,x_0) \;\in\; V(T) \;\subseteq\; B(\Omega_1,\, 3\varepsilon/4),$$

by (3.30) we now conclude

$$\Omega^\xi(T) \;=\; \{x^\xi(T,x_0)\,;\;\; x_0 \in \Omega_0\} \;\subseteq\; B(\Omega_1,\,\varepsilon). \tag{3.33}$$

This establishes the second inclusion in (1.6).

To prove the first inclusion, consider the continuous map $x_0 \mapsto x^\xi(T,x_0)$ from the compact set $\overline{B}(\Omega_1,\,\varepsilon/4)$ into $I\!R^d$. By (3.28) and (3.30) it follows

$$|x^\xi(T,x_0) - x_0| \;\leq\; \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \qquad \text{for all } x_0 \in \overline{B}\Big(\Omega_1,\,\frac{\varepsilon}{4}\Big). \tag{3.34}$$

For any given $y \in \Omega_1$, define the continuous map $g^y : \overline{B}(0,\varepsilon/4) \mapsto I\!R^d$ by setting

$$g^y(z) \;\doteq\; x^\xi(T,y-z) - (y-z) \qquad \text{for all } z \in \overline{B}(0,\varepsilon/4)\,.$$

By (3.34) one has

$$g^y(\overline{B}(0,\varepsilon/4)) \;\subseteq\; \overline{B}(0,\varepsilon/4).$$

Therefore, Brouwer's fixed point theorem implies

$$g^y(z_0) \;=\; z_0 \qquad \text{for some } z_0 \in \overline{B}(0,\varepsilon/4).$$

This yields

$$y \;=\; x^\xi(T,x_0) \qquad \text{with} \qquad x_0 \;=\; y - z_0 \in \overline{B}(y,\varepsilon/4).$$

Hence $\Omega_1 \subseteq \Omega^\xi(T)$.

5. Finally, to pass from approximate controllability to exact controllability one can split the interval $[0,T]$, inserting an increasing sequence of times τ_j with $\tau_j \to T-$ as $j \to \infty$. Then construct Lipschitz controls $t \mapsto \xi(t)$ on each subinterval $[\tau_{j-1},\tau_j]$ such that the corresponding sets $\Omega^\xi(\tau_j)$ satisfy

$$\overline{B}(\Omega_1, 2^{-j}) \;\subseteq\; \Omega^\xi(\tau_j) \;\subseteq\; \overline{B}(\Omega_1, 2^{1-j}).$$

□

4 Approximating a sweeping process

The key tool for the proof of Theorem 3 is the following lemma, which improves on Lemma 1 under the stronger assumption **(A2′)**.

Lemma 2. *Let $\Omega \subset I\!R^d$ be a compact set with $\mathcal{C}^2$ boundary $\Sigma = \partial\Omega$. Let $\mathbf{v}$ be the vector field in (3.1). If the function φ satisfies* **(A1)-(A2′)**, *then*

$$|\mathbf{v}(x)| \;\to\; +\infty \qquad\qquad \textit{as} \quad d(x,\Sigma) \;\to\; 0, \tag{4.1}$$

$$\left|\frac{\mathbf{v}(x)}{|\mathbf{v}(x)|} - \frac{x-\pi(x)}{|x-\pi(x)|}\right| \;\to\; 0 \qquad \textit{as} \quad d(x,\Sigma) \;\to\; 0. \tag{4.2}$$

Proof. 1. Consider any point x sufficiently close to Σ so that the perpendicular projection $y_x \doteq \pi(x)$ at (3.2) is well defined. As in the proof of Lemma 1, in a neighborhood of y_x, the surface Σ can be expressed as the graph of a function $f : V_x \mapsto I\!R$. More precisely, call $\varepsilon = d(x,\Sigma) = |x - y_x|$. Then, given $\frac{1}{2} < \alpha < 1$, we can write $\Sigma = \Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2 \cup \Sigma_3$, where

$$\begin{cases} \Sigma_1 &=\; \Big\{y + f(y)\,\mathbf{n}_x\,;\;\; y \in V_x\,,\;\; |y| \le \varepsilon^\alpha\Big\}, \\ \Sigma_2 &=\; \Big\{y + f(y)\,\mathbf{n}_x\,;\;\; y \in V_x\,,\;\; \varepsilon^\alpha < |y| \le \delta_0\Big\}, \\ \Sigma_3 &=\; \Sigma \setminus (\Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2)\,. \end{cases} \tag{4.3}$$

Notice that, by the regularity and compactness of the surface Σ, we can assume that the radius δ_0 of the ball where the function f is defined is independent of $y_x \in \Sigma$. Moreover, the $\mathcal{C}^2$ norm of f remains uniformly bounded.

Without loss of generality, in the following computations we shall assume $y_x = 0 \in I\!R^d$. By construction we again have the bounds (3.4), valid for some constant C_0, uniform w.r.t. $y_x \in \Sigma$. We shall estimate the vector field

$$\mathbf{v}(x) = \mathbf{v}_1(x) + \mathbf{v}_2(x) + \mathbf{v}_3(x)$$

by splitting the integral (3.1) in three parts, as in (3.7). Notice, however, that now we refer to the different decomposition (4.3) of the surface Σ.

2. Calling $J(y) = \sqrt{1 + |\nabla f(y)|^2}$ the Jacobian determinant of the map $y \mapsto y + f(y)\mathbf{n}_x$ from $V_x \cap B(y_x, \delta_0)$ into Σ, we have

$$\mathbf{v}_1(x) \;=\; \int_{|y|<\varepsilon^\alpha} \varphi(|x-y-f(y)\mathbf{n}_x|) \cdot \frac{x-y-f(y)\mathbf{n}_x}{|x-y-f(y)\mathbf{n}_x|}\, J(y)\, dy. \tag{4.4}$$

We write

$$\mathbf{v}_1(x) \;=\; \mathbf{v}_{11}(x) + \mathbf{v}_{12}(x),$$

where

$$\mathbf{v}_{11}(x) \;=\; \int_{|y|<\varepsilon^\alpha} \varphi(|x-y|)\, \frac{x-y}{|x-y|}\, dy\,, \qquad\qquad \mathbf{v}_{12}(x) \;=\; \mathbf{v}_1(x) - \mathbf{v}_{11}(x). \tag{4.5}$$

Notice that $\mathbf{v}_{11}(x)$ is a vector parallel to $\mathbf{n}_x$ and is computed as

$$\mathbf{v}_{11}(x) \;=\; \left(c_0 \int_0^{\varepsilon^\alpha} r^{d-2} \varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2 + r^2}\Big) \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{\varepsilon^2 + r^2}}\, dr \right) \cdot \mathbf{n}_x\,, \tag{4.6}$$

for some constant $c_0 > 0$. Hence, in order to obtain the limit (4.2), let's first prove that

$$\frac{|\mathbf{v}_{12}(x)|}{|\mathbf{v}_{11}(x)|} \;\to\; 0 \qquad \text{as} \quad \varepsilon \to 0\,. \tag{4.7}$$

The vector $\mathbf{v}_{12}(x)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{v}_{12}(x) \;&=\; \int_{|y|<\varepsilon^\alpha} \Big[\varphi(|x-y-f(y)\mathbf{n}_x|) - \varphi(|x-y|)\Big] \cdot \frac{x-y-f(y)\mathbf{n}_x}{|x-y-f(y)\mathbf{n}_x|}\, J(y)\, dy \\
&\quad + \int_{|y|<\varepsilon^\alpha} \varphi(|x-y|) \cdot \left\{ \frac{x-y-f(y)\mathbf{n}_x}{|x-y-f(y)\mathbf{n}_x|} - \frac{x-y}{|x-y|} \right\} J(y)\, dy \\
&\quad + \int_{|y|<\varepsilon^\alpha} \varphi(|x-y|) \cdot \frac{x-y}{|x-y|}\, [J(y)-1]\, dy \\
&=\; A_1 + A_2 + A_3\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

