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#### Abstract

The converse of Fortin's Lemma in Banach spaces is established in this Note.
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## 1. Introduction

Let $V$ and $W$ be two complex Banach spaces equipped with the norms $\|\cdot\|_{V}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{W}$, respectively. We adopt the convention that dual spaces are denoted with primes and are composed of antilinear forms; complex conjugates are denoted by an overline. Let $a$ be a sesquilinear form on $V \times W$ (linear w.r.t. its first argument and antilinear w.r.t. its second argument). We assume that $a$ is bounded, i.e.,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|a\|:=\sup _{v \in V} \sup _{w \in W} \frac{|a(v, w)|}{\|v\|_{V}\|w\|_{W}}<\infty \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and that the following inf-sup condition holds:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha:=\inf _{v \in V} \sup _{w \in W} \frac{|a(v, w)|}{\|v\|_{V}\|w\|_{W}}>0 \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here and in what follows, arguments in infima and suprema are implicitly assumed to be nonzero.
Let $V_{h} \subset V$ and $W_{h} \subset W$ be two finite-dimensional subspaces equipped with the norms of $V$ and $W$, respectively. A question of fundamental importance is to assert the following discrete inf-sup condition:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{\alpha}:=\inf _{v_{h} \in V_{h}} \sup _{w_{h} \in W_{h}} \frac{\left|a\left(v_{h}, w_{h}\right)\right|}{\left\|v_{h}\right\|_{V}\left\|w_{h}\right\|_{W}}>0 \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$
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The aim of this Note is to prove the following result.
Theorem 1 (Fortin's Lemma with converse) Under the above assumptions, consider the following two statements:
(i) There exists a map $\Pi_{h}: W \rightarrow W_{h}$ and a real number $\gamma_{\Pi}>0$ such that $a\left(v_{h}, \Pi_{h} w-w\right)=0$, for all $\left(v_{h}, w\right) \in V_{h} \times W$, and $\gamma_{\Pi}\left\|\Pi_{h} w\right\|_{W} \leq\|w\|_{W}$ for all $w \in W$.
(ii) The discrete inf-sup condition (3) holds.

Then, (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) with $\hat{\alpha}=\gamma_{\Pi} \alpha$. Conversely, (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) with $\gamma_{\Pi}=\frac{\hat{\alpha}}{\|a\|}$, and $\Pi_{h}$ can be constructed to be idempotent. Moreover, $\Pi_{h}$ can be made linear if $W$ is a Hilbert space.

The statement (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) in Theorem 1 is classical and is known in the literature as Fortin's Lemma, see [5] and [1, Prop. 5.4.3]. It provides an effective tool to prove the discrete inf-sup condition (3) by constructing explicitly a Fortin operator $\Pi_{h}$. We briefly outline a proof that (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) for completeness. Assuming (i), we have

$$
\sup _{w_{h} \in W_{h}} \frac{\left|a\left(v_{h}, w_{h}\right)\right|}{\left\|w_{h}\right\|_{W}} \geq \sup _{w \in W} \frac{\left|a\left(v_{h}, \Pi_{h} w\right)\right|}{\left\|\Pi_{h} w\right\|_{W}}=\sup _{w \in W} \frac{\left|a\left(v_{h}, w\right)\right|}{\left\|\Pi_{h} w\right\|_{W}} \geq \gamma_{\Pi} \sup _{w \in W} \frac{\left|a\left(v_{h}, w\right)\right|}{\|w\|_{W}} \geq \gamma_{\Pi} \alpha\left\|v_{h}\right\|_{V}
$$

since $a$ satisfies (2) and $V_{h} \subset V$. This proves (ii) with $\hat{\alpha}=\gamma_{\Pi} \alpha$.
The converse (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) is of independent theoretical interest and is the main object of this Note. This property is useful when it is easier to prove the discrete inf-sup condition directly rather than constructing a Fortin operator. Another application of current interest is the analysis framework for discontinuous Petrov-Galerkin methods (dPG) recently proposed in [3] which includes the existence of a Fortin operator among its key assumptions. Incidentally, we observe that there is a gap in the stability constant $\gamma_{\Pi}$ between the direct and converse statements, since the ratio of the two is equal to $\frac{\|a\|}{\alpha}$ (which is independent of the spaces $V_{h}$ and $\left.W_{h}\right)$.

