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#### Abstract

The pseudoinverse of a matrix, a generalized notion of the inverse, is of fundamental importance in linear algebra. However, there does not exist a closed form representation of the pseudoinverse, which can be straightforwardly computed. Therefore, an algorithmic computation is necessary. An algorithmic computation can only be evaluated by also considering the underlying hardware, typically digital hardware, which is responsible for performing the actual computations step by step. In this paper, we analyze if and to what degree the pseudoinverse actually can be computed on digital hardware platforms modeled as Turing machines. For this, we utilize the notion of an effective algorithm which describes a provably correct computation: upon an input of any error parameter, the algorithm provides an approximation within the given error bound with respect to the unknown solution. We prove that an effective algorithm for computing the pseudoinverse of any matrix can not exist on a Turing machine, although provably correct algorithms do exist for specific classes of matrices. Even more, our results introduce a lower bound on the accuracy that can be obtained algorithmically when computing the pseudoinverse on Turing machines.


## 1 Introduction

The pseudoinverse $[25,28]$ of a matrix and related matrix functions such as the least squares problem play an important role in various areas of linear algebra. For instance, the solution of linear systems [19], the condition number of a matrix, the orthogonal projection onto the range of a matrix and statistical applications in linear models [1] are all connected to the associated pseudoinverse. Moreover, the pseudoinverse also arises in areas related to matrix decomposition [13], Schur complements [14], Toeplitz matrices [15], and graph theory [5, 37, 3].

An interesting link exists to quantum algorithms, i.e., algorithm designed to run on quantum computers [27]. In [20], a quantum algorithm, which estimates features of the solution of a set of linear equations, is presented that enables a speedup in comparison to classical counterparts on digital hardware. Additionally, proof-of-concept implementations have been presented in [4, 12]. However, to exploit the speedup of this quantum algorithm, the condition number of the input matrix describing the set of linear equations is required as input to this quantum algorithm, i.e., one needs to be able to compute the condition number (via the pseudoinverse) in advance, which is typically performed on digital hardware.

These examples stress the significance of the pseudoinverse in various applications. Unfortunately, there does not exist a computable, i.e., constructive, closed-from representation of the pseudoinverse despite the fact that its existence and uniqueness can be proven [25, 28. Therefore, the ability to compute the pseudoinverse algorithmically is essential in the mentioned (and many other) instances. Today, virtually any general-purpose computing device, even high-performance computers, are based on digital hardware so that digital computations are ubiquitous. On digital hardware, exact computations on continuous quantities such as real numbers can not be expected, since the exact representation of these quantities is in general not feasible. Thus, only approximate solutions to problems with continuous quantities are realizable. However, the quality of the approximation can only be evaluated if the distance to the true (exact) solution is known. Hence, a key question is whether a general algorithm to compute the pseudoinverse with error control on digital hardware exists.

In practice, there do exist approaches to compute the pseudoinverse on digital hardware, e.g., by rank decomposition, applying the QR method, singular value decomposition [7] and based on Gaussian elimination [32, 21]. However, these approaches are not certifiably correct and lack error control; for certain input instances the computed outputs may strongly differ from the (unknown) true pseudoinverse, e.g., due to numerical errors.

Due to these shortcomings, it is also interesting to consider hardware platforms beyond classical digital hardware. In recent years, quantum algorithms gained considerable interest due to their potential benefits concerning running time compared to their classical counterparts. Indeed, quantum algorithms have been proposed to compute a singular value transformation which among other things enables the computation of the pseudoinverse 18 , 24. Crucially, these quantum algorithms depend on the assumption that the singular values of a matrix are restricted to a certain interval and are in particular non-zero. Although, there may exist quantum algorithms that do not depend on this assumption, none are known at the moment. Moreover, it is not clear if and when the theoretical benefits of quantum algorithm will translate into practical, real-world advantages since actual implementations of quantum computers are still missing [16].

Therefore, in this work our goal is to assess today's most relevant hardware platform, i.e., digital computers. The power and capabilities of digital computers can be studied via the mathematical model of Turing machines [36]. If a problem is not solvable on Turing machines, then the problem can not be solved on any real-world digital computer. Informally speaking, we show that the pseudoinverse can not be computed to arbitrary precision on Turing machines and we also provide a lower bound on the achievable algorithmic approximation accuracy. In other words, we prove that there does not exist a general algorithm to compute the pseudoinverse of any matrix on digital hardware with arbitrary accuracy.

### 1.1 Digital Computations

An algorithmic computation is a list of instructions to solve a given problem. The instructions and the computing device executing said instructions must be synchronized, i.e., only operations that the computing device can execute are allowed to be part of the instructions.

The predominant computing device today are digital computers. Digital hardware only allows for the exact computation of finite discrete problems. In case of continuous problems, algorithms on digital hardware can only provide an approximation of the exact solution. Thus, to evaluate the computed approximation and guarantee its correctness, a well-defined notion of approximate solution is required. An approach is to ask for effective algorithms, i.e., the algorithm does not only compute an approximate solution but also quantifies the error to the (generally unknown) exact solution. Even more, the algorithm must be able to provide an approximation within any prescribed error bound.

A theoretical model for digital computers is given by Turing machines [36], which capture the logic of digital computations but neglect real-word limitations such as memory constraints, energy consumption, etc. Any algorithm that can be executed by a real-world (digital) computer can, in theory, be simulated by a Turing machine, and vice versa. Turing machines represent an intuitive understanding of computation machines that manipulate (binary) symbols on a strip of tape according to certain given rules. The set of rules defines the feasible operations on a Turing machine.

Turing machines offer a mathematical model describing the power and limitations of digital computations. Therefore, the existence of effective algorithms can be studied via Turing machines. Intriguingly, one can, for instance, prove that there exist continuously differentiable and computable functions for which the first derivative is not computable [26]. Moreover, various analog systems can not be effectively approximated on digital machines, e.g. the Cauchy problem for the three dimensional wave equation [30], stable, linear, and time-invariant systems [11], channel capacities in information theory [17, 31] and operations in signal processing such as spectral factorization [10], or the Fourier transform of discrete and bandlimited signals (9].

Our main focus in this paper is on the computability of the function mapping a matrix to its pseudoinverse. For this, we will consider different notions of computable functions, more precisely, Banach-Mazur and Borel-Turing computability. Banach-Mazur computability is a prerequisite for the existence of any effective algorithm tackling a problem described by the input-output relation of a function. Consequently, Banach-Mazur non-computability of a function excludes an effective algorithmic solution of the associated problem. We provide a precise definition of those types of computability in Section 2.

### 1.2 Problem Formulation

The pseudoinverse $A^{\dagger} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$ of a matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ is characterized by the following conditions:

$$
\begin{aligned}
A A^{\dagger} A & =A \\
A^{\dagger} A A^{\dagger} & =A^{\dagger} \\
\left(A A^{\dagger}\right)^{H} & =A A^{\dagger} \\
\left(A^{\dagger} A\right)^{H} & =A^{\dagger} A
\end{aligned}
$$

Although these equations uniquely define the pseudoinverse, i.e., there exists precisely one matrix $A^{\dagger}$ which satisfies all four conditions, an explicit algebraic formula of $A^{\dagger}$ is known only in specific instances. For example, if $A$ has full rank such that its columns are linearly independent, then it is easy to verify that $A^{\dagger}=\left(A^{H} A\right)^{-1} A^{H}$. In the general case, an explicit description that allows for a direct computation is lacking. Therefore, the ability to algorithmically compute the pseudoinverse is tremendously important. The need is accentuated by fundamental problems whose solution depends on the pseudoinverse. The well-known least squares problem asks to

$$
\text { minimize }\|A x-b\|_{2} \text { over } x \in \mathbb{C}^{n} \quad \text { for } A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \text { and } b \in \mathbb{C}^{m}
$$

