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Introduction

In the present contribution we propose a new proof of the so-called fictitious space lemma. For the proof, we exhibit an explicit expression for the inverse of additive Schwarz preconditionner in terms of Moore-Penrose pseudo inverse of the map associated to the decomposition over the subdomain partition.

We will first briefly recall the definition of the pseudo-inverse of a matrix and some of its remarkable properties. We will then explain how this concept can be used to reformulate the fictitious space lemma in a very compact form. We will then give an alternative proof of the fictitious space lemma. As a remarkable feature, this proof does not rely on Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, as opposed to previous proofs provided by Nepomnyaschikh [5, 4], Griebel and Oswald [2] or Dolean, Jolivet and Nataf[1], see also [6]. The present proof applies directly in the infinite dimensional case.

1 Moore-Penrose pseudo-inverse

Assume given Hilbert spaces $H$ (resp. $V$) equipped with the norms $\| \cdot \|_H$ (resp. $\| \cdot \|_V$) and consider a surjective map $R: V \to H$. Define $R^{-1}(\{y\}) := \{x' \in H, Rx' = y\}$. The Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse of this map, denoted $R^\dagger: H \to V$, is defined, for all $y \in H$, by

$$R \cdot R^\dagger y = y \quad \text{and} \quad \|R^\dagger y\|_V = \inf_{x \in R^{-1}(\{y\})} \|x\|_V. \quad (1)$$

The property above directly implies that $R^\dagger$ is injective. Let us denote $V_R = \text{Ker}(R)^\perp$. For any $y \in H$, since the restricted operator $R|_{V_R}: V_R \to H$ is a bijection, there exists a unique $x \in V_R$ such that $Rx = y$. Besides, if $x' \in V$ is another element satisfying $Rx' = y$ then $x - x' \in \text{Ker}(R)$ so that $(x, x - x')_V$ and thus, by Pythagore’s rule,

$$\|x\|_V^2 \leq \|x\|_V^2 + \|x - x'\|_V^2 = \|x'\|_V^2 \quad (2)$$

As a consequence $x \in V$ solves the minimization problem (1) i.e. $x = R^\dagger y$. From this discussion we conclude that $R^\dagger = (R|_{V_R})^{-1}$.

The property $RR^\dagger = \text{Id}$ implies that $(R^\dagger R)^2 = R^\dagger (RR^\dagger) R = R^\dagger R$ i.e. $R^\dagger R$ is a projector. Because $R^\dagger$ is injective we obtain $\text{Ker}(R^\dagger R) = \text{Ker}(R)$. Besides for any $x \in V_R$ satisfying
\(Rx = y\), we have seen that \(x = R^\dagger y = R^\dagger R x\) which implies \(V_R = \text{Im}(R^\dagger R)\). As a conclusion, since \(\text{Ker}(R)\) and \(V_R\) are orthogonal by definition, we conclude that \(R^\dagger R\) is an orthogonal projection, which rewrites

\[
(R^\dagger R, y)_V = (x, R^\dagger R y)_V \quad \forall x, y \in V.
\]  

(3)

## 2 Weighted pseudo-inverse

Keeping the notations from the previous section, consider continuous operator \(B : V \to V\), and assume this operator is self-adjoint so that it induces a scalar product \((x, y)_B := (Bx, y)_V\) and a norm \(\|x\|_B := \sqrt{(x, x)_B}\). To each such \(B\) can be associated a so-called "weighted pseudo-inverse" \(R^\dagger_B : H \to V\) defined, for all \(y \in H\) by

\[
R \cdot R^\dagger_B y = y \quad \text{and} \quad \|R^\dagger_B y\|_B = \inf_{x \in R^{-1}(\{y\})} \|x\|_B.
\]  

(4)

The operator \(R^\dagger_B\) satisfies the same properties as \(R^\dagger\) except that \((,)_V\) is this time replaced by \((,)_B\). In particular it rewrites \((R^\dagger_B R, y)_B = (x, R^\dagger_B R y)_B\) for all \(x, y \in V\). Taking account of the expression of \((,)_B\) this is equivalent to

\[
BR^\dagger_B R = (R^\dagger_B R)^* B
\]  

(5)

where, for any continuous linear operator \(M : V \to V\) we denote \(M^*\) its adjoint with respect to \((,)_V\) defined by \((Mx, y)_V = (x, M^* y)_V\) for all \(x, y \in V\). Property (5) leads to a lemma.

**Lemma 2.1.**

\[RB^{-1}R^* = ((R^\dagger_B)^*BR^\dagger_B)^{-1}\]

**Proof:**

Since \(RR^\dagger_B = \text{Id}\) by construction, the lemma is a consequence of (5) through direct calculation

\[
(RB^{-1}R^* \cdot ((R^\dagger_B)^*BR^\dagger_B) = RB^{-1}(R^\dagger_B R)^*BR^\dagger_B = R(B^{-1}B)R^\dagger_B RR^\dagger_B = (RR^\dagger_B)^2 = \text{Id}. \]

□

## 3 Re-interpretation of the fictitious space lemma

In this section, we provide a new proof of the fictitious space lemma relying on the concept weighted pseudo-inverse. As a preliminary, let us recall a classical characterisation of extremal eigenvalues of self-adjoint operators (see e.g. theorem 1.2.1 and theorem 1.2.3 in \[3\]).