## 2. Proof of Theorem 1

Assume that the discrete inf-sup condition (3) holds. Let $A_{h}: V_{h} \rightarrow W_{h}^{\prime}$ be the operator defined by $\left\langle A_{h} v_{h}, w_{h}\right\rangle_{W_{h}^{\prime}, W_{h}}:=a\left(v_{h}, w_{h}\right)$. Identifying $V_{h}^{\prime \prime}$ with $V_{h}$ and $W_{h}^{\prime \prime}$ with $W_{h}$ (since these spaces are finitedimensional), we consider the linear map $A_{h}^{*}: W_{h} \rightarrow V_{h}^{\prime}$. Our goal is to construct a right-inverse map $R_{A_{h}^{*}}: V_{h}^{\prime} \rightarrow W_{h}$ (possibly nonlinear) such that, for all $\theta_{h} \in V_{h}^{\prime}, A_{h}^{*}\left(R_{A_{h}^{*}}\left(\theta_{h}\right)\right)=\theta_{h}$ and $\hat{\alpha}\left\|R_{A_{h}^{*}}\left(\theta_{h}\right)\right\|_{W} \leq$ $\left\|\theta_{h}\right\|_{V_{h}^{\prime}}$. Indeed, if such a map exists, we can consider the linear map $\Theta: W \rightarrow V_{h}^{\prime}$ such that, for all $w \in W,\left\langle\Theta(w), v_{h}\right\rangle_{V_{h}^{\prime}, V_{h}}:=\overline{a\left(v_{h}, w\right)}$ for all $v_{h} \in V_{h}$. Then defining $\Pi_{h}=R_{A_{h}^{*}} \circ \Theta: W \rightarrow W_{h}$ yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
a\left(v_{h}, \Pi_{h}(w)\right) & =\left\langle A_{h} v_{h}, R_{A_{h}^{*}}(\Theta(w))\right\rangle_{W_{h}^{\prime}, W_{h}}=\overline{\left\langle A_{h}^{*}\left(R_{A_{h}^{*}}(\Theta(w))\right), v_{h}\right\rangle_{V_{h}^{\prime}, V_{h}}} \\
& =\overline{\left\langle\Theta(w), v_{h}\right\rangle_{V_{h}^{\prime}, V_{h}}}=a\left(v_{h}, w\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

which proves that $a\left(v_{h}, \Pi_{h}(w)-w\right)=0$ for all $w \in W$. Moreover,

$$
\hat{\alpha}\left\|\Pi_{h}(w)\right\|_{W}=\hat{\alpha}\left\|R_{A_{h}^{*}}(\Theta(w))\right\|_{W} \leq\|\Theta(w)\|_{V_{h}^{\prime}} \leq\|a\|\|w\|_{W},
$$

which proves that $\frac{\hat{\alpha}}{\|a\|}\left\|\Pi_{h}(w)\right\|_{W} \leq\|w\|_{W}$. In addition, we observe that

$$
\left\langle\Theta\left(R_{A_{h}^{*}}\left(\theta_{h}\right)\right), v_{h}\right\rangle_{V_{h}^{\prime}, V_{h}}=\overline{\left\langle A_{h} v_{h}, R_{A_{h}^{*}}\left(\theta_{h}\right)\right\rangle_{W_{h}^{\prime}, W_{h}}}=\left\langle A_{h}^{*}\left(R_{A_{h}^{*}}\left(\theta_{h}\right)\right), v_{h}\right\rangle_{V_{h}^{\prime}, V_{h}}=\left\langle\theta_{h}, v_{h}\right\rangle_{V_{h}^{\prime}, V_{h}},
$$

for all $v_{h} \in V_{h}$, which proves that $\Theta\left(R_{A_{h}^{*}}\left(\theta_{h}\right)\right)=\theta_{h}$ for all $\theta_{h} \in V_{h}^{\prime}$. As a result, $\Pi_{h}\left(\Pi_{h}(w)\right)=R_{A_{h}^{*}}(\Theta \circ$ $\left.R_{A_{h}^{*}}(\Theta(w))\right)=R_{A_{h}^{*}}(\Theta(w))=\Pi_{h}(w)$, i.e., $\Pi_{h}$ is idempotent.