In the following, recalling (3.4), we use the bounds

$$|f(y)| \;\le\; \frac{C_0}{2}|y|^2, \qquad\qquad |J(y)-1| \;=\; \mathcal{O}(1) \cdot |y|^2, \tag{4.9}$$

and the identities (3.8). Since the function φ is decreasing and $r \leq \varepsilon^\alpha$, using (3.9) one obtains the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |A_1| &\leq C \cdot \int_0^{\varepsilon^\alpha} r^{d-2} \left[\varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2 + (1-C_0\varepsilon)r^2}\Big) - \varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\Big)\right] dr \\ &\qquad + C \cdot \int_0^{\varepsilon^\alpha} r^{d-2} \left[\varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\Big) - \varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2 + (1+2C_0\varepsilon)r^2}\Big)\right] dr \\ &\doteq A_{11} + A_{12}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

for some constant C and all $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. In addition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\frac{x-y-f(y)\mathbf{n}_x}{|x-y-f(y)\mathbf{n}_x|} - \frac{x-y}{|x-y|}\right| &\leq \left|\frac{|x-y| - |x-y-f(y)\mathbf{n}_x|}{|x-y|}\right| + \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|} \\ &\leq 2 \cdot \frac{|f(y)|}{|x-y|} \leq C_0 \cdot \frac{|y|^2}{|x-y|}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} |A_2| &\leq C \cdot \int_{|y|<\varepsilon^\alpha} \varphi\left(|x-y|\right) \cdot \frac{|y|^2}{|x-y|}\, dy = C \cdot c_0 \int_0^{\varepsilon^\alpha} r^{d-2} \varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\Big) \cdot \frac{r^2}{\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}}\, dr \\ &\leq C \cdot c_0 \int_0^{\varepsilon^\alpha} r^{d-2} \varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\Big) \cdot \frac{\varepsilon^{2\alpha}}{\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}}\, dr \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

and

$$|A_3| \leq C \cdot c_0 \int_0^{\varepsilon^\alpha} r^{d-2} \varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\Big)\, r^2\, dr \leq C \cdot c_0 \int_0^{\varepsilon^\alpha} r^{d-2} \varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\Big) \cdot \frac{\varepsilon^{2\alpha}}{\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}}\, dr \tag{4.13}$$

for a suitable constant C.

Since we are choosing $\alpha > 1/2$, comparing (4.12) and (4.13) with (4.6), it is clear that

$$\frac{|A_2| + |A_3|}{|\mathbf{v}_{11}(x)|} \leq 2C\varepsilon^{2\alpha-1} \to 0 \qquad \text{as} \quad \varepsilon \to 0. \tag{4.14}$$

Proving a similar estimate for A_1 requires more work. Performing the variable change

$$s = \sqrt{1-C_0\varepsilon} \cdot r\,,$$

one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \int_0^{\varepsilon^\alpha} r^{d-2} \left[\varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2 + (1-C_0\varepsilon)r^2}\Big) - \varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\Big)\right] dr \\ &\leq (1-C_0\varepsilon)^{-\frac{d-1}{2}} \int_0^{\varepsilon^\alpha \cdot \sqrt{1-C_0\varepsilon}} s^{d-2} \varphi\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+s^2}\right)\, ds - \int_0^{\varepsilon^\alpha} r^{d-2} \varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\Big)\, dr \\ &\leq \left[(1-C_0\varepsilon)^{-\frac{d-1}{2}} - 1\right] \int_0^{\varepsilon^\alpha} r^{d-2} \varphi\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\right)\, dr \\ &\leq C_1\varepsilon \int_0^{\varepsilon^\alpha} r^{d-2} \varphi\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\right)\, dr, \end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

for some constant C_1. Recalling (4.10) and comparing with (4.6), we thus obtain

$$\begin{aligned} A_{11} &\leq C_2\varepsilon \int_0^{\varepsilon^\alpha} r^{d-2}\varphi\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\right)\,dr \\ &\leq C_2\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+\varepsilon^{2\alpha}}\cdot\int_0^{\varepsilon^\alpha} r^{d-2}\varphi\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\right)\,\frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}}\,dr \\ &= \frac{C_2}{c_0}\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+\varepsilon^{2\alpha}}\cdot|\mathbf{v}_{11}(x)| \;\leq\; \frac{2C_2\varepsilon^\alpha}{c_0}\cdot|\mathbf{v}_{11}(x)| \end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

for some constant C_2. A similar argument yields

$$\begin{aligned} A_{12} &\leq C\cdot\left[\int_0^{\varepsilon^\alpha} r^{d-2}\varphi\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\right)\,dr \;-\left(\frac{1}{1+2C_0\varepsilon}\right)^{\frac{d-1}{2}}\cdot\int_0^{\varepsilon^\alpha\sqrt{1+2C_0\varepsilon}} r^{d-2}\varphi\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\right)\,dr\right] \\ &\leq C_3\varepsilon\int_0^{\varepsilon^\alpha} r^{d-2}\varphi\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\right)\,dr \;\leq\; \frac{2C_3\varepsilon^\alpha}{c_0}\cdot|\mathbf{v}_{11}(x)|\,. \end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

Putting together (4.10), (4.14), (4.16), and (4.17), we can compare the sizes of the vectors $\mathbf{v}_{11}$ and $\mathbf{v}_{12}$ in (4.5)–(4.8). Indeed, the previous analysis shows that

$$\frac{|\mathbf{v}_{12}(x)|}{|\mathbf{v}_{11}(x)|} \;\leq\; \frac{|A_1|+|A_2|+|A_3|}{|\mathbf{v}_{11}(x)|} \;\leq\; \frac{A_{11}+A_{12}+|A_2|+|A_3|}{|\mathbf{v}_{11}(x)|} \;\to\; 0 \qquad \text{as} \qquad \varepsilon \;\to\; 0\,. \tag{4.18}$$

3. In a similar fashion we now compute

$$\mathbf{v}_2(x) \;=\; \mathbf{v}_{21}(x)+\mathbf{v}_{22}(x), \tag{4.19}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}_{21}(x) &= \int_{\varepsilon^\alpha<|y|<\delta_0} \varphi\Big(|x-y|\Big)\cdot\frac{x-y}{|x-y|}\,dy \\ &= \left(c_0\int_{\varepsilon^\alpha}^{\delta_0} r^{d-2}\varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\Big)\cdot\frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}}\,dr\right)\mathbf{n}_x\,, \end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}_{22}(x) &= \int_{\varepsilon^\alpha<|y|<\delta_0}\Big[\varphi(|x-y-f(y)\mathbf{n}_x|)-\varphi(|x-y|)\Big]\cdot\frac{x-y-f(y)\mathbf{n}_x}{|x-y-f(y)\mathbf{n}_x|}\,J(y)\,dy \\ &\quad+\int_{\varepsilon^\alpha<|y|<\delta_0}\varphi(|x-y|)\cdot\left\{\frac{x-y-f(y)\mathbf{n}_x}{|x-y-f(y)\mathbf{n}_x|}-\frac{x-y}{|x-y|}\right\}J(y)\,dy \\ &\quad+\int_{\varepsilon^\alpha<|y|<\delta_0}\varphi(|x-y|)\cdot\frac{x-y}{|x-y|}\,[J(y)-1]\,dy \\ &= B_1+B_2+B_3\,. \end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

As in (4.12)-(4.13), we have

$$|B_2|+|B_3| \;\leq\; C_3\cdot\int_{\varepsilon^\alpha}^{\delta_0}\frac{r^d}{\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}}\cdot\varphi\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\right)\,dr \;\leq\; C_3\int_{\varepsilon^\alpha}^{\delta_0} r^{d-1}\varphi(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2})\,dr\,. \tag{4.22}$$

Using again (3.9) and the fact that φ is a decreasing function, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|B_1| &\leq C\cdot\Big[\int_{\varepsilon^\alpha}^{\delta_0} r^{d-2}\left[\varphi\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+(1-C_0\varepsilon)r^2}\right)-\varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\Big)\right]dr \\
&\qquad + \int_{\varepsilon^\alpha}^{\delta_0} r^{d-2}\left[\varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\Big)-\varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+(1+C_0\varepsilon)r^2+C_0^2r^4/4}\Big)\right]dr \\
&\doteq B_{11}+B_{12}\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.23}$$

