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# A variation on the "infsup" condition 
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## Scope of the lecture

1) One field study
2) Two fields analysis
3) Three fields formulation
4) Answer to an old question put by J. F. Maître

A real Hilbert space $H$
$\mathcal{S}_{H}=$ unity sphere in $H:\{h \in H,\|h\|=1\}$
$\mathcal{B}_{H}=$ unity ball in $H:\{h \in H,\|h\| \leq 1\}$
H' : topological dual of Hilbert space $H$
If $\zeta \in H^{\prime}$, then $<\zeta, h>\in \mathbb{R}$ and $\|\zeta\|=\sup \left\{<\zeta, h>, h \in \mathcal{B}_{H}\right\}$.
Following I. Babuška (1971) :
consider two Hilbert spaces $Y$ and $Z$

$$
\text { a continuous bilinear form } k: Y \times Z \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}
$$

introduce two associated linear operators

$$
\begin{aligned}
& K: Y \longrightarrow Z^{\prime}, \quad<K y, z>=k(y, z), \quad y \in Y, z \in Z \\
& K^{\prime}: Z \longrightarrow Y^{\prime}, \quad<y, K^{\prime} z>=k(y, z), \quad y \in Y, z \in Z .
\end{aligned}
$$

What are necessary and sufficient conditions to get $K \in \operatorname{Isom}\left(Y, Z^{\prime}\right)$ ?

On one hand, $K^{-1}$ must be continuous :

$$
\exists \gamma>0, \forall y \in Y,\|K y\| \geq \gamma\|y\|
$$

equivalently $\quad \exists \gamma>0, \forall y \in \mathcal{S}_{Y}, \exists z \in \mathcal{B}_{Z}, k(y, z) \geq \gamma$
equivalently $\quad \exists \gamma>0, \inf _{y \in Y} \sup _{z \in Z} \frac{k(y, z)}{\|y\|\|z\|} \geq \gamma$
the famous "infsup" condition!
On the other hand,
if $z$ is given in $\mathcal{S}_{Z}, \exists \zeta \in Z^{\prime}$ such that $\langle\zeta, z\rangle \neq 0$
the range of $K$ is equal to $Z^{\prime}$ then $\exists y_{0} \in Y, K y_{0}=\zeta$
then $k\left(y_{0}, z\right)=<K y_{0}, z>=<\zeta, z>\neq 0$
and

$$
\forall z \in \mathcal{S}_{Z}, \sup _{y \in Y} k(y, z)=+\infty
$$

the not so famous "infinity" condition.
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Babuška's theorem (1971) :
the infsup condition

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\exists \gamma>0, \forall y \in \mathcal{S}_{Y}, \exists z \in \mathcal{B}_{Z}, k(y, z) \geq \gamma \\
\forall z \in \mathcal{S}_{Z}, \sup _{y \in Y} k(y, z)=+\infty
\end{array}
$$

and the infinity condition
are necessary and sufficient conditions to get $\quad K \in \operatorname{Isom}\left(Y, Z^{\prime}\right)$.
Second fundamental result we have the equivalence $K \in \operatorname{Isom}\left(Y, Z^{\prime}\right) \Longleftrightarrow K^{\prime} \in \operatorname{Isom}\left(Z, Y^{\prime}\right)$

We deduce from these two theorems that
if $K$ is an isomorphism from $Y$ onto $Z^{\prime}$, we have the second infsup condition $\exists \gamma^{\prime}>0, \forall z \in \mathcal{S}_{Z}, \exists y \in \mathcal{B}_{Y}, k(y, z) \geq \gamma^{\prime}$
second infinity condition

$$
\forall y \in \mathcal{S}_{Y}, \sup _{\sim \in 7} k(y, z)=+\infty
$$
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Classical references :
O. Ladyzhenskaya (1963)
F. Brezzi (1974)
V. Girault and P.A. Raviart $(1979,1986)$

Consider two Hilbert spaces $X$ and $M$ and two continuous bilinear forms $a: X \times X \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$
b: X \times M \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}
$$

the associated linear operators

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
A: X \longrightarrow X^{\prime}, & <A u, v>=a(u, v), & u \in X, v \in X \\
B: X \longrightarrow M^{\prime}, & <B u, q>=b(u, q), & u \in X, q \in M \\
B^{\prime}: M \longrightarrow X^{\prime}, & <u, B^{\prime} q>=b(u, q), & u \in X, q \in M .
\end{array}
$$

In the framework of the first section: $\quad Y=Z=X \times M$ and

$$
k((u, p),(v, q))=a(u, v)+b(u, q)+b(v, p) .
$$

Operator $\Phi: X \times M \longrightarrow X^{\prime} \times M^{\prime}$ associated with the bilinear form $k(\bullet, \bullet)$ is defined by blocs :

$$
\Phi=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
A & B^{\prime} \\
B & 0
\end{array}\right)
$$

In order to study if $\Phi$ is an isomorphism, consider $f \in X^{\prime}, g \in Z^{\prime}$ and try to solve the system :
(1) $A u+B^{\prime} p=f$
(2) $B u=g$.