This optimization problem is convex and a minimizer $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{C}^{n}$ can be found via $A^{\dagger}$ as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{x}=A^{\dagger} b \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Intriguingly, $\hat{x}$ is the unique minimizer with minimum Euclidean norm (see e.g. [34]).
Our core question is whether the pseudoinverse and fundamental problems associated with the pseudoinverse such as the least squares problem and the condition number of a matrix can be effectively approximated. To that end, we consider the computability of the following mappings:
(I) The (matrix) function $g_{\text {inv }}: \mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$ mapping a matrix to its pseudoinverse

$$
g_{\mathrm{inv}}(A):=A^{\dagger} .
$$

(II) The function $g_{\text {norm }}: \mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ evaluating the norm of the pseudoinverse

$$
g_{\mathrm{norm}}(A):=\left\|A^{\dagger}\right\|_{F} .
$$

We chose the Frobenius norm $\|\cdot\|_{F}$, but any other computable norm would be suitable as well. We refer to Section 2 for a formal introduction of this notion.
(III) The function $\Psi_{\text {lsq }}: \mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \times \mathbb{C}^{m} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n}$ describing the solution of the least square problem, i.e.,

$$
\Psi_{\mathrm{lsq}}(A, b):=\inf _{x \in \mathbb{C}^{n}}\|A x-b\|_{2}
$$

The minimizer $\hat{x}$ in (1.1) guarantees the existence of the optimal value so that $\Psi_{\text {lsq }}$ can be rewritten as

$$
\Psi_{\mathrm{lsq}}(A, b)=\min _{x \in \mathbb{C}^{n}}\|A x-b\|_{2}
$$

(IV) The function $\Psi_{\text {sol }}: \mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \times \mathbb{C}^{m} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n}$ mapping $(A, b)$ to the minimizer $\hat{x}_{(A, b)}$ with minimal Euclidean norm, i.e.,

$$
\Psi_{\mathrm{sol}}(A, b):=\hat{x}_{(A, b)}
$$

(V) The function $\Psi_{\text {norm }}: \mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \times \mathbb{C}^{m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ computing the norm of the minimizer with minimal Euclidean norm, i.e.,

$$
\Psi_{\text {norm }}(A, b):=\left\|\hat{x}_{(A, b)}\right\|_{2}=\left\|A^{\dagger} b\right\|_{2} .
$$

(VI) The function $\kappa: \mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ describing the condition number of matrices, i.e.,

$$
\kappa(A):=\|A\|_{F}\left\|A^{\dagger}\right\|_{F} .
$$

Again, $\|\cdot\|_{F}$ can be replaced with any other computable norm (see Section 22).

### 1.3 Contributions and Impact

The key contribution of our paper is the proof of Banach-Mazur non-computability of all functions in (I)-(VI) in Theorem 3.1. Hence, there does not exist an effective algorithm for solving the problems described by these functions. In addition, we extend our result further in the following directions:

1. We first observe that there might still exist algorithms that provide sufficiently accurate approximations of the problems, e.g., algorithms that compute approximations with error at most $10^{-k}$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. If $k$ is suitably large, then the non-computability of the functions may be negligible, since the magnitude of the error is in fact insignificant for practical applications. To analyze this further, in Theorem 3.3 we also establish lower bounds on the algorithmically achievable accuracy by studying at which precision the computability property breaks down. It turns out that not even $k=1$ can be reached for our problems. In this way, we reinforce the impact of our analysis.
2. We also note that there still might exist algorithms that provide arbitrarily accurate approximations on a subset of the problems, e.g., restricting the input to diagonal matrices with non-zero entries on the diagonal changes the properties of the functions in (I)-(VI) significantly. In this case, the pseudoinverse equals the inverse, which can be straightforwardly computed, so that the posed problems can be effectively tackled. In a similar manner, one may be able to design algorithms which solve the problems described in (I)-(VI) on a restricted input domain for a certain class of matrices. Indeed, in the boundary case where we restrict the input to a fixed element, i.e., a fixed matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ or a fixed matrix-vector pair $(A, b) \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \times \mathbb{C}^{m}$ with computable elements, we show in Theorem 3.7 that the pseudoinverse $A^{\dagger}$ and the minimum norm solution $\hat{x}_{(A, b)}$ consist of computable elements, i.e., can be computed algorithmically - the notion of a computable number is introduced in Section 2 formally. The key is that the corresponding algorithms to compute $A^{\dagger}$ depend on the specific properties of the given matrix $A$ and can in general not be adapted to other matrices. In other words, each input requires a unique algorithm that exploits the characteristics of the given input and may not be feasible for a different input.

Summarizing, we show that for the introduced problems there can not exist an algorithm on digital hardware that is universal, i.e., can be applied to any matrix, and is provably correct at the same time. Aiming for improvements on either property necessarily leads to a degradation of the other property. Nevertheless, for a certain class of applications, which are based on restricted input sets, provably correct algorithms might exists. However, Theorem 3.3 indicates that the requirements on the input domain must be rather specific, simply considering a compact domain is in general not sufficient. Moreover, even finding a suitably narrow input domain, for which an effective algorithm does exist, is only partially sufficient. Now, the difficulty of deciding whether an arbitrary matrix is an element of the feasible input set arises. To tackle this issue on a Turing machine is far from trivial, since the equality of real numbers (and thereby also matrices) can not be effectively decided [29].

We wish to emphasize that the described computational barrier does not purely arises due to numerical errors in real-world implementations but is an inherent feature of Turing machines. Indeed, the condition number for invertible matrices provides a measure of numerical errors for implementations of the inversion operation on actual digital hardware with floating point arithmetic. However, computing the inverse of a fixed matrix can be performed effectively, even on instances with ill-conditioned inputs. Thus, non-computability is not inherently connected to ill-conditioned inputs. The non-computable property establishes an impossibility result for any realization on a digital machine, whereas the condition number only provides a heuristic to decide whether a specific input is 'benign' in certain circumstances. In fact, our findings indicate that not even the computation of this heuristic, i.e., the condition number, can be effectively performed on digital hardware in general.

### 1.4 Outline

First, we provide an introduction to computability theory in Section 2. Then, in Section 3 our results concerning the computability of the pseudoinverse and the functions introduced in (I)-(VI) are presented. Additionally, we discuss the implications of our findings on existing approaches for computing the pseudoinverse. Finally, Section 4 covers the proof of the statements from Section 3.

## 2 Computable Analysis

Turing machines are a mathematical model of what we intuitively understand as computation machines that manipulate symbols on a strip of tape. They yield an abstract idealization of today's real-world (digital) computers.

This section is devoted to presenting the necessary definitions and results from computability theory based on Turing machines. A comprehensive formal introduction on the topic of computability may be found in $[33,38,29,2]$.

We first recall two notions from classical computability theory.

## Definition 2.1.

(1) A set $A \subset \mathbb{N}$ of natural numbers is said to be recursive (or computable or decidable), if there exists an algorithm taking natural numbers as input and which correctly decides
after a finite amount of time whether the input belongs to $A$ or to the complement set $A^{c}=\mathbb{N} \backslash A$.
(2) A set $A \subset \mathbb{N}$ is called recursively enumerable, if there exists an algorithm, which correctly identifies (after a finite amount of time) all inputs belonging to $A$, but which may not halt if the input does not belong to $A$.

The halting problem for Turing machines is an example of a recursively enumerable set that is non-recursive.

The notion of computability on Turing machines is strongly related to the set of recursive functions 22, which constitute a natural mathematical class of computable functions on the natural numbers (35].

Lemma 2.2. A (partial) function $f: \mathbb{N}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is a recursive function if and only if it computable by a Turing machine, i.e., if there exists a Turing machine that accepts an input $x \in \mathbb{N}$ if and only if $f(x)$ is defined, and, upon acceptance, leaves the string $f(x)$ on its tape.

The goal of computable analysis is to extend the notion of computability on Turing machines to uncountable domains.

### 2.1 Computable Real Numbers

The natural domain of Turing machines acting on the real numbers are the computable real numbers. Informally, a computable real number is one which can be approximated to any desired degree of precision by a Turing machine given in advance. This property can also be expressed via specific sequences of rational numbers which we introduce next.

Definition 2.3. A sequence $\left(r_{k}\right)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of rational numbers is computable, if there exist three recursive functions $a, b, s: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $b(k) \neq 0$ and

$$
r_{k}=(-1)^{s(k)} \cdot \frac{a(k)}{b(k)} \quad \text { for all } k \in \mathbb{N}
$$

Remark 2.4. The definition can be straightforwardly extended to multi-indexed sequences. For a fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$, a sequence $\left(r_{k_{1}, \ldots, k_{n}}\right)_{k_{1}, \ldots, k_{n} \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{Q}$ is then called computable, if there exist three recursive functions $a, b, s: \mathbb{N}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$
r_{k_{1}, \ldots, k_{n}}=(-1)^{s\left(k_{1}, \ldots, k_{n}\right)} \cdot \frac{a\left(k_{1}, \ldots, k_{n}\right)}{b\left(k_{1}, \ldots, k_{n}\right)} \quad \text { for all } k_{1}, \ldots, k_{n} \in \mathbb{N}
$$

Now, we define computable real numbers as the limit of computable sequences of rational numbers.

