

The Complexity of linear Tensor Product Problems in (Anti-) Symmetric Hilbert Spaces*

Markus Weimar[†]

October 24, 2018

Abstract

We study linear problems S_d defined on tensor products of Hilbert spaces with an additional (anti-) symmetry property. We construct a linear algorithm that uses finitely many continuous linear functionals and show an explicit formula for its worst case error in terms of the eigenvalues λ of the operator $W_1 = S_1^\dagger S_1$ of the univariate problem. Moreover, we show that this algorithm is optimal with respect to a wide class of algorithms and investigate its complexity. We clarify the influence of different (anti-) symmetry conditions on the complexity, compared to the classical unrestricted problem. In particular, for symmetric problems with $\lambda_1 \leq 1$ we give characterizations for polynomial tractability and strong polynomial tractability in terms of λ and the amount of the assumed symmetry. Finally, we apply our results to the approximation problem of solutions of the electronic Schrödinger equation.

Keywords: Antisymmetry, Hilbert spaces, Tensor Products, Complexity.

1 Introduction

In the theory of linear operators $S_d: H_d \rightarrow G_d$ defined between Hilbert spaces it is well-known that we often observe the so-called *curse of dimensionality* if we deal with d -fold tensor product problems. That is, the complexity of approximating the operator S_d by algorithms using finitely many pieces of information increases exponentially fast with the dimension d .

*This is an extended version of a same-named paper by the author which was published in the Journal of Approximation Theory [8]. Here all the proofs, as well as some additional assertions, are explicitly included.

[†]Mathematisches Institut, Universität Jena, Ernst-Abbe-Platz 2, 07743 Jena, Germany. Email: markus.weimar@uni-jena.de. Web: <http://users.minet.uni-jena.de/~weimar>.

In the last years there have been various approaches to break this exponential dependence on the dimension, e.g., we can relax the error definitions. Another way to overcome the curse is to introduce weights in order to shrink the space of problem elements H_d . In the case of function spaces this approach is motivated by the assumption that we have some additional a priori knowledge about the importance of several (groups of) variables.

In the present paper we describe an essentially new kind of a priori knowledge. We assume the problem elements $f \in H_d$ to be (*anti-*) *symmetric*. This allows us to vanquish the curse and obtain different types of tractability.

The problem of approximating *wave functions*, e.g., solutions of the *electronic Schrödinger equation*, serves as an important example from computational chemistry and physics. In quantum physics wave functions Ψ describe quantum states of certain d -particle systems. Formally, these functions depend on d blocks of variables y_j , which represent the spacial coordinates and certain additional intrinsic parameters, e.g., the *spin*, of each particle within the system. Due to the *Pauli principle*, the only wave functions Ψ which are physically admissible are antisymmetric in the sense that $\Psi(y) = (-1)^{|\pi|} \Psi(\pi(y))$ for all y and all permutations π on a subset $I \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$ of particles with the same spin. Here $(-1)^{|\pi|}$ denotes the sign of π . The above relation means that Ψ only changes its sign if we replace particles by each other which possess the same spin. For further details on this topic we refer to Section 5 of this paper and the references given there. Inspired by this application we illustrate our results with some simple toy examples at the end of this section.

To this end, let H_1 and G_1 be infinite dimensional separable Hilbert spaces of univariate functions $f: D \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and consider a compact linear operator $S_1: H_1 \rightarrow G_1$ with singular values $\sigma = (\sigma_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$. Further, let $\lambda = (\lambda_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} = (\sigma_j^2)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ denote the sequence of the squares of the singular values of S_1 . Finally, assume $S_d: H_d \rightarrow G_d$ to be the d -fold tensor product problem. We want to approximate S_d by linear algorithms using a finite number of continuous linear functionals.

By $n^{\text{ent}}(\varepsilon, d)$ we denote the minimal number of information operations needed to achieve an approximation with worst case error at most $\varepsilon > 0$ on the unit ball of H_d . The integer $n^{\text{ent}}(\varepsilon, d)$ is called *information complexity* of the *entire* tensor product problem. Further, consider the subspace of all $f \in H_d$ that are *fully symmetric*, i.e.,

$$f(x) = f(\pi(x)) \quad \text{for all } x \in D^d \text{ and all permutations } \pi \text{ of } \{1, \dots, d\}.$$

The minimal number of linear functionals needed to achieve an ε -approximation for this subspace is denoted by $n^{\text{sym}}(\varepsilon, d)$. Finally, define the subspace of all functions $f \in H_d$ that are *fully antisymmetric* by the condition

$$f(x) = (-1)^{|\pi|} f(\pi(x)) \quad \text{for all } x \in D^d \text{ and all } \pi$$

and denote the information complexity with respect to this subspace by $n^{\text{asy}}(\varepsilon, d)$.

Since H_d is a Hilbert space, the optimal algorithm for the entire tensor product problem is well-known. Moreover, it is known that its worst case error, and therefore also the information complexity, can be expressed in terms of λ , i.e. in terms of the squared singular values of the univariate problem operator S_1 , see, e.g., Sections 4.2.3 and 5.2 in Novak and Woźniakowski [4]. It turns out that this algorithm, applied to the (anti-) symmetric problem, calculates redundant pieces of information. Hence, it can not be optimal in this setting.

In preparation for our algorithms, Section 2 is devoted to (anti-) symmetric subspaces in a more general fashion than in this introduction. Moreover, there we study some basic properties. In Section 3 we conclude formulae of algorithms for linear tensor product problems defined on these subspaces. We show their optimality in a wide class of algorithms and deduce an exact expression for the n -th minimal error in terms of the squared singular values of S_1 . Theorem 1 summarizes the main results. Finally, we use this error formula to obtain tractability results in Section 4 and apply them to wave functions in Section 5.

Our results yield that in any case (if we deal with the absolute error criterion)

$$n^{\text{asy}}(\varepsilon, d) \leq n^{\text{sym}}(\varepsilon, d) \leq n^{\text{ent}}(\varepsilon, d) \quad \text{for every } \varepsilon > 0 \text{ and all } d \in \mathbb{N},$$

where for $d = 1$ the terms coincide, since then we do not claim any (anti-) symmetry. To see that additional (anti-) symmetry conditions may reduce the information complexity dramatically consider the simple case of a linear operator S_1 with singular values σ such that $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 1$ and $\lambda_j = 0$ for $j \geq 3$. Then the information complexity of the entire tensor product problem can be shown to be

$$n^{\text{ent}}(\varepsilon, d) = 2^d \quad \text{for all } d \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } \varepsilon < 1.$$

Hence, the problem suffers from the curse of dimensionality and is therefore *intractable*. On the other hand, our results show that in the fully symmetric setting we have *polynomial tractability*, because

$$n^{\text{sym}}(\varepsilon, d) = d + 1 \quad \text{for all } d \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } \varepsilon < 1.$$

It can be proved that in this case the complexity of the fully antisymmetric problem decreases with increasing dimension d and, finally, the problem even gets trivial. In detail, we have

$$n^{\text{asy}}(\varepsilon, d) = \max\{3 - d, 0\} \quad \text{for all } d \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } \varepsilon < 1,$$

which yields *strong polynomial tractability*.

Next, let us consider a more challenging problem where $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \dots = \lambda_m = 1$ and $\lambda_j = 0$ for every $j > m \geq 2$. For $m = 2$ this obviously coincides with the example studied

above, but letting m increase may tell us more about the structure of (anti-) symmetric tensor product problems. In this situation it is easy to check that

$$n^{\text{ent}}(\varepsilon, d) = m^d \quad \text{and} \quad n^{\text{asy}}(\varepsilon, d) = \begin{cases} \binom{m}{d}, & d \leq m \\ 0, & d > m, \end{cases} \quad \text{for every } d \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and all } \varepsilon < 1.$$

Since $\binom{m}{d} \geq 2^{d-1}$ for $d \leq \lfloor m/2 \rfloor$, this means that for large m the complexity in the antisymmetric case increases exponentially fast with d up to a certain maximum. Beyond this point it falls back to zero. The information complexity in the symmetric setting is much harder to calculate for this case. However, it can be seen that we have polynomial tractability, but $n^{\text{sym}}(\varepsilon, d)$ needs to grow at least linearly with d such that the symmetric problem can not be strongly polynomially tractable, whereas this holds in the antisymmetric setting. The entire problem again suffers from the curse of dimensionality.

The reason why antisymmetric problems are that much easier than their symmetric counterparts is that from the antisymmetry condition it follows that $f(x) = 0$ if there exist coordinates j and l such that $x_j = x_l$. Another explanation for the good tractability behavior of antisymmetric tensor product problems might be the *initial error* $\varepsilon_d^{\text{init}}$. For every choice of λ it tends to zero as d grows, what is not necessarily the case for the corresponding entire and the symmetric problem, respectively. In fact, we have

$$\varepsilon_{d,\text{ent}}^{\text{init}} = \varepsilon_{d,\text{sym}}^{\text{init}} = \lambda_1^{d/2}, \quad \text{whereas} \quad \varepsilon_{d,\text{asy}}^{\text{init}} = \prod_{j=1}^d \lambda_j^{1/2}.$$

For a last illustrative example consider the case $\lambda_1 = 1$ and $\lambda_{j+1} = j^{-\beta}$ for some $\beta \geq 0$ and all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. That means that we have the two largest singular values $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$ of S_1 equal to one. The remaining series decays like the inverse of some polynomial. If $\beta = 0$ the operator S_1 is not compact, since $(\lambda_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ does not tend to zero. Hence, all the information complexities are infinite in this case. For $\beta > 0$, any $\delta > 0$ and some $C > 0$ it is

$$n^{\text{ent}}(\varepsilon, d) \geq 2^d, \quad n^{\text{sym}}(\varepsilon, d) \geq d + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad n^{\text{asy}}(\varepsilon, d) \leq C\varepsilon^{-(2/\beta + \delta)}, \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon < 1, d \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Thus, again for the entire problem we have the curse, whereas the antisymmetric problem is strongly polynomially tractable. Once more, the symmetric problem can shown to be polynomially tractable. Note that in this example the antisymmetric case is not trivial, because all λ_j are strictly positive. If we replace $j^{-\beta}$ by $\log^{-1}(j + 1)$ in this example we obtain (polynomial) intractability even in the antisymmetric setting.

Altogether these examples show that exploiting an a priori knowledge about (anti-) symmetries of the given tensor product problem can help to obtain tractability, but it does not make the problem trivial in general. We conclude the introduction with a partial summary of our main complexity results.

Theorem. Let $\lambda = (\lambda_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ denote the non-increasing sequence of the squared singular values of $S_1: H_1 \rightarrow G_1$ and assume $\lambda_2 > 0$. Then for the information complexity of (anti-) symmetric linear tensor product problems S_d we obtain the following characterizations:

- The *fully symmetric* problem is strongly polynomially tractable w.r.t. the normalized error criterion iff $\lambda \in \ell_\tau$ for some $\tau > 0$ and $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2$. Furthermore, in the case $\lambda_1 \leq 1$ the problem is strongly polynomially tractable w.r.t. the absolute error criterion iff $\lambda \in \ell_\tau$ and $\lambda_2 < 1$.
- The *fully antisymmetric* problem is strongly polynomially tractable w.r.t. the absolute error criterion iff $\lambda \in \ell_\tau$ for some $\tau > 0$.

In contrast, it is known, see Novak and Woźniakowski [4], that

- the *entire* tensor product problem is never (strongly) polynomially tractable w.r.t. to normalized error criterion. Moreover, the problem is strongly polynomially tractable w.r.t. the absolute error criterion iff $\lambda \in \ell_\tau$ for some $\tau > 0$ and $\lambda_1 < 1$.

2 Spaces with (anti-) symmetry conditions

Motivated by the example of wave functions in Section 1, we mainly deal with *function spaces* in this section. To this end, we start by defining (anti-) symmetry properties for functions which will lead us to orthogonal projections, mapping the function space onto its subspace of (anti-) symmetric functions. It will turn out that these projections applied to a given basis in the tensor product Hilbert function space lead us to handsome formulae for orthonormal bases of the subspaces. In a final remark we generalize our approach and define (anti-) symmetry conditions for *arbitrary* tensor product Hilbert spaces based on the deduced results for function spaces.

We use a general approach to (anti-) symmetric functions, as it can be found in Section 2.5 of Hamaekers [1]. Therefore, for a moment, consider an abstract separable Hilbert space F of real-valued functions defined on a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. In this part of the paper let $d \geq 2$ be fixed. The inner product on F is denoted by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_F$. Moreover, let $I = I(d) \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$ be an arbitrary given non-empty subset of coordinates. Then we define the set

$$\mathcal{S}_I = \{\pi: \{1, \dots, d\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, d\} \mid \pi \text{ bijective and } \pi|_{\{1, \dots, d\} \setminus I} = \text{id}\}$$

of all permutations on $\{1, \dots, d\}$ that leave the complement of I fixed. Obviously, the cardinality of this set is given by $\#\mathcal{S}_I = (\#I)!$, where $\#$ denotes the number of elements of

a set. For a given $\pi \in \mathcal{S}_I$ we define the mapping

$$\pi': \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, \quad x = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \mapsto \pi'(x) = (x_{\pi(1)}, \dots, x_{\pi(d)}).$$

To abbreviate the notation we identify π and π' with each other.

For an appropriate definition of partial (anti-) symmetry of functions $f \in F$ we need the following simple assumptions. For every $\pi \in \mathcal{S}_I$ we assume

(A1) $x \in \Omega$ implies $\pi(x) \in \Omega$,

(A2) $f \in F$ implies $f(\pi(\cdot)) \in F$ and

(A3) there exists $c_\pi \geq 0$ (independent of f) such that $\|f(\pi(\cdot))\|_F \leq c_\pi \|f\|_F$.

Note that these assumptions always hold if F is a d -fold tensor product Hilbert space $H_d = H_1 \otimes \dots \otimes H_1$ equipped with a cross norm, as described in the examples of the previous section.

Now we call a function $f \in F$ *partially symmetric with respect to I* (or *I -symmetric* for short) if a permutation $\pi \in \mathcal{S}_I$ applied to the argument x does not affect the value of f . Hence,

$$f(x) = f(\pi(x)) \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega \quad \text{and every } \pi \in \mathcal{S}_I. \quad (1)$$

Moreover, we call a function $f \in F$ *partially antisymmetric with respect to I* (or *I -antisymmetric*, respectively) if f changes its sign by exchanging the variables x_i and x_j with each other, where $i, j \in I$. That is, we have

$$f(x) = (-1)^{|\pi|} f(\pi(x)) \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega \quad \text{and every } \pi \in \mathcal{S}_I, \quad (2)$$

where $|\pi|$ denotes the *inversion number* of the permutation π . The term $(-1)^{|\pi|}$ therefore coincides with the *sign*, or *parity of π* and is equal to the determinant of the associated permutation matrix. In the case $\#I = 1$ we do not claim any (anti-) symmetry, since the set $\mathcal{S}_I = \{\text{id}\}$ is trivial. For $I = \{1, \dots, d\}$ functions f which satisfy (1) or (2), respectively, are called *fully (anti-) symmetric*.

Note that, in particular, formula (2) yields that the value $f(x)$ of (partially) antisymmetric functions f equals zero if $x_i = x_j$ with $i \neq j$ and $i, j \in I$. For (partially) symmetric functions such an implication does not hold. Therefore, the (partial) antisymmetry property is a somewhat more restrictive condition than the (partial) symmetry property with respect to the same subset I . As we will see in the next sections this will also affect our complexity estimates.

Next, we define the so-called *symmetrizer* \mathfrak{S}_I^F and *antisymmetrizer* \mathfrak{A}_I^F on F with respect to the subset I by

$$\mathfrak{S}_I^F: F \rightarrow F, \quad f \mapsto \mathfrak{S}_I^F(f) = \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{S}_I} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}_I} f(\pi(\cdot))$$

and

$$\mathfrak{A}_I^F: F \rightarrow F, \quad f \mapsto \mathfrak{A}_I^F(f) = \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{S}_I} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}_I} (-1)^{|\pi|} f(\pi(\cdot)).$$

If there is no danger of confusion we use the notation \mathfrak{S}_I and \mathfrak{A}_I instead of \mathfrak{S}_I^F and \mathfrak{A}_I^F , respectively. The following lemma collects together some basic properties which can be proved easily. For details see the appendix of this paper.

Lemma 1. Both the mappings $P_I \in \{\mathfrak{S}_I, \mathfrak{A}_I\}$ define bounded linear operators on F with $P_I^2 = P_I$. Thus, \mathfrak{S}_I and \mathfrak{A}_I provide orthogonal projections of F onto the closed linear subspaces

$$\mathfrak{S}_I(F) = \{f \in F \mid f \text{ satisfies (1)}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{A}_I(F) = \{f \in F \mid f \text{ satisfies (2)}\} \quad (3)$$

of all partially (anti-) symmetric functions (w.r.t. I) in F , respectively. Hence,

$$F = \mathfrak{S}_I(F) \oplus (\mathfrak{S}_I(F))^\perp = \mathfrak{A}_I(F) \oplus (\mathfrak{A}_I(F))^\perp. \quad (4)$$

Note that the notion of partially (anti-) symmetric functions can be extended to more than one subset I . Therefore, consider two non-empty subsets of coordinates $I, J \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$ with $I \cap J = \emptyset$. Then we call a function $f \in F$ *multiple partially (anti-) symmetric with respect to I and J* if f satisfies (1), or (2), respectively, for I and J . Since I and J are disjoint we observe that $\pi \circ \sigma = \sigma \circ \pi$ for all $\pi \in \mathcal{S}_I$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_J$. Thus, the linear projections $P_I \in \{\mathfrak{S}_I, \mathfrak{A}_I\}$ and $P_J \in \{\mathfrak{S}_J, \mathfrak{A}_J\}$ commute on F , i.e. $P_I \circ P_J = P_J \circ P_I$.

Further extensions to more than two disjoint subsets of coordinates are possible. We will restrict ourselves to the case of at most two (anti-) symmetry conditions, because in particular wave functions can be modeled as functions which are antisymmetric with respect to I and $J = I^C$, where I^C denotes the complement of I in $\{1, \dots, d\}$; see, e.g., Section 5 of this paper.

Up to this point the function space F was an arbitrary separable Hilbert space of d -variate real-valued functions. Indeed, for the definition of (anti-) symmetry we did not claim any product structure. On the other hand, it is also motivated by applications to consider tensor

product function spaces; see, e.g., Section 3.6 in Yserentant [10]. In detail, it is well-known that so-called spaces of dominated mixed smoothness, e.g. $W_2^{(1,\dots,1)}(\mathbb{R}^{3d})$, can be represented as certain tensor products; see Section 1.4.2 in Hansen [2].