Of course the kernel $V$ of operator $B$ has a crucial role ;
define $V=\operatorname{ker} B=\{v \in X, \forall q \in M, b(v, q)=0\}$,
use the orthogonality decomposition in Hilbert spaces : if $u \in X$, consider $u^{0} \in V$ and $u^{1} \in V^{\perp}$ such that $u=u^{0}+u^{1}$.

Observe that the polar set $V^{0} \equiv\left\{\zeta \in X^{\prime}, \forall v \in V,\langle\zeta, v>=0\}\right.$ can be identified with the dual space $\left(V^{\perp}\right)^{\prime}$ of its orthogonal.
(1) $A u+B^{\prime} p=f$
(2) $B u \quad=g$.
the equation (2) takes the form : natural hypothesis (i) to solve (3) :
(3) $\quad u^{1} \in V^{\perp}, \quad B u^{1}=g$. $B \in \operatorname{Isom}\left(V^{\perp}, M^{\prime}\right)$ then report $u^{1}$ inside equation (1) and test this equation against $v \in V$ to eliminate the so-called pressure $p$ :
(4) $\quad u^{0} \in V, \quad \forall v \in V,<A u^{0}, v>=<f-A u^{1}, v>$ natural hypothesis (ii) to solve (4) : $\quad A \in \operatorname{Isom}\left(V, V^{\prime}\right)$ observe that equation (4) can also be written as $\quad f-A u \in V^{0}$ then equation (1) takes the form :
(5) $\quad p \in M, \quad B^{\prime} p=f-A u$ and has a unique solution due to the hypothesis (i) :

$$
B^{\prime} \in \operatorname{Isom}\left(M, V^{0}\right)
$$

and the fact that the right hand side in (5) belongs to polar space $V^{0}$.
"my version" of the Girault and Raviart's theorem (1986) :
$\Phi=\left(\begin{array}{cc}A & B^{\prime} \\ B & 0\end{array}\right)$ is an isomorphism from $X \times M$ onto its dual
if and only if the hypotheses (i) $\quad B \in \operatorname{Isom}\left(V^{\perp}, M^{\prime}\right)$

$$
\text { and (ii) } \quad A \in \operatorname{Isom}\left(V, V^{\prime}\right) \quad \text { are satisfied. }
$$

Other expression of hypothesis (i): $\left.\quad B^{\prime} \in \operatorname{Isom}\left(M,\left(V^{\perp}\right)^{\prime} \equiv V^{0}\right)\right)$ Infsup condition associated with this formulation of hypothesis (i) :

$$
\exists \beta^{\prime}>0, \forall p \in \mathcal{S}_{M}, \exists v \in \mathcal{B}_{V^{\perp}}, b(v, p) \geq \beta^{\prime}
$$

equivalently : $\quad \exists \beta^{\prime}>0, \forall p \in \mathcal{S}_{M}, \exists v \in \mathcal{B}_{X}, b(v, p) \geq \beta^{\prime}$
equivalently : $\quad \exists \beta^{\prime}>0, \inf _{p \in M} \sup _{v \in X} \frac{b(v, p)}{\|v\|\|p\|} \geq \beta^{\prime} \quad$ classical!
Observe that the infinity condition

$$
\forall v \in \mathcal{B}_{V^{\perp}}, \quad \sup _{p \in M} b(v, p)=+\infty \quad \text { is trivial }!
$$
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Girault and Raviart's theorem (1986), formulated by the authors : $\Phi=\left(\begin{array}{cc}A & B^{\prime} \\ B & 0\end{array}\right)$ is an isomorphism from $X \times M$ onto its dual if and only if the hypotheses

$$
\begin{equation*}
\exists \beta^{\prime}>0, \inf _{p \in M} \sup _{v \in X} \frac{b(v, p)}{\|v\|\|p\|} \geq \beta^{\prime} \tag{i}
\end{equation*}
$$

and
(ii) $\quad A \in \operatorname{Isom}\left(V, V^{\prime}\right)$ are satisfied.

The infinity hypothesis for $B^{\prime}$ operator is lost in this formulation due to the particularity of the situation!