## Definition 2.5.

(1) A sequence $\left(r_{k}\right)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of rational numbers converges effectively to $x \in \mathbb{R}$, if there exists a recursive function $e: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$
\left|r_{k}-x\right| \leq 2^{-N} \quad \text { for all } N \in \mathbb{N} \text { and all } k \geq e(N)
$$

(2) A real number $x \in \mathbb{R}$ is computable, if there exists a computable sequence $\left(r_{k}\right)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{Q}$ which converges effectively to $x$. We refer to the sequence $\left(r_{k}\right)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ as a representation for $x$ and denote the set of computable real numbers by $\mathbb{R}_{c}$.

Next, we collect some useful properties of computable numbers as well as extend the notion to multi-dimensional objects.
Remark 2.6. (1) The set $\mathbb{R}_{c}$ is a subfield of $\mathbb{R}$ with countably many elements. Since all rational numbers are computable, $\mathbb{R}_{c}$ is dense in $\mathbb{R}$.
(2) A number $x \in \mathbb{R}$ is computable if and only if there exists a computable sequence $\left(r_{k}\right)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{Q}$ such that

$$
\left|r_{k}-x\right| \leq 2^{-k} \quad \text { for all } k \in \mathbb{N} \text {. }
$$

(3) A vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ is computable if each of its components is computable. Similarly, a complex number is computable if its real and imaginary parts are computable. We denote the set of computable complex numbers by $\mathbb{C}_{c}:=\left\{x+i y \in \mathbb{C}: x, y \in \mathbb{R}_{c}\right\}$.

### 2.2 Computable Sequences of Real Numbers

The next step is to extend the computability notion from numbers to sequences.
Definition 2.7. Let $\left(x_{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a sequence and $\left(x_{n, k}\right)_{n, k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}$ a double-indexed sequence such that, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$
x_{n, k} \rightarrow x_{n} \quad \text { for } k \rightarrow \infty .
$$

We say that $\left(x_{n, k}\right)_{n, k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to $\left(x_{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ effectively in $k$ and $n$, if there exists a recursive function $e: \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$
\left|x_{n, k}-x_{n}\right| \leq 2^{-N} \quad \text { for all } n, N \in \mathbb{N} \text { and all } k \geq e(n, N)
$$

A sequence of real numbers $\left(x_{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is computable (as a sequence) if there exists a computable double-indexed sequence $\left(r_{n, k}\right)_{n, k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{Q}$ such that $r_{n, k}$ converges to $x_{n}$ effectively in $k$ and $n$.

Remark 2.8. In the previous definition one may assume without loss of generality that the recursive function $e: \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is an increasing function in both variables.

Subsequently, we give a convenient equivalent characterization of computable real sequences and extend the notion to multi-dimensional objects.
Remark 2.9. (1) A sequence $\left(x_{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}$ is computable if and only if there exists a computable double-indexed sequence $\left(r_{n, k}\right)_{n, k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{Q}$ such that

$$
\left|r_{n, k}-x_{n}\right| \leq 2^{-k} \quad \text { for all } k, n \in \mathbb{N} \text {. }
$$

(2) We can again straightforwardly extend the computability notion to multi-indexed sequences. For a fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we call a sequence $\left(x_{k_{1}, \ldots, k_{n}}\right)_{k_{1}, \ldots, k_{n} \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}$ computable if and only if there exists a computable sequence $\left(r_{k_{1}, \ldots, k_{n+1}}\right)_{k_{1}, \ldots, k_{n+1} \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{Q}$ of rational numbers such that

$$
\left|r_{k_{1}, \ldots, k_{n+1}}-x_{k_{1}, \ldots, k_{n}}\right| \leq 2^{-k_{n+1}} \quad \text { for all } k_{1}, \ldots, k_{n+1} \in \mathbb{N}
$$

(3) A sequence of vectors $\left(v_{k}\right)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$ is computable if each of its components is a computable sequence. A sequence of complex numbers is computable if its real and imaginary parts are computable sequences.
An important result is that the limit of a computable sequence is again computable under certain assumptions (see e.g. [29]).

Theorem 2.10 (Closure under effective convergence). Let $\left(x_{n, k}\right)_{n, k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a computable double-indexed sequence of real numbers, which converges to a sequence $\left(x_{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ effectively in $k$ and $n$. Then the sequence $\left(x_{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is computable.

### 2.3 Computable Functions

Computability of functions is a well-studied property, and there exist various computability notions. For a comprehensive review of different computabillity notions we refer to [2]. The notions we will employ in our analysis are the following ones.

Definition 2.11. A function $f: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{c}^{n}, I \subset \mathbb{R}_{c}^{m}$, is called Borel-Turing computable, if there exists an algorithm (or Turing machine) that transforms each given computable representation of a computable vector $x \in I$ into a representation for $f(x)$.

Remark 2.12. Borel-Turing computability is the minimal requirement for a verifiable correct algorithmic computation (with error control) of the input-output relation of a problem on perfect digital hardware. Thus, effective algorithms can only exist if the associated problem is Borel-Turing computable.

The weakest form of computability is Banach-Mazur computability. If a function is not Banach-Mazur computable, then it is not computable on digital hardware with respect to any other reasonable notion of computability including Borel-Turing computability.

Definition 2.13 (Banach-Mazur computability). A function $f: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{c}^{n}, I \subset \mathbb{R}_{c}^{m}$, is said to be Banach-Mazur computable, if $f$ maps computable sequences $\left(t_{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset I$ onto computable sequences $\left(f\left(t_{n}\right)\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}_{c}^{n}$.

Remark 2.14. (1) We can extend the notion of Borel-Turing and Banach-Mazur computability in a straightforward fashion to the complex domain. A function $f: I \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_{c}^{n}, I \subset \mathbb{C}_{c}^{m}$ is Borel-Turing, respectively Banach-Mazur, computable if its real and imaginary part are Borel-Turing, respectively Banach-Mazur, computable. Hence, the problem of computability reduces to the real-valued case.
(2) Analogously, Borel-Turing and Banach-Mazur computability can also be extended to include matrix function, i.e., functions that take matrices as input and/or map on matrices.

Remark 2.15. The domain of computations exclusively performed on Turing machines (i.e., digital hardware) are the computable numbers. One might be interested in non-computable inputs as well by extending the computations beyond Turing machines. For instance, an oracle could provide representations for any (and not just computable) real number [23]. Noncomputability results on the computable numbers extend to the non-computable domain, since $\mathbb{R}_{c}$ is a subset of $\mathbb{R}$.

Many elementary functions can be identified as computable [29].
Remark 2.16 (Elementary functions). Let $\left(x_{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}},\left(y_{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}$ be computable sequences. Then the following sequences are computable in the Borel-Turing as well as Banach-Mazur sense:

- $\left(x_{n} \pm y_{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}},\left(x_{n} y_{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}},\left(\frac{x_{n}}{y_{n}}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\left(\right.$ if $y_{n} \neq 0$ for all $\left.n\right)$, ,
- $\left(\max \left\{x_{n}, y_{n}\right\}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}},\left(\min \left\{x_{n}, y_{n}\right\}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$,
- $\left(\exp x_{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}},\left(\log x_{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}},\left(\left|x_{n}\right|\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}},\left(\sqrt{x_{n}}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Now, the computability of various matrix and vector norms is immediate via Remark 2.16 .
Lemma 2.17. The Euclidean norm and the Frobenius norm are Banach-Mazur computable.

## 3 Main Results

Our goal is to assess the possibility of an effective computation of the pseudoinverse on digital hardware. In Theorem 3.1, we show that the mapping of a matrix to its pseudoinverse is not Banach-Mazur computable. Therefore, an effective approach to compute the pseudoinverse (on digital hardware) can generally not exist. Moreover, Theorem 3.3 provides a lower bound on the achievable accuracy of any algorithm computing the pseudoinverse. Finally, we also relate our findings to existing approaches, in particular iterative methods, to compute the pseudoinverse.