As in (4.15), performing the variable change $s=\sqrt{1-C_0\varepsilon}\cdot r$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
B_{11} &= C\cdot\int_{\varepsilon^\alpha}^{\delta_0} r^{d-2}\left[\varphi\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+(1-C_0\varepsilon)r^2}\right)-\varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\Big)\,dr\right] \\
&= C\cdot\left[(1-C_0\varepsilon)^{-\frac{d-1}{2}}\int_{\varepsilon^\alpha\sqrt{1-C_0\varepsilon}}^{\delta_0\sqrt{1-C_0\varepsilon}} s^{d-2}\varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+s^2}\Big)\,ds-\int_{\varepsilon^\alpha}^{\delta_0} r^{d-2}\varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\Big)\,dr\right] \\
&\leq C_3\varepsilon\int_{\varepsilon^\alpha}^{\delta_0} r^{d-2}\varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\Big)\,dr+C_3\int_{\varepsilon^\alpha\sqrt{1-C_0\varepsilon}}^{\varepsilon^\alpha} r^{d-2}\varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\Big)\,dr
\end{aligned} \tag{4.24}$$

for a suitable constant C_3. Since φ is decreasing, for ε sufficiently small we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^{\varepsilon^\alpha} r^{d-2}\varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\Big)\,dr &\geq \int_{\varepsilon^\alpha(1-C_3\sqrt{\varepsilon})}^{\varepsilon^\alpha} r^{d-2}\varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\Big)\,dr \\
&\geq (1-C_3\sqrt{\varepsilon})^{d-2}\cdot\int_{\varepsilon^\alpha(1-C_3\sqrt{\varepsilon})}^{\varepsilon^\alpha} \varepsilon^{d-2}\varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\Big)\,dr \\
&\geq (1-C_3\sqrt{\varepsilon})^{d-2}\cdot\frac{C_3\varepsilon^{\alpha+\frac12}}{C_3\varepsilon^{\alpha+1}}\cdot\int_{\varepsilon^\alpha(1-C_3\varepsilon)}^{\varepsilon^\alpha} r^{d-2}\varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\Big)\,dr \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\varepsilon}}\cdot\int_{\varepsilon^\alpha(1-C_3\varepsilon)}^{\varepsilon^\alpha} r^{d-2}\varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\Big)\,dr.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.25}$$

In turn, this yields

$$\begin{aligned}
B_{11} &\leq C_3\varepsilon\int_{\varepsilon^\alpha}^{\delta_0} r^{d-2}\varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\Big)\,dr+2C_3\sqrt{\varepsilon}\int_0^{\varepsilon^\alpha} r^{d-2}\varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\Big)\,dr \\
&\leq C_3\varepsilon\int_{\varepsilon^\alpha}^{\delta_0} r^{d-2}\varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\Big)\,dr+2C_3\sqrt{\varepsilon+\varepsilon^{2\alpha-1}}\cdot\int_0^{\varepsilon^\alpha}\frac{\varepsilon r^{d-2}}{\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}}\cdot\varphi\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\right)\,dr \\
&\leq C_3\varepsilon\int_{\varepsilon^\alpha}^{\delta_0} r^{d-2}\varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\Big)\,dr+\frac{4C_3\varepsilon^{\alpha-\frac12}}{c_0}\cdot|\mathbf{v}_{11}(x)|\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.26}$$

Next, performing the change of variable $t=\sqrt{(1+C_0\varepsilon)r^2+C_0^2r^4/4}$, we estimate

$$\int_{\varepsilon^\alpha}^{\delta_0} r^{d-2}\cdot\varphi\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+(1+C_0\varepsilon)r^2+C_0^2r^4/4}\Big)\,dr \geq \int_{\varepsilon^\alpha(1+2C_0\sqrt{\varepsilon})}^{\delta_0}\frac{t^{d-2}}{1+C_4(\varepsilon+t^2)}\cdot\varphi\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+t^2}\right)dt$$

for a suitable constant C_4. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} B_{12} &\leq C \cdot \left[\int_{\varepsilon^\alpha}^{\delta_0} r^{d-2} \varphi\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\right) dr - \int_{\varepsilon^\alpha(1+2C_0\sqrt{\varepsilon})}^{\delta_0} \frac{r^{d-2}}{1+C_4(\varepsilon+r^2)} \cdot \varphi\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\right) dr \right] \\ &\leq C \cdot \left[\int_{\varepsilon^\alpha}^{\delta_0} \left(1 - \frac{1}{1+C_4(\varepsilon+r^2)}\right) r^{d-2} \varphi\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\right) dr + \int_{\varepsilon^\alpha}^{\varepsilon^\alpha(1+2C_0\sqrt{\varepsilon})} r^{d-2} \varphi\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\right) dr \right] \\ &\leq CC_4 \int_{\varepsilon^\alpha}^{\delta_0} (\varepsilon+r^2) r^{d-2} \varphi\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\right) \, dr + C \int_{\varepsilon^\alpha}^{\varepsilon^\alpha(1+2C_0\sqrt{\varepsilon})} r^{d-2} \varphi\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\right) \, dr \,. \end{aligned}$$

As in (4.25), one estimates

$$\int_{\varepsilon^\alpha}^{\varepsilon^\alpha(1+2C_0\sqrt{\varepsilon})} r^{d-2} \varphi\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\right) \leq 2\sqrt{\varepsilon} \int_0^{\varepsilon^\alpha} r^{d-2} \varphi\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\right) dr$$

for ε sufficiently small. Thus, as in (4.23), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} B_{12} &\leq CC_4 \int_{\varepsilon^\alpha}^{\delta_0} (\varepsilon+r^2) r^{d-2} \varphi\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\right) \, dr + 2C\sqrt{\varepsilon} \int_0^{\varepsilon^\alpha} r^{d-2} \varphi\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\right) dr \\ &\leq CC_4 \int_{\varepsilon^\alpha}^{\delta_0} (\varepsilon+r^2) r^{d-2} \varphi\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\right) \, dr + 4C\varepsilon^{\alpha-\frac{1}{2}} \cdot |\mathbf{v}_{11}(x)| \,. \end{aligned} \tag{4.27}$$

Combining (4.21), (4.22), (4.23), (4.26), and (4.27), we finally obtain

$$|\mathbf{v}_{22}(x)| \leq C_5 \cdot \int_{\varepsilon^\alpha}^{\delta_0} (\varepsilon+r+r^2) r^{d-2} \varphi\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\right) \, dr + C_5 \varepsilon^{\alpha-\frac{1}{2}} \cdot |\mathbf{v}_{11}(x)| \tag{4.28}$$

for some constant C_5.

4. Finally, since in (4.8) the integral over Σ_3 involves functions which are uniformly bounded over Σ, we have a trivial bound of the form

$$|\mathbf{v}_3(x)| \leq C_6 \,. \tag{4.29}$$

5. We now compare the sizes of $\mathbf{v}_{22}(x)$ and $\mathbf{v}_3(x)$ with $\mathbf{v}_{11}(x)$. From (4.6) it follows

$$|\mathbf{v}_{11}(x)| \geq c_0 \int_0^{\varepsilon^\alpha} r^d \cdot \frac{\varphi\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}\right)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}} \, dr \,.$$

Performing the change of variable $t = \sqrt{\varepsilon^2+r^2}$ one obtains

$$|\mathbf{v}_{11}(x)| \geq c_0 \int_\varepsilon^{\sqrt{\varepsilon^2+\varepsilon^{2\alpha}}} (t^2-\varepsilon^2)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} \varphi(t) \, dt \geq c_0 \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} \cdot \int_{2\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon^\alpha} r^{d-1} \varphi(r) \, dr. \tag{4.30}$$

Recalling (4.28) and (4.29), we obtain

$$\frac{|\mathbf{v}_{22}(x)| + |\mathbf{v}_3(x)|}{|\mathbf{v}_{11}(x)|} \leq C_7 \cdot \frac{\displaystyle\int_{\varepsilon^\alpha}^{\delta_0} r^{d-1} \varphi(r) \, dr}{\displaystyle\int_{2\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon^\alpha} r^{d-1} \varphi(r) \, dr} + C_5 \cdot \varepsilon^{\alpha-\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{C_7}{|\mathbf{v}_{11}(x)|} \,, \tag{4.31}$$

for some constant C_7.