Nevertheless, if we take into account such a structure, i.e., assume $F = H_d = H_1 \otimes \dots \otimes H_1$ (d times), where H_1 is a suitable Hilbert space of functions $f: D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, it is known that we can construct an orthonormal basis (ONB) of F out of a given ONB of H_1 . In fact, if $\{\eta_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is an ONB of the underlying Hilbert function space H_1 then the set of all d -fold tensor products $\{\eta_{d,j} = \bigotimes_{l=1}^d \eta_{j_l} \mid j = (j_1, \dots, j_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d\}$,

$$\eta_{d,j}(x) = \prod_{l=1}^d \eta_{j_l}(x_l), \quad x = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in D^d,$$

is mutually orthonormal in H_d and forms a basis. To exploit this representation we start with a simple observation.

Let $j \in \mathbb{N}^d$ and $x \in D^d$, as well as a non-empty subset I of $\{1, \dots, d\}$ be arbitrarily fixed. If we define $\sigma = \pi^{-1} \in \mathcal{S}_I$ then

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathfrak{A}_I \eta_{d,j})(x) &= \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{S}_I} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}_I} (-1)^{|\pi|} \eta_{d,j}(\pi(x)) = \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{S}_I} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}_I} (-1)^{|\pi|} \prod_{m=1}^d \eta_{j_m}(x_{\pi(m)}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{S}_I} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}_I} (-1)^{|\pi|} \prod_{m=1}^d \eta_{j_{\sigma(m)}}(x_m) = \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{S}_I} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}_I} (-1)^{|\sigma^{-1}|} \eta_{d,\sigma(j)}(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{S}_I} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_I} (-1)^{|\sigma|} \eta_{d,\sigma(j)}(x). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

For simplicity, once again we identified $\pi(j) = \pi(j_1, \dots, j_d)$ with $(j_{\pi(1)}, \dots, j_{\pi(d)})$ for multi-indices $j \in \mathbb{N}^d$. Obviously, the same calculation can be made for \mathfrak{S}_I without the factor (-1) . Since $x \in D^d$ was arbitrary we obtain

$$\mathfrak{S}_I \eta_{d,j} = \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{S}_I} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_I} \eta_{d,\sigma(j)} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{A}_I \eta_{d,j} = \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{S}_I} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_I} (-1)^{|\sigma|} \eta_{d,\sigma(j)} \quad \text{for all } j \in \mathbb{N}^d. \quad (6)$$

Note that in general, i.e. for arbitrary $j \in \mathbb{N}^d$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_I$, the tensor products $\eta_{d,\sigma(j)}$ and $\eta_{d,j}$ do not coincide, because taking the tensor product is not commutative in general. Therefore, \mathfrak{S}_I is not simply the identity on $\{\eta_{d,j} \mid j \in \mathbb{N}^d\}$. On the other hand, we see that for different $j \in \mathbb{N}^d$ many of the functions $\mathfrak{S}_I \eta_{d,j}$ coincide. Of course the same holds true for $\mathfrak{A}_I \eta_{d,j}$, at least up to a factor of (-1) .

We will see in the following that for $P_I \in \{\mathfrak{S}_I, \mathfrak{A}_I\}$ a linearly independent subset of all projections $\{P_I \eta_{d,j} \mid j \in \mathbb{N}^d\}$ equipped with suitable normalizing constants can be used as an ONB of the linear subspace $P_I(H_d)$ of I -(anti-)symmetric functions in H_d . To this end, we need a further definition. For fixed $d \geq 2$ and $I \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$, let us introduce a function

$$M_I = M_{I,d}: \mathbb{N}^d \rightarrow \{0, \dots, \#I\}^{\#I}$$

which counts how often different integers occur in a given multi-index $j \in \mathbb{N}^d$ among the subset I of coordinates, ordered with respect to their rate. To give an example let $d = 7$ and $I = \{1, \dots, 6\}$. Then $M_{I,7}$ applied to $j = (12, 4, 4, 12, 6, 4, 4) \in \mathbb{N}^7$ gives the $\#I = 6$ dimensional vector $M_{I,7}(j) = (3, 2, 1, 0, 0, 0)$, because j contains the number “4” three times among the coordinates j_1, \dots, j_6 , “12” two times and so on. Since in this example there are only three different numbers involved, the fourth to sixth coordinates of $M_{I,7}(j)$ equal zero. Obviously, M_I is invariant under all permutations $\pi \in \mathcal{S}_I$ of the argument. Thus,

$$M_I(j) = M_I(\pi(j)) \quad \text{for all } j \in \mathbb{N}^d \quad \text{and} \quad \pi \in \mathcal{S}_I.$$

In addition, since $M_I(j)$ is again a multi-index, we see that $|M_I(j)| = \#I$ and $M_I(j)!$ are well-defined for every $j \in \mathbb{N}^d$. With this tool we are ready to state the following assertion which can be shown using elementary arguments as well as Lemma 1; see the appendix.

Lemma 2. Assume $\{\eta_{d,j} \mid j \in \mathbb{N}^d\}$ to be a given orthonormal tensor product basis of the function space H_d and let $\emptyset \neq I = \{i_1, \dots, i_{\#I}\} \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$. Moreover, for $P_I \in \{\mathfrak{S}_I, \mathfrak{A}_I\}$ define functions $\xi_j: D^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\xi_j = \sqrt{\frac{\#\mathcal{S}_I}{M_I(j)!}} \cdot P_I(\eta_{d,j}) \quad \text{for } j \in \mathbb{N}^d.$$

Then the set $\{\xi_k \mid k \in \nabla_d\}$ builds an orthonormal basis of the partially (anti-) symmetric subspace $P_I(H_d)$, where ∇_d is given by

$$\nabla_d = \begin{cases} \{k \in \mathbb{N}^d \mid k_{i_1} \leq k_{i_2} \leq \dots \leq k_{i_{\#I}}\}, & \text{if } P_I = \mathfrak{S}_I, \\ \{k \in \mathbb{N}^d \mid k_{i_1} < k_{i_2} < \dots < k_{i_{\#I}}\}, & \text{if } P_I = \mathfrak{A}_I. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Observe that in the antisymmetric case the definition of ξ_j for $j \in \nabla_d$ simplifies, since then $M_I(j)! = 1$ for all $j \in \nabla_d$. Moreover, note that in the special case $I = \{1, \dots, \#I\}$ we have

$$P_I(H_d) = P_I \left(\bigotimes_{j \in I} H_1 \right) \otimes \left(\bigotimes_{j \notin I} H_1 \right).$$

That is, we can consider the subspace of I -(anti-)symmetric functions $f \in H_d$ as the tensor product of the set of all fully (anti-) symmetric $\#I$ -variate functions with the $(d - \#I)$ -fold tensor product of H_1 . Modifications in connection with multiple partially (anti-) symmetric functions are obvious.

Finally, note that Lemma 2 also holds if the index set \mathbb{N} of the univariate basis $\{\eta_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is replaced by a more general countable set equipped with a total order. But let us shortly focus on another generalization of the previous results.

Remark 1 (Arbitrary tensor product Hilbert spaces). Up to now we exclusively dealt with Hilbert *function* spaces. However, the proofs of Lemma 1 and Lemma 2 yield that there are only a few key arguments in connection with (anti-) symmetry such that we do not need this restriction.

Starting from the very beginning we need to adapt the definition of I -(anti-)symmetry due to (1) and (2). Of course it is sufficient to define this property at first only for basis elements. Therefore, if $E_d = \{\eta_{d,k} \mid k \in \mathbb{N}^d\}$ denotes a tensor product ONB of H_d and $\emptyset \neq I \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$ is given then we call an element $\eta_{d,k} = \bigotimes_{l=1}^d \eta_{k_l}$ *partially symmetric with respect to I* (or *I -symmetric* for short), if

$$\eta_{d,k} = \eta_{d,\pi(k)} \quad \text{for all } \pi \in \mathcal{S}_I,$$

where \mathcal{S}_I and $\pi(k) = (k_{\pi(1)}, \dots, k_{\pi(d)})$ are defined as above. Analogously we define *I -antisymmetry* with an additional factor $(-1)^{|\pi|}$. Moreover, an arbitrary element in H_d is called *I -(anti-)symmetric* if in its basis expansion every element with non-vanishing coefficient possesses this property.

Next, the *antisymmetrizer* \mathfrak{A}_I is defined as the uniquely defined continuous extension of the linear mapping

$$\mathfrak{A}_I: E_d \rightarrow H_d, \quad \mathfrak{A}_I(\eta_{d,k}) = \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{S}_I} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}_I} (-1)^{|\pi|} \eta_{d,\pi(k)}$$

from E_d to H_d . Again the *symmetrizer* \mathfrak{S}_I is given in a similar way. Hence, in the general setting we define the mappings using formula (6), which we derived for the special case. Note that the triangle inequality yields $\|P_I\| \leq 1$, for $P_I \in \{\mathfrak{S}_I, \mathfrak{A}_I\}$.

Once more we denote the sets of all I -(anti-)symmetric elements of H_d by $P_I(H_d)$, where $P_I \in \{\mathfrak{S}_I, \mathfrak{A}_I\}$. Observe, that this can be justified since the operators P_I again provide orthogonal projections onto closed linear subspaces as described in Lemma 1.

Finally, also the proof of Lemma 2 can be adapted to the general Hilbert space case.

3 Optimal algorithms

In the present section we conclude optimal algorithms for linear problems defined on (anti-) symmetric subsets of tensor product Hilbert spaces as described in the previous paragraph. Moreover, we deduce formulae for the n -th minimal errors of these (anti-) symmetric problems and recover the known assertions for the entire tensor product problem.

3.1 Basic definitions and the main result

Throughout the whole section we use the following notation. Let H_1 be a (infinite dimensional) separable Hilbert space with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_1}$ and let G_1 be some arbitrary Hilbert space. Furthermore, assume $S_1: H_1 \rightarrow G_1$ to be a compact linear operator between these spaces and consider its singular value decomposition. That is, define the compact self-adjoint operator $W_1 = S_1^\dagger S_1: H_1 \rightarrow H_1$ and denote its eigenpairs with respect to a non-increasing ordering of the eigenvalues by $\{(e_i, \lambda_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}$, i.e.

$$W_1(e_i) = \lambda_i e_i, \quad \text{and} \quad \langle e_i, e_j \rangle_{H_1} = \delta_{i,j} \quad \text{with} \quad \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq 0. \quad (8)$$

Then $\lambda = (\lambda_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ coincides with the sequence of the squared singular values $\sigma^2 = (\sigma_i^2)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of S_1 and the set $\{e_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ forms an ONB of H_1 ; see, e.g., Section 4.2.3 in Novak and Woźniakowski [4]. In the following we will refer to S_1 as the *univariate problem* or *univariate case*.

For $d \geq 2$, let $H_d = H_1 \otimes \dots \otimes H_1$ be the d -fold tensor product space of H_1 . This means that H_d is the closure of the set of all linear combinations of formal objects $f = \bigotimes_{l=1}^d f_l$ with $f_l \in H_1$, called *simple tensors* or *pure tensors*. Here the closure is taken with respect to the inner product in H_d which is defined such that

$$\left\langle \bigotimes_{l=1}^d f_l, \bigotimes_{l=1}^d g_l \right\rangle_{H_d} = \prod_{l=1}^d \langle f_l, g_l \rangle_{H_1} \quad \text{for} \quad f_l, g_l \in H_1.$$

With these definitions H_d is also an infinite dimensional Hilbert space and it is easy to check that

$$E_d = \left\{ \eta_{d,j} = \bigotimes_{l=1}^d \eta_{j_l} \in H_d \mid j = (j_1, \dots, d) \in \mathbb{N}^d \right\} \quad (9)$$

forms an orthonormal basis in H_d if $\{\eta_i \in H_1 \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is an arbitrary ONB in the underlying space H_1 . Similarly, let $G_d = G_1 \otimes \dots \otimes G_1$, d times, and define S_d as the tensor product operator

$$S_d = S_1 \otimes \dots \otimes S_1: H_d \rightarrow G_d.$$

In detail, we define the bounded linear operator $\tilde{S}_d: E_d \rightarrow G_d$ such that for all $j \in \mathbb{N}^d$ we have $\tilde{S}_d(\eta_{d,j}) = \tilde{S}_d(\bigotimes_{l=1}^d \eta_{j_l}) = \bigotimes_{l=1}^d S_1(\eta_{j_l}) \in G_d$. Then S_d is assumed to be the uniquely defined linear, continuous extension of \tilde{S}_d from E_d to H_d .

We refer to the problem of approximating $S_d: H_d \rightarrow G_d$ as the *entire d -variate problem*. In contrast, we are interested in the restriction $S_d|_{P_I(H_d)}: P_I(H_d) \rightarrow G_d$ of S_d to some (anti-)symmetric subspace $P_I(H_d)$ with $P_I \in \{\mathfrak{S}_I, \mathfrak{A}_I\}$ as described in the previous section. To abbreviate the notation we denote this restriction again by S_d and refer to it as the *I -(anti-)symmetric problem*.

For the singular value decomposition of the entire problem operator S_d we consider the self-adjoint, compact operator

$$W_d = S_d^\dagger S_d: H_d \rightarrow H_d.$$

Its eigenpairs $\{(e_{d,j}, \lambda_{d,j}) \mid j = (j_1, \dots, j_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d\}$ are given by the set of all d -fold (tensor) products of the univariate eigenpairs (8) of W_1 , i.e.,

$$e_{d,j} = \bigotimes_{l=1}^d e_{j_l} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_{d,j} = \prod_{l=1}^d \lambda_{j_l} \quad \text{for } j = (j_1, \dots, j_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d. \quad (10)$$

It is well-known how these eigenpairs can be used to construct a linear algorithm $A'_{n,d}$ which is optimal for the entire d -variate tensor product problem. In detail, $A'_{n,d}$ minimizes the *worst case error*

$$e^{\text{wor}}(A_{n,d}; H_d) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{B}(H_d)} \|A_{n,d}(f) - S_d(f)\|_{G_d}$$

among all adaptive linear algorithms $A_{n,d}$ using n continuous linear functionals. Here $\mathcal{B}(H_d)$ denotes the unit ball of H_d . In other words, $A'_{n,d}$ achieves the *n -th minimal error*

$$e(n, d; H_d) = \inf_{A_{n,d}} e^{\text{wor}}(A_{n,d}; H_d).$$

With this notation our main result reads as follows.

Theorem 1. Let $\{(e_m, \lambda_m) \mid m \in \mathbb{N}\}$ denote the eigenpairs of W_1 given by (8). Moreover, for $d > 1$ let $\emptyset \neq I = \{i_1, \dots, i_{\#I}\} \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$ and assume S_d to be the linear tensor product problem restricted to the I -(anti-)symmetric subspace $P_I(H_d)$, where $P_I \in \{\mathfrak{S}_I, \mathfrak{A}_I\}$, of the d -fold tensor product space H_d . Finally, let ∇_d be given by (7) and define

$$\{(\xi_{\psi(v)}, \lambda_{d,\psi(v)}) \mid v \in \mathbb{N}\} = \{(\xi_k, \lambda_{d,k}) \mid k \in \nabla_d\} \quad (11)$$

by $\xi_k = \sqrt{\#\mathcal{S}_I/M_I(k)!} \cdot P_I(e_{k_1} \otimes \dots \otimes e_{k_d})$ and $\lambda_{d,k} = \prod_{l=1}^d \lambda_{k_l}$, for $k \in \nabla_d$, where $\psi: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \nabla_d$ provides a non-increasing rearrangement of $\{\lambda_{d,k} \mid k \in \nabla_d\}$. Then for every $d > 1$ the set (11) denotes the eigenpairs of $W_d|_{P_I(H_d)} = S_d^\dagger S_d$. Thus, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the linear algorithm $A_{n,d}^*: P_I(H_d) \rightarrow P_I(G_d)$,

$$A_{n,d}^* f = \sum_{v=1}^n \langle f, \xi_{\psi(v)} \rangle_{H_d} \cdot S_d \xi_{\psi(v)}, \quad (12)$$

which uses n linear functionals, is n -th optimal for S_d on $P_I(H_d)$ with respect to the worst case setting. Furthermore, it is

$$e(n, d; P_I(H_d)) = e^{\text{wor}}(A_{n,d}^*; P_I(H_d)) = \sqrt{\lambda_{d, \psi(n+1)}}. \quad (13)$$

Let us add some remarks on this theorem. First of all, the sum over an empty index set is to be interpreted as zero such that $A_{0,d}^* f \equiv 0$. Further, note that the worst case error can be attained with the function $\xi_{\psi(n+1)}$. It can be improved neither by non-linear algorithms using continuous information, nor by linear algorithms using adaptive information. Moreover, observe that the classical entire tensor product problem is included as the case $\#I = 1$, where we do not claim any (anti-) symmetry. Then $\nabla_d = \mathbb{N}^d$ and the ξ_k 's simply equal the tensor products $e_{d,k} = \otimes_{l=1}^d e_{k_l}$. Hence, $A_{n,d}^* = A'_{n,d}$.

The remainder of this section is devoted to the proof of the main result Theorem 1.

3.2 Proof of Theorem 1

We start with an auxiliary result which shows that any optimal algorithm A^* for S_d needs to preserve the (anti-) symmetry properties of its domain of definition, i.e. $A^* f \in P_I(G_d)$ for all $f \in P_I(H_d)$. The following proposition generalizes Lemma 10.2 in Zeiser [11] where this assertion was shown for the approximation problem, i.e. for $S_d = \text{id}$. A comprehensive proof can be found in the appendix of this paper.

Proposition 1. Let $d > 1$ and assume $\emptyset \neq I \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$. Furthermore, for $X \in \{H, G\}$, let P_I^X denote the (anti-) symmetrizer $P_I \in \{\mathfrak{S}_I, \mathfrak{A}_I\}$ on X_d with respect to I and suppose $A: P_I^H(H_d) \rightarrow G_d$ to be an arbitrary algorithm for S_d . Then, for $g \in H_d$,

$$(S_d \circ P_I^H)(g) = (P_I^G \circ S_d)(g), \quad (14)$$

and for all $f \in P_I^H(H_d)$ it holds

$$\|S_d f - A f\|_{G_d}^2 = \|S_d f - P_I^G(A f)\|_{G_d}^2 + \|A f - P_I^G(A f)\|_{G_d}^2. \quad (15)$$

Hence, an optimal algorithm A^* for S_d preserves (anti-) symmetry, i.e.

$$A^*f \in P_I^G(G_d) \quad \text{for all } f \in P_I^H(H_d).$$

Beside this qualitative assertion we are interested in explicit error bounds. Therefore, the next proposition shows an upper bound on the worst case error of the algorithm $A_{n,d}^*$ given by (12).