### 3.1 Banach-Mazur Non-Computabilty of the Pseudoinverse

The Borel-Turing computability of the mapping of a matrix on its pseudoinverse would immediately imply that all functions in (I)-(VI) are computable (on digital hardware) due to Remark 2.16 and Lemma 2.17. A standard approach to compute the pseudoinverse on digital hardware is given by the singular value decomposition. A crucial step therein is to identify the non-zero singular values of a matrix. However, the comparison to zero can not be performed effectively on digital hardware [29]. Hence, applying the singular value decomposition is not sufficient to establish an effective approach to compute the pseudoinverse. Nevertheless, there might exist a different effective approach to obtain the pseudoinverse. Unfortunately, the next theorem implies that such an effective approach can not exist in general. A proof is provided in Section 4 .

Theorem 3.1. For $m, n \geq 2$, the functions in (I)-(VI) are not Banach-Mazur computable.
Remark 3.2. Since every Borel-Turing computable function is Banach-Mazur computable, the statement of Theorem 3.1 also holds with respect to computability in Borel-Turing sense. Hence, an algorithmic computations on digital hardware in the sense of Remark 2.12 of the problems posed by (I)-(VI) is not feasible.

Borel-Turing non-computability implies that there does not exist an algorithm that solves the problem posed by the functions (I)-(VI) to arbitrary accuracy. However, we can even be more precise, i.e., we can even precisely specify the approximation accuracy that is algorithmically achievable. Again, we refer to Section 4 for the proof.

Theorem 3.3. For $m, n \geq 2$, the functions in (I)-(VI) are not algorithmically approximable to arbitrary precision. In particular, we have the following bounds.
(i) Let $\hat{g}_{\text {inv }}: \mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$ be an arbitrary function approximating $g_{\text {inv }}$ with

$$
\sup _{\substack{A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \\\|A\|_{F} \leq \sqrt{2}}}\left\|g_{i n v}(A)-\hat{g}_{i n v}(A)\right\|_{F}<\infty .
$$

Then $\hat{g}_{\text {inv }}$ is not Banach-Mazur computable.
(ii) Let $\hat{g}_{\text {norm }}: \mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an arbitrary function approximating $g_{\text {norm }}$ with

$$
\sup _{\substack{A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \\\|A\|_{F} \leq \sqrt{2}}}\left|g_{\text {norm }}(A)-\hat{g}_{\text {norm }}(A)\right|<\infty .
$$

Then $\hat{g}_{\text {norm }}$ is not Banach-Mazur computable.
(iii) Let $\hat{\Psi}_{l s q}: \mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \times \mathbb{C}^{m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an arbitrary function approximating $\Psi_{\text {lsq }}$ with

$$
\sup _{\substack{(A, b) \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \times \mathbb{C}^{m}: \\\|A\|_{F} \leq \sqrt{2},\|b\|_{2} \leq \sqrt{2}}}\left|\Psi_{l s q}(A, b)-\hat{\Psi}_{l s q}(A, b)\right|<\frac{1}{4} .
$$

Then $\hat{\Psi}_{l s q}$ is not Banach-Mazur computable.
(iv) Let $\hat{\Psi}_{\text {sol }}: \mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \times \mathbb{C}^{m} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n}$ be an arbitrary function approximating $\Psi_{\text {sol }}$ with

$$
\sup _{\substack{(A, b) \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \times \mathbb{C}^{m} ; \\\|A\|_{F} \leq \sqrt{2},\|b\|_{2} \leq \sqrt{2}}}\left\|\Psi_{\text {sol }}(A, b)-\hat{\Psi}_{\text {sol }}(A, b)\right\|_{2}<\infty
$$

Then $\hat{\Psi}_{\text {sol }}$ is not Banach-Mazur computable.
(v) Let $\hat{\Psi}_{\text {norm }}: \mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \times \mathbb{C}^{m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an arbitrary function approximating $\Psi_{\text {norm }}$ with

$$
\sup _{\substack{(A, b) \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \times \mathbb{C}^{m} ; \\\|A\|_{F} \leq \sqrt{2},\|b\|_{2} \leq \sqrt{2}}}\left|\Psi_{\text {norm }}(A, b)-\hat{\Psi}_{\text {norm }}(A, b)\right|<\infty .
$$

Then $\hat{\Psi}_{\text {norm }}$ is not Banach-Mazur computable.
(vi) Let $\hat{\kappa}: \mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an arbitrary function approximating $\kappa$ with

$$
\sup _{\substack{A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \\\|A\|_{F} \leq \sqrt{2}}}|\kappa(A)-\hat{\kappa}(A)|<\infty .
$$

Then $\hat{\kappa}$ is not Banach-Mazur computable.

Remark 3.4. In (iii) the existence of an algorithm with uniform error $\frac{1}{4}$ over the input set $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \times \mathbb{C}^{m}$ may be theoretically feasible. However, we still need to find an explicit description of an algorithm and prove its correctness up to the given error. The situation is even more bleak in $(i),(i i)$ and $(i v)-(v i)$. In these settings, there do not exist algorithms with (uniformly) bounded error over the respective input sets. Even more, any algorithm is guaranteed to make arbitrary large errors on inputs from a sufficiently large compact subset.

### 3.2 Non-Effectiveness of Iterative Processes computing the Pseudoinverse

It is important to stress that our findings do not contradict the existence of procedures, which compute the pseudoinverse with provable convergence guarantees. For instance, the iterative process $\left(A_{k}\right)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in [6], which is given by

$$
A_{k}:=\left\{\begin{array}{ll}
\alpha A^{H} & : \text { if } k=0,  \tag{3.1}\\
2 A_{k-1}-A_{k-1} A A_{k-1} & : \text { if } k \in \mathbb{N},
\end{array} \quad \text { for some } 0<\alpha<\frac{2}{\|A\|_{2}^{2}},\right.
$$

converges to the pseudoinverse $A^{\dagger}$ of a non-zero rank $p$ matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$, i.e.,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|A^{\dagger}-A_{k}\right\|_{2} \leq \frac{\|A\|_{2}}{\lambda_{p}\left(A^{H} A\right)}\left(1-\lambda_{p}\left(A^{H} A\right)\right)^{2^{k}} \quad \text { for } k \in \mathbb{N} \cup\{0\} \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{2}$ denotes the spectral norm and $\lambda_{p}\left(A^{H} A\right)>0$ the $p$-th largest eigenvalue of $A^{H} A$. In particular, the convergences rate obeys

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|A^{\dagger}-A_{k}\right\|_{2} \leq\|A\|_{2}\left\|A^{\dagger}-A_{k-1}\right\|_{2}^{2} \quad \text { for } k \in \mathbb{N} \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The existence of this iterative process may appear to contradict the non-computability in Borel-Turing sense of $g_{\text {inv }}$, i.e., the mapping of a matrix on its pseudoinverse, in Remark 3.2. Indeed, an approach based on the iteration (3.1) appears to yield an effective algorithm to compute the pseudoinverse to any desired precision due to the convergence of the sequence $\left(A_{k}\right)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. This would imply that the function $g_{\text {inv }}$ is Borel-Turing computable. However, we will demonstrate that convergence does not suffice to guarantee the existence of an effective algorithm. The basis of the approach in (3.1) is the function $f: \mathbb{C}^{n \times m} \times \mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$ given by

$$
f(X, B)=2 X-X B X
$$

representing the iteration step in (3.1). It is immediate to verify via Remark 2.16 that $f$ is Borel-Turing computable (in both arguments). Using $f_{B}:=f(\cdot, B)$ we can rewrite the iteration in (3.1) as

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{k}=f_{A}\left(A_{k-1}\right)=f_{A}\left(f_{A}\left(\cdots f_{A}\left(A_{0}\right)\right)\right) \quad \text { for } k \in \mathbb{N} \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

The composition of Borel-Turing computable functions is again Borel-Turing computable. Consequently, the sequence $\left(A_{k}\right)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in (3.1) is a computable sequence provided that the initialization $A_{0}$ is a computable matrix. Unfortunately, the computability of the sequence does not ensure the effectiveness of the iteration.