By (4.18) we already know that the ratio $|\mathbf{v}_{12}|/|\mathbf{v}_{11}|$ approaches zero as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Moreover, by (4.6) and (4.20) one has

$$\mathbf{v}_{21}(x) \;=\; C_\varepsilon\, \mathbf{v}_{11}(x) \qquad \text{for some constant } C_\varepsilon > 0\,.$$

Therefore, in view of (4.31), we can conclude that (4.2) holds true provided that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0+} \frac{\displaystyle\int_{\varepsilon^\alpha}^1 r^{d-1}\varphi(r)\; dr}{\displaystyle\int_{2\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon^\alpha} r^{d-1}\varphi(r)\; dr} \;=\; 0\,. \tag{4.32}$$

We show that (4.32) is satisfied if φ satisfies the assumption **(A2′)**. Indeed, let $\beta > \frac{1}{2}$ be as in **(A2′)** and choose $\frac{1}{2} < \alpha < \beta$. Setting $\tilde\varepsilon = 2\varepsilon$, we have $\varepsilon^\alpha > \tilde\varepsilon^\beta$ if ε is sufficiently small. Consequently,

$$\int_{\varepsilon^\alpha}^1 r^{d-1}\varphi(r)dr \;\leq\; \int_{\tilde\varepsilon^\beta}^1 r^{d-1}\varphi(r)dr \qquad \text{and} \qquad \int_{2\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon^\alpha} r^{d-1}\varphi(r)dr \;\geq\; \int_{\tilde\varepsilon}^{\tilde\varepsilon^\beta} r^{d-1}\varphi(r)dr\,.$$

On the other hand, as in the proof of Lemma 1, it holds

$$\lim_{r\to 0+} \int_r^1 s^{d-1}\varphi(s)\; ds \;=\; +\infty\,.$$

Using L'Hopital's rule and the assumption (**A2′**), we obtain

$$\lim_{\tilde\varepsilon\to 0+} \frac{\displaystyle\int_{\tilde\varepsilon^\beta}^1 r^{d-1}\varphi(r)dr}{\displaystyle\int_{\tilde\varepsilon}^1 r^{d-1}\varphi(r)dr} \;=\; \lim_{\tilde\varepsilon\to 0} \frac{\tilde\varepsilon^{\beta(d-1)}\varphi(\tilde\varepsilon^\beta)\cdot(\beta\tilde\varepsilon^{\beta-1})}{\tilde\varepsilon^{d-1}\cdot\varphi(\tilde\varepsilon)} \;=\; \beta\cdot\lim_{\tilde\varepsilon\to 0}\frac{\tilde\varepsilon^{\beta d}\cdot\varphi(\tilde\varepsilon^\beta)}{\tilde\varepsilon^{d}\cdot\varphi(\tilde\varepsilon)} \;=\; 0\,.$$

This implies

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0+} \frac{\displaystyle\int_{\varepsilon^\alpha}^1 r^{d-1}\varphi(r)\; dr}{\displaystyle\int_{2\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon^\alpha} r^{d-1}\varphi(r)\; dr} \;\leq\; \lim_{\tilde\varepsilon\to 0+} \frac{\displaystyle\int_{\tilde\varepsilon^\beta}^1 r^{d-1}\varphi(r)dr}{\displaystyle\int_{\tilde\varepsilon}^{\tilde\varepsilon^\beta} r^{d-1}\varphi(r)dr} \;=\; 0,$$

proving (4.32). □

Corollary 2. *Consider a family of compact $\mathcal{C}^2$ surfaces $\Sigma(t)$, continuously depending on $t \in [0,T]$, with uniformly bounded curvature. Define the vector fields $\mathbf{v}(t,\cdot)$ as in (3.16). Then for any $N, \varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that, for all $t \in [0,T]$,*

$$\begin{aligned} d(x,\Sigma(t)) \;\leq\; \delta \qquad &\Longrightarrow \qquad |\mathbf{v}(t,x)| \;\geq\; N, \\ d(x,\Sigma(t)) \;\leq\; \delta \qquad &\Longrightarrow \qquad \left|\frac{\mathbf{v}(t,x)}{|\mathbf{v}(t,x)|} - \frac{x-\pi(t,x)}{|x-\pi(t,x)|}\right| \;\leq\; \varepsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{4.33}$$

Indeed, the proof of Lemma 2 shows that the limits (4.1)-(4.2) are uniformly valid over a family of surfaces $\Sigma(t)$ with uniformly bounded curvature.

5 Proof of Theorem 3.

Relying on Lemma 2, we can now give a proof of the convergence to the sweeping process, stated in (1.16). We recall that this sweeping process keeps all trajectories inside a moving compact set $V(t) \subset I\!R^d$ with smooth boundary $\Sigma(t)$. To fix the ideas, we assume that this set is defined in terms of a $\mathcal{C}^2$ function ψ, as in (1.10)-(1.11). The argument relies on three main properties.

(P1) There exists a radius $\rho_0 > 0$ such that, if $t \in [0,T]$ and $d(x,\Sigma(t)) \leq \rho_0$, then the perpendicular projection $\pi(t,x)$ of x on $\Sigma(t)$ is well defined. In this case we denote by $\mathbf{n}(t,x)$ the unit normal vector to $\Sigma(t)$ at the point $\pi(t,x)$, as in (3.15)

(P2) Setting

$$\mathbf{v}(t,x) \;\doteq\; \int_{\Sigma(t)} \varphi(|x-\xi|)\,\frac{x-\xi}{|x-\xi|}\,d\sigma(\xi), \tag{5.1}$$

for any $\delta > 0$ the solution $t \mapsto x^\delta(t)$ to

$$\dot{x} \;=\; \delta\,\mathbf{v}(t,x), \qquad\qquad x(0) = x_0\,. \tag{5.2}$$

satisfies $x^\delta(t) \in V(t)$, for every $x_0 \in int(V(0))$ and $t \in [0,T]$.

To see why this is true, assume $d(x^\delta(t),\Sigma(t)) < \rho_0$ and consider the unit normal vector

$$\mathbf{n}(t,x^\delta) \;\doteq\; \frac{x^\delta(t)-\pi(t,x^\delta(t))}{|x^\delta(t)-\pi(t,x^\delta(t))|}. \tag{5.3}$$

Then

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Big(d(x^\delta(t),\Sigma(t))\Big) \;\geq\; \Big\langle \delta\mathbf{v}(t,x^\delta(t)),\,\mathbf{n}(t,x^\delta)\Big\rangle - L_\Sigma\,,$$

where L_Σ is a Lipschitz constant for the multifunction $t \mapsto \Sigma(t)$. By (4.1)-(4.2), it follows that

$$\langle \mathbf{v}(t,y),\,\mathbf{n}(t,y)\rangle \;\to\; +\infty \qquad \text{as} \qquad d(y,\Sigma(t)) \to 0.$$

Hence the distance $d(x^\delta(t),\Sigma(t))$ remains uniformly positive in time, for every fixed $\delta > 0$ and all initial points x_0 at a uniformly positive distance from $\Sigma(0)$.

Finally, by the properties (1.1) of φ it follows

(P3) For every $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{4}$, by choosing $0 < \delta < \delta_0 < \varepsilon$ sufficiently small, for every $x \in V(t)$ one has the implication

$$0 \;<\; d(x,\Sigma(t)) \;\leq\; \delta_0 \qquad \Longrightarrow \qquad \left|\frac{\mathbf{v}(t,x)}{|\mathbf{v}(t,x)|} - \frac{x-\pi(t,x)}{|x-\pi(t,x)|}\right| \;<\; \varepsilon. \tag{5.4}$$

$$d(x,\Sigma(t)) \;>\; \delta_0 \qquad \Longrightarrow \qquad \delta|\mathbf{v}(t,x)| \;<\; \varepsilon. \tag{5.5}$$

Indeed, (5.4) follows from Corollary 2 and the properties (1.11) of the function ψ, defining the boundary $\Sigma(t)$. The implication (5.5) trivially holds, choosing $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small.