Motivation :
vorticity-velocity-pressure formulation of the Stokes problem
FD (1992, 2002), FD, S. Salaün and S. Salmon (2000, 2003) :

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\omega-\operatorname{curl} u & =0 \\
\nu \operatorname{curl} \omega+\nabla p & =g \\
\operatorname{div} u & =0
\end{array}
$$

Integrate by parts and multiply by ad hoc coefficients : abstract form $W$ : space for vorticity, $U$ for velocity, $P$ for pressure three continuous linear forms

$$
\begin{aligned}
& j: W \times W \ni(\omega, \varphi) \longmapsto j(\omega, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R} \\
& r: W \times U \ni(\omega, v) \longmapsto r(\omega, v) \in \mathbb{R} \\
& d: U \times P \ni(u, q) \longmapsto d(u, q) \in \mathbb{R} \\
& \text { bilinear form } k:(W \times U \times P) \times(W \times U \times P) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\
& k((\omega, u, p),(\varphi, v, q))=j(\omega, \varphi)+r(\omega, v)+r(\varphi, u)+d(u, q)+d(v, p)
\end{aligned}
$$

associated linear operators :

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
J: W \longrightarrow W^{\prime}, & <J \omega, \varphi>=j(\omega, \varphi), & \omega \in W, \varphi \in W \\
R: W \longrightarrow U^{\prime}, & <R \omega, v>=r(\omega, v), & \omega \in W, v \in U \\
R^{\prime}: U \longrightarrow W^{\prime}, & <\omega, R^{\prime} v>=r(\omega, v), & \omega \in W, v \in U \\
D: U \longrightarrow P^{\prime}, & <D u, q>=d(u, q), & u \in U, q \in P \\
D^{\prime}: P \longrightarrow U^{\prime}, & <u, D^{\prime} q>=d(u, q), & u \in U, q \in P
\end{array}
$$

linear system to solve :
(6) $J \omega+R^{\prime} u=f$
(7) $R \omega+D^{\prime} p=g$
(8) $D u \quad=h$
orthogonal decomposition of the velocity :

$$
u=u^{0}+u^{1}, u^{0} \in \operatorname{ker} D, u^{1} \in(\operatorname{ker} D)^{\perp}
$$

orthogonal decomposition of the vorticity :

$$
\omega=\omega^{0}+\omega^{1}, \omega^{0} \in \operatorname{ker} R, \omega^{1} \in(\operatorname{ker} R)^{\perp}
$$

(6) $J \omega+R^{\prime} u=f$
(7) $R \omega+D^{\prime} p=g$
(8) $D u=h$

Equation (8) takes the form :
(9) $\quad u^{1} \in(\operatorname{ker} D)^{\perp}, \quad D u^{1}=h$ $D \in \operatorname{Isom}\left((\operatorname{ker} D)^{\perp}, P^{\prime}\right)$ natural hypothesis (iii) to solve (9) : test second equation against $v \in \operatorname{ker} D$ to eliminate the pressure $p$ :

$$
<D^{\prime} p, v>=<p, D v>=0
$$

(10) $\quad \omega^{1} \in(\operatorname{ker} D)^{\perp}, \quad \forall v \in \operatorname{ker} D,\left\langle R \omega^{1}, v\right\rangle=\langle g, v\rangle$ natural hypothesis (iv) to solve (10) : $R \in \operatorname{Isom}\left((\operatorname{ker} R)^{\perp},(\operatorname{ker} D)^{\prime}\right)$ then equation (10) implies that and equation (7) takes now the form then due to hypothesis (iii) : $g-R \omega \in(\operatorname{ker} D)^{0}$ (11) $D^{\prime} p=g-R \omega$
$D^{\prime} \in \operatorname{Isom}\left(P,(\operatorname{ker} D)^{0}\right)$
equation (11) has a unique solution
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(6) $J \omega+R^{\prime} u=f$
(7) $R \omega+D^{\prime} p=g$
(8) $D u=h$

The fields $u^{1}, \omega^{1}$ and $p$ are known.
Test equation (6) against $\varphi \in \operatorname{ker} R:\left\langle R^{\prime} u, \varphi\right\rangle=\langle u, R \varphi\rangle=0$ and report the value of $\omega^{1}$ :
(12) $\quad \omega^{0} \in \operatorname{ker} R, \quad \forall \varphi \in \operatorname{ker} R,\left\langle J \omega^{0}, \varphi\right\rangle=\left\langle f-J \omega^{1}, \varphi\right\rangle$ natural hypothesis (v) to solve (12) : $J \in \operatorname{Isom}\left(\operatorname{ker} R,(\operatorname{ker} R)^{\prime}\right)$ then equation (12) implies that $\quad f-J \omega \in(\operatorname{ker} R)^{0}$ and equation (6) takes now the form
(13) $u^{0} \in \operatorname{ker} R, R^{\prime} u^{0}=f-J \omega-R^{\prime} u^{1}$
due to hypothesis (iv) :
$R^{\prime} \in \operatorname{Isom}\left(\operatorname{ker} D,(\operatorname{ker} R)^{0}\right)$
equation (13) has a unique solution.
Note the algorithm induced by this approach : $u^{1}, \omega^{1}, p, \omega^{0}, u^{0}$.