**Lemma 3.1.**

*Assume \(H\) is an Hilbert space equipped with the scalar product \((,)_H\) and let \(T : H \to H\) be a bounded operator that is self-adjoint for \((,)_H\). Denoting \(\sigma(T)\) the spectrum of \(T\), we have

\[
\inf \sigma(T) = \inf_{x \in H \setminus \{0\}} \frac{(Tx, x)_H}{(x, x)_H} \quad \text{and} \quad \sup \sigma(T) = \sup_{x \in H \setminus \{0\}} \frac{(Tx, x)_H}{(x, x)_H}
\]

This lemma holds independently of the choice of the scalar product, provided that \(T\) be self-adjoint with respect to it. As a consequence of the previous lemma, if \(\alpha(, , )\) and \(\beta(, , )\) are two scalar products over \(H\) and \(T\) is self-adjoint with respect to both, then
\[ \inf_{x \in \mathbb{H} \setminus \{0\}} \alpha(Tx, x)/\alpha(x, x) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{H} \setminus \{0\}} \beta(Tx, x)/\beta(x, x), \] and a similar result holds for the supremum.

Now we recall the fictitious space lemma, adopting the same formulation of this result as [1 Lemma 7.4] and [2 p.168].

**Lemma 3.2.**

Let \( H \) and \( V \) be two Hilbert spaces equipped with the scalar products \((\ , \ )_H\) and \((\ , \ )_V\). Let \( A : H \to H \) (resp. \( B : V \to V \)) be a bounded operator that is positive definite self-adjoint with respect to \((\ , \ )_H\) (resp. \((\ , \ )_V\)), and denote \((\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})_A := (A\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})_H\) (resp. \((\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})_B := (B\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})_V\)). Suppose that there exists a surjective bounded linear operator \( R : V \to H \), and constants \( c_{\pm} > 0 \) such that

1. for all \( \mathbf{u} \in H \) there exists \( \mathbf{v} \in V \) with \( R\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{u} \) and \( c_-(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v})_B \leq (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u})_A \),
2. \( (R\mathbf{v}, R\mathbf{v})_A \leq c_+(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v})_B \) for all \( \mathbf{v} \in V \).

Then, denoting \( R^* : H \to V \) the linear map defined by \( (R\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})_H = (\mathbf{u}, R^*\mathbf{v}) \) for all \( \mathbf{u} \in V, \mathbf{v} \in H \), we have

\[ c_-(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u})_A \leq (\mathbf{R}^{-1}R^* A\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u})_A \leq c_+(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u})_A \quad \forall \mathbf{u} \in H. \tag{6} \]

In addition, if \( c_{\pm} \) are the optimal constants satisfying i)-ii) then the bounds in (6) are optimal as well.

**Proof:**

We simply reformulate i)-ii) by means of the weighted pseudo-inverse. If i) holds then, for any \( \mathbf{u} \in H \) we have \( c_-\|\mathbf{v}\|_B^2 \leq (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u})_A \forall \mathbf{v} \in R^{-1}(\{\mathbf{u}\}) \). Taking the infimum and using (1), we obtain \( c_-\|R_B^\dagger\mathbf{u}\|_B \leq (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u})_A \). On the other hand, it is clear that, if \( c_-\|R_B^\dagger\mathbf{u}\|_B \leq (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u})_A \forall \mathbf{u} \in H \) then i) holds.

Next if ii) holds, then we have \( (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u})_A \leq c_+\|\mathbf{v}\|_B \forall \mathbf{v} \in R^{-1}(\{\mathbf{u}\}) \) and for all \( \mathbf{u} \in H \). Taking the infimum over \( \mathbf{v} \in R^{-1}(\{\mathbf{u}\}) \) and using (1), we conclude that \( (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u})_A \leq c_+\|R_B^\dagger\mathbf{u}\|_B \forall \mathbf{u} \in H \), and this is equivalent due to the optimality condition in (1). To conclude we have just shown that conditions i)-ii) in Lemma 3.2 are actually equivalent to

\[ c_-(R_B^\dagger\mathbf{u}, R_B^\dagger\mathbf{u})_B \leq (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u})_A \leq c_+(R_B^\dagger\mathbf{u}, R_B^\dagger\mathbf{u})_B \quad \forall \mathbf{u} \in H. \tag{7} \]

Next define \( S := (R_B^\dagger)^*B^\dagger \), which is obviously bounded positive definite self-adjoint so it induces a scalar product \((\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})_S := (S\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})_H \) and a norm \( \|\mathbf{u}\|_S := \sqrt{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u})_S} \). We can re-write \((R_B^\dagger\mathbf{u}, R_B^\dagger\mathbf{u})_B = (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u})_S\), and \((\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u})_A = (\mathbf{R}^{-1}R^* A\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u})_S\) according to Lemma 2.1. Hence (7) can be re-written

\[ c_-(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u})_S \leq (\mathbf{R}^{-1}R^* A\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u})_S \leq c_+(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u})_S \quad \forall \mathbf{u} \in H. \tag{8} \]

To conclude the proof there only remains to observe that, since \( \mathbf{R}^{-1}R^* = S^{-1} \), then \( \mathbf{R}^{-1}R^* A \) is self-adjoint with respect to both \((\ , \ )_S\) and \((\ , \ )_A\). As a consequence, Lemma 3.1 combined with (8) implies (6). \( \square \)
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