In the following, using the properties **(P1)**–**(P3)**, we estimate the distance between $x^\delta(t)$ and the solution $x(t, x_0)$ of the sweeping process (1.12). The proof will be given in several steps.

1. For a given initial condition $x_0 \in intV(0)$, let $t \mapsto x^\delta(t)$ be the solution to

$$\dot{x} \;=\; \delta \mathbf{v}(t, x), \qquad\qquad x(0) = x_0\,,$$

and let $t \mapsto x(t)$ be the corresponding solution to the sweeping process driven by the set $V(t)$.

For every $t \in [0, T]$ such that $d(x(t), \Sigma(t)) \leq \rho_0/2$, let $\mathbf{n}(t)$ be the unit normal vector to $\Sigma(t)$ at the point $\pi(t, x(t))$. By the regularity of $\Sigma(\cdot)$, we can extend $\mathbf{n}(\cdot)$ to a Lipschitz function defined on the entire time interval $[0, T]$. For simplicity, this extension will still be denoted by $t \mapsto \mathbf{n}(t)$.

We now split the difference as

$$w(t) \;\doteq\; x^\delta(t) - x(t) \;=\; w_1(t) + w_2(t), \tag{5.6}$$

where the vector $w_1(t)$ is parallel to $\mathbf{n}(t)$ while $w_2(t)$ is orthogonal to $\mathbf{n}(t)$. Namely,

$$w_1(t) \;\doteq\; \theta(t)\mathbf{n}(t), \qquad \theta(t) \;=\; \langle w(t), \mathbf{n}(t)\rangle, \qquad w_2(t) \;=\; w(t) - w_1(t). \tag{5.7}$$

For future use, we observe that, if $d(x^\delta(t), \Sigma(t)) \leq \rho_0$, then the unit normal vector $\mathbf{n}(t, x^\delta)$ at (5.3) is well defined and

$$|\mathbf{n}(t) - \mathbf{n}(t, x^\delta)| \;\leq\; C_{\mathbf{n}}|w(t)|, \tag{5.8}$$

for a suitable constant $C_{\mathbf{n}}$.

Our main goal is to show that $w(t)$ remains small. This will be achieved by estimating the time derivatives $\dot{w}_1(t), \dot{w}_2(t)$, considering two possible alternatives (see Fig. 3).

CASE 1: $d(x^\delta(t), \Sigma(t)) \geq \delta_0$.

CASE 2: $d(x^\delta(t), \Sigma(t)) < \delta_0$.

We observe that, by the $\mathcal{C}^2$ regularity of the boundaries $\Sigma(t) = \partial V(t)$, there exists a constant C_Σ such that

$$\langle \mathbf{n}(t, x),\, y - x\rangle \;\geq\; -\,C_\Sigma \cdot |y - x|^2 \qquad \text{for all} \quad t \in [0, T], \quad x \in \Sigma(t), \quad y \in V(t)\,. \tag{5.9}$$

In particular,

$$x(t) \in \Sigma(t) \qquad \Longrightarrow \qquad \theta(t) \;\geq\; -\,C_\Sigma\,|w_2(t)|^2. \tag{5.10}$$

2. In this step we consider the Case 1: $d(x^\delta(t), \Sigma(t)) \geq \delta_0$.

On the interval $[0, T]$, let $L_{\mathbf{n}} \geq 1$ be a Lipschitz constant for the map $t \mapsto \mathbf{n}(t)$, and let L_Σ be a Lipschitz constant for the multifunction $t \mapsto \Sigma(t)$, w.r.t. the Hausdorff distance. Observe



Figure 3: Left and center: the two different cases considered in the proof of Theorem 3, depending on the distance of $x^\delta(t)$ from the boundary $\Sigma(t)$. Right: if $d(x^\delta(t), \Sigma(t)) < \delta_0$, then the speed $\delta\,\mathbf{v}(t, x^\delta)$ can be very large, and the same is true of $\dot\theta$. To handle this situation, we need to insert a weight function W in our estimates.

that L_Σ provides a common Lipschitz constant for all trajectories $t \mapsto x(t)$ of the sweeping process.

We claim that

$$\varepsilon + C_2|w_2(t)| \;\geq\; \dot\theta(t) \;\geq\; \begin{cases} -\varepsilon - L_{\mathbf{n}}|w_2(t)| & \text{if} \quad x(t) \notin \Sigma(t) \\ -C_1 & \text{if} \quad x(t) \in \Sigma(t) \end{cases}, \qquad |\dot w_2(t)| \;\leq\; \varepsilon + C_2\,|w(t)|, \tag{5.11}$$

where $C_1 = 1 + L_\Sigma + L_{\mathbf{n}} \cdot \max_{t\in[0,T]}\{\mathrm{diam}(V(t))\}$ and $C_2 = 2L_{\mathbf{n}}$. Indeed, recalling (5.5) and (5.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dot\theta(t) &= \langle \dot w(t), \mathbf{n}(t)\rangle + \langle w(t), \dot{\mathbf{n}}(t)\rangle \\ &= \langle \dot x^\delta(t), \mathbf{n}(t)\rangle - \langle \dot x(t), \mathbf{n}(t)\rangle + \theta(t)\langle \mathbf{n}(t), \dot{\mathbf{n}}(t)\rangle + \langle w_2(t), \dot{\mathbf{n}}(t)\rangle \\ &\geq -|\dot x^\delta(t)| - |\dot x(t)| - |w_2(t)|\cdot|\dot{\mathbf{n}}(t)| \\ &\geq \begin{cases} -\varepsilon - L_{\mathbf{n}}|w_2(t)| & \text{if} \quad x(t) \notin \Sigma(t), \\ -\varepsilon - L_\Sigma - L_{\mathbf{n}}|w_2(t)| & \text{if} \quad x(t) \in \Sigma(t). \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

Moreover,

$$\dot\theta(t) \;\leq\; \langle \dot x^\delta(t), \mathbf{n}(t)\rangle - \langle \dot x(t), \mathbf{n}(t)\rangle + |w_2(t)|\cdot|\dot{\mathbf{n}}(t)| \;\leq\; \varepsilon + L_{\mathbf{n}}\,|w_2(t)|. \tag{5.13}$$

Together, (5.12)-(5.13) yield the upper and lower bounds on $\dot\theta$ in (5.11).

Next, by (5.7) one has

$$\begin{aligned} |\dot w_2(t)| &= \left|\frac{d}{dt}\,[w(t) - w_1(t)]\right| \;=\; \left|\frac{d}{dt}\Big[w(t) - \langle w(t), \mathbf{n}(t)\rangle\,\mathbf{n}(t)\Big]\right| \\ &= \Big|\dot w(t) - \langle \dot w(t), \mathbf{n}(t)\rangle\,\mathbf{n}(t) - \langle w(t), \dot{\mathbf{n}}(t)\rangle\,\mathbf{n}(t) - \langle w(t), \mathbf{n}(t)\rangle\,\dot{\mathbf{n}}(t)\Big| \\ &\leq \Big|\dot w(t) - \langle \dot w(t), \mathbf{n}(t)\rangle\,\mathbf{n}(t)\Big| + 2L_{\mathbf{n}}\,|w(t)|\,. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\dot x(t)$ is either zero or parallel to $\mathbf{n}(t)$, by (5.5) it follows

$$\Big|\dot w(t) - \langle \dot w(t), \mathbf{n}(t)\rangle\,\mathbf{n}(t)\Big| \;=\; \Big|\delta\,\mathbf{v}(t, x^\delta(t)) - \dot x(t) - \langle \delta\,\mathbf{v}(t, x^\delta(t)) - \dot x(t), \mathbf{n}(t)\rangle\,\mathbf{n}(t)\Big|$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \ |\delta\, \mathbf{v}(t, x^\delta(t)) - \langle \delta\, \mathbf{v}(t, x^\delta(t)), \mathbf{n}(t)\rangle\, \mathbf{n}(t)| \\
&\le \ |\delta\, \mathbf{v}(t, x^\delta(t))| \ \le \ \varepsilon\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

This implies the second inequality in (5.11). In particular, if $x(t) \in int(V(t))$ then $\dot{x}(t) = 0$ and

$$
\frac{d}{dt}|w(t)| \ \le \ 3(\varepsilon + \mathbf{L_n}\, |w(t)|)\,. \tag{5.14}
$$

3. In this step we consider Case 2: $d(x^\delta(t), \Sigma(t)) < \delta_0$. As long as

$$
|w(t)| \ \le \ \frac{1}{4C_\mathbf{n}}, \tag{5.15}
$$

we claim that

$$
\theta(t) \ \le \ \delta_0 + C_3(\delta_0 + |w(t)|)^2, \tag{5.16}
$$

$$
\dot{\theta}(t) \ \ge \ \begin{cases} -L_\mathbf{n}|w_2(t)| & \text{if} \quad x(t) \notin \Sigma(t), \\ -C_1 & \text{if} \quad x(t) \in \Sigma(t), \end{cases} \qquad |\dot{w}_2(t)| \ \le \ C_4(\varepsilon + |w(t)|)(1 + |\dot{\theta}(t)|), \tag{5.17}
$$

for some constants C_3, C_4.