Proposition 2 (Upper bound). Under the assumptions of Theorem 1 the worst case error of $A_{n,d}^*$ given by (12) is bounded from above by

$$e^{\text{wor}}(A_{n,d}^*; P_I(H_d)) \leq \sqrt{\lambda_{d,\psi(n+1)}}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 2 we have for all $f \in P_I(H_d)$ the unique representation

$$f = \sum_{k \in \nabla_d} \langle f, \xi_k \rangle \cdot \xi_k.$$

Therefore, the boundedness of S_d together with (11) implies that

$$S_d f = \sum_{k \in \nabla_d} \langle f, \xi_k \rangle_{H_d} \cdot S_d \xi_k = \sum_{v \in \mathbb{N}} \langle f, \xi_{\psi(v)} \rangle_{H_d} \cdot S_d \xi_{\psi(v)} \quad \text{for every } f \in P_I(H_d). \quad (16)$$

Furthermore, in the case $P_I = \mathfrak{A}_I$ it is easy to see that we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle S_d \xi_j, S_d \xi_k \rangle_{G_d} &= \frac{\#\mathcal{S}_I}{\sqrt{M_I(j)! \cdot M_I(k)!}} \cdot \langle S_d \mathfrak{A}_I e_{d,j}, S_d \mathfrak{A}_I e_{d,k} \rangle_{G_d} \\ &= \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{S}_I \sqrt{M_I(j)! \cdot M_I(k)!}} \sum_{\pi, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}_I} (-1)^{|\pi|+|\sigma|} \langle S_d e_{d,\pi(j)}, S_d e_{d,\sigma(k)} \rangle_{G_d} \end{aligned}$$

for $i, j \in \nabla_d$, because of the commutativity of S_d and \mathfrak{A}_I due to (14) in Proposition 1. Obviously, the same calculation can be done in the symmetric case, where $P_I = \mathfrak{S}_I$. Since $e_{d,\pi(j)}$ and $e_{d,\sigma(k)}$ are orthonormal eigenelements of $W_d = S_d^\dagger S_d: H_d \rightarrow H_d$, see (10), it is $\langle S_d e_{d,\pi(j)}, S_d e_{d,\sigma(k)} \rangle_{G_d} = \lambda_{d,\pi(j)} \langle e_{d,\pi(j)}, e_{d,\sigma(k)} \rangle_{H_d} = \lambda_{d,\pi(j)} \delta_{\pi(j),\sigma(k)}$. Hence, similar to the proof of the mutual orthonormality of $\{\xi_k \mid k \in \nabla_d\}$ for Lemma 2 we obtain

$$\langle S_d \xi_j, S_d \xi_k \rangle_{G_d} = \lambda_{d,j} \delta_{j,k} \quad \text{for all } j, k \in \nabla_d. \quad (17)$$

Therefore, we calculate for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $f \in P_I(H_d)$

$$\|S_d f - A_{d,n}^* f\|_{G_d}^2 = \left\| \sum_{v > n} \langle f, \xi_{\psi(v)} \rangle_{H_d} \cdot S_d \xi_{\psi(v)} \right\|_{G_d}^2 = \sum_{v > n} \langle f, \xi_{\psi(v)} \rangle_{H_d}^2 \cdot \lambda_{d,\psi(v)}.$$

On the other hand, for $f \in \mathcal{B}(P_I(H_d))$, we have by Parseval's identity

$$1 \geq \|f|_{P_I(H_d)}\|^2 = \|f|_{H_d}\|^2 = \left\| \sum_{v \in \mathbb{N}} \langle f, \xi_{\psi(v)} \rangle_{H_d} \cdot \xi_{\psi(v)} |_{H_d} \right\|^2 = \sum_{v \in \mathbb{N}} \langle f, \xi_{\psi(v)} \rangle_{H_d}^2.$$

Thus, because of the non-increasing ordering of $(\lambda_{d,\psi(v)})_{v \in \mathbb{N}}$ due to the choice of the rearrangement ψ , we can estimate the worst case error

$$e^{\text{wor}}(A_{n,d}^*; P_I(H_d))^2 = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{B}(P_I(H_d))} \|S_d f - A_{n,d}^* f|_{G_d}\|^2 \leq \lambda_{d,\psi(n+1)},$$

as claimed. ■

Note that formula (17) in the proof of Proposition 2 together with Lemma 2 yields that the set (11) describes the eigenpairs of the self-adjoint operator

$$W_d|_{P_I(H_d)} = S_d^\dagger S_d: P_I(H_d) \rightarrow P_I(H_d)$$

as stated in Theorem 1. Therefore, the upper bound given in Proposition 2 is sharp and $A_{n,d}^*$ in (12) is n -th optimal, due to the general theory; see, e.g., Corollary 4.12 in Novak and Woźniakowski [4]. From the general theory it also follows that adaption does not help to improve this n -th minimal error, see [4, Theorem 4.5], and that linear algorithms are best possible; see [4, Theorem 4.8]. Hence, the proof of Theorem 1 is complete.

Since it seems to be a little bit unsatisfying to refer to these deep results for the proof of such an easy theorem we refer the reader to the appendix where a nearly self-contained proof of the remaining facts can be found. Moreover, there we describe what we mean by adaption in this context.

4 Complexity

In this part of the paper we investigate tractability properties of approximating the linear tensor product operator S_d on certain (anti-) symmetric subsets $P_I(H_d) = P_{I_d}(H_d)$, where $P \in \{\mathfrak{S}, \mathfrak{A}\}$ and $\emptyset \neq I_d \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$. Therefore, as usual, we express the n -th minimal error derived in formula (13) in terms of the *information complexity*, i.e. the minimal number of information operations needed to achieve an error smaller than a given $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$n(\varepsilon, d; P_I(H_d)) = \min \{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \mid e(n, d; P_I(H_d)) \leq \varepsilon\}.$$

To abbreviate the notation we write $n^{\text{ent}}(\varepsilon, d)$ if we deal with the entire tensor product problem. Furthermore, as in the introduction, we denote the information complexity of the fully (anti-) symmetric problem by $n^{\text{asy}}(\varepsilon, d)$ and $n^{\text{sym}}(\varepsilon, d)$, respectively.

4.1 Preliminaries

From Theorem 1 we obtain for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and every $d \in \mathbb{N}$

$$n(\varepsilon, d; P_I(H_d)) = \min \{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \mid \lambda_{d, \psi(n+1)} \leq \varepsilon^2\} = \# \left\{ k \in \nabla_d \mid \prod_{l=1}^d \lambda_{k_l} > \varepsilon^2 \right\}$$

by solving (13) for ψ . Using this expression we can easily conclude the results for the first two problems in the introduction. There we dealt with the case $\lambda_1 = \dots = \lambda_m = 1$ and $\lambda_j = 0$ for $j > m \geq 2$.

Let us recall some common notions of tractability. If for a given problem the information complexity $n(\varepsilon, d)$ increases exponentially in the dimension d we say the problem suffers from the *curse of dimensionality*. That is, there exist constants $c > 0$ and $C > 1$ such that for at least one $\varepsilon > 0$ we have

$$n(\varepsilon, d) \geq c \cdot C^d$$

for infinitely many $d \in \mathbb{N}$. More generally, if the information complexity depends exponentially on d or ε^{-1} we call the problem *intractable*. Since there are many ways to measure the lack of exponential dependence we distinguish between different types of tractability. The most important type is *polynomial tractability*. We say that the problem is polynomially tractable if there exist constants $C, p > 0$, as well as $q \geq 0$, such that

$$n(\varepsilon, d) \leq C \cdot \varepsilon^{-p} \cdot d^q \quad \text{for all } d \in \mathbb{N}, \varepsilon \in (0, 1].$$

If this inequality holds with $q = 0$, the problem is called *strongly polynomially tractable*. If polynomial tractability does not hold we say the problem is *polynomially intractable*. For more specific definitions and relations between these and other classes of tractability see, e.g., the monographs of Novak and Woźniakowski [4, 5, 6].

In the following we distinguish two cases. First we consider the *absolute error criterion*, where we investigate the dependence of $n(\varepsilon, d; P_I(H_d))$ on $1/\varepsilon$ and on the dimension d for every $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ and $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that without loss of generality we can restrict ourselves to $\varepsilon \leq \min \{1, \varepsilon_d^{\text{init}}\}$ since obviously $n(\varepsilon, d; P_I(H_d)) = 0$ for all $\varepsilon \geq \varepsilon_d^{\text{init}}$. Here

$$\varepsilon_d^{\text{init}} = e(0, d; P_I(H_d)) = \sqrt{\lambda_{d, \psi(1)}} = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\lambda_1^d}, & \text{if } P = \mathfrak{S}, \\ \sqrt{\lambda_1^{b_d} \cdot \lambda_1 \cdot \dots \cdot \lambda_{a_d}}, & \text{if } P = \mathfrak{A} \end{cases}$$

describes the *initial error* of the d -variate problem on the subspace $P_I(H_d)$ where $\psi: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \nabla_d$ again is a non-increasing rearrangement of the set of eigenvalues $\{\lambda_{d,k} \mid k \in \nabla_d\}$ of

$W_d|_{P_I(H_d)} = S_d^\dagger S_d$ and $b_d = d - a_d$ denotes the number of coordinates without (anti-) symmetry conditions in dimension d , i.e. $a_d = \#I_d$ and $b_d = d - \#I_d$, respectively.

Afterwards, we deal with the *normalized error criterion*, where we especially investigate the dependence of $n(\varepsilon' \cdot \varepsilon_d^{\text{init}}, d; P_I(H_d))$ on $1/\varepsilon'$ for $\varepsilon' \in (0, 1)$. That is, we search for the minimal number of information operations needed to improve the initial error by a factor ε' less than one.

To avoid triviality we will assume $\varepsilon_d^{\text{init}} > 0$, for every $d \in \mathbb{N}$, in both cases, because otherwise we have strong polynomial tractability by default. From this assumption it follows that $\lambda_1 > 0$, which simply means that S_d is not the zero operator. Moreover, note that in the case of antisymmetric problems, if the number of antisymmetric coordinates, i.e. the set $I = I(d)$, grows with the dimension, the condition $\varepsilon_d^{\text{init}} > 0$ (for every $d \in \mathbb{N}$) even implies that

$$\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots > 0.$$

Finally, we always assume $\lambda_2 > 0$, because otherwise S_d is equivalent to a continuous linear functional which can be solved exactly with one information operation; see Novak and Woźniakowski [4, p.176].

For the study of tractability for the absolute error criterion we use a slightly modified version of Theorem 5.1, [4]. It deals with the more general situation of arbitrary compact linear operators between Hilbert spaces. In contrast to Novak and Woźniakowski we drop the (hidden) condition $\varepsilon_d^{\text{init}} = 1$ for the initial error in dimension d . For the sake of completeness a proof can be found in the appendix. If we denote Riemann's zeta function by ζ the assertion reads as follows.

Proposition 3. Consider a family of compact linear operators $\{T_d: F_d \rightarrow G_d \mid d \in \mathbb{N}\}$ between Hilbert spaces and the absolute error criterion in the worst case setting. Furthermore, for $d \in \mathbb{N}$ let $(\lambda_{d,i})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ denote the non-negative sequence of eigenvalues of $T_d^\dagger T_d$ w.r.t. a non-increasing ordering.

- If $\{T_d\}$ is polynomially tractable with the constants $C, p > 0$ and $q \geq 0$ then for all $\tau > p/2$ we have

$$C_\tau = \sup_{d \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{d^r} \left(\sum_{i=f(d)}^{\infty} \lambda_{d,i}^\tau \right)^{1/\tau} < \infty, \quad (18)$$

where $r = 2q/p$ and $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with $f(d) = \lceil (1 + C) d^q \rceil$.
In this case $C_\tau \leq C^{2/p} \zeta(2\tau/p)^{1/\tau}$.

- If (18) is satisfied for some parameters $r \geq 0$, $\tau > 0$ and a function $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $f(d) = \left\lceil C \cdot (\min \{\varepsilon_d^{\text{init}}, 1\})^{-p} \cdot d^q \right\rceil$, where $C > 0$ and $p, q \geq 0$, then the problem is polynomially tractable and $n(\varepsilon, d) \leq (C + C_\tau^\tau) \varepsilon^{-\max\{p, 2\tau\}} d^{\max\{q, r\tau\}}$ for every $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$.

Let us add some comments on this result. Since, clearly,

$$1 \leq (\min \{\varepsilon_d^{\text{init}}, 1\})^{-p} \quad \text{for all } p \geq 0$$

Proposition 3 provides a characterization for (strong) polynomial tractability, similar to [4, Theorem 5.1]. But, compared with the assertions from the authors of [4], our result yields the essential advantage that the given estimates incorporate the initial error $\varepsilon_d^{\text{init}}$. Hence, if $\varepsilon_d^{\text{init}}$ is sufficiently small then we can conclude polynomial tractability while ignoring a larger set of eigenvalues in the summation (18).

Observe that the first statement does not cover any assertion about the initial error, since $f(d) \geq 2$. Hence, it might happen that we have (strong) polynomial tractability though the largest eigenvalue $\lambda_{d,1} = (\varepsilon_d^{\text{init}})^2$ tends faster to infinity than any polynomial. To this end, for $d \in \mathbb{N}$, consider the sequences $(\lambda_{d,m})_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ given by

$$\lambda_{d,1} = e^{2d} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_{d,m} = \frac{1}{m}, \quad \text{for } m \geq 2.$$

Here, obviously, the initial error grows exponentially fast to infinity, but nevertheless the second point of Proposition 3 shows that $\{S_d\}$ is strongly polynomially tractable, since (18) holds with $r = p = q = 0$, and $C = \tau = 2$.

Let us now return to our I -(anti)-symmetric tensor product problems S_d as defined in Section 3. Therefore, let $\emptyset \neq I_d = \{i_1, \dots, i_{\#I_d}\} \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$ and $P_{I_d} \in \{\mathfrak{S}_{I_d}, \mathfrak{A}_{I_d}\}$ for every $d > 1$. We start by using Proposition 3 to conclude a simple necessary condition for (strong) polynomial tractability of $\{S_d\}$ in the worst case setting w.r.t. the absolute error criterion. Recall that $\psi: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \nabla_d$ defines a rearrangement of the parameter set ∇_d given in (7). That is,

$$\{\lambda_{d,\psi(v)} \mid v \in \mathbb{N}\} = \left\{ \lambda_{d,k} = \prod_{l=1}^d \lambda_{k_l} \mid k \in \nabla_d \right\} \quad (19)$$

denotes the set of eigenvalues of $S_d^\dagger S_d$ with respect to a non-increasing ordering, see Theorem 1.

Lemma 3 (General necessary conditions). The fact that $\{S_d\}$ is polynomially tractable with the constants $C, p > 0$ and $q \geq 0$ implies that $\lambda = (\lambda_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \in \ell_\tau$ for all $\tau > p/2$. Moreover, for any such τ and all $d \in \mathbb{N}$ the following estimate holds:

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_{d,\psi(1)}^\tau} \sum_{k \in \nabla_d} \lambda_{d,k}^\tau \leq (1 + C) d^q + C^{2\tau/p} \zeta \left(\frac{2\tau}{p} \right) \left(\frac{d^{2q/p}}{\lambda_{d,\psi(1)}} \right)^\tau.$$

Proof. From Proposition 3 we know that for $\tau > p/2$ and $r = 2q/p$ it is

$$\sup_{d \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{d^r} \left(\sum_{v=f(d)}^{\infty} \lambda_{d,\psi(v)}^\tau \right)^{1/\tau} < \infty, \quad (20)$$

where the function $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is given by $f(d) = \lceil (1 + C) d^q \rceil$.

Note that for the proof of the first assertion we only need to consider the case where all λ_m are strictly positive. Then the condition (20), in particular, implies that the sum in the brackets converges for every fixed $d \in \mathbb{N}$. If we denote the subset of indices $j \in \nabla_d$ of the $f(d) - 1$ largest eigenvalues $\lambda_{d,\psi(v)}$ by L_d then there exists a natural number $s = s(d) \geq d$ such that L_d is completely contained in the cube

$$Q_{d,s} = \{1, \dots, s\}^d. \quad (21)$$

Hence, we can crudely estimate the sum from below by

$$\sum_{j \in \nabla_d \setminus Q_{d,s}} \lambda_{d,j}^\tau \leq \sum_{j \in \nabla_d \setminus L_d} \lambda_{d,j}^\tau = \sum_{v=f(d)}^{\infty} \lambda_{d,\psi(v)}^\tau < \infty.$$

Since $R_{d,s} = \{j = (1, 2, \dots, d-1, m) \in \mathbb{N}^d \mid m > s\}$ is a subset of $\nabla_d \setminus Q_{d,s}$, independently of the concrete (anti-) symmetrizer P_{I_d} , where $P \in \{\mathfrak{S}, \mathfrak{A}\}$, we obtain

$$(\lambda_1 \cdot \lambda_2 \cdot \dots \cdot \lambda_{d-1})^\tau \sum_{m=s+1}^{\infty} \lambda_m^\tau = \sum_{j \in R_{d,s}} \lambda_{d,j}^\tau \leq \sum_{j \in \nabla_d \setminus Q_{d,s}} \lambda_{d,j}^\tau.$$

Thus, for each fixed $d \in \mathbb{N}$ the tail series $\sum_{m=s(d)+1}^{\infty} \lambda_m^\tau$ is finite, which is only possible if $\|\lambda\|_{\ell_\tau} < \infty$. Hence, $\lambda \in \ell_\tau$ is necessary for (strong) polynomial tractability.

Let us turn to the second assertion. Obviously, (20) implies the existence of some constant $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{v=f(d)}^{\infty} \lambda_{d,\psi(v)}^\tau \leq C_1 d^{r\tau} \quad \text{for all } d \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Indeed, Proposition 3 yields that we can take $C_1 = C^{2\tau/p}\zeta(2\tau/p)$. The rest of the sum can also be bounded easily for any $d \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\sum_{v=1}^{f(d)-1} \lambda_{d,\psi(v)}^\tau \leq \lambda_{d,\psi(1)}^\tau (f(d) - 1),$$

due to the ordering provided by ψ . Since $\sum_{k \in \nabla_d} \lambda_{d,k}^\tau = \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{d,\psi(v)}^\tau$, it remains to show that $f(d) - 1 \leq (1 + C)d^q$ for every $d \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\lambda_{d,\psi(1)} > 0$, which is also obvious due to the definition of f . \blacksquare

Since we know that antisymmetric problems are easier than symmetric problems we have to distinguish these cases in order to conclude sharp conditions for tractability.

4.2 Tractability of symmetric problems (absolute error)

Beside the general assertion $\lambda \in \ell_\tau$, we start with necessary conditions for (strong) polynomial tractability in the symmetric setting. By b_d we denote the amount of coordinates without symmetry conditions in dimension d .

Proposition 4 (Necessary conditions, symmetric case). Let $\{S_d\}$ be the problem considered in Lemma 3 and assume $P = \mathfrak{S}$.