It remains to build the right-inverse map $R_{A_{h}^{*}}$ to complete the proof. We can rewrite (3) as follows:

$$
\hat{\alpha}=\inf _{v_{h} \in V_{h}} \sup _{w_{h} \in W_{h}} \frac{\left|\left\langle A_{h} v_{h}, w_{h}\right\rangle_{W_{h}^{\prime}, W_{h}}\right|}{\left\|v_{h}\right\|_{V}\left\|w_{h}\right\|_{W}}>0
$$

Let us assume first that $W$ is a Hilbert space. Let $K_{h}$ be the orthogonal complement of $\operatorname{ker}\left(A_{h}^{*}\right)$ in $W_{h}$, i.e., $W_{h}=K_{h} \oplus \operatorname{ker}\left(A_{h}^{*}\right)$. Observing that $A_{h}^{*}: K_{h} \rightarrow V_{h}^{\prime}$ is bijective, we set $R_{A_{h}^{*}}=\left(A_{h \mid K_{h}}^{*}\right)^{-1}: V_{h}^{\prime} \rightarrow K_{h} \subset W_{h}$. Then $A_{h}^{*} R_{A_{h}^{*}} \theta_{h}=\theta_{h}$ for all $\theta_{h} \in V_{h}^{\prime}$, by definition, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\hat{\alpha} & =\inf _{v_{h} \in V_{h}} \sup _{w_{h} \in W_{h}} \frac{\left|\left\langle A_{h} v_{h}, w_{h}\right\rangle_{W_{h}^{\prime}, W_{h}}\right|}{\left\|v_{h}\right\|_{V}\left\|w_{h}\right\|_{W}}=\inf _{w_{h} \in W_{h}} \sup _{v_{h} \in V_{h}} \frac{\left|\left\langle A_{h} v_{h}, w_{h}\right\rangle_{W_{h}^{\prime}, W_{h}}\right|}{\left\|v_{h}\right\|_{V}\left\|w_{h}\right\|_{W}} \\
& \leq \inf _{w_{h} \in K_{h}} \sup _{v_{h} \in V_{h}} \frac{\left|\left\langle A_{h} v_{h}, w_{h}\right\rangle_{W_{h}^{\prime}, W_{h}}\right|}{\left\|v_{h}\right\|_{V}\left\|w_{h}\right\|_{W}}=\inf _{\theta_{h} \in V_{h}^{\prime}} \sup _{v_{h} \in V_{h}} \frac{\left|\left\langle A_{h} v_{h}, R_{A_{h}^{*}} \theta_{h}\right\rangle_{W_{h}^{\prime}, W_{h}}\right|}{\left\|v_{h}\right\|_{V}\left\|R_{A_{h}^{*}} \theta_{h}\right\|_{W}} \\
& =\inf _{\theta_{h} \in V_{h}^{\prime}} \sup _{v_{h} \in V_{h}} \frac{\left|\left\langle A_{h}^{*} R_{A_{h}^{*}} \theta_{h}, v_{h}\right\rangle_{V_{h}^{\prime}, V_{h}}\right|}{\left\|v_{h}\right\|_{V}\left\|R_{A_{h}^{*}} \theta_{h}\right\|_{W}}=\inf _{\theta_{h} \in V_{h}^{\prime}} \frac{\left\|\theta_{h}\right\|_{V_{h}^{\prime}}}{\left\|R_{A_{h}^{*}} \theta_{h}\right\|_{W}},
\end{aligned}
$$