Isomorphism Theorem with three fields
Let $K$ be defined from $W \times U \times P$ to $W^{\prime} \times U^{\prime} \times P^{\prime}$

$$
\text { by the matrix } K=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
J & R^{\prime} & 0 \\
R & 0 & D^{\prime} \\
0 & D & 0
\end{array}\right)
$$

then $K$ is an isomorphism if and only if the three hypotheses
(v) $J \in \operatorname{Isom}\left(\operatorname{ker} R,(\operatorname{ker} R)^{\prime}\right)$
(iv) $R \in \operatorname{Isom}\left((\operatorname{ker} R)^{\perp},(\operatorname{ker} D)^{\prime}\right)$
(iii) $D \in \operatorname{Isom}\left((\operatorname{ker} D)^{\perp}, P^{\prime}\right)$ are satisfied

We can replace (iii) by and (iv) by

$$
\begin{array}{r}
D^{\prime} \in \operatorname{Isom}\left(P,(\operatorname{ker} D)^{0}\right) \\
R^{\prime} \in \operatorname{Isom}\left(\operatorname{ker} D,(\operatorname{ker} R)^{0}\right) .
\end{array}
$$

Note that the infinity condition associated to (iv) :

$$
\forall \varphi \in \mathcal{S}_{(\operatorname{ker} R)^{\perp}}, \sup _{u \in \operatorname{ker} D} r(\varphi, u)=+\infty \quad \text { is a priori not trivial ! }
$$
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J.F. Maître (Giens, Canum 1993) :
"What is the link between the three fields infsup conditions and the classical two fields infsup conditions ?"
In other terms, $\quad\left(\begin{array}{ccc}J & R^{\prime} & 0 \\ R & 0 & D^{\prime} \\ 0 & D & 0\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{cc}A & B^{\prime} \\ B & 0\end{array}\right)$ ?
ok when $\quad X=W \times U, M=P, A=\left(\begin{array}{cc}J & R^{\prime} \\ R & 0\end{array}\right), \quad B=\left(\begin{array}{ll}0 & D\end{array}\right)$.
the infsup condition for $B^{\prime}$ operator $\exists \beta^{\prime}>0, \inf _{p \in M} \sup _{v \in X} \frac{b(v, p)}{\|v\|\|p\|} \geq \beta^{\prime}$
takes the analogous form for $\mathrm{D}^{\prime}: \quad \exists \delta^{\prime}>0, \inf _{p \in P} \sup _{v \in U} \frac{d(v, p)}{\|v\|\|p\|} \geq \delta^{\prime}$
At what precise conditions operator $A$ is an isomorphism from $\operatorname{ker} B=W \times \operatorname{ker} D$ onto its dual $(\operatorname{ker} B)^{\prime}=W^{\prime} \times(\operatorname{ker} D)^{\prime}$ ?
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Make attention that $R^{\prime}$ is not exactly equal to $R^{\prime}$ restricted to $\operatorname{ker} D$ ! The exact isomorphism condition $\quad R^{\prime} \in \operatorname{Isom}\left(\operatorname{ker} D,(\operatorname{ker} R)^{0}\right)$ leads to an infsup condition

$$
\exists \rho^{\prime}>0, \inf _{u \in \operatorname{ker} D} \sup _{\varphi \in(\operatorname{ker} R)^{\perp}} \frac{r(\varphi, u)}{\|\varphi\|\|u\|} \geq \delta^{\prime}
$$

that can be written equivalently

$$
\exists \rho^{\prime}>0, \inf _{u \in \operatorname{ker} D} \sup _{\varphi \in W} \frac{r(\varphi, u)}{\|\varphi\|\|u\|} \geq \delta^{\prime}
$$

But the associated infinity condition

$$
\forall \varphi \in \mathcal{S}_{(\operatorname{ker} R)^{\perp}}, \sup _{u \in \operatorname{ker} D} r(\varphi, u)=+\infty
$$

remains a priori not trivial and has not to be dropped!