Notice that, if $d(x(t), \Sigma(t)) \ge \rho_0/2$, we then have $|w(t)| \ge \rho_0/4$, because without loss of generality we can assume $\delta_0 < \varepsilon < \rho_0/4$. In this case the estimate (5.16) is trivially satisfied, by choosing a constant C_3 large enough.

In the following, we thus assume $d(x(t), \Sigma(t)) \ge \rho_0/2$, so that the projection $\pi(t, x(t))$ is well defined. Recalling (5.6)–(5.9) we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\theta(t) \ &= \ \Big\langle x^\delta(t) - x(t), \mathbf{n}(t)\Big\rangle \ = \ \Big\langle x^\delta(t) - \pi(t, x^\delta), \mathbf{n}(t)\Big\rangle + \Big\langle \pi(t, x^\delta) - x(t), \mathbf{n}(t)\Big\rangle \\
&\le \ \Big|x^\delta(t) - \pi(t, x^\delta)\Big| + \Big\langle \pi(t, x^\delta) - x(t), \mathbf{n}(t)\Big\rangle \\
&\le \ \delta_0 + \Big\langle \pi(t, x^\delta) - x(t),\, \mathbf{n}(t) - \mathbf{n}(t, x^\delta)\Big\rangle + \Big\langle \pi(t, x^\delta) - x(t),\, \mathbf{n}(t, x^\delta)\Big\rangle \\
&\le \ \delta_0 + C_\mathbf{n}\, |w(t)|\, \Big|\pi(t, x^\delta) - x(t)\Big| + C_\Sigma\, \Big|\pi(t, x^\delta) - x(t)\Big|^2 \\
&\le \ \delta_0 + C_\mathbf{n}\, |w(t)|\, (\delta_0 + |w(t)|) + C_\Sigma\, (\delta_0 + |w(t)|)^2 \\
&\le \ \delta_0 + C_3\, (\delta_0 + |w(t)|)^2
\end{aligned}
$$

for a suitable constant C_3. This implies (5.16).

Using (5.4), the time derivative $\dot{\theta}$ can be estimated as

$$
\begin{aligned}
\dot{\theta}(t) \ &= \ \langle \dot{w}(t), \mathbf{n}(t)\rangle + \langle w(t), \dot{\mathbf{n}}(t)\rangle \ \ge \ \langle \dot{x}^\delta(t), \mathbf{n}(t)\rangle - |\dot{x}(t)| - |w_2(t)|\, |\dot{\mathbf{n}}(t)| \\
&= \ \delta|\mathbf{v}(t, x^\delta)| \Big\langle \Big(\tfrac{\mathbf{v}(t,x^\delta)}{|\mathbf{v}(t,x^\delta)|} - \mathbf{n}(t, x^\delta)\Big) + \Big(\mathbf{n}(t, x^\delta) - \mathbf{n}(t)\Big) + \mathbf{n}(t),\, \mathbf{n}(t)\Big\rangle \\
&\qquad - |\dot{x}(t)| - |w_2(t)|\, |\dot{\mathbf{n}}(t)| \qquad\qquad (5.18) \\
&\ge \ \begin{cases} \delta|\mathbf{v}(t, x^\delta)|\Big(-\varepsilon - C_\mathbf{n}|w(t)| + 1\Big) - L_\mathbf{n}\, |w_2(t)| & \text{if} \quad x(t) \notin \Sigma(t), \\ \delta|\mathbf{v}(t, x^\delta)|\Big(-\varepsilon - C_\mathbf{n}|w(t)| + 1\Big) - L_\Sigma - L_\mathbf{n}\, |w_2(t)| & \text{if} \quad x(t) \in \Sigma(t). \end{cases}
\end{aligned}
$$

As long as (5.15) holds, we have $1-\varepsilon-C_{\mathbf{n}}|w(t)|\geq\frac{1}{2}$. This already yields the first inequality in (5.17). From (5.18) we also deduce

$$|\delta\mathbf{v}(t,x^\delta)| \;\leq\; 2(C_1+|\dot\theta(t)|). \tag{5.19}$$

In turn, this yields

$$\begin{aligned}
|\dot w_2(t)| &\leq \Big|\delta\mathbf{v}(t,x^\delta)-\langle\delta\,\mathbf{v}(t,x^\delta),\mathbf{n}(t)\rangle\,\mathbf{n}(t)\Big|+2L_{\mathbf{n}}\,|w(t)|\\
&\leq |\delta\mathbf{v}(t,x^\delta)|\left|\frac{\mathbf{v}(t,x^\delta)}{|\mathbf{v}(t,x^\delta)|}-\mathbf{n}(t)\right|+2L_{\mathbf{n}}\,|w(t)|\\
&\leq |\delta\mathbf{v}(t,x^\delta)|\left\{\left|\frac{\mathbf{v}(t,x^\delta)}{|\mathbf{v}(t,x^\delta)|}-\mathbf{n}(t,x^\delta)\right|+\Big|\mathbf{n}(t,x^\delta)-\mathbf{n}(t)\Big|\right\}+2L_{\mathbf{n}}\,|w(t)|\\
&\leq |\delta\mathbf{v}(t,x^\delta)|\,(\varepsilon+C_{\mathbf{n}}|w(t)|)+2L_{\mathbf{n}}\,|w(t)|\\
&\leq 2(C_1+|\dot\theta(t)|)\,(\varepsilon+C_{\mathbf{n}}|w(t)|)+2L_{\mathbf{n}}\,|w(t)|,
\end{aligned}$$

establishing the second inequality in (5.17).

4. In this step we prove that there exists a constant $C_5>0$ such that, for every $t\in[0,T]$,

$$|\theta(t)| \;\leq\; C_5(\varepsilon+\widetilde w_2(t))\,, \tag{5.20}$$

where

$$\widetilde w_2(t) \;\doteq\; \max_{s\in[0,t]}\;|w_2(s)| \qquad \text{for all } t\in[0,T]. \tag{5.21}$$

Notice that, if $x(t)\in\Sigma(t)$, then (5.10) applies. Let us assume that $x(t)\notin\Sigma(t)$ and define the time

$$t_0 \;\doteq\; \inf\{s\in[0,t]\;;\;x(r)\notin\Sigma(r)\quad\text{for all } r\in[s,t]\}\,.$$

From (5.11) and (5.17) it follows

$$\dot\theta(s) \;\geq\; -\varepsilon-L_{\mathbf{n}}|w_2(s)|) \;\geq\; -\varepsilon-L_{\mathbf{n}}\widetilde w_2(s) \qquad \text{for a.e. } s\in[t_0,t]\,.$$

This yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta(t) &= \theta(t_0)+\int_{t_0}^t\dot\theta(s)\,ds \;\geq\; \theta(t_0)-\int_{t_0}^t\varepsilon+L_{\mathbf{n}}\widetilde w_2(s)\;ds\\
&\geq -C_\Sigma\,|w_2(t_0)|^2-T(\varepsilon+L_{\mathbf{n}}\widetilde w_2(t)) \;\geq\; -C_\Sigma\,\widetilde w_2^2(t)-T(\varepsilon+L_{\mathbf{n}}\widetilde w_2(t))\,.
\end{aligned}$$

As long as $\widetilde w_2(t)<1$, recalling that $L_{\mathbf{n}}\geq 1$ we have

$$\theta(t) \;\geq\; -(C_\Sigma+TL_{\mathbf{n}})\cdot(\varepsilon+\widetilde w_2(t))\,.$$

Thus, to obtain (5.20), one only needs to consider the case where $\theta(t)>0$. Observe that, if $d(x^\delta(t),\Sigma(t))\leq\delta_0$, as long as

$$\varepsilon+|w(t)| \;\leq\; \frac{1}{2C_3}\,, \tag{5.22}$$

from (5.16) it follows

$$\theta(t) \;\leq\; \widetilde{C}_5(\varepsilon + \widetilde{w}_2(t)) \tag{5.23}$$

for some constant $\widetilde{C}_5$.