Indeed, a practical implementation of the iterative process requires additionally a stopping criterion that aborts the computation once the approximation is sufficiently close to $A^{\dagger}$. Ideally, the algorithm would take an error parameter $N \in \mathbb{N}$ as additional input and halt, if for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$ the approximation error of $A_{m}$ is smaller than $2^{-N}$. Therefore, an effective implementation, which takes any (non-zero) matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ (via a representation) and error parameter $N$ as input and outputs an $2^{-N}$-close approximation (in the spectral norm) of the pseudoinverse $A^{\dagger}$, consists of the following steps:

Step 1: Determine a (suitable) initialization $A_{0}$.
Step 2: Perform the iteration in (3.1) based on the computed $A_{0}$.
Step 3: Abort the iteration once the approximation $A_{k}$ suffices the error bound $2^{-N}$.
Step 4: Output $A_{k}$.
The crucial aspect in this procedure is that the initialization and the termination of the iteration are integral parts of the effective implementation. Otherwise, the iterative process would require additional guidance, e.g., by a human, and the computations could not be performed independently and uniquely on digital hardware.

In the context of Turing machines the question of the effective implementation can be formalized in the following way: Does there exist a Borel-Turing computable function $G$ : $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ such that $A_{0}=G(A)$ and (3.4) converges effectively to the pseudoinverse $A^{\dagger}$ ? In particular, does there exist a corresponding recursive function $e: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that, for any $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ with $G(A)=A_{0}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|A^{\dagger}-A_{k}\right\|_{2} \leq \frac{1}{2^{N}} \quad \text { holds true for all } N \in \mathbb{N} \text { and } k \geq e(N) ? \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Unfortunately, we can immediately observe that the function $G$ with the described properties can not exist. Indeed, (3.5) would enable us to transform the representation of any non-zero matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ into a representation of the pseudoinverse $A^{\dagger}$. In other words, the mapping $g_{\text {inv }}$ is Borel-Turing computable. This contradicts Theorem 3.1, where we showed that $g_{\text {inv }}$ is not Banach-Mazur computable.

Corollary 3.5. For $n, m \geq 2$, there does not exist a Borel-Turing computable function $G: \mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ to compute an initialization $A_{0}=G(A)$ such that the sequence $\left(A_{k}\right)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, defined by

$$
A_{k}=2 A_{k-1}-A_{k-1} A A_{k-1} \quad \text { for } k \in \mathbb{N}
$$

converges effectively to the pseudoinverse $A^{\dagger}$.
Remark 3.6. (1) Notice that applying Theorem 3.3 implies that (3.5) can not be achieved on the compact input set $\|A\|_{F} \leq \sqrt{2}$ even for $N=1$.
(2) Strictly speaking, Theorem 3.1 only states the Banach-Mazur non-computability of $g_{\text {inv }}$ on the input space $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$. However, the proof in Section 4 shows that the noncomputability remains valid when excluding the zero matrix as input. Hence, the reasoning above Corollary 3.5 is indeed valid.

Corollary 3.5 shows that the iterative process (3.1) can not be implemented effectively on digital hardware. On the other hand, with a specifically chosen initialization the iteration (3.4) converges effectively. Indeed, fix any non-zero matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}_{c}^{m \times n}$ and initialize $A_{0} \in$ $\mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$ as $A_{0}=\beta A^{H}$, where $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_{c}$ satisfies the condition in (3.1). Since $\mathbb{R}_{c}$ is dense in $\mathbb{R}$, $\beta$ does indeed exist. Thus, the sequence $\left(A_{k}\right)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ defined by (3.1) converges to $A^{\dagger}$ so that there exists $k^{*} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$
\left\|A^{\dagger}-A_{k^{*}}\right\|_{2} \leq \begin{cases}\frac{1}{2} & : \text { if }\|A\|_{2} \leq 1  \tag{3.6}\\ \frac{1}{2\|A\|_{2}} & : \text { if }\|A\|_{2}>1\end{cases}
$$

Additionally, $A_{0}$ is computable because $\beta$ and $A^{H}$ are a computable number and matrix, respectively. Thus, due to (3.4) $\left(A_{k}\right)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a computable sequence and, in particular, $A_{k^{*}}$ is a computable matrix. It follows that the sequence $\left(A_{k^{*}+k}\right)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is computable, where we again applied (3.4). Then, (3.3) together with Equation (3.6) imply for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ that

$$
\left\|A^{\dagger}-A_{k^{*}+k}\right\|_{2} \leq \frac{1}{2^{k}}
$$

Hence, the computable sequence $\left(A_{k^{*}+k}\right)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges effectively to $A^{\dagger}$, i.e., $A^{\dagger}$ is computable in the sense that all elements of $A^{\dagger}$ are computable numbers. Thus, we can state the following theorem which is an immediate consequence of the observation that $A^{\dagger}$ consists of computable elements, provided that $A$ consists of computable elements, combined with Remark 2.16 and Lemma 2.17

Theorem 3.7. For computable inputs, the values of the functions in (I)-(VI) are computable, i.e., the values consists of computable elements.

Remark 3.8. (1) The construction of $\left(A_{k^{*}+k}\right)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ based on (3.6) for an arbitrary matrix $A \in$ $\mathbb{C}_{c}^{m \times n}$ can not be effective, i.e., Borel-Turing computable, despite the existence of the starting point $A_{k^{*}}$. However, Theorem 3.7 shows that for every fixed (non-zero) matrix with computable elements there exists a corresponding effective algorithm to compute the associated pseudoinverse. Since the elements of the pseudoinverse are computable, one may simply choose the algorithm that computes a representation of the pseudoinverse. However, this choice highlights that the algorithm is applicable only for the given matrix. In other words, the algorithm does not take an arbitrary matrix as input (to compute its pseudoinverse) but the algorithm is constructed with a specific matrix in mind. Thus, the algorithm(s) associated to specific matrices can not be generalized to solve the problems posed by the functions in (I)-(VI) for arbitrary computable inputs.
(2) The analysis of the iterative process (3.1) illustrates the contrast between effective initialization and effective convergence of the iteration. If an effective initialization is implemented, then effective convergence is not feasible. On the other hand, if effective convergence is guaranteed as in (3.6), then the corresponding initialization can not be performed effectively.
The previous discussion shows that any iterative process necessarily needs to rely on heuristics for initialization and stopping criteria. The heuristics may work reasonably well
for specific classes of matrices but they can not guarantee correctness (in the effective sense) in the general case. Moreover, the conducted analysis certainly remains valid for any approach trying to compute the pseudoinverse on digital hardware since the implications of Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.3 affect any such approach.

## 4 Proof Section

The proofs of Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.3 rely on general non-computability and nonapproximability conditions, which we introduce in Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.2, respectively. Similar non-computability and non-approximability conditions were established in [8], where the computability of finite-dimensional inverse problem is investigated. We present the necessary steps for the proofs of Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.2, but may occasionally refer to [8] for details.

### 4.1 Tools

The following lemma is the basis of our non-computability results in Theorem 3.1.
Lemma 4.1. Let $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and consider the map $f: X \rightarrow Y$, where $X \subset \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ or $X \subset \mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \times \mathbb{C}^{m}$ and $Y \subset \mathbb{C}^{n}, Y \subset \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$ or $Y \subset \mathbb{R}$. Denote by $\|\cdot\|_{X}$ a norm on $X$ and by $\|\cdot\|_{Y}$ a norm on $Y$, which is Banach-Mazur computable (as a function). Further, suppose that there exists a computable sequence $\left(x_{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset X$ satisfying the following conditions:
(a) There exists $x^{*} \in X$ such that $\left\|x_{n}-x^{*}\right\|_{X} \leq 2^{-n}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
(b) There exists $\eta>0, \eta \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $\inf _{n \in \mathbb{N}}\left\|f\left(x_{n}\right)-f\left(x^{*}\right)\right\|_{Y}>\eta$.

Then $f$ is not Banach-Mazur computable.
Proof. Since Banach-Mazur computability of a complex function demands Banach-Mazur computibility of the real-valued functions representing the real and imaginary parts, it suffices to consider real-valued domains (and codomains).

Consider a recursively enumerable, but non-recursive set $B \subset \mathbb{N}$. Denote by $T M_{B}$ a Turing machine, which accepts $n \in \mathbb{N}$ if $n \in B$ and does not halt otherwise. We next define the double-indexed sequence $\left(r_{n, j}\right)_{n, j \in \mathbb{N}}$ based on the output of $T M_{B}(n)$ after $j$ steps of computation. In particular, we set

$$
r_{n, j}= \begin{cases}q_{n} & : \text { if } T M_{B} \text { accepts } n \text { after at most } j \text { steps }, \\ j & : \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

where $q_{n} \leq j$ denotes the least number of computation steps of $T M_{B}$ required to accept input $n$. It is now not difficult to show that $\left(r_{n, j}\right)_{n, j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a computable double-indexed sequence of rational numbers. For details we refer to Lemma 4.6 in [8].