- If $\{S_d\}$ is polynomially tractable and $\lambda_1 \geq 1$ then $b_d \in \mathcal{O}(\ln d)$.
- If $\{S_d\}$ is strongly polynomially tractable and $\lambda_1 \geq 1$ then $b_d \in \mathcal{O}(1)$ and $\lambda_2 < 1/\lambda_1$.

Proof. Assume $\lambda_1 \geq 1$ and let τ be given by Lemma 3. Then, independent of the amount of symmetry conditions, we have $\lambda_{d,\psi(1)} = \lambda_1^d \geq 1$ and there exist absolute constants $r \geq 0$ and $C > 1$ such that

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_1^{\tau d}} \sum_{k \in \nabla_d} \lambda_{d,k}^\tau \leq C d^r, \quad d \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (22)$$

due to Lemma 3. In the case of strong polynomial tractability we even have $r = 0$. For $d \geq 2$ we use the product structure of $\lambda_{d,k}$, $k \in \nabla_d$, and split the sum on the left w.r.t. the coordinates with and without symmetry conditions. Hence, we conclude

$$\sum_{k=(h,j) \in \nabla_d} \lambda_{d,k}^\tau = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}^{b_d}} \lambda_{b_d,j}^\tau \sum_{\substack{h \in \mathbb{N}^{a_d}, \\ h_1 \leq \dots \leq h_{a_d}}} \lambda_{a_d,h}^\tau = \left(\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \lambda_m^\tau \right)^{b_d} \sum_{\substack{h \in \mathbb{N}^{a_d}, \\ h_1 \leq \dots \leq h_{a_d}}} \lambda_{a_d,h}^\tau, \quad d = a_d + b_d \geq 2, \quad (23)$$

which leads to

$$\left(\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\lambda_m}{\lambda_1} \right)^\tau \right)^{b_d} \sum_{\substack{h \in \mathbb{N}^{a_d}, \\ h_1 \leq \dots \leq h_{a_d}}} \prod_{l=1}^{a_d} \left(\frac{\lambda_{h_l}}{\lambda_1} \right)^\tau \leq C d^r.$$

In any case the second sum in the above inequality is bounded from below by 1. Thus, we conclude that $(1 + \lambda_2^\tau / \lambda_1^\tau)^{b_d} \leq (\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \lambda_m^\tau / \lambda_1^\tau)^{b_d}$ needs to be polynomially bounded from above. Since we always assume $\lambda_2 > 0$ this leads to the claimed bounds on b_d in the case of (strong) polynomial tractability.

It remains to show that $\lambda_2 < 1/\lambda_1$ is necessary for strong polynomial tractability. To this end, assume for a moment $\lambda_2 \geq 1/\lambda_1$. Then it is easy to see that (independent of the number of symmetry conditions) there are at least $1 + \lfloor d/2 \rfloor$ different $k \in \nabla_d$ such that $\lambda_{d,k} \geq 1$. Namely, for $l = 0, \dots, \lfloor d/2 \rfloor$ we can take the first $d - l$ coordinates of $k \in \nabla_d$ equal to one. To the remaining coordinates we assign the value two.

In other words, we have $\lambda_{d,\psi(1+\lfloor d/2 \rfloor)} \geq 1$. On the other hand, strong polynomial tractability implies $\sum_{v=\lceil 1+C \rceil}^{\infty} \lambda_{d,\psi(v)}^\tau \leq C_1$ for some absolute constants $\tau, C, C_1 > 0$ and all $d \in \mathbb{N}$; see (20). Hence, for every $d \geq 2 \lceil 1+C \rceil$,

$$C_1 \geq \sum_{v=\lceil 1+C \rceil}^{\infty} \lambda_{d,\psi(v)}^\tau \geq \sum_{v=\lceil 1+C \rceil}^{1+\lfloor d/2 \rfloor} \lambda_{d,\psi(v)}^\tau \geq \lambda_{d,\psi(1+\lfloor d/2 \rfloor)}^\tau (2 + \lfloor d/2 \rfloor - \lceil 1+C \rceil) \geq \lfloor d/2 \rfloor + 1 - \lceil C \rceil,$$

because of the ordering provided by ψ . Obviously, this is a contradiction. Thus, we have $\lambda_2 < 1/\lambda_1$ and the proof is complete. \blacksquare

Note in passing that the previous argument can also be used to show that (independent of the number of symmetry conditions) the information complexity $n(\varepsilon, d)$ needs to grow at least linearly in d if we assume $\lambda_2 \geq 1/\lambda_1$. In particular, we cannot have strong polynomial tractability if $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 1$.

We continue the analysis of I -symmetric problems with respect to the absolute error criterion by proving that the stated necessary conditions are also sufficient for (strong) polynomial tractability. To this end, we need a rather technical preliminary lemma that can be proven by elementary induction arguments. For the convenience of the reader we included also this proof in the appendix.

Lemma 4. Let $(\mu_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a non-increasing sequence of non-negative real numbers with $\mu_1 > 0$. Then, for all $V \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and every $d \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds

$$\sum_{\substack{k \in \mathbb{N}^d, \\ 1 \leq k_1 \leq \dots \leq k_d}} \mu_{d,k} \leq \mu_1^d d^V \left(1 + V + \sum_{L=1}^d \mu_1^{-L} \sum_{\substack{j^{(L)} \in \mathbb{N}^L, \\ V+2 \leq j_1^{(L)} \leq \dots \leq j_L^{(L)}}} \mu_{L,j^{(L)}} \right). \quad (24)$$

Now the sufficient conditions read as follows. Once again, we denote the number of coordinates without symmetry conditions in dimension d by b_d .

Proposition 5 (Sufficient conditions, symmetric case). Let $\{S_d\}$ be the problem considered in Lemma 3, assume $P = \mathfrak{S}$ and let $\lambda = (\lambda_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \in \ell_{\tau_0}$ for some $\tau_0 \in (0, \infty)$.

- If $\lambda_1 < 1$ then $\{S_d\}$ is strongly polynomially tractable.
- If $\lambda_1 = 1 > \lambda_2$ and $b_d \in \mathcal{O}(1)$ then $\{S_d\}$ is strongly polynomially tractable.
- If $\lambda_1 = 1$ and $b_d \in \mathcal{O}(\ln d)$ then $\{S_d\}$ is polynomially tractable.

Proof. Step 1. We start the proof by exploiting the property $\lambda \in \ell_{\tau_0}$. It is easy to see that the ordering of $(\lambda_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ implies

$$m\lambda_m^{\tau_0} \leq \lambda_1^{\tau_0} + \dots + \lambda_m^{\tau_0} < \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i^{\tau_0} = \|\lambda\|_{\ell_{\tau_0}}^{\tau_0} < \infty$$

for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, there exists some $C_{\tau_0} > 0$ such that λ_m is bounded from above by $C_{\tau_0} \cdot m^{-r}$ for every $r \leq 1/\tau_0$. Therefore, there is some index such that for every larger $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\lambda_m < 1$. We denote the smallest of these indices by m_0 . Similar to the calculation of Novak and Woźniakowski in [4, p.180] this leads to

$$\sum_{m=m_0}^{\infty} \lambda_m^{\tau} \leq (p+1)\lambda_{m_0}^{\tau} + C_{\tau_0}^{\tau} \int_{m_0+p}^{\infty} x^{-\tau r} dx = (p+1)\lambda_{m_0}^{\tau} + \frac{C_{\tau_0}^{\tau}}{\tau r - 1} \cdot \frac{1}{(m_0+p)^{\tau r - 1}}$$

for every $p \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and all τ such that $\tau r > 1$. Thus, in particular, with $r = 1/\tau_0$ we conclude

$$\sum_{m=m_0}^{\infty} \lambda_m^{\tau} \leq (p+1)\lambda_{m_0}^{\tau} + \frac{1/\tau}{1/\tau_0 - 1/\tau} \left(\frac{C_{\tau_0}^{1/(1/\tau_0 - 1/\tau)}}{m_0 + p} \right)^{\tau(1/\tau_0 - 1/\tau)} \quad \text{for all } \tau > \tau_0, p \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Note that for a given $\delta > 0$ there exists some constant $\tau_1 \geq \tau_0$ such that for all $\tau > \tau_1$ it is $1/(1/\tau_0 - 1/\tau) \in (\tau_0, \tau_0 + \delta)$. Hence, if $p \in \mathbb{N}$ is sufficiently large then we obtain for all $\tau > \tau_1$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m=m_0}^{\infty} \lambda_m^\tau &\leq (p+1)\lambda_{m_0}^\tau + \frac{\tau_0 + \delta}{\tau} \left(\frac{C_1}{m_0 + p} \right)^{\tau(1/\tau_0 - 1/\tau)} \\ &\leq (p+1)\lambda_{m_0}^\tau + \frac{\tau_0 + \delta}{\tau_1} \left(\frac{C_1}{m_0 + p} \right)^{\tau/(\tau_0 + \delta)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we set $C_1 = \max\{1, C_{\tau_0}^{\tau_0 + \delta}\}$. Finally, since $\lambda_{m_0} < 1$, both the summands tend to zero as τ approaches infinity. In particular, there need to exist some $\tau > \tau_1 \geq \tau_0$ such that

$$\sum_{m=m_0}^{\infty} \lambda_m^\tau \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Step 2. All the stated assertions can be seen using the second point of Proposition 3. Indeed, for polynomial tractability, it is sufficient to show that

$$\sum_{k \in \nabla_d} \lambda_{d,k}^\tau \leq C d^{r\tau} \quad \text{for all } d \in \mathbb{N} \quad (25)$$

and some $C, \tau > 0$ as well as some $r \geq 0$. If this even holds for $r = 0$ we obtain strong polynomial tractability.

In the case $\lambda_1 < 1$ we can estimate the sum on the left of (25) from above by $(\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \lambda_m^\tau)^d$. Using Step 1 with $m_0 = 1$ we conclude $\sum_{k \in \nabla_d} \lambda_{d,k}^\tau \leq 2^{-d}$ for some large $\tau > \tau_0$. Hence, the problem is strongly polynomially tractable in this case.

For the proof of the remaining points assume $\lambda_1 = 1$. In any case $\sum_{k \in \nabla_1} \lambda_{1,k}^\tau \leq \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \lambda_m^{\tau_0} = \|\lambda\|_{\ell_{\tau_0}}^{\tau_0} < \infty$ for all $\tau \geq \tau_0$, because of $\lambda \in \ell_{\tau_0}$. Therefore, we can assume $d \geq 2$ in the following. Again we split the sum in (25) with respect to the coordinates with and without symmetry conditions, i.e., for $d = a_d + b_d \geq 2$ we have

$$\sum_{k=(h,j) \in \nabla_d} \lambda_{d,k}^\tau = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}^{b_d}} \lambda_{b_d,j}^\tau \sum_{\substack{h \in \mathbb{N}^{a_d}, \\ h_1 \leq \dots \leq h_{a_d}}} \lambda_{a_d,h}^\tau = \left(1 + \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \lambda_m^\tau \right)^{b_d} \sum_{\substack{h \in \mathbb{N}^{a_d}, \\ h_1 \leq \dots \leq h_{a_d}}} \lambda_{a_d,h}^\tau. \quad (26)$$

If $\lambda_2 < 1$ and b_d is universally bounded then the first factor can be bounded by a constant and the second factor can be estimated using Lemma 4 with $V = 0$, d replaced by a_d and μ

replaced by λ^τ . It follows that if τ is large enough we have

$$\sum_{\substack{h \in \mathbb{N}^{a_d}, \\ h_1 \leq \dots \leq h_{a_d}}} \lambda_{a_d, h}^\tau \leq 1 + \sum_{L=1}^{a_d} \sum_{\substack{j^{(L)} \in \mathbb{N}^L, \\ 2 \leq j_1^{(L)} \leq \dots \leq j_L^{(L)}}} \lambda_{L, j^{(L)}}^\tau \leq 1 + \sum_{L=1}^{a_d} \left(\sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \lambda_m^\tau \right)^L \leq 1 + \sum_{L=1}^{\infty} 2^{-L} = 2,$$

where we again used Step 1 and the properties of geometric series. Thus, $\sum_{k \in \nabla_d} \lambda_{d, k}^\tau$ is universally bounded in this case and therefore the problem is strongly polynomially tractable.

To prove the last point we argue in the same manner. Now $b_d \in \mathcal{O}(\ln d)$ yields that the first factor in the splitting (26) is polynomially bounded in d . For the second factor we again apply Lemma 4, but in this case we set $V = m_0 - 2$, where m_0 denotes the first index $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\lambda_m < 1$. Keep in mind that this index is at least two because of $\lambda_1 = 1$. On the other hand it needs to be finite, since $\lambda \in \ell_{\tau_0}$. Therefore, the second factor in the splitting (26) is also polynomially bounded in d due to the same arguments as above. All in all, this proves (25) and the problem is polynomially tractable in this case. ■

We summarize the results obtained for I -symmetric tensor product problems in the following theorem.

Theorem 2 (Tractability of symmetric problems, absolute error). Assume $S_1: H_1 \rightarrow G_1$ to be a compact linear operator between two Hilbert spaces and let $\lambda = (\lambda_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ denote the sequence of non-negative eigenvalues of $W_1 = S_1^\dagger S_1$ w.r.t. a non-increasing ordering. Moreover, for $d > 1$ let $\emptyset \neq I_d \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$. Assume S_d to be the linear tensor product problem restricted to the I_d -symmetric subspace $\mathfrak{S}_{I_d}(H_d)$ of the d -fold tensor product space H_d , consider the worst case setting w.r.t. the absolute error criterion and let $\lambda_1 \leq 1$. Then the problem is strongly polynomially tractable if and only if $\lambda \in \ell_\tau$ for some $\tau > 0$ and

- $\lambda_1 < 1$, or
- $1 = \lambda_1 > \lambda_2$ and $(d - \#I_d) \in \mathcal{O}(1)$.

Moreover, the problem is polynomially tractable if and only if $\lambda \in \ell_\tau$ for some $\tau > 0$ and

- $\lambda_1 < 1$, or
- $\lambda_1 = 1$ and $(d - \#I_d) \in \mathcal{O}(\ln d)$.

4.3 Tractability of symmetric problems (normalized error)

Here we briefly focus on the normalized error criterion for the I -symmetric setting. Since $(\varepsilon_d^{\text{init}})^2 = \lambda_{d,\psi(1)} = \lambda_1^d$ for any kind of symmetric problem, this means that we have to investigate the influence of d and $1/\varepsilon'$ on

$$\begin{aligned} n(\varepsilon' \cdot \varepsilon_d^{\text{init}}, d; \mathfrak{S}_{I_d}(H_d)) &= \min \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid \lambda_{d,\psi(n+1)} \leq (\varepsilon')^2 \lambda_{d,\psi(1)}\} \\ &= \# \left\{ k \in \nabla_d \mid \prod_{l=1}^d \left(\frac{\lambda_{k_l}}{\lambda_1} \right) > (\varepsilon')^2 \right\} \quad \text{for } \varepsilon' \in (0, 1), d \in \mathbb{N}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, in fact we have to study the information complexity of a scaled tensor product problem $S'_d: \mathfrak{S}_{I_d}(H_d) \rightarrow G_d$ with respect to the absolute error criterion. The squared singular values of S'_1 equal $\mu = (\mu_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\mu_m = \lambda_m/\lambda_1$. Obviously, we always have $\mu_1 = 1$. Furthermore, $\mu \in \ell_\tau$ if and only if $\lambda \in \ell_\tau$. This leads to the following theorem.

Theorem 3 (Tractability of symmetric problems, normalized error). Assume $S_1: H_1 \rightarrow G_1$ to be a compact linear operator between two Hilbert spaces and let $\lambda = (\lambda_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ denote the sequence of non-negative eigenvalues of $W_1 = S_1^\dagger S_1$ w.r.t. a non-increasing ordering. Moreover, for $d > 1$ let $\emptyset \neq I_d \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$. Assume S_d to be the linear tensor product problem restricted to the I_d -symmetric subspace $\mathfrak{S}_{I_d}(H_d)$ of the d -fold tensor product space H_d and consider the worst case setting w.r.t. the normalized error criterion.

Then the problem is strongly polynomially tractable if and only if $\lambda \in \ell_\tau$ for some $\tau > 0$ and $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2$ and $(d - \#I_d) \in \mathcal{O}(1)$.

Moreover, $\{S_d\}$ is polynomially tractable if and only if $\lambda \in \ell_\tau$ for some $\tau > 0$ and $(d - \#I_d) \in \mathcal{O}(\ln d)$.

4.4 Tractability of antisymmetric problems (absolute error)

We start this subsection with simple sufficient conditions for strong polynomial tractability.

Proposition 6 (Sufficient conditions, antisymmetric case). Let $\{S_d\}$ be the problem considered in Lemma 3, assume $P = \mathfrak{A}$ and let $\lambda = (\lambda_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \in \ell_{\tau_0}$ for some $\tau_0 \in (0, \infty)$.

- If $\lambda_1 < 1$ then $\{S_d\}$ is strongly polynomially tractable, independent of the number of antisymmetry conditions.
- If $\lambda_1 \geq 1$ and if there exist constants $\tau \geq \tau_0$ and $d_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for the number of antisymmetric coordinates a_d in dimension d it holds that

$$\frac{\ln(a_d!)}{d} \geq \ln(\|\lambda\|_{\ell_\tau}^\tau) \quad \text{for all } d \geq d_0 \quad (27)$$

then the problem $\{S_d\}$ is also strongly polynomially tractable.

Proof. Like for the symmetric setting, the proof of these sufficient conditions is based on the second point of Proposition 3. We show that under the given assumptions

$$\left(\sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{d,\psi(v)}^{\tau} \right)^{1/\tau} \leq C < \infty \quad \text{for every } d \in \mathbb{N}$$

and some $\tau \geq \tau_0$. Once again ψ and ∇_d are given as in (19) and (7), respectively.

Since for $d = 1$ there is no antisymmetry condition we have $\psi = \text{id}$ and

$$\left(\sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{1,\psi(v)}^{\tau} \right)^{1/\tau} = \left(\sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \lambda_v^{\tau} \right)^{1/\tau} = \|\lambda\|_{\ell_{\tau}} \leq \|\lambda\|_{\ell_{\tau_0}}.$$

Therefore, due to the hypothesis $\lambda \in \ell_{\tau_0}$ the term for $d = 1$ is finite.