We claim that (5.20) holds, for a suitable constant C_5. Indeed, consider the time

$$t_1 \;\doteq\; \inf\Big\{s \in [0,t)\,;\; \theta(r) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad d(x^\delta(r), \Sigma(r)) > \delta_0 \quad \text{for all } r \in (s,t)\Big\}.$$

We then have $\theta(t_1) \leq \widetilde{C}_5(\varepsilon + \widetilde{w}_2(t))$. Therefore, by (5.23) and (5.11) it follows

$$\begin{aligned}\theta(t) \;&=\; \theta(t_1) + \int_{t_1}^t \dot\theta(s)\,ds \;\leq\; \widetilde{C}_5(\varepsilon + \widetilde{w}_2(t_1)) + \int_{t_1}^t \Big(\varepsilon + C_2|w_2(s)|\Big)\,ds \\ &\leq\; \widetilde{C}_5(\varepsilon + \widetilde{w}_2(t)) + \int_{t_1}^t \Big(\varepsilon + C_2\widetilde{w}_2(t)\Big)\,ds \;\leq\; C_5(\varepsilon + \widetilde{w}_2(t)).\end{aligned}$$

5. In the following we shall assume $|w(t)| \leq \rho_0/3$ for all $t \in [0,T]$. In this case, when $d(x(t), \Sigma(t)) > \rho_0$ we have $\dot x(t) = 0$, $|\dot x^\delta(t)| < \varepsilon$ and the estimates are trivial. Without loss of generality, we can thus assume that the normal vectors $\mathbf{n}(t)$ and $\mathbf{n}(t, x^\delta)$ are well defined.

For a suitable constant κ (to be determined later), define the weight

$$W(t) \;\doteq\; \begin{cases} \exp\Big\{-\kappa\, d(x^\delta(t), \Sigma(t))\Big\} & \text{if} \quad d(x^\delta(t), \Sigma(t)) \leq \delta_0\,, \\ \exp\{-\kappa\delta_0\} & \text{if} \quad d(x^\delta(t), \Sigma(t)) \geq \delta_0\,. \end{cases} \tag{5.24}$$

We now analyze how the weighted distance

$$\Lambda(t) \;\doteq\; |\theta(t)| + W(t)\,\widetilde{w}_2(t)$$

changes in time. The heart of the matter is to provide a bound on $\widetilde{w}_2$. Indeed, by (5.20) the component $w_1(t) = \theta(t)\mathbf{n}(t)$ can be bounded in terms of $\widetilde{w}_2(t)$.

6. At any point $t \in [0,T]$ where $w_2(\cdot)$ is differentiable, by the definition of $\widetilde{w}_2$ it follows

$$0 \;\leq\; \frac{d}{dt}\,\widetilde{w}_2(t) \;\leq\; |\dot w_2(t)|. \tag{5.25}$$

We first consider Case 1, where $d(x^\delta(t), \Sigma(t)) \geq \delta_0$. By (5.11) and (5.20), we have that $\dot W(t) = 0$ and

$$|\dot w_2(t)| \;\leq\; \varepsilon + C_2\,|w(t)| \;\leq\; C_2\,(\varepsilon + |\theta(t)| + \widetilde{w}_2(t)) \;\leq\; C_2\,(1 + C_5)(\varepsilon + \widetilde{w}_2(t))\,.$$

Therefore, (5.25) yields

$$\frac{d}{dt}\,(W(t)\widetilde{w}_2(t)) \;=\; W(t)\,\frac{d}{dt}\widetilde{w}_2(t) \;\leq\; W(t)\cdot|\dot w_2(t)| \;\leq\; C_2\,(1 + C_5)W(t)(\varepsilon + \widetilde{w}_2(t))\,.$$

On the other hand, in the case where $d(x^\delta(t),\Sigma(t)) < \delta_0$, by (5.17) and (5.20) one has

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\dot w_2(t)| &\le C_4(\varepsilon+|w(t)|)(1+|\dot\theta(t)|)\\
&\le C_4(\varepsilon+|\theta(t)|+\widetilde w_2(t))(1+|\dot\theta(t)|) \;\le\; (C_4+C_4C_5)(\varepsilon+\widetilde w_2(t))(1+|\dot\theta(t)|)\\
&\le \begin{cases} (C_4+C_4C_5)(1+C_1)\,(\varepsilon+\widetilde w_2(t)) & \text{if} \quad \dot\theta(t)\le 0,\\ (C_4+C_4C_5)(\varepsilon+\widetilde w_2(t))(1+\dot\theta(t)) & \text{if} \quad \dot\theta(t)>0\,,\end{cases}\\
&\le \begin{cases} C_6(\varepsilon+\widetilde w_2(t)) & \text{if} \quad \dot\theta(t)\le 0,\\ C_6(\varepsilon+\widetilde w_2(t))(1+\dot\theta(t)) & \text{if} \quad \dot\theta(t)>0\,,\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
$$

By (5.25), for a.e. $t\in[0,T]$ one has

$$
\frac{d}{dt}\widetilde w_2(t) \;\le\; \begin{cases} C_6(\varepsilon+\widetilde w_2(t)) & \text{if} \quad \dot\theta(t)\le 0,\\ C_6(\varepsilon+\widetilde w_2(t))(1+\dot\theta(t)) & \text{if} \quad \dot\theta(t)>0\,.\end{cases} \tag{5.26}
$$

As long as $\varepsilon+|w(t)|\le \frac{1}{2C_1(2C_{\mathbf{n}}+C_4)}$, from (5.8), (5.12), and (5.19), it follows

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\, d(x^\delta(t),\Sigma(t)) &\ge \Big\langle \delta\mathbf{v}(t,x^\delta(t)),\, \mathbf{n}(t,x^\delta)\Big\rangle - L_\Sigma\\
&\ge \Big\langle \delta\mathbf{v}(t,x^\delta(t)),\, \mathbf{n}(t)\Big\rangle - C_{\mathbf{n}}|w(t)|\cdot|\delta\mathbf{v}(t,x^\delta(t))| - L_\Sigma\\
&\ge \Big\langle \dot w_1(t),\, \mathbf{n}(t)\Big\rangle + \Big\langle \dot w_2(t),\, \mathbf{n}(t)\Big\rangle + \Big\langle \dot x(t),\, \mathbf{n}(t)\Big\rangle - C_{\mathbf{n}}|w(t)|\cdot|\delta\mathbf{v}(t,x^\delta(t))| - L_\Sigma\\
&\ge \dot\theta(t) - |\dot w_2(t)| - C_{\mathbf{n}}|w(t)|\cdot|\delta\mathbf{v}(t,x^\delta(t))| - L_\Sigma\\
&\ge \dot\theta(t) - C_4(\varepsilon+|w(t)|)\cdot(1+|\dot\theta(t)|) - 2C_{\mathbf{n}}|w(t)|\cdot(C_1+|\dot\theta(t)|) - L_\Sigma\\
&\ge \dot\theta(t) - (2C_{\mathbf{n}}+C_4)(\varepsilon+|w(t)|)\cdot(C_1+|\dot\theta(t)|) - L_\Sigma \;\ge\; \tfrac12\dot\theta(t) - C_7
\end{aligned}
$$

for some constant $C_7>0$. Inserting the weight, we now estimate

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\Big(W(t)\widetilde w_2(t)\Big) &= -\kappa W(t)\widetilde w_2(t)\cdot\frac{d}{dt}d(x^\delta(t),\Sigma(t)) + W(t)\cdot\frac{d}{dt}\widetilde w_2(t)\\
&\le -\frac{\kappa}{2}W(t)\widetilde w_2(t)\dot\theta(t) + \kappa C_7 W(t)\widetilde w_2(t) + W(t)\cdot\frac{d}{dt}\widetilde w_2(t)\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

Two cases can occur:

- If $\dot\theta(t)\le 0$, then (5.26) and (5.17) yield

$$
\frac{d}{dt}\Big(W(t)\widetilde w_2(t)\Big) \;\le\; C_8\, W(t)\,(\varepsilon+\widetilde w_2(t))
$$

  for some constant C_8.