where the first equality results from Lemma 2 below (this lemma provides an abstract counterpart of the fact that the singular values of a square matrix and its transpose coincide; this algebraic result could be invoked here directly). This implies that $\hat{\alpha}\left\|R_{A_{h}^{*}}\right\|_{W} \leq\left\|\theta_{h}\right\|_{V_{h}^{\prime}}$ for all $\theta_{h} \in V_{h}^{\prime}$. Hence $R_{A_{h}^{*}}$ has the desired properties; note that $R_{A_{h}^{*}}$ is linear.
In the more general setting of Banach spaces, we set $Y:=W_{h}, Z:=V_{h}^{\prime}$, and $B:=A_{h}^{*}$. Identifying $A_{h}^{* *}$ with $A_{h}$, we obtain

$$
\hat{\alpha}=\inf _{z^{\prime} \in Z^{\prime}} \sup _{y \in Y} \frac{\left|\left\langle B^{*} z^{\prime}, y\right\rangle_{Y^{\prime}, Y}\right|}{\left\|z^{\prime}\right\|_{Z^{\prime}}\|y\|_{Y}}>0
$$

We now apply Lemma 4 below and infer that there exists a right-inverse map $R_{A_{h}^{*}}: V_{h}^{\prime} \rightarrow W_{h}$ with the desired properties.
Remark 1 (Linearity and uniform stability) Assume that we have at hand a sequence of finite-dimensional subspaces $\left\{V_{h}\right\}_{h \in \mathcal{H}},\left\{W_{h}\right\}_{h \in \mathcal{H}}$. Assume the existence of a decomposition $W_{h}=\operatorname{ker}\left(A_{h}^{*}\right) \oplus K_{h}$ that is uniformly stable with respect to $h \in \mathcal{H}$, i.e., there is $\kappa>0$, independent of $h \in \mathcal{H}$, such that the induced projector $\pi_{K_{h}}: W_{h} \rightarrow K_{h}$ satisfies $\kappa\left\|\pi_{K_{h}} w_{h}\right\|_{W} \leq\left\|w_{h}\right\|_{W}$ for all $w_{h} \in W_{h}$. This property holds in the Hilbertian setting with $\kappa=1$. Then, even for Banach spaces, one can use the reasoning above for Hilbert spaces to build a linear operator $\Pi_{h}$ that is uniformly bounded; the only difference is the bound $\left\|R_{A_{h}^{*}}\left(\theta_{h}\right)\right\|_{W} \leq(\kappa \hat{\alpha})^{-1}\left\|\theta_{h}\right\|_{V_{h}^{\prime}}$ leading to $\gamma_{\Pi}=\frac{\kappa \hat{\alpha}}{\|a\|}$.

## 3. Operators in Banach spaces

Let $Y$ and $Z$ be two complex Banach spaces equipped with the norms $\|\cdot\|_{Y}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{Z}$, respectively. Let $B: Y \rightarrow Z$ be a bounded linear map.
Lemma 2 (Inf-sup) Assume that $B$ is bijective and that $Y$ is reflexive. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\inf _{y \in Y} \sup _{z^{\prime} \in Z^{\prime}} \frac{\left|\left\langle z^{\prime}, B y\right\rangle_{Z^{\prime}, Z}\right|}{\left\|z^{\prime}\right\|_{Z^{\prime}}\|y\|_{Y}}=\inf _{z^{\prime} \in Z^{\prime}} \sup _{y \in Y} \frac{\left|\left\langle z^{\prime}, B y\right\rangle_{Z^{\prime}, Z}\right|}{\left\|z^{\prime}\right\|_{Z^{\prime}}\|y\|_{Y}} . \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof Denote by $l$ and $r$ the left- and right-hand side of (4), respectively. The left-hand side being equal to $l$ means that $l$ is the largest number such that $\|B y\|_{Z} \geq l\|y\|_{Y}$ for all $y$ in $Y$. Let $z^{\prime} \in Z^{\prime}$ and
$z \in Z$. Since $B$ is surjective, there is $y_{z} \in Y$ so that $B y_{z}=z$ and the previous statement regarding $l$ implies that $l\left\|y_{z}\right\|_{Y} \leq\|z\|_{Z}$. This in turn implies that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|z^{\prime}\right\|_{Z^{\prime}} & =\sup _{z \in Z} \frac{\left|\left\langle z^{\prime}, z\right\rangle_{Z^{\prime}, Z}\right|}{\|w\|_{Z}}=\sup _{z \in Z} \frac{\left|\left\langle w^{\prime}, B y_{z}\right\rangle_{Z^{\prime}, Z}\right|}{\|z\|_{Z}}=\sup _{z \in Z} \frac{\left|\left\langle B^{*} w^{\prime}, y_{z}\right\rangle_{Y^{\prime}, Y}\right|}{\|z\|_{Z}} \\
& \leq\left\|B^{*} z^{\prime}\right\|_{Y^{\prime}} \sup _{z \in Z} \frac{\left\|y_{z}\right\|_{Y}}{\|z\|_{Z}} \leq \frac{1}{l}\left\|B^{*} z^{\prime}\right\|_{Y^{\prime}}
\end{aligned}
$$