Hence, let $d \geq 2$ be arbitrarily fixed. For $s \in \mathbb{N}$ with $s \geq d$ we define the cubes $Q_{d,s}$ of multi-indices similar to (21). With this notation we obtain the representation

$$\sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{d,\psi(v)}^{\tau} = \sum_{k \in \nabla_d} \lambda_{d,k}^{\tau} = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k \in \nabla_d \cap Q_{d,s}} \lambda_{d,k}^{\tau}.$$

Without loss of generality we may reorder the set of coordinates such that $I_d = \{i_1, \dots, i_{a_d}\} = \{1, \dots, a_d\}$. That is, we assume partial antisymmetry with respect to the first a_d coordinates. Furthermore, we define $U_{a_d,s} = \{j \in Q_{a_d,s} \mid j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_{a_d}\}$ and set $b_d = d - a_d$.

If $b_d > 0$ then the set of multi-indices under consideration splits into two non-trivial parts:

$$\nabla_d \cap Q_{d,s} = U_{a_d,s} \times Q_{b_d,s} \quad \text{for all } s \geq d.$$

Because of the product structure of $\lambda_{d,k}$ ($k \in \nabla_d$) this implies

$$\sum_{k=(j,i) \in \nabla_d \cap Q_{d,s}} \lambda_{d,k}^{\tau} = \left(\sum_{j \in U_{a_d,s}} \prod_{l=1}^{a_d} \lambda_{j_l}^{\tau} \right) \left(\sum_{i \in Q_{b_d,s}} \prod_{l=1}^{b_d} \lambda_{i_l}^{\tau} \right).$$

Since the sequence $\lambda = (\lambda_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an element of ℓ_{τ} we can easily estimate the second factor for every $s \geq d$ from above by

$$\sum_{i \in Q_{b_d,s}} \prod_{l=1}^{b_d} \lambda_{i_l}^{\tau} = \prod_{l=1}^{b_d} \sum_{m=1}^s \lambda_m^{\tau} = \left(\sum_{m=1}^s \lambda_m^{\tau} \right)^{b_d} \leq \left(\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \lambda_m^{\tau} \right)^{1/\tau \cdot b_d \cdot \tau} = \|\lambda\|_{\ell_{\tau}}^{b_d \cdot \tau}. \quad (28)$$

To handle the first term we need an additional argument. Note that the structure of $U_{a_d,s}$ implies

$$\sum_{j \in Q_{a_d,s}} \prod_{l=1}^{a_d} \lambda_{jl}^\tau = \sum_{\substack{j \in Q_{a_d,s} \\ \exists k,m: j_k=j_m}} \prod_{l=1}^{a_d} \lambda_{jl}^\tau + a_d! \sum_{j \in U_{a_d,s}} \prod_{l=1}^{a_d} \lambda_{jl}^\tau,$$

which leads to the upper bound

$$\sum_{j \in U_{a_d,s}} \prod_{l=1}^{a_d} \lambda_{jl}^\tau \leq \frac{1}{a_d!} \sum_{j \in Q_{a_d,s}} \prod_{l=1}^{a_d} \lambda_{jl}^\tau \leq \frac{1}{a_d!} \|\lambda | \ell_\tau\|^{a_d \cdot \tau},$$

where we used the same arguments as in (28). Once again this upper bound does not depend on $s \geq d$. Hence, due to $d = a_d + b_d$, we conclude

$$\sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{d,\psi(v)}^\tau = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k \in \nabla_d \cap Q_{d,s}} \lambda_{d,k}^\tau \leq \frac{1}{a_d!} \|\lambda | \ell_\tau\|^{\tau d}$$

for every choice of \mathfrak{A}_{I_d} . Of course, for every $2 \leq d < d_0$ this upper bound is trivially less than an absolute constant. Thus, we can assume $d \geq d_0$. Then, due to the hypothesis of the second point we have $\ln(a_d!) \geq \ln(\|\lambda | \ell_\tau\|^{\tau d})$, which implies

$$\left(\sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{d,\psi(v)}^\tau \right)^{1/\tau} \leq \left(\frac{1}{a_d!} \|\lambda | \ell_\tau\|^{\tau d} \right)^{1/\tau} \leq 1 \quad \text{for } d \geq d_0.$$

Hence, (27) is sufficient for strong polynomial tractability, independent of λ_1 . Therefore it suffices to show that $\lambda_1 < 1$ implies (27) in order to complete the proof. To this end, let $\lambda_1 < 1$. We know from Step 1 in the proof of Proposition 5 that there exists some $\tau \geq \tau_0$ such that

$$\|\lambda | \ell_\tau\|^\tau = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \lambda_m^\tau \leq \frac{1}{2} < 1.$$

Thus, we see that the right hand side of (27) is negative, whereas the left hand side is non-negative for every choice of a_d . ■

We also briefly comment on this result. First, note that a sequence $\lambda = (\lambda_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ that is not included in any ℓ_τ -space, $0 < \tau < \infty$, has to converge to zero more slowly than the

inverse of any polynomial, i.e., $m^{-\alpha}$ for $\alpha > 0$ arbitrarily fixed. Thus, only sequences like $\lambda_m = 1/\ln(m)$ lead to polynomial intractability in the fully antisymmetric setting.

Secondly, observe that (27) is quite a weak assumption. For example if we have

$$a_d \geq \left\lceil \frac{d}{\ln d^\alpha} \right\rceil \quad \text{with} \quad 0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{\ln(\|\lambda | \ell_\tau\|^\tau)}$$

for all sufficiently large d then

$$\frac{\ln(a_d!)}{d} \geq \frac{a_d(\ln(a_d) - 1)}{d} \geq \frac{1}{\alpha} \cdot \frac{\ln\left(\frac{1}{e\alpha} \cdot \frac{d}{\ln d}\right)}{\ln d} \longrightarrow \frac{1}{\alpha} > \ln(\|\lambda | \ell_\tau\|^\tau), \quad d \rightarrow \infty.$$

If α equals its upper bound, i.e. $\alpha = 1/\ln(\|\lambda | \ell_\tau\|^\tau)$, then the condition (27) does not hold. This also shows that assumptions like $a_d = \lceil d^\beta \rceil$ with $\beta < 1$ are not sufficient to conclude (27).

Note that Proposition 3 allows us to omit the largest $f(d) - 1$ eigenvalues $\lambda_{d,\psi(v)}$ where $f(d)$ may grow polynomially in $(\varepsilon_d^{\text{init}})^{-1}$ with d . We did not use this fact in the proof of the sufficient conditions.

Let us now turn to the necessary conditions. We will see that we need a condition similar to (27) in order to conclude polynomial tractability if we deal with slowly decreasing eigenvalues λ .

Proposition 7 (Necessary conditions, antisymmetric case). Let $\{S_d\}$ be the problem considered in Lemma 3 and assume $P = \mathfrak{A}$. Furthermore, let $\{S_d\}$ be polynomially tractable with the constants $C, p > 0$ and $q \geq 0$.

Then, for d tending to infinity, the initial error $\varepsilon_d^{\text{init}}$ tends to zero faster than the inverse of any polynomial. Furthermore, $\lambda = (\lambda_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \in \ell_\tau$ for every $\tau > p/2$ and for all $\delta > 0$ there exists some $d_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\ln(\|\lambda | \ell_\tau\|^\tau) - \delta \leq \frac{1}{d} \sum_{k=1}^{a_d} \ln\left(\frac{\|\lambda | \ell_\tau\|^\tau}{\lambda_k^\tau}\right) \quad \text{for all } d \geq d_0. \quad (29)$$

Thus, we have $\lambda_1 < 1$ or $\lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} a_d = \infty$.

Proof. Step 1. For the whole proof assume $\tau > p/2$ to be fixed. Then Lemma 3 shows that $\lambda \in \ell_\tau$. Moreover, we again use the notation $d = a_d + b_d$, where $a_d = \#I_d$ denotes the number of coordinates with antisymmetry conditions in dimension d . Similar to the symmetric case we can split the sum of the eigenvalues such that for all $d \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\sum_{k \in \nabla_d} \lambda_{d,k}^\tau = \left(\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \lambda_m^\tau \right)^{b_d} \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{N}^{a_d} \\ 1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_{a_d}}} \lambda_{a_d,j}^\tau \geq \|\lambda | \ell_\tau\|^{\tau b_d} \cdot \lambda_1^\tau \cdot \dots \cdot \lambda_{a_d}^\tau.$$

Hence, Lemma 3 implies that

$$\left(\frac{\|\lambda\| \ell_\tau^\tau}{\lambda_1^\tau}\right)^{b_d} \leq (1+C) d^q + C^{2\tau/p} \zeta \left(\frac{2\tau}{p}\right) \left(\frac{d^{2q/p}}{\lambda_{d,\psi(1)}}\right)^\tau. \quad (30)$$

In what follows we will use this inequality to conclude all the stated assertions.

Step 2. Here we prove the limit property for the initial error $\varepsilon_d^{\text{init}} = \sqrt{\lambda_{d,\psi(1)}}$, i.e. we need to show that for every fixed polynomial $\mathcal{P} > 0$

$$\lambda_{d,\psi(1)} \mathcal{P}(d) \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{if } d \rightarrow \infty. \quad (31)$$

Since $\lambda_{d,\psi(1)} = \lambda_1^{b_d} \cdot \lambda_1 \cdot \dots \cdot \lambda_{a_d} \leq \lambda_1^{b_d} \cdot \lambda_1^{a_d} = \lambda_1^d$ due to the ordering of $\lambda = (\lambda_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ we can restrict ourselves to the non-trivial case $\lambda_1 \geq 1$ in the following. Now assume that there exists a subsequence $(d_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of natural numbers as well as some constant $C_0 > 0$ such that $\lambda_{d_k,\psi(1)} \mathcal{P}(d_k)$ is bounded from below by C_0 for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then for every $d = d_k$ the right hand side of (30) is bounded from above by some polynomial $\mathcal{P}_1(d_k) > 0$. On the other hand, due to the general condition $\lambda_2 > 0$, the term $\|\lambda\| \ell_\tau^\tau / \lambda_1^\tau$ is strictly larger than one. Thus, it follows that there exists some $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$b_{d_k} \leq C_1 \ln(d_k) \quad \text{for every } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Therefore, we have in particular $a_{d_k} = d_k - b_{d_k} \rightarrow \infty$, for $k \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, the assumed boundedness of $\lambda_{d_k,\psi(1)} \mathcal{P}(d_k)$ leads to

$$C_0 \mathcal{P}(d_k)^{-1} \leq \lambda_{d_k,\psi(1)} \leq \lambda_1^{C_1 \ln(d_k)} \cdot \lambda_1 \cdot \dots \cdot \lambda_{a_{d_k}} = d_k^{C_1 \ln(\lambda_1)} \cdot \lambda_1 \cdot \dots \cdot \lambda_{a_{d_k}}$$

since $\lambda_1 \geq 1$. As we showed in Step 1 of the proof of Proposition 5 the fact $\lambda \in \ell_\tau$ yields the existence of some $C_\tau > 0$ such that $\lambda_m \leq C_\tau m^{-1/\tau}$ for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Indeed, this holds for $C_\tau = \|\lambda\| \ell_\tau$, which needs to be larger than one because of $\lambda_1 \geq 1$. Hence, $\lambda_1^\tau \cdot \dots \cdot \lambda_{a_{d_k}}^\tau \leq C_\tau^{\tau a_{d_k}} (a_{d_k}!)^{-1}$, what implies

$$\left(\frac{a_{d_k}}{e}\right)^{a_{d_k}} \leq a_{d_k}! \leq (C_\tau^\tau)^{a_{d_k}} \mathcal{P}_2(d_k), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}$$

for some other polynomial $\mathcal{P}_2 > 0$. Thus, if k is sufficiently large we conclude

$$a_{d_k} \leq a_{d_k} \ln \left(\frac{a_{d_k}}{e C_\tau^\tau}\right) \leq \ln(\mathcal{P}_2(d_k)),$$

since $a_{d_k} \rightarrow \infty$ implies $a_{d_k} / (e C_\tau^\tau) \geq e$ for $k \geq k_0$. Therefore, the number of antisymmetric coordinates a_d needs to be logarithmically bounded from above for every d out of the sequence

$(d_k)_{k \geq k_0}$. Because also b_{d_k} was found to be logarithmically bounded this is a contradiction to the fact $d_k = a_{d_k} + b_{d_k}$. Thus, the hypothesis $\lambda_{d_k, \psi(1)} \mathcal{P}(d_k) \geq C_0 > 0$ can not be true for any subsequence $(d_k)_k$. In other words it holds (31).

Step 3. Next we show (29). From the former step we know that there needs to exist some $d^* \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $1/\lambda_{d, \psi(1)} \geq 1$ for all $d \geq d^*$. Hence, (30) together with $\tau > p/2$ implies

$$\left(\frac{\|\lambda | \ell_\tau\|^\tau}{\lambda_1^\tau} \right)^{b_d} \leq C_2 \left(\frac{d^{2q/p}}{\lambda_{d, \psi(1)}} \right)^\tau = \frac{C_2 d^{2q\tau/p}}{\lambda_1^{\tau b_d} \cdot \lambda_1^\tau \cdot \dots \cdot \lambda_{a_d}^\tau} \quad \text{for } d \geq d^*,$$

where we set $C_2 = 1 + C + C^{2\tau/p} \zeta(2\tau/p)$. Therefore, we conclude

$$\frac{1}{C_2 d^{2q\tau/p}} \|\lambda | \ell_\tau\|^{\tau d} \leq \prod_{k=1}^{a_d} \frac{\|\lambda | \ell_\tau\|^\tau}{\lambda_k^\tau}$$

for all $d \geq d^*$, which is equivalent to

$$\ln(\|\lambda | \ell_\tau\|^\tau) - \frac{\ln(C_2 d^{2q\tau/p})}{d} \leq \frac{1}{d} \sum_{k=1}^{a_d} \ln \left(\frac{\|\lambda | \ell_\tau\|^\tau}{\lambda_k^\tau} \right). \quad (32)$$

Obviously, for given $\delta > 0$, there is some d^{**} such that $\ln(C_2 d^{2q\tau/p})/d < \delta$ for all $d \geq d^{**}$. Hence, we can choose $d_0 = \max\{d^*, d^{**}\}$ in order to obtain (29).

Step 4. It remains to show that $\lambda_1 \geq 1$ implies that $\lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} a_d$ is infinite. To this end, note that every summand in (32) is strictly positive. If we assume for a moment the existence of a subsequence $(d_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that a_{d_k} is bounded for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ then the right hand side of (32) is less than some positive constant divided by d_k . Hence, it tends to zero if k approaches infinity. On the other hand, for large d , the left hand side of (32) is strictly larger than some positive constant, because of $\lambda_1 \geq 1$ and $\lambda_2 > 0$. This contradiction completes the proof. ■

As mentioned before there are examples such that the sufficient condition (27) from Proposition 6 is also necessary (up to some constant factor) in order to conclude polynomial tractability in the antisymmetric setting. Now we are ready to give such an example.

Example 1. Consider the situation of Lemma 3 for $P = \mathfrak{A}$ and assume the problem $\{S_d\}$ to be polynomially tractable. In addition, for a fixed $\tau \in (0, \infty)$, let $\lambda = (\lambda_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \in \ell_\tau$ be given such that $\lambda_1 \geq 1$ and, moreover, assume that there exist $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\lambda_m \geq \frac{\|\lambda | \ell_\tau\|}{m^{\alpha/\tau}} \quad \text{for all } m > m_0 \quad \text{and some } \alpha > 1. \quad (33)$$

Then we claim that for every $\delta > 0$ there exists $\bar{d} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\left(\frac{1}{\alpha} - \delta\right) \ln(\|\lambda | \ell_\tau\|^\tau) \leq \frac{\ln(a_d!)}{d} \quad \text{for all } d \geq \bar{d}. \quad (34)$$

Recall that due to Proposition 6, for the amount of antisymmetry a_d , it was sufficient to assume

$$\ln(\|\lambda | \ell_\tau\|^\tau) \leq \frac{\ln(a_d!)}{d} \quad \text{for every } d \text{ larger than some fixed } d_0 \in \mathbb{N}$$

in order to conclude strong polynomial tractability.

Before we prove the claim it might be useful to give a concrete example where (33) holds true. To this end, set $\lambda_m = 1/m^2$, $\tau = 1$, $\alpha = 3$ and $m_0 = 2$. Then it is easy to check that $\|\lambda | \ell_\tau\| = \zeta(2) = \pi^2/6$ and obviously we have $\lambda_1 = 1$.

To see that the claimed inequality (34) holds true we can use Proposition 7 and, in particular, inequality (32). Since $\lambda_1 \geq 1$ we know that $\lim_d a_d = \infty$, i.e. $a_d > m_0$ for every d larger than some $d_1 \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, note that (33) is equivalent to

$$\ln\left(\frac{\|\lambda | \ell_\tau\|^\tau}{\lambda_m^\tau}\right) \leq \alpha \ln(m) \quad \text{for all } m > m_0.$$

Hence, if $d \geq d_1$ we can estimate the right hand side of (32) from above by

$$\frac{1}{d} \sum_{k=1}^{a_d} \ln\left(\frac{\|\lambda | \ell_\tau\|^\tau}{\lambda_k^\tau}\right) \leq \frac{m_0}{d} \cdot \ln\left(\frac{\|\lambda | \ell_\tau\|^\tau}{\lambda_{m_0}^\tau}\right) + \frac{\alpha}{d} \sum_{k=m_0+1}^{a_d} \ln(k) \leq \frac{C_\lambda}{d} + \alpha \frac{\ln(a_d!)}{d}.$$

Consequently, this leads to

$$\frac{1}{\alpha} \ln(\|\lambda | \ell_\tau\|^\tau) - \frac{C_\lambda + \ln(C_2 d^{2q\tau/p})}{\alpha \cdot d} \leq \frac{\ln(a_d!)}{d} \quad \text{for } d \geq \max\{d^*, d_1\}.$$

Now (34) follows easily by choosing $\bar{d} \geq \max\{d^*, d_1\}$ large enough such that the negative term on the left is smaller than a given $\delta > 0$ times $\ln(\|\lambda | \ell_\tau\|^\tau)$.

Although there remains a small gap between the necessary and the sufficient conditions for the absolute error criterion, the most important cases of antisymmetric tensor product problems are covered by our results. We summarize the main facts in the next theorem.

Theorem 4 (Tractability of antisymmetric problems, absolute error). Let $S_1: H_1 \rightarrow G_1$ be a compact linear operator between two Hilbert spaces and let $\lambda = (\lambda_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ denote the sequence

of non-negative eigenvalues of $W_1 = S_1^\dagger S_1$ w.r.t. a non-increasing ordering. Moreover, for $d > 1$ let $\emptyset \neq I_d \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$. Assume S_d to be the linear tensor product problem restricted to the I_d -antisymmetric subspace $\mathfrak{A}_{I_d}(H_d)$ of the d -fold tensor product space H_d and consider the worst case setting with respect to the absolute error criterion.

