

A new perspective on the fictitious space lemma

X.Claeys¹

¹Sorbonne Université, Université Paris-Diderot SPC, CNRS, Laboratoire
Jacques-Louis Lions

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 preconditioners 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 $R : V \rightarrow H$. Define $R^{-1}(\{y\}) := \{x' \in H, Rx' = y\}$. The Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse of this map, denoted $R^\dagger : H \rightarrow V$ 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 $R|_{V_R} : V_R \rightarrow H$ 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 $(x, x - x')_V = 0$ 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

$R\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}$, we have seen that $\mathbf{x} = R^\dagger \mathbf{y} = R^\dagger R\mathbf{x}$ 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

$$(R^\dagger R\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_V = (\mathbf{x}, R^\dagger R\mathbf{y})_V \quad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in V. \quad (3)$$

2 Weighted pseudo-inverse

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

$$R \cdot R_B^\dagger \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y} \quad \text{and} \quad \|R_B^\dagger \mathbf{y}\|_B = \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in R^{-1}(\{\mathbf{y}\})} \|\mathbf{x}\|_B. \quad (4)$$

The operator R_B^\dagger satisfies the same properties as R^\dagger except that $(\cdot, \cdot)_V$ is this times replaced by $(\cdot, \cdot)_B$. In particular (3) rewrites $(R_B^\dagger R\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_B = (\mathbf{x}, R_B^\dagger R\mathbf{y})_B$ for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in V$. Taking account of the expression of $(\cdot, \cdot)_B$ this is equivalent to

$$B R_B^\dagger R = (R_B^\dagger R)^* B \quad (5)$$

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

Lemma 2.1.

$$RB^{-1}R^* = ((R_B^\dagger)^* B R_B^\dagger)^{-1}$$

Proof:

Since $RR_B^\dagger = \text{Id}$ by construction, the lemma is a consequence of (5) through direct calculation $(RB^{-1}R^*) \cdot ((R_B^\dagger)^* B R_B^\dagger) = RB^{-1}(R_B^\dagger)^* B R_B^\dagger = R(B^{-1}B)R_B^\dagger R R_B^\dagger = (RR_B^\dagger)^2 = \text{Id}$. \square

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 pseudoinverse. 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 $(\cdot, \cdot)_H$ and let $T : H \rightarrow H$ be a bounded operator that is self-adjoint for $(\cdot, \cdot)_H$. Denoting $\sigma(T)$ the spectrum of T , we have

$$\inf \sigma(T) = \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in H \setminus \{0\}} \frac{(T\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})_H}{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})_H} \quad \sup \sigma(T) = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in H \setminus \{0\}} \frac{(T\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})_H}{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})_H}$$

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 $\alpha(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $\beta(\cdot, \cdot)$ are two scalar products over H and T is self-adjoint with respect to both, then

$\inf_{\mathbf{x} \in H \setminus \{0\}} \alpha(T\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})/\alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) = \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in H \setminus \{0\}} \beta(T\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})/\beta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})$, 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 $(\cdot, \cdot)_H$ and $(\cdot, \cdot)_V$. Let $A : H \rightarrow H$ (resp. $B : V \rightarrow V$) be a bounded operator that is positive definite self-adjoint with respect to $(\cdot, \cdot)_H$ (resp. $(\cdot, \cdot)_V$), 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 $R : V \rightarrow H$, and constants $c_{\pm} > 0$ such that

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

ii) $(R\mathbf{v}, R\mathbf{v})_A \leq c_+(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v})_B$ for all $\mathbf{v} \in V$.

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

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

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 (4), 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 (4), we conclude that $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u})_A \leq c_+\|R_B^\dagger \mathbf{u}\|_B^2 \forall \mathbf{u} \in H$, and this is equivalent due to the optimality condition in (4). To conclude we have just shown that conditions i)-ii) in Lemma 3.2 are actually equivalent to

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

Next define $S := (R_B^\dagger)^* B R_B^\dagger$, 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 $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u})_A = (RB^{-1}R^*A\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u})_S$ according to Lemma 2.1. Hence (7) can be re-written

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

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

References

- [1] V. Dolean, P. Jolivet, and F. Nataf. *An introduction to domain decomposition methods*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2015. Algorithms, theory, and parallel implementation.
- [2] M. Griebel and P. Oswald. On the abstract theory of additive and multiplicative Schwarz algorithms. *Numer. Math.*, 70(2):163–180, 1995.
- [3] K.E. Gustafson and D.K.M. Rao. *Numerical range*. Universitext. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997. The field of values of linear operators and matrices.
- [4] S. V. Nepomnyaschikh. Mesh theorems on traces, normalizations of function traces and their inversion. *Soviet J. Numer. Anal. Math. Modelling*, 6(3):223–242, 1991.
- [5] S. V. Nepomnyaschikh. Decomposition and fictitious domains methods for elliptic boundary value problems. In *Fifth International Symposium on Domain Decomposition Methods for Partial Differential Equations (Norfolk, VA, 1991)*, pages 62–72. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 1992.
- [6] J. Xu. Iterative methods by space decomposition and subspace correction. *SIAM Rev.*, 34(4):581–613, 1992.