which implies $l \leq r$. That $r \leq l$ is proved similarly by working with $Z^{\prime}$ in lieu of $Y, Y^{\prime}$ in lieu of $Z$ and $B^{*}$ in lieu of $B$ (which is also surjective). We infer that

$$
\inf _{z^{\prime} \in Z^{\prime}} \sup _{y^{\prime \prime} \in Y^{\prime \prime}} \frac{\left\langle y^{\prime \prime}, B^{*} z^{\prime}\right\rangle_{Y^{\prime \prime}, Y^{\prime}}}{\left\|y^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{Y^{\prime \prime}}\left\|z^{\prime}\right\|_{Z^{\prime}}} \leq \inf _{y^{\prime \prime} \in Y^{\prime \prime}} \sup _{z^{\prime} \in Z^{\prime}} \frac{\left\langle y^{\prime \prime}, B^{*} z^{\prime}\right\rangle_{Y^{\prime \prime}, Y^{\prime}}}{\left\|y^{\prime \prime}\right\|_{Y^{\prime \prime}}\left\|z^{\prime}\right\|_{Z^{\prime}}}
$$

and we conclude using the reflexivity of $Y$.
The following result is a consequence of Banach's Open Mapping and Closed Range Theorems, see, e.g., [4, Lem. A. 36 \& A.40].

Lemma 3 (Surjectivity) The following three statements are equivalent:
(i) $B: Y \rightarrow Z$ is surjective.
(ii) $B^{*}: Z^{\prime} \rightarrow Y^{\prime}$ is injective and $\operatorname{im}\left(B^{*}\right)$ is closed in $Y^{\prime}$.
(iii) The following holds:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta:=\inf _{z^{\prime} \in Z^{\prime}} \sup _{y \in Y} \frac{\left\langle B^{*} z^{\prime}, y\right\rangle_{Y^{\prime}, Y}}{\left\|z^{\prime}\right\|_{Z^{\prime}}\|y\|_{Y}}>0 \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Assume that $B$ is surjective, i.e., the inf-sup condition (5) holds. We now show that it is possible to construct a right-inverse map of $B$ and to control its norm by the inf-sup constant $\beta$.
Lemma 4 (Right inverse) Assume that (5) holds and that $Y$ is reflexive. Then there is a right-inverse map $R_{B}: Z \rightarrow Y$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\forall z \in Z, \quad B\left(R_{B}(z)\right)=z \quad \text { and } \quad \beta\left\|R_{B}(z)\right\|_{Y} \leq\|z\|_{Z} . \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, it is possible to construct a linear map $R_{B}$ if $Y$ is a Hilbert space.
Proof This result can be found in [4, Lem. A.42]; for completeness, we present a proof. The inf-sup condition (5) implies that $B^{*}$ is injective (see Lemma 3(ii)). Let us set $\mathcal{H}:=\operatorname{im}\left(B^{*}\right) \subset Y^{\prime}$ equipped with the norm of $Y^{\prime}$. Let $R_{B^{*}}: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow Z^{\prime}$ be such that, for all $y^{\prime} \in \mathcal{H}, B^{*}\left(R_{B^{*}}\left(y^{\prime}\right)\right)=y^{\prime}$. $B^{*}$ being injective, $R_{B^{*}}$ is uniquely defined and is a linear map; notice also that $R_{B^{*}}\left(B^{*}\left(z^{\prime}\right)\right)=z^{\prime}$ for all $z^{\prime} \in Z^{\prime}$ since $R_{B^{*}}\left(B^{*}\left(z^{\prime}\right)\right)-z^{\prime}$ is in $\operatorname{ker}\left(B^{*}\right)=\{0\}$. Moreover, the inf-sup condition (5) implies that $\left\|R_{B^{*}}\left(y^{\prime}\right)\right\|_{Z^{\prime}} \leq$ $\beta^{-1}\left\|y^{\prime}\right\|_{Y^{\prime}}$. We next define the linear map $\phi: Z \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{\prime}$ such that, for all $z \in Z,\left\langle\phi(z), y^{\prime}\right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}^{\prime}, \mathcal{H}}=$ $\overline{\left\langle R_{B^{*}}\left(y^{\prime}\right), z\right\rangle_{Z^{\prime}, Z}}$ for all $y^{\prime} \in \mathcal{H}$. We infer that