Then for the case $\lambda_1 < 1$ the following statements are equivalent:

- $\{S_d\}$ is strongly polynomially tractable.
- $\{S_d\}$ is polynomially tractable.
- There exists a universal constant $\tau \in (0, \infty)$ such that $\lambda \in \ell_\tau$.

Moreover, the same equivalences hold true if $\lambda_1 \geq 1$ and $\#I_d$ grows linearly with the dimension d .

Finally, before we continue with the normalized error criterion, we want to deduce an exact formula for the complexity in the case of fully antisymmetric functions. Hence, we set $I = I_d = \{1, \dots, d\}$ for every $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and consider

$$S_d: \mathfrak{A}_I(H_d) \rightarrow G_d$$

in the following. In this case the set of parameters ∇_d is given by

$$\nabla_d = \{k = (k_1, \dots, k_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d \mid k_1 < k_2 < \dots < k_d\}.$$

Thus, to obtain a worst case error less or equal than a given $\varepsilon > 0$ we need at least

$$n^{\text{asy}}(\varepsilon, d) = n(\varepsilon, d; \mathfrak{A}(H_d)) = \# \left\{ k \in \nabla_d \mid \lambda_{d,k} = \prod_{l=1}^d \lambda_{k_l} > \varepsilon^2 \right\}$$

linear functionals for the d -variate case.

Due to the ordering of $(\lambda_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ the largest eigenvalue $\lambda_{d,k}$ with $k \in \nabla_d$ is given by the square of $\varepsilon_d^{\text{init}} = \sqrt{\lambda_1 \cdot \lambda_2 \cdot \dots \cdot \lambda_d}$. In other words, it is

$$n^{\text{asy}}(\varepsilon, d) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon \geq \varepsilon_d^{\text{init}}.$$

To calculate the cardinality also for $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_d^{\text{init}}$ let us define

$$i_d(\delta^2) = \min \{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid \alpha_i = \lambda_i \cdot \lambda_{i+1} \cdot \dots \cdot \lambda_{i+d-1} \leq \delta^2\}, \quad \text{for } \delta > 0 \quad \text{and } d \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (35)$$

Using this notation we can formulate the following assertion. Again the proof can be found in the appendix of this paper.

Proposition 8 (Complexity of fully antisymmetric problems). Let $\{S_d\}$ be the problem considered in Lemma 3 and assume $P = \mathfrak{A}$ as well as $I = I_d = \{1, \dots, d\}$. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ the information complexity is given by $n^{\text{asy}}(\varepsilon, d) = n^{\text{ent}}(\varepsilon, 1)$, if $d = 1$, and

$$n^{\text{asy}}(\varepsilon, d) \tag{36}$$

$$= \sum_{l_1=2}^{i_d(\varepsilon^2)} \sum_{l_2=l_1+1}^{i_{d-1}(\varepsilon^2/\lambda_{l_1-1})} \dots \sum_{l_{d-1}=l_{d-2}+1}^{i_2(\varepsilon^2/[\lambda_{l_1-1} \dots \lambda_{l_{d-2}-1}])} \left[n^{\text{ent}} \left(\varepsilon / \sqrt{\lambda_{l_1-1} \dots \lambda_{l_{d-1}-1}}, 1 \right) - l_{d-1} + 1 \right]$$

if $d \geq 2$. Here the quantities i_j , for $j = 2, \dots, d$, are defined as in (35).

Remark 2. If we define

$$\alpha_m^{(k)} = \prod_{l=0}^{k-1} \lambda_{m+l}, \quad m \in \mathbb{N},$$

for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and a non-increasing sequence $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots > 0$, then we can interpret the quantities $i_k(\delta^2)$ as information complexities of modified univariate problems $S_1^{(k)}$. In detail, let $S_1^{(k)}: H_1 \rightarrow G_1$ define a compact linear operator such that

$$W_1^{(k)} = \left(S_1^{(k)} \right)^\dagger \left(S_1^{(k)} \right) : H_1 \rightarrow H_1$$

possesses the eigenvalues $\{\alpha_m^{(k)} \mid m \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Then

$$n^{\text{ent}}(\delta, 1) = n^{\text{ent}}(\delta, 1; S_1^{(k)}: H_1 \rightarrow G_1) = i_k(\delta^2) - 1 \quad \text{for all } \delta > 0.$$

Further, note that for $k \geq 2$ the quantities $i_k(\varepsilon^2/[\lambda_{l_1-1} \dots \lambda_{l_{d-k}-1}])$ are non-increasing functions in l_1, \dots, l_{d-k} and ε .

Out of Proposition 8 we can conclude bounds on the information complexity. If $d \geq 2$ and $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_d^{\text{init}}$ then the sum in (36) contains at least the term with the index $l_1 = 2, l_2 = 3, \dots, l_{d-1} = d$. That is, for any choice of λ we get the lower bound

$$n^{\text{asy}}(\varepsilon, d) \geq n^{\text{ent}} \left(\varepsilon / \sqrt{\lambda_1 \dots \lambda_{d-1}}, 1 \right) - d + 1,$$

which can be used to show that we cannot expect the same nice conditions for (strong) polynomial tractability as before if we switch from the absolute to the normalized error criterion. We conclude this subsection with a corresponding example.

Example 2. Assume $\lambda_m = m^{-2\alpha}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and some $\alpha > 0$. Then we need to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} n^{\text{ent}}\left(\varepsilon/\sqrt{\lambda_1 \cdot \dots \cdot \lambda_{d-1}}, 1\right) &= n^{\text{ent}}\left(\varepsilon \cdot (d-1)!^\alpha, 1\right) \\ &= \#\{m \in \mathbb{N} \mid m^{-2\alpha} > (\varepsilon \cdot (d-1)!^\alpha)^2\} \\ &= \#\left\{m \in \mathbb{N} \mid m < \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{1/\alpha} \cdot (d-1)!}\right\} \geq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{1/\alpha} \cdot (d-1)!} - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$n^{\text{asy}}(\varepsilon, d) \geq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{1/\alpha} \cdot (d-1)!} - d = d \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{1/\alpha} \cdot d!} - 1 \right) \quad \text{if } d \geq 2 \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon < \varepsilon_d^{\text{init}}.$$

Since in this case the initial error $\varepsilon_d^{\text{init}}$ for the d -variate problem equals $1/d!^\alpha$, we need at least

$$n^{\text{asy}}(\varepsilon' \cdot \varepsilon_d^{\text{init}}, d) \geq d \left(\frac{1}{(\varepsilon')^{1/\alpha}} - 1 \right)$$

linear functionals to improve the initial error by a factor $\varepsilon' < 1$. Because this bound grows linearly with the dimension the problem is not strongly polynomially tractable with respect to the *normalized error criterion*. Nevertheless, the sequence λ is an element of $l_{1/\alpha}$, say, which implies strong polynomial tractability for the *absolute error criterion* due to Theorem 4.

4.5 Tractability of antisymmetric problems (normalized error)

Up to now every complexity assertion in this paper was mainly based on Proposition 3 which dealt with the general situation of arbitrary compact linear operators between Hilbert spaces and with the absolute error criterion. While investigating tractability properties of I -symmetric problems with respect to the normalized error criterion, we were able to use assertions from the absolute error setting. Since for I -antisymmetric problems the structure of the initial error is more complicated, this approach will not work again. Therefore, we start this subsection with a modified version of another known theorem by Novak and Woźniakowski [4, Theorem 5.2].

Proposition 9. Consider a family of compact linear operators $\{T_d: F_d \rightarrow G_d \mid d \in \mathbb{N}\}$ between Hilbert spaces and the normalized error criterion in the worst case setting. Furthermore, for $d \in \mathbb{N}$ let $(\lambda_{d,i})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ denote the non-negative sequence of eigenvalues of $T_d^\dagger T_d$ w.r.t. a non-increasing ordering.

- If $\{T_d\}$ is polynomially tractable with the constants $C, p > 0$ and $q \geq 0$ then for all $\tau > p/2$ we have

$$C_\tau = \sup_{d \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{d^r} \left(\sum_{i=f(d)}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\lambda_{d,i}}{\lambda_{d,1}} \right)^\tau \right)^{1/\tau} < \infty, \quad (37)$$

where $r = 2q/p$ and $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with $f(d) \equiv 1$.
In this case, $C_\tau^\tau \leq 1 + C + C^{2\tau/p} \zeta(2\tau/p)$.

- If (37) is satisfied for some parameters $r \geq 0, \tau > 0$ and a function $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $f(d) = \lceil C d^q \rceil$, where $C > 0$ and $q \geq 0$, then the problem is polynomially tractable and $n(\varepsilon' \cdot \varepsilon_d^{\text{init}}, d) \leq (C + C_\tau^\tau) (\varepsilon')^{-2\tau} d^{\max\{q, r\tau\}}$.

Note that this shows that (strong) polynomial tractability is characterized by the boundedness of the sum over the normalized eigenvalues, were we are allowed to omit the Cd^q largest of them. Of course, our results are equivalent to the assertions given by Novak and Woźniakowski [4], as one can see easily. But now the connection between the different error criterions is more obvious. From this point of view Proposition 9 reads more natural than [4, Theorem 5.2]. The key is to apply the same proof technique for both the assertions.

Moreover, observe that also the theorem in [4] for the normalized error criterion includes further assertions concerning, e.g., the exponent of strong polynomial tractability. Again our proof implies the same results.

Similar to the former sections we continue with an application of Proposition 9 to our antisymmetric tensor product problems. To this end, assume $S_1: H_1 \rightarrow G_1$ to be a compact linear operator between two Hilbert spaces and let $\lambda = (\lambda_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ denote the sequence of non-negative eigenvalues of $W_1 = S_1^\dagger S_1$ w.r.t. a non-increasing ordering. Moreover, for $d > 1$ let $\emptyset \neq I_d = \{1, \dots, d\}$. Assume S_d to be the linear tensor product problem restricted to the I_d -antisymmetric subspace $\mathfrak{A}_{I_d}(H_d)$ of the d -fold tensor product space H_d and consider the worst case setting w.r.t. the normalized error criterion. Finally, let b_d denote the number of coordinates without antisymmetry conditions in dimension d , i.e. $b_d = d - a_d$, where $a_d = \#I_d$ for $d \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proposition 10 (Necessary conditions, antisymmetric case). Under these assumptions the fact that $\{S_d\}$ is polynomially tractable with the constants $C, p > 0$ and $q \geq 0$ implies that $\lambda \in \ell_\tau$ for all $\tau > p/2$.

Moreover, for d tending to infinity, $\varepsilon_d^{\text{init}}$ tends to zero faster than the inverse of any polynomial and $b_d \in \mathcal{O}(\ln d)$. Thus, $\lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} a_d/d = 1$.

In addition, if $\{S_d\}$ is strongly polynomially tractable then $b_d \in \mathcal{O}(1)$.

Proof. From Proposition 9 it follows that there is some $C_1 > 0$ such that for every $d \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_{d,\psi(1)}^\tau} \sum_{k \in \nabla_d} \lambda_{d,\psi(v)}^\tau = \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\lambda_{d,\psi(v)}}{\lambda_{d,\psi(1)}} \right)^\tau \leq C_1 d^{2\tau q/p},$$

if $\tau > p/2$. Once more the rearrangement function ψ and the index set ∇_d are given as in (19). Indeed, the proof of Proposition 9 yields that it is sufficient to take $C_1 = 1 + C + C^{2\tau/p} \zeta(2\tau/p)$. In particular, for $d = 1$ it is $\nabla_1 = \mathbb{N}$ and $\lambda_{1,k} = \lambda_k$, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, such that we have $\psi = \text{id}$ because of the ordering of λ . Hence, we conclude

$$\|\lambda | \ell_\tau\|^\tau = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k^\tau \leq C_1 \lambda_1^\tau < \infty.$$

In other words, $\lambda \in \ell_\tau$. Moreover, like with the arguments of Step 1 in the proof of Proposition 7, it follows

$$\left(\frac{\|\lambda | \ell_\tau\|^\tau}{\lambda_1^\tau} \right)^{b_d} \leq C_1 d^{2\tau q/p}, \quad d \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (38)$$

since $\lambda_{d,\psi(1)} = \lambda_1^{b_d} \cdot \lambda_1 \cdot \dots \cdot \lambda_{a_d}$ and $\|\lambda | \ell_\tau\|^\tau > \lambda_1^\tau$ due to the general assertion $\lambda_2 > 0$. Thus, polynomial tractability of $\{S_d\}$ implies $b_d \leq C_2 \ln(d)$ for some $C_2 > 0$, i.e. $b_d \in \mathcal{O}(\ln d)$. Therefore, obviously, we have

$$1 \geq \frac{a_d}{d} = 1 - \frac{b_d}{\ln d} \cdot \frac{\ln d}{d} \geq 1 - C_2 \cdot \frac{\ln d}{d} \rightarrow 1, \quad d \rightarrow \infty.$$

The proof that strong polynomial tractability leads to $b_d \in \mathcal{O}(1)$ can be obtained using (38) with the same arguments as before and $q = 0$. Finally, we need to show the assertion concerning $\varepsilon_d^{\text{init}}$. To this end, we refer to Step 2 in the proof of Proposition 7. \blacksquare

5 Application: wave functions

During the last decades there has been considerable interest in finding approximations of *wave functions*, e.g., solutions of the electronic Schrödinger equation. Due to the so-called *Pauli principle* of quantum physics only functions with certain (anti-) symmetry properties are of physical interest.

In this last section of the present paper we briefly introduce wave functions and show how our results allow to handle the approximation problem for such classes of functions. For

a more detailed view, see, e.g., Hamaekers [1], Yserentant [10], or Zeiser [11]. Furthermore, for a comprehensive introduction to the topic, as well as a historical survey, we refer the reader to Hunziker and Sigal [3] and Reed and Simon [7].

In particular, the notion of multiple partial antisymmetry with respect to two sets of coordinates is useful for describing wave functions Ψ . In computational chemistry such functions occur as models which describe quantum states of certain physical d -particle systems. Formally, these functions depend on d blocks of variables $y_i = (x^{(i)}, s^{(i)})$, for $i = 1, \dots, d$, which represent the spacial coordinates $x^{(i)} = (x_1^{(i)}, x_2^{(i)}, x_3^{(i)}) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and certain additional intrinsic parameters $s^{(i)} \in C$ of each particle y within the system. Hence, rearranging the arguments such that $x = (x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(d)})$ and $s = (s^{(1)}, \dots, s^{(d)})$ yields that

$$\Psi: (\mathbb{R}^3)^d \times C^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad (x, s) \mapsto \Psi(x, s).$$

In the case of systems of electrons one of the most important parameters is called *spin* and it can take only two values, i.e., $s^{(i)} \in C = \{-\frac{1}{2}, +\frac{1}{2}\}$. Due to the Pauli principle the only wavefunctions Ψ that are physically admissible are those which are antisymmetric in the sense that for $I \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$ and $I^C = \{1, \dots, d\} \setminus I$

$$\Psi(\pi(x), \pi(s)) = (-1)^{|\pi|} \Psi(x, s) \quad \text{for all } \pi \in \mathcal{S}_I \cup \mathcal{S}_{I^C}.$$

Thus, Ψ changes its sign if we replace any particles y_i and y_j by each other which possess the same spin, i.e. $s^{(i)} = s^{(j)}$. So, the set of particles, and therefore also the set of spacial coordinates, naturally split into two groups I_+ and I_- . In detail, for wave functions of d particles y_i we can (without loss of generality) assume that the first $\#I_+$ indices i belong to the group of positive spin, whereas the rest of them possess negative spin, i.e. $I_+ = \{1, \dots, \#I_+\}$ and $I_- = \{\#I_+ + 1, \dots, d\}$.

In physics it is well-known that some problems, e.g., the electronic Schrödinger equation, which involve (general) wave functions can be reduced to a bunch of similar problems, where each of them only acts on functions Ψ_s out of a certain Hilbert space $F_d = F_d(s)$. That is,

$$\Psi_s = \Psi(\cdot, s) \in F_d = \{f: (\mathbb{R}^3)^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$$

with a given fixed spin configuration $s \in C^d$. Of course, every possible spin configuration s corresponds to exactly one choice $I_+ \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$ of indices. Moreover, it is known that F_d is a Hilbert space which possesses a tensor product structure. Therefore, we can model wave functions as elements of certain classes of smoothness, e.g., $F_d \subset H_d = W_2^{(1, \dots, 1)}(\mathbb{R}^{3d})$, as Yserentant [10] recently did, and incorporate spin properties by using the projections of the type $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{A}_{I_+} \circ \mathfrak{A}_{I_-}$, as defined in Section 2.

In particular, Lemma 2 yields

$$F_d = \mathfrak{A}(H_d) = \mathfrak{A}_{I_+}(H_{\#I_+}) \otimes \mathfrak{A}_{I_-}(H_{\#I_-})$$

and the system of all

$$\tilde{\xi}_k = \sqrt{\#S_{I_+} \cdot \#S_{I_-}} \cdot \mathfrak{A}(\eta_k), \quad k \in \tilde{\nabla}_d,$$

with

$$\tilde{\nabla}_d = \{k = (i, j) \in \mathbb{N}^{\#I_+ + \#I_-} \mid i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_{\#I_+} \text{ and } j_1 < \dots < j_{\#I_-}\}$$

builds an orthonormal basis of $F_d = \mathfrak{A}(H_d)$, where the set $\{\eta_k \mid k = (k_1, \dots, k_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d\}$ is once again assumed to be an orthonormal tensor product basis of $H_d = H_1 \otimes \dots \otimes H_1$ constructed with the help of $\{\eta_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}$, an arbitrary orthonormal basis of H_1 .

Note that in the former sections the underlying Hilbert space H_1 always consists of univariate functions. In contrast wave functions of one particle depend on three variables, but we want to stress the point that this is just a formal issue. However, this approach radically decreases the degrees of freedom and improves the solvability of certain problems S_d like the approximation problem, i.e. $S_1 = \text{id}: H_1 \rightarrow G_1$, considered in connection with the electronic Schrödinger equation.

Theorem 1 then provides an algorithm which is optimal for the G_d -approximation of d -particle wave functions in F_d with respect to all linear algorithms that use at most n continuous linear functionals. Moreover, the error can be calculated exactly in terms of the squared singular values $\lambda = (\lambda_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ of S_1 .

Furthermore, it is possible to prove a modification of Theorem 4 for problems dealing with wave functions. In fact, for the mentioned approximation problem polynomial tractability as well as strong polynomial tractability are equivalent to the fact that the sequence λ of the squared singular values of the univariate problem belong to some ℓ_τ -space if we consider the absolute error criterion. The reason is that all the assertions in Section 4.4 can be easily extended to the multiple partially antisymmetric case. In detail, if we denote the number of antisymmetric coordinates $x^{(i)}$ within each antisymmetry group $I_d^m \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$ by $a_{d,m}$, $m = 1, \dots, M$, then the constraint $a_d + b_d = d$ extends to $a_{d,1} + \dots + a_{d,M} + b_d = d$. Here b_d again denotes the number of coordinates without any antisymmetry condition. In conclusion, the sufficient condition (27) in Proposition 6 transfers to

$$\frac{1}{d} \sum_{m=1}^M \ln(a_{d,m}!) \geq \|\lambda\|_{\ell_\tau}^\tau, \quad \text{for all } d \geq d_0,$$

which is always satisfied in the case of wave functions, since then $M = 2$ and at least the cardinality $a_{d,m}$ of one of the groups of the same spin needs to grow linearly with the dimension d .