- If $\dot\theta(t) > 0$, then (5.26) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\,(W(t)\widetilde{w}_2(t)) &\leq -\frac{\kappa}{2}W(t)\widetilde{w}_2(t)\dot\theta(t) + W(t)\cdot\frac{d}{dt}\widetilde{w}_2(t) + \kappa C_7 W(t)\widetilde{w}_2(t)\\ &\leq -\frac{\kappa}{2}W(t)\widetilde{w}_2(t)\dot\theta(t) + C_6 W(t)(\varepsilon+\widetilde{w}_2(t))(1+\dot\theta(t)) + \kappa C_7 W(t)\widetilde{w}_2(t)\\ &\leq W(t)\cdot\left[\left(-\frac{\kappa}{2}\widetilde{w}_2(t) + C_6\cdot(\varepsilon+\widetilde{w}_2(t))\right)\cdot\dot\theta(t) + (C_6+\kappa C_7)(\varepsilon+\widetilde{w}_2(t))\right].\end{aligned}$$

We now choose the constant κ in (5.24) so that

$$\frac{\kappa}{2} \geq 2C_6\,.$$

In this case, either $\widetilde{w}_2(t) < \varepsilon$, or else

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\Big(W(t)\,\widetilde{w}_2(t)\Big) &\leq W(t)\cdot\left[\left(-\frac{\kappa}{2}+2C_6\right)\dot\theta(t)\widetilde{w}_2(t) + (C_6+\kappa C_7)(\varepsilon+\widetilde{w}_2(t))\right]\\ &\leq W(t)\,(C_6+\kappa C_7)(\varepsilon+\widetilde{w}_2(t))\,.\end{aligned} \tag{5.27}$$

Combining both Cases 1 and 2, we obtain that either $\widetilde{w}_2(t) \leq \varepsilon$ or else

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Big(W(t)\,\widetilde{w}_2(t)\Big) \leq C_9\,W(t)\,\widetilde{w}_2(t), \tag{5.28}$$

provided that

$$\varepsilon + |\theta(t)| + \widetilde{w}_2(t) \leq \min\left\{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4C_{\mathbf{n}}}, \frac{1}{2C_3}, \frac{1}{2C_1(2C_{\mathbf{n}}+C_4)}, \frac{\rho_0}{3}\right\}. \tag{5.29}$$

7. To complete the argument, consider the time

$$\bar t \doteq \sup\Big\{\tau\in[0,T]\,;\ (5.29)\text{ holds for all } t\in[0,\tau]\Big\}.$$

Since $\widetilde{w}_2(t)$ is continuous and non-decreasing, there exists $t_\varepsilon \in [0,\bar t]$ such that

$$\begin{cases}\widetilde{w}_2(t) \leq \varepsilon & \text{for all } t\in[0,t_\varepsilon],\\ \widetilde{w}_2(t) > \varepsilon & \text{for all } t\in\,]t_\varepsilon,\bar t]\,.\end{cases}$$

Hence (5.28) implies

$$W(t)\widetilde{w}_2(t) \leq e^{C_9(t-t_\varepsilon)}W(t_\varepsilon)\widetilde{w}_2(t_\varepsilon) \qquad \text{for all } t_\varepsilon \leq t \leq \bar t\,.$$

Since $e^{-\kappa\delta_0} \leq W(t) \leq 1$, we have

$$\widetilde{w}_2(t) \leq \exp\left(C_9 T + \kappa\cdot\delta_0\right)\cdot\varepsilon \qquad \text{for all } t\in[0,\bar t]\,.$$

Recalling (5.20), we obtain

$$|\theta(t)| \leq C_5\,\left[\exp\left(C_9 T + \kappa\cdot\delta_0\right)+1\right]\cdot\varepsilon \qquad \text{for all } t\in[0,\bar t]\,.$$

This yields

$$\varepsilon + |\theta(t)| + \widetilde{w}_2(t) \;\leq\; C_{10}\,\varepsilon \qquad \text{for all } t \in [0, \bar{t}],$$

where

$$C_{10} \;=\; (1 + C_5)\left[\exp\left(C_9 T + \kappa \cdot \delta_0\right) + 1\right] .$$

Therefore, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\varepsilon \;<\; \frac{1}{C_{10}} \min\left\{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4C_{\mathbf{n}}}, \frac{1}{2C_3}, \frac{1}{2C_1(2C_{\mathbf{n}} + C_4)}, \frac{\rho_0}{3}\right\},$$

we conclude that

$$\bar{t} = T, \qquad\qquad |w(t)| \;\leq\; |\theta(t)| + \widetilde{w}_2(t) \;\leq\; C_{10}\,\varepsilon \qquad \text{for all } t \in [0, T]\,. \tag{5.30}$$

8. The previous analysis has shown that, by choosing $\delta > 0$ small enough, the sweeping process can be arbitrarily well approximated by the evolution generated by the vector field $\delta\mathbf{v}(t, x)$. Repeating the argument in step **3** of the proof of Theorem 2, we now construct a control function $t \mapsto \xi(t)$ such that trajectories of the ODE

$$\dot{x}(t) \;=\; \varphi(|x - \xi(t)|)\frac{x - \xi(t)}{|x - \xi(t)|}$$

approximate the trajectories of $\dot{x} = \delta\,\mathbf{v}(t, x)$, uniformly for $t \in [0, T]$ and for all initial data in the compact set $\Omega_0 \subset I\!R^d \setminus \Sigma(0)$. This completes the proof. □

Acknowledgments. The research by K. T. Nguyen was partially supported by a grant from the Simons Foundation/SFARI (521811, NTK).

References

[1] J. P. Aubin, Mutational equations in metric spaces, *Set Valued Anal.* **1** (1993), 3–46.

[2] J. P. Aubin, and A. Cellina, *Differential inclusions. Set-valued maps and viability theory.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1984.

[3] N. Bellomo and C. Dogbe, On the modeling of traffic and crowds: a survey of models, speculations, and perspectives. *SIAM Review* **53** (2011), 409-463.

[4] A. Bressan and D. Zhang, Control problems for a class of set valued evolutions, *Set Valued. Var. Anal.* **20** (2012), 581–601.

[5] T. Cardinali, G. Colombo, F. Papalini, and M. Tosques, On a class of evolution equations without convexity, *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Meth. Appl.* **28** (1997), 217–234.

[6] G. Colombo and V. Goncharov, The sweeping processes without convexity, *Set Valued Anal.* **7** (1999), 357–374.

[7] G. Colombo and M. Monteiro Marques, Sweeping by a continuous ϕ-convex set, *J. Differential Equations* **187** (2003), 46–72.

[8] R. M. Colombo and M. Lécureux-Mercier, An analytical framework to describe the interactions between individuals and a continuum. *J. Nonlinear Science*, **22** (2012), 39–61.

[9] R. M. Colombo and N. Pogodaev, Confinement strategies in a model for the interaction between individuals and a continuum, *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.* **11** (2012), 741–770.

[10] R. M. Colombo and N. Pogodaev, On the control of moving sets: positive and negative confinement results. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **51** (2013), 380–401.

[11] T. Lorenz, *Mutational Analysis*. Lecture Notes in Math. **1996**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2010.

[12] J. J. Moreau, Evolution problem associated with a moving convex set in a Hilbert space, *J. Differential Equations* **26**, (1977), 347–374.