$$
\left|\left\langle\phi(z), y^{\prime}\right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}^{\prime}, \mathcal{H}}\right| \leq\left\|R_{B^{*}}\left(y^{\prime}\right)\right\|_{Z^{\prime}}\|z\|_{Z} \leq \beta^{-1}\left\|y^{\prime}\right\|_{Y^{\prime}}\|z\|_{Z}
$$

This means that $\phi(z)$ is bounded on $\mathcal{H} \subset Y^{\prime}$ with $\|\phi(z)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\prime}} \leq \beta^{-1}\|z\|_{z}$. Owing to the Hahn-Banach Theorem in complex Banach spaces (see [2, Prop. 11.23]), $\phi(z)$ can be extended to $Y^{\prime}$ with the same norm. Let $\mathcal{E}(\phi(z)) \in Y^{\prime \prime}$ be the extension in question with $\|\mathcal{E}(\phi(z))\|_{Y^{\prime \prime}} \leq \beta^{-1}\|z\|_{Z}$. Since $Y$ is reflexive, the canonical isometry $J_{Y}: Y \rightarrow Y^{\prime \prime}$ is a linear isomorphism. Let us set $R_{B}(z):=J_{Y}^{-1}(\mathcal{E}(\phi(z)))$; notice that $J_{Y}\left(R_{B}(z)\right)=\mathcal{E}(\phi(z))$. Then, the following holds for all $z^{\prime} \in Z^{\prime}$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\langle z^{\prime}, B\left(R_{B}(z)\right)\right\rangle_{Z^{\prime}, Z} & =\left\langle B^{*} z^{\prime}, R_{B}(z)\right\rangle_{Y^{\prime}, Y}=\overline{\left\langle J_{Y}\left(R_{B}(z)\right), B^{*} z^{\prime}\right\rangle_{Y^{\prime \prime}, Y^{\prime}}}=\overline{\left\langle\mathcal{E}(\phi(z)), B^{*} z^{\prime}\right\rangle_{Y^{\prime \prime}, Y^{\prime}}} \\
& =\left\langle\phi(z), B^{*} z^{\prime}\right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}^{\prime}, \mathcal{H}}=\left\langle R_{B^{*}}\left(B^{*} z^{\prime}\right), z\right\rangle_{Z^{\prime}, Z}=\left\langle z^{\prime}, z\right\rangle_{Z^{\prime}, Z},
\end{aligned}
$$

showing that $B\left(R_{B}(z)\right)=z$. Moreover, $\left\|R_{B}(z)\right\|_{Y}=\left\|J_{Y}\left(R_{B}(z)\right)\right\|_{Y^{\prime \prime}}=\|\mathcal{E}(\phi(z))\|_{Y^{\prime \prime}}=\|\phi(z)\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\prime}} \leq$ $\beta^{-1}\|z\|_{Z}$, showing that (6) holds. In conclusion, $R_{B}=J_{Y}^{-1} \circ \mathcal{E} \circ \phi$, where the first and third maps are linear. If $Y$ is a Hilbert space, then the extension map $\mathcal{E}$ is also linear; it suffices to extend linear forms on $\mathcal{H}$ by zero on the orthogonal complement of $\mathcal{H}$ in $Y^{\prime}$.
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