The next step is to introduce the sequence $\left(z_{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset X$, which will be the main ingredient in establishing Banach-Mazur non-computability of $f$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, set

$$
z_{n}:= \begin{cases}x_{q_{n}} & : \text { if } n \in B  \tag{4.1}\\ x^{*} & : \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

and note that

$$
x_{r_{n, j}} \rightarrow z_{n} \quad \text { for } j \rightarrow \infty
$$

since:

- if $n \in B$, then $T M_{B}$ stops after a finite number of steps, i.e. $r_{n, j}=q_{n}$ for $j$ large enough;
- if $n \notin B$, then $T M_{B}$ does not stop, i.e. $r_{n, j}=j$ for any $j$, and therefore $x_{r_{n, j}}=x_{j} \rightarrow x^{*}$ by condition (a).

The construction and the computability of $\left(r_{n, j}\right)_{n, j \in \mathbb{N}}$ entail that $\left(z_{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a computable sequence; see Lemma 4.6 in [8] for details.

Assume for the sake of contradiction that $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is Banach-Mazur computable, i.e., $f$ maps computable sequences on computable sequences. Therefore, $\left(f\left(z_{n}\right)\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a computable sequence. Additionally, the effective convergence in condition (a) implies that $x^{*}$ is computable so that $f\left(x^{*}\right)$ is also a computable object.

The computability of these quantities enables us to establish an algorithm which decides in a finite number of steps whether $f\left(z_{n}\right)$ equals $f\left(x^{*}\right)$. By definition of $\left(z_{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in (4.1), we know that

$$
f\left(z_{n}\right)= \begin{cases}f\left(x_{q_{n}}\right) & : \text { if } n \in B  \tag{4.2}\\ f\left(x^{*}\right) & : \text { if } n \notin B\end{cases}
$$

for arbitrary $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, an algorithm deciding the equality of $f\left(z_{n}\right)$ and $f\left(x^{*}\right)$ also effectively decides whether $n$ is an element of $B$. However, this contradicts the fact that $B$ is not recursive. Thus, our assumption concerning Banach-Mazur computability of $f$ must be false, i.e., $f$ is not Banach-Mazur computable.

It is left to show that the algorithm deciding $B$ indeed exists. For this, the assumption that $\|\cdot\|_{Y}$ is Banach-Mazur computable and the computability of $f\left(x^{*}\right)$ and $\left(f\left(z_{n}\right)\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ imply that the sequence $\left(s_{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ defined by

$$
s_{n}:=\left\|f\left(z_{n}\right)-f\left(x^{*}\right)\right\|_{Y} \quad \text { for } n \in \mathbb{N}
$$

is computable. Hence, there exists a computable double-sequence of rationals $\left(p_{n, k}\right)_{n, k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{Q}$ and a recursive function $e_{s}: \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n, M \in \mathbb{N}$

$$
\left|s_{n}-p_{n, k}\right| \leq 2^{-M} \quad \text { for } \quad k \geq e_{s}(n, M)
$$

Next, choose $M$ such that $2^{-M}<\frac{\eta}{3}$, which can be done effectively as both $2^{-M}$ and $\frac{\eta}{3}$ are rational. Also observe that due to condition (b), for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
s_{n}=0, \quad \text { if } f\left(z_{n}\right)=f\left(x^{*}\right), \quad \text { or } \quad s_{n}>\eta, \quad \text { if } f\left(z_{n}\right)=f\left(x_{q_{n}}\right) \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore, the approximation $p_{n, e_{s}(n, M)}$ of $s_{n}$ is within the following range:

- if $s_{n}=0$, then $p_{n, e_{s}(n, M)} \in\left(-\frac{\eta}{3}, \frac{\eta}{3}\right)$;
- if $s_{n} \geq \eta$, then $p_{n, e_{s}(n, M)}>\eta-\frac{\eta}{3}=\frac{2}{3} \eta$.

Hence, checking whether $p_{n, e_{s}(n, M)}$ is smaller or larger than $\frac{\eta}{2}$ - both are rational so that the comparison can be performed on a Turing machine - suffices to determine the equality of $f\left(z_{n}\right)$ and $f\left(x^{*}\right)$.

In conclusion, we can construct a Turing machine which completes the following steps. First, it determines an $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2^{-M}<\frac{\eta}{3}$. Due to the computability of $s_{n}$, the Turing machine is able to compute an approximation of $s_{n}$ with error at most $2^{-M}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, the Turing machine compares the approximation of $s_{n}$ with $\frac{\eta}{2}$. The outcome of the comparison is linked to the set $B$ via (4.3) and (4.2). Thus, there exists a Turing machine which on input $n$ decides in a finite number of steps if $n$ is in $B$, i.e., the sought algorithm exists if $f$ is Banach-Mazur computable.

Analyzing the construction in the previous proof enables us to determine the degree of algorithmic non-approximability more precisely. This will be the basis for proving Theorem 3.3.

Lemma 4.2. Consider the same setting as in Lemma 4.1. In addition, let $\hat{f}: X \rightarrow Y$ be an arbitrary function with

$$
\sup _{x \in X}\|f(x)-\hat{f}(x)\|_{Y}<\frac{\eta}{4} .
$$

Then $\hat{f}$ is not Banach-Mazur computable.
Proof. We prove the result by contradiction. Assume that there exists a function $\hat{f}$ with

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sup _{x \in X}\|f(x)-\hat{f}(x)\|_{Y}<\frac{\eta}{4}, \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is Banach-Mazur computable. Recall our construction in the proof of Lemma 4.1, especially the computable sequence $\left(z_{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in (4.1) and the identity in (4.2). Then, the assumptions imply that, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$
\left\|f\left(x^{*}\right)-f\left(z_{n}\right)\right\|_{Y}= \begin{cases}\left\|f\left(x^{*}\right)-f\left(x_{q_{n}}\right)\right\|_{Y}>\eta & : \text { if } n \in B \\ \left\|f\left(x^{*}\right)-f\left(x^{*}\right)\right\|_{Y}=0 \quad & : \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

Now, we make the following observations concerning the sequence $\left(s_{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$
s_{n}:=\left\|\hat{f}\left(x^{*}\right)-\hat{f}\left(z_{n}\right)\right\|_{Y} .
$$

- For $n \in B$, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\eta & <\left\|f\left(x^{*}\right)-f\left(z_{n}\right)\right\|_{Y} \\
& \leq\left\|f\left(x^{*}\right)-\hat{f}\left(x^{*}\right)\right\|_{Y}+\left\|\hat{f}\left(x^{*}\right)-\hat{f}\left(z_{n}\right)\right\|_{Y}+\left\|\hat{f}\left(z_{n}\right)-f\left(z_{n}\right)\right\|_{Y} \\
& <\frac{2 \eta}{4}+\left\|\hat{f}\left(x^{*}\right)-\hat{f}\left(z_{n}\right)\right\|_{Y},
\end{aligned}
$$

i.e.,

$$
s_{n}>\eta-\frac{\eta}{2}=\frac{\eta}{2} .
$$

- For $n \in \mathbb{N} \backslash B$, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
s_{n} & =\left\|\hat{f}\left(x^{*}\right)-\hat{f}\left(z_{n}\right)\right\|_{Y} \\
& \leq\left\|\hat{f}\left(x^{*}\right)-f\left(x^{*}\right)\right\|_{Y}+\left\|f\left(x^{*}\right)-f\left(z_{n}\right)\right\|_{Y}+\left\|f\left(z_{n}\right)-\hat{f}\left(z_{n}\right)\right\|_{Y} \\
& <\frac{\eta}{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Due to the assumption that $\hat{f}$ is Banach-Mazur computable, we derive that $\left(s_{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a computable sequence. Therefore, similar to the proof of Lemma 4.1, we can construct an effective method to decide $B$. For this, notice that we can decide $B$ by comparing the computable $s_{n}$ and the rational $\frac{\eta}{2}$, since $s_{n}>\frac{\eta}{2}$ or $s_{n}<\frac{\eta}{2}$ depending on whether $n \in B$. However, the existence of this effective method contradicts the non-recursiveness of $B$, i.e., a Banach-Mazur computable function $\hat{f}$ satisfying (4.4) can not exist.