Acknowledgments

The author thanks E. Novak and H. Woźniakowski for their valuable comments on this paper.

References

- [1] HAMAEEKERS, J. *Tensor Product Multiscale Many-Particle Spaces with Finite-Order Weights for the Electronic Schrödinger Equation*. PhD thesis, Uni. Bonn, 2009. (urn:nbn:de:hbz:5N-18339).
- [2] HANSEN, M. *Nonlinear Approximation and Function Spaces of Dominating Mixed Smoothness*. PhD thesis, FSU Jena, 2010. (urn:nbn:de:gbv:27-20110121-105128-4).
- [3] HUNZIKER, W., AND SIGAL, I. M. The quantum N -body problem. *J. Math. Phys.* **41** (2000), 3448–3510.
- [4] NOVAK, E., AND WOŹNIAKOWSKI, H. *Tractability of Multivariate Problems. Vol. I: Linear Information*. EMS Tracts in Mathematics. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2008.
- [5] NOVAK, E., AND WOŹNIAKOWSKI, H. *Tractability of Multivariate Problems. Vol. II: Standard Information for Functionals*. EMS Tracts in Mathematics. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2010.
- [6] NOVAK, E., AND WOŹNIAKOWSKI, H. *Tractability of Multivariate Problems. Vol. III: Standard Information for Linear Operators*. EMS Tracts in Mathematics. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, in preparation.
- [7] REED, M., AND SIMON, B. *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics. Vol. IV: Analysis of Operators*. Academic Press, New York, 1978.
- [8] WEIMAR, M. The complexity of linear tensor product problems in (anti)symmetric Hilbert spaces. *J. Approx. Theory* **164** (2012), 1345–1368.
- [9] WEIMAR, M. Tractability results for weighted Banach spaces of smooth functions. *J. Complexity* **28** (2012), 59–75.
- [10] YSERENTANT, H. *Regularity and Approximability of Electronic Wave Functions*. Lecture Notes in Math. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2010.

- [11] ZEISER, A. *Direkte Diskretisierung der Schrödingergleichung auf dünnen Gittern*. PhD thesis, TU Berlin, 2010. (urn:nbn:de:kobv:83-opus-27910).

Appendix

Proof of Lemma 1 in Section 2

We show Lemma 1 in the case of function spaces.

Proof. Obviously, $P \in \{\mathfrak{S}_I, \mathfrak{A}_I\}$ is well-defined due to the assumptions (A1) and (A2). The linearity directly follows from the definition and, using (A3), the operator norm is bounded by $\max\{c_\pi \mid \pi \in \mathcal{S}_I\}$.

To show that the operators are idempotent, i.e. $P^2 = P$, we first prove that $\mathfrak{A}_I(f)$ satisfies (2) for every $f \in F$. Therefore, we use the representation

$$(\mathfrak{A}_I(f))(\pi(x)) = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_I} (-1)^{|\sigma|} f(\sigma(\pi(x))) = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{S}_I} (-1)^{|\lambda|+|\pi|} f(\lambda(x)) = (-1)^{|\pi|} (\mathfrak{A}_I(f))(x)$$

for every fixed $\pi \in \mathcal{S}_I$. Here we imposed $\lambda = \sigma \circ \pi \in \mathcal{S}_I$ and used

$$|\lambda \circ \pi^{-1}| = |\lambda| + |\pi^{-1}| = |\lambda| + |\pi|.$$

Hence, we have $\mathfrak{A}_I(F) \subset \{f \in F \mid f \text{ satisfies (2)}\}$. In a second step, it is easy to check that for every function $g \in F$ which satisfies (2) it is $\mathfrak{A}_I(g) = g$. Thus, $\{f \in F \mid f \text{ satisfies (2)}\} \subset \mathfrak{A}_I(F)$ and \mathfrak{A}_I is a projector onto $\mathfrak{A}_I(F)$.

Since the same arguments also apply for the symmetrizer \mathfrak{S}_I this shows (3), as well as $P^2 = P$ for $P \in \{\mathfrak{S}_I, \mathfrak{A}_I\}$. Because of the boundedness of the operators the subsets $\mathfrak{S}_I(F)$ and $\mathfrak{A}_I(F)$ are closed linear subspaces of F and we obtain the orthogonal decompositions

$$F = \mathfrak{S}_I(F) \oplus (\mathfrak{S}_I(F))^\perp = \mathfrak{A}_I(F) \oplus (\mathfrak{A}_I(F))^\perp,$$

where the \perp denotes the orthogonal complement with respect to $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_F$, i.e. the image of the projectors $(\text{id} - \mathfrak{S}_I)$ and $(\text{id} - \mathfrak{A}_I)$, respectively. ■

The proof of Lemma 1 in the case of arbitrary tensor product Hilbert spaces works exactly in the same way.

Proof of Lemma 2 in Section 2

We prove Lemma 2 in the case of function spaces. For the case of arbitrary tensor product Hilbert spaces only slight modifications are needed. Indeed, the only difference is the conclusion of formula (39) in Step 2. In the general setting this simply follows from our definitions.

Proof. Step 1. We start by proving orthonormality. Therefore, let us recall (6). To abbreviate the notation further, we suppress the index H_d at the inner products $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_d}$ in this proof. For $P_I = \mathfrak{A}_I$ and $j, k \in \nabla_d$ easy calculus yields

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \xi_j, \xi_k \rangle &= \frac{\#\mathcal{S}_I}{\sqrt{M_I(j)! \cdot M_I(k)!}} \langle \mathfrak{A}_I(\eta_{d,j}), \mathfrak{A}_I(\eta_{d,k}) \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{S}_I \sqrt{M_I(j)! \cdot M_I(k)!}} \sum_{\pi, \sigma \in \mathcal{S}_I} (-1)^{|\pi|+|\sigma|} \langle \eta_{d,\pi(j)}, \eta_{d,\sigma(k)} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Of course, up to the factor controlling the sign, the same is true for the case $P_I = \mathfrak{S}_I$. Assume now there exists $m \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ such that $j_m \neq k_m$. Then the ordering of $j, k \in \nabla_d$ implies that $\pi(j) \neq \sigma(k)$ for all $\sigma, \pi \in \mathcal{S}_I$, since π and σ leave the coordinates $m \in I^C$ fixed. Hence, we conclude that we have $\pi(j) = \sigma(k)$ only if $j = k$.

At this point we have to distinguish the antisymmetric and the symmetric case. For $P = \mathfrak{A}_I$ the only way to conclude $\pi(j) = \sigma(k)$ is to claim $j = k$ and $\pi = \sigma$. Furthermore, we see that in the antisymmetric case we have $M_I(j)! = 1$ for all $j \in \nabla_d$, since all coordinates j_l , where $l \in I$, differ. Therefore, in this case the last inner product coincides with $\delta_{j,k} \cdot \delta_{\pi,\sigma}$ because of the mutual orthonormality of $\{\eta_{d,j} \mid j \in \mathbb{N}^d\}$. Hence,

$$\langle \xi_j, \xi_k \rangle = \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{S}_I} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}_I} (-1)^{2|\pi|} \delta_{j,k} = \delta_{j,k} \quad \text{for all } j, k \in \nabla_d$$

as claimed.

So, let us consider the case $P_I = \mathfrak{S}_I$ and $j = k \in \nabla_d$, because we already saw that otherwise $\langle \xi_j, \xi_k \rangle$ equals zero. Then for fixed $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_I$ there are $M_I(j)!$ different permutations $\pi \in \mathcal{S}_I$ such that $\pi(j) = \sigma(j)$. This leads to

$$\langle \xi_j, \xi_j \rangle = \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{S}_I \cdot M_I(j)!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_I} M_I(j)! = 1$$

and completes the proof of orthonormality.

Step 2. It remains to show that the span of $\{\xi_k \mid k \in \nabla_d\}$ is dense in $P_I(H_d)$ for $P \in \{\mathfrak{S}_I, \mathfrak{A}_I\}$. To this end, note that every multi-index $j \in \mathbb{N}^d$ can be represented by a uniquely defined multi-index $k \in \nabla_d$ and exactly $M_I(k)!$ different permutations $\pi \in \mathcal{S}_I$ such that $j = \pi(k)$.

Now assume $f \in \mathfrak{A}_I(H_d)$, i.e. $f \in H_d$ satisfies (2). Then the expansion of $f(\pi(x))$ with respect to the basis functions $\{\eta_{d,j} \mid j \in \mathbb{N}^d\}$ in H_d yields for $\pi \in \mathcal{S}_I$

$$(-1)^{|\pi|} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}^d} \langle f, \eta_{d,j} \rangle \cdot \eta_{d,j}(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}^d} \langle f, \eta_{d,k} \rangle \cdot \eta_{d,k}(\pi(x)) \quad \text{for every } x \in D^d.$$

Similar to the arguments used in (5) we have $\eta_{d,k}(\pi(x)) = \eta_{d,\sigma(k)}(x)$ with $\sigma = \pi^{-1}$. Therefore, we conclude for $x \in D^d$

$$\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}^d} ((-1)^{|\pi|} \cdot \langle f, \eta_{d,j} \rangle) \cdot \eta_{d,j}(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}^d} \langle f, \eta_{d,\pi(\sigma(k))} \rangle \cdot \eta_{d,\sigma(k)}(x) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}^d} \langle f, \eta_{d,\pi(j)} \rangle \cdot \eta_{d,j}(x).$$

Because the expansion is uniquely defined we get

$$(-1)^{|\pi|} \cdot \langle f, \eta_{d,j} \rangle = \langle f, \eta_{d,\pi(j)} \rangle \quad \text{for all } j \in \mathbb{N}^d \quad \text{and } \pi \in \mathcal{S}_I. \quad (39)$$

Using the observations from the beginning of this step we can decompose the basis expansion of $f \in \mathfrak{A}_I(H_d) \subset H_d$ and use the derived formula (39) to get

$$f = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}^d} \langle f, \eta_{d,j} \rangle \eta_{d,j} = \sum_{k \in \nabla_d} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_I} \frac{\langle f, \eta_{d,\sigma(k)} \rangle \eta_{d,\sigma(k)}}{M_I(k)!} = \sum_{k \in \nabla_d} \frac{1}{M_I(k)!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_I} (-1)^{|\sigma|} \langle f, \eta_{d,k} \rangle \eta_{d,\sigma(k)}.$$

Now (6) yields that

$$f = \sum_{k \in \nabla_d} \sqrt{\frac{\#\mathcal{S}_I}{M_I(k)!}} \cdot \langle f, \eta_{d,k} \rangle \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\#\mathcal{S}_I}{M_I(k)!}} \cdot \mathfrak{A}_I(\eta_{d,k}).$$

Furthermore, summing up (39) with respect to π leads to

$$\langle f, \eta_{d,k} \rangle = \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{S}_I} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}_I} (-1)^{|\pi|} \langle f, \eta_{d,\pi(k)} \rangle = \left\langle f, \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{S}_I} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}_I} (-1)^{|\pi|} \eta_{d,\pi(k)} \right\rangle = \langle f, \mathfrak{A}_I(\eta_{d,k}) \rangle,$$

for $k \in \nabla_d$, such that finally $f \in \mathfrak{A}_I(H_d)$ possesses the following representation

$$f = \sum_{k \in \nabla_d} \langle f, \xi_k \rangle \cdot \xi_k,$$

since $\xi_k = \sqrt{\#\mathcal{S}_I/M_I(k)!} \cdot \mathfrak{A}_I(\eta_{d,k})$ per definition. This proves the assertion for the case $P_I = \mathfrak{A}_I$. The remaining case $P_I = \mathfrak{S}_I$ can be treated in the same way. \blacksquare

Proof of Proposition 1 in Section 3.2

Proof. The proof is organized as follows. First we show that the problem operator S_d and the (anti-) symmetrizer P_I commute on H_d , i.e. it holds (14). In a second step we conclude

(15) out of this. The (anti-) symmetry of A^*f for an optimal algorithm A^* then follows immediately.

Step 1. Assume $E_d = \{\eta_{d,j} \mid j \in \mathbb{N}^d\}$ to be an arbitrary tensor product ONB of H_d , as defined in (9). Then, for fixed $j \in \mathbb{N}^d$, formula (6) and the structure of the linear tensor product operator $S_d = S_1 \otimes \dots \otimes S_1$ yields in the case $P_I = \mathfrak{A}_I$

$$\begin{aligned} S_d(\mathfrak{A}_I^H(\eta_{d,j})) &= S_d\left(\frac{1}{\#\mathcal{S}_I} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}_I} (-1)^{|\pi|} \bigotimes_{l=1}^d \eta_{j_{\pi(l)}}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{S}_I} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}_I} (-1)^{|\pi|} \bigotimes_{l=1}^d S_1(\eta_{j_{\pi(l)}}) = \mathfrak{A}_I^G(S_d(\eta_{d,j})). \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, the same is true for $P_I = \mathfrak{S}_I$. Hence, it holds (14) at least on the set of basis elements E_d of H_d . Because of the representation

$$g = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}^d} \langle g, \eta_{d,j} \rangle_{H_d} \cdot \eta_{d,j}, \quad g \in H_d,$$

as well as the linearity and boundedness of the operators P_I^H, P_I^G and S_d we can extend the relation (14) from E_d to the whole space H_d .

Step 2. Now let $f \in P_I^H(H_d)$ and let Af denote an arbitrary approximation of $S_d f$. Then $S_d f = S_d(P_I^H f) = P_I^G(S_d f)$, due to Step 1. Using the fact that P_I^G provides an orthogonal projection onto $P_I^G(G_d)$, see (4), we obtain (15),

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_d f - Af \mid G_d\|^2 &= \|P_I^G(S_d f) - [P_I^G(Af) + (\text{id}^G - P_I^G)(Af)] \mid G_d\|^2 \\ &= \|P_I^G(S_d f - Af) \mid G_d\|^2 + \|(\text{id}^G - P_I^G)(Af) \mid G_d\|^2 \\ &= \|S_d f - P_I^G(Af) \mid G_d\|^2 + \|Af - P_I^G(Af) \mid G_d\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

as claimed. ■

A self-contained proof of Theorem 1 in Section 3

In order to deduce a lower bound on the n -th minimal error of approximating S_d on (anti-) symmetric subspaces $P_I(H_d)$, where $P \in \{\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{S}\}$, let us define the classes of algorithms under consideration.

An algorithm $A_{n,d}$ for $S_d: F_d = P_I(H_d) \rightarrow G_d$ which uses n pieces of information is modeled as a mapping $\phi: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow G_d$ and a function $N: F_d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $A_{n,d} = \phi \circ N$. In detail, the information map N is given by

$$N(f) = (L_1(f), L_2(f), \dots, L_n(f)), \quad f \in F_d, \quad (40)$$

where $L_j \in \Lambda$. Here we distinguish certain classes of information operations Λ . In one case we assume that we can compute continuous linear functionals. Then $\Lambda = \Lambda^{\text{all}}$ coincides with F_d^* , the dual space of F_d . If L_v depends continuously on f but is not necessarily linear the class is denoted by Λ^{cont} . Note that in both the cases also N is continuous and we obviously have $\Lambda^{\text{all}} \subset \Lambda^{\text{cont}}$.

Furthermore, we distinguish between *adaptive* and *non-adaptive* algorithms. The latter case is described above in formula (40), where L_v does not depend on the previously computed values $L_1(f), \dots, L_{v-1}(f)$. In contrast, we also discuss algorithms of the form $A_{n,d} = \phi \circ N$ with

$$N(f) = (L_1(f), L_2(f; y_1), \dots, L_n(f; y_1, \dots, y_{n-1})), \quad f \in F_d,$$

where $y_1 = L_1(f)$ and $y_v = L_v(f; y_1, \dots, y_{v-1})$ for $v = 2, 3, \dots, n$. If N is adaptive we restrict ourselves to the case where L_v depends linearly on f , i.e. $L_v(\cdot; y_1, \dots, y_{v-1}) \in \Lambda^{\text{all}}$.

In all cases of information maps, the mapping ϕ can be chosen arbitrarily and is not necessarily linear or continuous. The smallest class of algorithms under consideration is the class of linear, non-adaptive algorithms of the form

$$A_{n,d}f = \sum_{v=1}^n L_v(f) \cdot g_v,$$

with some $g_v \in G_d$ and $L_v \in \Lambda^{\text{all}}$. We denote the class of all such algorithms by $\mathcal{A}_n^{\text{lin}}$. On the other hand, the most general classes consist of algorithms $A_{n,d} = \phi \circ N$, where ϕ is arbitrary and N either uses non-adaptive continuous or adaptive linear information. We denote the respective classes by $\mathcal{A}_n^{\text{cont}}$ and $\mathcal{A}_n^{\text{adapt}}$.

For the proof that the upper bound given in Proposition 2 is sharp we use a generalization of Lemma 1 in W. [9].