### 4.2 Proof of Theorem 3.1

We next present the construction that allows to invoke Lemma 4.1 to prove Theorem 3.1.
Proof of Theorem 3.1. The basic idea is to construct sequences, which satisfy the conditions of Lemma 4.1, in the domain of the considered functions. Due to clarity, we will consider fixed dimensions $m \geq 2$ and $n=2$. The following matrix-vector pair will be the basis of our construction. Define for $\varepsilon \geq 0$ the matrix

$$
A_{\varepsilon}:=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
1 & 0 \\
0 & \varepsilon \\
0 & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots \\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right) \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \quad \text { and fix } \quad b:=\left(\begin{array}{c}
1 \\
1 \\
0 \\
\vdots \\
0
\end{array}\right) \in \mathbb{C}^{m}
$$

where $m-2$ zero rows are appended, respectively. The general case $n>2$ follows by appending $n-2$ zero-columns to $A_{\varepsilon}$.

Now, we make the following observations.

- For $\varepsilon>0$, the columns of $A_{\varepsilon}$ are linearly independent, i.e., $A_{\varepsilon}^{T} A_{\varepsilon}$ is invertible, so that

$$
A_{\varepsilon}^{\dagger}=\left(A_{\varepsilon}^{T} A_{\varepsilon}\right)^{-1} A_{\varepsilon}^{T}=\left(\begin{array}{ccccc}
1 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0  \tag{4.5}\\
0 & \varepsilon^{-1} & 0 & \ldots & 0
\end{array}\right) \quad \text { and } \quad \hat{x}_{\left(A_{\varepsilon}, b\right)}=A_{\varepsilon}^{\dagger} b=\binom{1}{\varepsilon^{-1}} .
$$

- Similarly for $\varepsilon=0$, we obtain

$$
A_{0}^{\dagger}=\left(\begin{array}{lllll}
1 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0  \tag{4.6}\\
0 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0
\end{array}\right) \quad \text { and } \quad \hat{x}_{\left(A_{0}, b\right)}=A_{0}^{\dagger} b=\binom{1}{0} .
$$

- Finally, notice that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|A_{\varepsilon}-A_{0}\right\|_{F}=\varepsilon \quad \text { and } \quad\left\|A_{\varepsilon}^{\dagger}-A_{0}^{\dagger}\right\|_{F}=\varepsilon^{-1} \text { for } \varepsilon>0 . \tag{4.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

In order to obtain Banach-Mazur non-computability, we will specify non-negative sequences $\left(\varepsilon_{n}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}$ and the corresponding matrix sequences $\left(A_{\varepsilon_{n}}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$.

We begin with the mapping $g_{\text {inv }}$ of a matrix to its pseudoinverse. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\varepsilon_{n}=$ $2^{-n}$, i.e., we consider the sequence $\left(A_{2^{-n}}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. It is immediate to verify that the sequence $\left(A_{2^{-n}}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is computable. Additionally, by applying (4.7), we obtain that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left\|A_{2^{-n}}-A_{0}\right\|_{F}=2^{-n} \quad \text { and } \\
& \left\|g_{\text {inv }}\left(A_{2-n}\right)-g_{\text {inv }}\left(A_{0}\right)\right\|_{F}=\left\|A_{2^{-n}}^{\dagger}-A_{0}^{\dagger}\right\|_{F}=2^{n} \geq 2 \quad \text { for } n \in \mathbb{N} . \tag{4.8}
\end{align*}
$$

Finally, recall that $\|\cdot\|_{F}$ is Banach-Mazur computable so that all the conditions in Lemma 4.1 are satisfied. Thus, $g_{\mathrm{inv}}$ is not Banach-Mazur computable.

By the same reasoning, it immediately follows that $g_{\text {norm }}$ is not Banach-Mazur computable. Indeed, using the same sequence $\left(A_{2^{-n}}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and observing that

$$
\left|g_{\text {norm }}\left(A_{2^{-n}}\right)-g_{\text {norm }}\left(A_{0}\right)\right|=\left|\left\|A_{2^{-n}}^{\dagger}\right\|_{F}-\left\|A_{0}^{\dagger}\right\|_{F}\right|=\sqrt{1^{2}+\left(2^{n}\right)^{2}}-1 \geq n \geq 1 \quad \text { for } n \in \mathbb{N}
$$

shows that the conditions in Lemma 4.1 are met, since the absolute value function is BanachMazur computable (see Remark 2.16).

Next, we consider the mapping $\Psi_{\mathrm{lsq}}$ describing the solution of the least squares problem. First, we need to define a norm on $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \times \mathbb{C}^{m}$. Further, let $\|(\cdot, \cdot)\|_{(F, 2)}: \mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \times \mathbb{C}^{m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given by

$$
\|(A, b)\|_{(F, 2)}:=\|A\|_{F}+\|b\|_{2}
$$

Hence, $\|(\cdot, \cdot)\|_{(F, 2)}$ is indeed a norm on $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \times \mathbb{C}^{m}$. Notice that 4.7) implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\left(A_{\varepsilon}, b\right)-\left(A_{0}, b\right)\right\|_{(F, 2)}=\left\|A_{\varepsilon}-A_{0}\right\|_{F}+\|b-b\|_{2}=\varepsilon . \tag{4.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, due to (4.5) and (4.6) we conclude that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left\|A_{\varepsilon} \hat{x}_{\left(A_{\varepsilon}, b\right)}-b\right\|_{2}=0 \text { for } \varepsilon>0, \quad \text { as well as } \\
& \left\|A_{0} \hat{x}_{\left(A_{0}, b\right)}-b\right\|_{2}=1 \tag{4.10}
\end{align*}
$$

Now, consider the sequence of matrix-vector pairs $\left(\left(A_{2^{-n}}, b\right)\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Since both sequences -$\left(A_{2^{-n}}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and the constant sequence $b$ - are computable, it follows that $\left(\left(A_{2^{-n}}, b\right)\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a computable sequence. Additionally, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, (4.9) yields that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|\left(A_{2^{-n}}, b\right)-\left(A_{0}, b\right)\right\|_{(F, 2)}=2^{-n} \tag{4.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

and (4.10) gives that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\Psi_{\mathrm{lsq}}\left(A_{2^{-n}}, b\right)-\Psi_{\mathrm{lsq}}\left(A_{0}, b\right)\right|=\left|\left\|A_{2^{-n}} \hat{x}_{\left(A_{2-n}, b\right)}-b\right\|_{2}-\left\|A_{0} \hat{x}_{\left(A_{0}, b\right)}-b\right\|_{2}\right|=1 \tag{4.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence, once again all assumptions in Lemma 4.1 are satisfied, i.e., $\Psi_{\text {lsq }}$ is not Banach-Mazur computable.

Similarly, we show that $\Psi_{\text {sol }}$, which maps $(A, b)$ on $\hat{x}_{(A, b)}$, is not Banach-Mazur computable. For this, observe that

$$
\left\|\hat{x}_{\left(A_{\varepsilon}, b\right)}-\hat{x}_{\left(A_{0}, b\right)}\right\|_{2}=\varepsilon^{-1} \text { for } \varepsilon>0
$$

where we have applied (4.5) and (4.6). Thus, we conclude that

$$
\left\|\Psi_{\mathrm{sol}}\left(A_{2-n}, b\right)-\Psi_{\mathrm{sol}}\left(A_{0}, b\right)\right\|_{2}=\left\|\hat{x}_{\left(A_{2}-n, b\right)}-\hat{x}_{\left(A_{0}, b\right)}\right\|_{2}=2^{n} \geq 2
$$

for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, the sequence $\left(\left(A_{2^{-n}}, b\right)\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ meets the conditions in Lemma 4.1 due to (4.11). Since the Euclidean norm is computable, Banach-Mazur non-computability of $\Psi_{\text {sol }}$ follows.

Banach-Mazur non-computability of $\Psi_{\text {norm }}$ follows from the previous construction and the fact that (4.5) and (4.6) imply for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that

$$
\left|\Psi_{\text {norm }}\left(A_{2^{-n}}, b\right)-\Psi_{\text {norm }}\left(A_{0}, b\right)\right|=\left|\left\|\hat{x}_{\left(A_{2-n}, b\right)}\right\|_{2}-\left\|\hat{x}_{\left(A_{0}, b\right)}\right\|_{2}\right|=\sqrt{1+2^{2 n}}-1 \geq n \geq 1
$$

It is left to show Banach-Mazur non-computability of the mapping of a matrix on its condition number denoted by $\kappa$. Due to (4.5) and (4.6), we obtain that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|A_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{F}\left\|A_{\varepsilon}^{\dagger}\right\|_{F}=\sqrt{1+\varepsilon^{2}} \sqrt{1+\varepsilon^{-2}} \text { for } \varepsilon>0 \quad \text { and } \quad\left\|A_{0}\right\|_{F}\left\|A_{0}^{\dagger}\right\|_{F}=1 \tag{4.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Consequently, we can conclude that for $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\kappa\left(A_{2^{-n}}\right)-\kappa\left(A_{0}\right)\right| & =\left|\left\|A_{2^{-n}}\right\|_{F}\left\|A_{2^{-n}}^{\dagger}\right\|_{F}-\left\|A_{0}\right\|_{F}\left\|A_{0}^{\dagger}\right\|_{F}\right| \\
& =\sqrt{1+2^{-2 n}} \sqrt{1+2^{2 n}}-1 \\
& \geq \sqrt{1+2^{2 n}}-1 \geq n \geq 1
\end{aligned}
$$

Thereby, considering the sequence $\left(A_{2^{-n}}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ shows that all conditions in Lemma 4.1 are met with regard to $\kappa$. Therefore, $\kappa$ is not Banach-Mazur computable.

Finally, we prove that the applied norms, i.e., the Euclidean or Frobenius norm, in the definitions of $g_{\text {norm }}, \Psi_{\text {norm }}$, and $\kappa$ may be replaced with any other computable norm. We explicitly show this statement for $\kappa$. However, the remaining two cases $g_{\text {norm }}$ and $\Psi_{\text {norm }}$ follow analogously.

Let $\|\cdot\|_{c}$ be an arbitrary computable (matrix) norm and denote by $\tilde{\kappa}$ the corresponding condition number, i.e., the mapping $\tilde{\kappa}: \mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$
\tilde{\kappa}(A):=\|A\|_{c}\left\|A^{\dagger}\right\|_{c} .
$$

Again, our goal is to construct a sequence in the domain of $\tilde{\kappa}$, which allows to invoke Lemma 4.1. To that end, we make the following observation. Since all norms are equivalent on a finite-dimensional space, there exist constants $c, C, d, D>0$ such that, for any matrix $M \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$, we have

$$
c\|M\|_{F} \leq\|M\|_{c} \leq C\|M\|_{F} \quad \text { and } \quad d\left\|M^{\dagger}\right\|_{F} \leq\left\|M^{\dagger}\right\|_{c} \leq D\left\|M^{\dagger}\right\|_{F}
$$

Thus, due to 4.13

$$
\begin{array}{lll} 
& \left\|A_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{c}\left\|A_{\varepsilon}^{\dagger}\right\|_{c} \geq c d\left\|A_{\varepsilon}\right\|_{F}\left\|A_{\varepsilon}^{\dagger}\right\|_{F}=c d \sqrt{1+\varepsilon^{2}} \sqrt{1+\varepsilon^{-2}} \quad \text { for } \varepsilon>0 \\
\text { as well as } & \left\|A_{0}\right\|_{c}\left\|A_{0}^{\dagger}\right\|_{c} \leq C D\left\|A_{0}\right\|_{F}\left\|A_{0}^{\dagger}\right\|_{F}=C D \tag{4.14}
\end{array}
$$

Next, choose $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
c d \sqrt{1+2^{2 r}}>C D \tag{4.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

and consider the sequence $\left(A_{2^{-(r+n)}}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Notice that $\left(A_{2^{-(r+n)}}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is computable and

$$
\left\|A_{2^{-(r+n)}}-A_{0}\right\|_{F}=2^{-(r+n)} \leq 2^{-n} \quad \text { for } n \in \mathbb{N}
$$

where we applied (4.8). Moreover, by (4.14) we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|\tilde{\kappa}\left(A_{2^{-(r+n)}}\right)-\tilde{\kappa}\left(A_{0}\right)\right| & =\left|\left\|A_{2^{-(r+n)}}\right\|_{c}\left\|A_{2^{-(r+n)}}^{\dagger}\right\|_{c}-\left\|A_{0}\right\|_{c}\left\|A_{0}^{\dagger}\right\|_{c}\right| \\
& \geq\left|\left\|A_{2^{-(r+n)}}\right\|_{c}\left\|A_{2^{-(r+n)}}^{\dagger}\right\|_{c}\right|-\left|\left\|A_{0}\right\|_{c}\left\|A_{0}^{\dagger}\right\|_{c}\right| \\
& \geq c d \sqrt{1+2^{-2(r+n)}} \sqrt{1+2^{2(r+n)}}-C D .
\end{aligned}
$$

Due to (4.15)

$$
c d \sqrt{1+2^{2(r+n)}} \geq c d \sqrt{1+2^{2 r}}>C D
$$

i.e., there exists $\eta>0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$
\left|\tilde{\kappa}\left(A_{2^{-(r+n)}}\right)-\tilde{\kappa}\left(A_{0}\right)\right| \geq c d \sqrt{1+2^{-2(r+n)}} \sqrt{1+2^{2(r+n)}}-C D>\eta
$$

Hence, via the sequence $\left(A_{2-(r+n)}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ all assumptions in Lemma 4.1 are met, which implies that $\tilde{\kappa}$ is not Banach-Mazur computable.

### 4.3 Proof of Theorem 3.3

Finally, we prove the algorithmic non-approximability statement in Theorem 3.3 by utilizing Lemma 4.2 .

Proof of Theorem 3.3. It suffices to show that the conditions in Lemma 4.2 are satisfied for the functions in (I)-(VI). We already established the conditions (a) and (b) of Theorem 3.1 in the proof of Theorem 3.1. Hence, after applying the same constructions, it only remains to specify the separation $\eta>0$ to invoke Lemma 4.2.

For this, recall the sequence $\left(A_{2^{-n}}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, the matrix $A_{0}$ and the vector $b$ in the proof of Theorem 3.1. We first consider $(i)$. We have seen in (4.8) that

$$
\left\|g_{\text {inv }}\left(A_{2-n}\right)-g_{\text {inv }}\left(A_{0}\right)\right\|_{F}=2^{n} \quad \text { for any } n \in \mathbb{N}
$$

Thus, for any $c>0$ there exists $k_{c} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$
\left\|g\left(A_{2^{-\left(k_{c}+\ell\right)}}\right)-g\left(A_{0}\right)\right\|_{F}>4 c \quad \text { for } \ell \in \mathbb{N} .
$$

Observe that the computable sequence $\left(A_{2-\left(n+k_{c}\right)}\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the conditions in Lemma 4.2 with $\eta=4 c$. Since this holds for any $c>0, \eta$ can be chosen arbitrarily large. Furthermore, notice that

$$
\left\|A_{0}\right\|_{F} \leq \sqrt{2} \quad \text { and } \quad\left\|A_{2-\left(n+k_{c}\right)}\right\|_{F} \leq \sqrt{2} \quad \text { for any } n \in \mathbb{N} \text { and } k_{c},
$$

i.e.,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\{A_{0}\right\} \cup\left\{A_{2^{-\left(n+k_{c}\right)}}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset\left\{A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}:\|A\|_{F} \leq \sqrt{2}\right\} \quad \text { for any } k_{c} . \tag{4.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence, it suffices to consider the compact input domain $A_{\text {compact }}:=\left\{A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}:\|A\|_{F} \leq\right.$ $\sqrt{2}\} \subset \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$, which implies $(i)$.

The cases $(i i),(i v)-(v i)$ follow analogously. Now, we consider the remaining case (iii). We showed in 4.12 that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$
\left|\Psi_{\mathrm{lsq}}\left(A_{2^{-n}}, b\right)-\Psi_{\mathrm{lsq}}\left(A_{0}, b\right)\right|=1
$$

Therefore, we can invoke Lemma 4.2 via the sequence $\left(\left(A_{2^{-n}}, b\right)\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with any $0<\eta<1$. Finally, observing that $\|b\|_{2} \leq \sqrt{2}$, together with 4.16), implies that it is sufficient to consider the input domain $A_{\text {compact }} \times\left\{v \in \mathbb{C}^{m}:\|v\|_{2} \leq \sqrt{ } 2\right\} \subset \mathbb{C}^{m \times n} \times \mathbb{C}^{m}$, gives (iii).
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