Lemma 5. Suppose S to be a homogeneous operator between linear normed spaces X and Y , i.e. $S(\alpha x) = \alpha S(x)$ for all $x \in X$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Furthermore, assume that $V \subset X$ is a linear subspace with dimension m and there exists a constant $a \geq 0$ such that

$$a \cdot \|f\|_X \leq \|S(f)\|_Y \quad \text{for all } f \in V.$$

Then for every $n < m$ and every algorithm $A_n \in \mathcal{A}_n^{\text{cont}} \cup \mathcal{A}_n^{\text{adapt}}$

$$e^{\text{wor}}(A_n; S, X) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{B}(X)} \|S(f) - A_n(f)\|_Y \geq a.$$

Proof. It is well-known that for $A_n = \phi \circ N$ with $n < m$ there exists $f^* \in V$ such that $N(f^*) = N(-f^*)$ and $\|f^* | X\| = 1$. Thus, $A_n(f^*) = A_n(-f^*)$. For a more detailed view, see, W. [9, Lemma 1] and the references in there. Using the triangle inequality for Y we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\text{wor}}(A_n; X) &\geq \max \{ \|S(\pm f^*) - A_n(\pm f^*) | Y\| \} = \max \{ \|S(f^*) \pm A_n(f^*) | Y\| \} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} (\|S(f^*) + A_n(f^*) | Y\| + \|S(f^*) - A_n(f^*) | Y\|) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \|2 \cdot S(f^*) | Y\| \geq a \|f^* | X\| = a \end{aligned}$$

and the proof is complete. ■

Now let $X = P_I(H_d)$ and $Y = G_d$. Furthermore, for a given $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, define $a = \sqrt{\lambda_{d,\psi(n+1)}}$ and consider $V = \text{span} \{ \xi_{\psi(1)}, \dots, \xi_{\psi(n+1)} \} \subset P_I(H_d)$. Then, obviously, $\dim V = n + 1 = m > n$. With the representation (16) and formula (17) from the proof of Proposition 2 we conclude

$$\|S_d f | G_d\|^2 = \sum_{v=1}^{n+1} \langle f, \xi_{\psi(v)} \rangle^2 \cdot \lambda_{d,\psi(v)} \geq \lambda_{d,\psi(n+1)} \sum_{v=1}^{n+1} \langle f, \xi_{\psi(v)} \rangle^2 = a^2 \|f | H_d\|^2, \quad f \in V,$$

where we used the monotonicity of $\{ \lambda_{d,\psi(v)} \}_{v \in \mathbb{N}}$ and Parseval's identity. This leads to the desired lower bound result:

Proposition 11 (Lower bound). Under the assumptions of Theorem 1 the n -th minimal error with respect to the class $\mathcal{A}_n^{\text{cont}} \cup \mathcal{A}_n^{\text{adapt}}$ is bounded from below by

$$e(n, d; P_I(H_d)) = \inf_{A_{n,d}} e^{\text{wor}}(A_{n,d}; P_I(H_d)) \geq \sqrt{\lambda_{d,\psi(n+1)}} \quad \text{for all } d \in \mathbb{N}, n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Hence, this together with Proposition 2 shows that $A_{n,d}^*$ given in (12) is n -th optimal with respect to the class $\mathcal{A}_n^{\text{cont}} \cup \mathcal{A}_n^{\text{adapt}}$ as claimed in Theorem 1.

Proof of Proposition 3 in Section 4.1

Proof. If the problem is polynomially tractable then there exist constants $C, p > 0$ and $q \geq 0$ such that for all $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$

$$n(\varepsilon, d) = n(\varepsilon, d; F_d) \leq C \cdot \varepsilon^{-p} \cdot d^q.$$

Here, $\varepsilon_d^{\text{init}} = e(0, d) = \sqrt{\lambda_{d,1}} > 0$ denotes the initial error of T_d . Since $e(n, d) = \sqrt{\lambda_{d,n+1}}$ it is $n(\varepsilon, d) = \#\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid \lambda_{d,i} > \varepsilon^2\}$ and therefore $\lambda_{d,n(\varepsilon,d)+1} \leq \varepsilon^2$. The non-increasing ordering of $(\lambda_{d,i})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ implies

$$\lambda_{d, \lfloor C\varepsilon^{-p}d^q \rfloor + 1} \leq \varepsilon^2.$$

If we set $i = \lfloor C \cdot \varepsilon^{-p} \cdot d^q \rfloor + 1$ and vary $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ then i takes the values $\lfloor C \cdot d^q \rfloor + 1$, $\lfloor C \cdot d^q \rfloor + 2$, and so forth. On the other hand, we have $i \leq C\varepsilon^{-p}d^q + 1$, which is equivalent to $\varepsilon^2 \leq (Cd^q/(i-1))^{2/p}$ if $i \geq 2$. Thus,

$$\lambda_{d,i} \leq \lambda_{d,n(\varepsilon,d)+1} \leq \varepsilon^2 \leq \left(\frac{Cd^q}{i-1}\right)^{2/p} \quad \text{for all } i \geq \max\{2, \lfloor C \cdot d^q \rfloor + 1\}.$$

Choosing $\tau \geq 0$ and $f(d) = \lceil (1+C) \cdot d^q \rceil \geq \max\{2, \lfloor C \cdot d^q \rfloor + 1\}$ we conclude

$$\sum_{i=f(d)}^{\infty} \lambda_{d,i}^{\tau} \leq \sum_{i=f(d)}^{\infty} \left(\frac{Cd^q}{i-1}\right)^{2\tau/p} = (Cd^q)^{2\tau/p} \sum_{i=f(d)-1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i^{2\tau/p}} \leq (Cd^q)^{2\tau/p} \cdot \zeta\left(\frac{2\tau}{p}\right),$$

where ζ denotes the Riemann zeta function. In other words, if $\tau > p/2 > 0$ then

$$\frac{1}{d^{2q/p}} \left(\sum_{i=f(d)}^{\infty} \lambda_{d,i}^{\tau} \right)^{1/\tau} \leq C^{2/p} \cdot \zeta\left(\frac{2\tau}{p}\right)^{1/\tau} < \infty \quad \text{for every } d \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Setting $r = 2q/p$ proves the assertion, as well as the claimed bound on C_{τ} .

Conversely, assume now that (18) holds with

$$f(d) = \left\lceil C \cdot (\min\{\varepsilon_d^{\text{init}}, 1\})^{-p} \cdot d^q \right\rceil \quad \text{where } C > 0 \quad \text{and } p, q \geq 0.$$

That is, for some $r \geq 0$ and $\tau > 0$ we have

$$0 < C_2 = \sup_{d \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{d^r} \left(\sum_{i=f(d)}^{\infty} \lambda_{d,i}^{\tau} \right)^{1/\tau} < \infty.$$

For $n \geq f(d)$, the ordering of $(\lambda_{d,i})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ implies $\sum_{i=f(d)}^n \lambda_{d,i}^{\tau} \geq \lambda_{d,n}^{\tau} \cdot (n - f(d) + 1)$. Hence,

$$\lambda_{d,n} \cdot (n - f(d) + 1)^{1/\tau} \leq \left(\sum_{i=f(d)}^n \lambda_{d,i}^{\tau} \right)^{1/\tau} \leq \left(\sum_{i=f(d)}^{\infty} \lambda_{d,i}^{\tau} \right)^{1/\tau} \leq C_2 d^r,$$

or, respectively, $\lambda_{d,n+1} \leq C_2 d^r \cdot ((n+1) - f(d) + 1)^{-1/\tau}$, for all $n \geq f(d) - 1$. Note that for $\varepsilon \in (0, \min \{\varepsilon_d^{\text{init}}, 1\}]$ we have $C_2 d^r \cdot ((n+1) - f(d) + 1)^{-1/\tau} \leq \varepsilon^2$ if and only if

$$n \geq n^* = \left\lceil \left(\frac{C_2 d^r}{\varepsilon^2} \right)^\tau \right\rceil + f(d) - 2.$$

In particular, it is $\lambda_{d,n+1} \leq \varepsilon^2$ at least for $n \geq \max \{n^*, f(d) - 1\}$. Therefore, for every $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \min \{\varepsilon_d^{\text{init}}, 1\}]$ it is

$$\begin{aligned} n(\varepsilon, d; F_d) &\leq \max \{n^*, f(d) - 1\} \leq f(d) - 1 + \left(\frac{C_2 d^r}{\varepsilon^2} \right)^\tau \\ &\leq C \cdot (\min \{\varepsilon_d^{\text{init}}, 1\})^{-p} \cdot d^q + C_2^\tau \varepsilon^{-2\tau} d^{r\tau} \\ &\leq (C + C_2^\tau) \cdot \varepsilon^{-\max\{p, 2\tau\}} \cdot d^{\max\{q, r\tau\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the problem is polynomially tractable. ■

An explicit proof of Lemma 4 in Section 4.2

Proof. Step 1. By induction on s we first show for every fixed $m \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\sum_{\substack{k \in \mathbb{N}^s, \\ m \leq k_1 \leq \dots \leq k_s}} \mu_{s,k} = \mu_m^s + \sum_{l=1}^s \mu_m^{s-l} \sum_{\substack{j^{(l)} \in \mathbb{N}^l, \\ m+1 \leq j_1^{(l)} \leq \dots \leq j_l^{(l)}}} \mu_{l,j^{(l)}} \quad \text{for all } s \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (41)$$

Easy calculus shows that this holds at least for the initial step $s = 1$. Therefore, assume (41) to be true for some $s \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{k \in \mathbb{N}^{s+1}, \\ m \leq k_1 \leq \dots \leq k_{s+1}}} \mu_{s+1,k} &= \sum_{k_1=m}^{\infty} \mu_{k_1} \sum_{\substack{h \in \mathbb{N}^s, \\ k_1 \leq h_1 \leq \dots \leq h_s}} \mu_{s,h} = \mu_m \sum_{\substack{h \in \mathbb{N}^s, \\ m \leq h_1 \leq \dots \leq h_s}} \mu_{s,h} + \sum_{k_1=m+1}^{\infty} \mu_{k_1} \sum_{\substack{h \in \mathbb{N}^s, \\ k_1 \leq h_1 \leq \dots \leq h_s}} \mu_{s,h} \\ &= \mu_m \sum_{\substack{h \in \mathbb{N}^s, \\ m \leq h_1 \leq \dots \leq h_s}} \mu_{s,h} + \sum_{\substack{k \in \mathbb{N}^{s+1}, \\ m+1 \leq k_1 \leq \dots \leq k_{s+1}}} \mu_{s+1,k} \end{aligned}$$

Now, by inserting the induction hypothesis for the first sum and renaming k to $j^{(s+1)}$ in the remaining sum, we conclude

$$\sum_{\substack{k \in \mathbb{N}^{s+1}, \\ m \leq k_1 \leq \dots \leq k_{s+1}}} \mu_{s+1,k} = \mu_m^{s+1} + \sum_{l=1}^s \mu_m^{s+1-l} \sum_{\substack{j^{(l)} \in \mathbb{N}^l, \\ m+1 \leq j_1^{(l)} \leq \dots \leq j_l^{(l)}}} \mu_{l,j^{(l)}} + \sum_{\substack{j^{(s+1)} \in \mathbb{N}^{s+1}, \\ m+1 \leq j_1^{(s+1)} \leq \dots \leq j_{s+1}^{(s+1)}}} \mu_{s+1,j^{(s+1)}}.$$

Hence, (41) also holds for $s + 1$ and the induction is complete.

Step 2. Here we prove (24) via another induction on $V \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Therefore, let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ be fixed arbitrarily. The initial step, $V = 0$, corresponds to (41) for $s = d$ and $m = 1$. Thus, assume (24) to be true for some fixed $V \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then it is

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{k \in \mathbb{N}^d, \\ 1 \leq k_1 \leq \dots \leq k_d}} \mu_{d,k} &\leq \mu_1^d d^V \left(1 + V + \sum_{L=1}^d \mu_1^{-L} \sum_{\substack{j^{(L)} \in \mathbb{N}^L, \\ V+2 \leq j_1^{(L)} \leq \dots \leq j_L^{(L)}}} \mu_{L,j^{(L)}} \right) \\ &= \mu_1^d d^V \left(1 + V + \sum_{L=1}^d \mu_1^{-L} \left(\mu_{V+2}^L + \sum_{l=1}^L \mu_{V+2}^{L-l} \sum_{\substack{j^{(l)} \in \mathbb{N}^l, \\ (V+2)+1 \leq j_1^{(l)} \leq \dots \leq j_l^{(l)}}} \mu_{l,j^{(l)}} \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

using (41) for $s = L$ and $m = V + 2$. Now we estimate $1 + V$ by $d(1 + V)$, take advantage of the non-increasing ordering of $(\mu_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ and extend the inner sum from L to d in order to obtain

$$\sum_{\substack{k \in \mathbb{N}^d, \\ 1 \leq k_1 \leq \dots \leq k_d}} \mu_{d,k} \leq \mu_1^d d^{V+1} \left(1 + (V + 1) + \sum_{l=1}^d \mu_1^{-l} \sum_{\substack{j^{(l)} \in \mathbb{N}^l, \\ (V+1)+2 \leq j_1^{(l)} \leq \dots \leq j_l^{(l)}}} \mu_{l,j^{(l)}} \right).$$

Since this estimate corresponds to (24) for $V + 1$ the claim is proven. ■

Proof of Proposition 8 in Section 4.4

Proof. Note that due to $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_m = 0$ the quantity i_d is well defined, because $(\alpha_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a non-increasing sequence which tends to zero for i tending to infinity, and $i_d(\delta^2) > 1$ for $\delta < \varepsilon_d^{\text{init}}$. Furthermore, we have

$$i_1(\delta^2) = \#\{m \in \mathbb{N} \mid \lambda_m > \delta^2\} + 1 = n^{\text{ent}}(\delta, 1) + 1 = n^{\text{asy}}(\delta, 1) + 1$$

and if $d \geq 2$ we can rewrite i_d to obtain

$$i_d(\delta^2) = \min \left\{ i \in \mathbb{N} \mid \lambda_{i+1} \cdot \dots \cdot \lambda_{i+d-1} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_i} \delta^2 \right\}.$$

Hence, for every $k = (k_1, \dots, k_{d-1}) \in \nabla_{d-1}$ with $k_1 > i_d(\delta^2)$ it is

$$\lambda_{d-1,k} = \lambda_{k_1} \cdot \dots \cdot \lambda_{k_{d-1}} \leq \lambda_{i_d(\delta^2)+1} \cdot \dots \cdot \lambda_{i_d(\delta^2)+d-1} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_{i_d(\delta^2)}} \delta^2$$

or, equivalently,

$$\left\{ k \in \nabla_{d-1} \mid i < k_1 \text{ and } \lambda_{d-1,k} > \frac{1}{\lambda_i} \delta^2 \right\} = \emptyset \quad \text{for all } i \geq i_d(\delta^2).$$

This leads to the disjoint decomposition of

$$\begin{aligned} \{j \in \nabla_d \mid \lambda_{d,j} > \delta^2\} &= \left\{ j = (i, k) \in \mathbb{N} \times \nabla_{d-1} \mid i < k_1 \text{ and } \lambda_{d-1,k} > \frac{1}{\lambda_i} \delta^2 \right\} \\ &= \bigcup_{i=1}^{i_d(\delta^2)-1} \left\{ (i, k) \mid k \in \nabla_{d-1} \text{ such that } i < k_1 \text{ and } \lambda_{d-1,k} > \frac{1}{\lambda_i} \delta^2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the information complexity of the d -variate problem is given by

$$\begin{aligned} n^{\text{asy}}(\varepsilon, d) &= \#\{j \in \nabla_d \mid \lambda_{d,j} > \varepsilon^2\} = \sum_{i=1}^{i_d(\varepsilon^2)-1} \#\left\{ k \in \nabla_{d-1} \mid i < k_1 \text{ and } \lambda_{d-1,k} > \frac{1}{\lambda_i} \varepsilon^2 \right\} \\ &= \sum_{l_1=2}^{i_d(\varepsilon^2)} \#\left\{ k \in \nabla_{d-1} \mid l_1 \leq k_1 \text{ and } \lambda_{d-1,k} > \frac{1}{\lambda_{l_1-1}} \varepsilon^2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, for fixed $l_1 \in \{2, \dots, i_d(\varepsilon^2)\}$, we can repeat this procedure and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\#\{j \in \nabla_{d-1} \mid l_1 \leq j_1 \text{ and } \lambda_{d-1,j} > \delta^2\} \\ &= \sum_{l_2=l_1+1}^{i_{d-1}(\delta^2)} \#\left\{ k \in \nabla_{d-2} \mid l_2 \leq k_1 \text{ and } \lambda_{d-2,k} > \frac{1}{\lambda_{l_2-1}} \delta^2 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

if $d > 2$ and $\delta^2 = \varepsilon^2 / \lambda_{l_1-1}$. Note that $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_d^{\text{init}}$ implies $i_{d-1}(\delta^2) \geq l_1 + 1$ such that $\{l_1 + 1, \dots, i_{d-1}(\delta^2)\} \neq \emptyset$. Iterating the argument we get

$$\begin{aligned} &n^{\text{asy}}(\varepsilon, d) \\ &= \sum_{l_1=2}^{i_d(\varepsilon^2)} \sum_{l_2=l_1+1}^{i_{d-1}(\varepsilon^2/\lambda_{l_1-1})} \dots \sum_{l_{d-1}=l_{d-2}+1}^{i_2(\varepsilon^2/[\lambda_{l_1-1} \dots \lambda_{l_{d-2}-1}])} \#\left\{ k \in \nabla_1 \mid l_{d-1} \leq k_1 \text{ and } \lambda_{1,k} > \frac{1}{\lambda_{l_{d-1}-1}} \delta^2 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

with $\delta^2 = \varepsilon^2 / [\lambda_{l_1-1} \cdot \dots \cdot \lambda_{l_{d-2}-1}]$. It remains to calculate the cardinality of the last set. Of course, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ k \in \nabla_1 \mid l_{d-1} \leq k_1 \text{ and } \lambda_{1,k} > \frac{1}{\lambda_{l_{d-1}-1}} \delta^2 \right\} \\ &= \left\{ k \in \mathbb{N} \mid l_{d-1} \leq k \text{ and } \lambda_k > \frac{1}{\lambda_{l_{d-1}-1}} \delta^2 \right\} \\ &= \left\{ k \in \mathbb{N} \mid \lambda_k > \frac{1}{\lambda_{l_{d-1}-1}} \delta^2 \right\} \setminus \left\{ k \in \{1, \dots, l_{d-1} - 1\} \mid \lambda_k > \frac{1}{\lambda_{l_{d-1}-1}} \delta^2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The first of these sets in the last line contains exactly $n^{\text{ent}}(\delta / \sqrt{\lambda_{l_{d-1}-1}}, 1)$ elements. On the other hand, if $k \leq l_{d-1} \leq i_2(\delta^2)$ then

$$\lambda_k \lambda_{l_{d-1}-1} \geq \lambda_{i_2(\delta^2)} \lambda_{i_2(\delta^2)-1} > \delta^2,$$

where the last inequality holds due to the definition of $i_2(\delta^2)$. Therefore, the last set coincides with $\{1, \dots, l_{d-1} - 1\}$ and its cardinality is equal to $l_{d-1} - 1$. Furthermore, note that the estimate also shows that $n^{\text{ent}}(\delta / \sqrt{\lambda_{l_{d-1}-1}}, 1)$ is at least equal to l_{d-1} . Thus,

$$\# \left\{ k \in \nabla_1 \mid l_{d-1} \leq k_1 \text{ and } \lambda_{1,k} > \frac{1}{\lambda_{l_{d-1}-1}} \delta^2 \right\} = n^{\text{ent}} \left(\delta / \sqrt{\lambda_{l_{d-1}-1}}, 1 \right) - l_{d-1} + 1 \geq 1$$

and the proof is complete. ■

Proof of Proposition 9 in Section 4.5

One possibility to prove the second point of Proposition 9 is to apply Proposition 3 to a scaled problem $\{\tilde{T}_d\}$ such that $\tilde{W}_d = \tilde{T}_d^\dagger \tilde{T}_d$ possesses the eigenvalues $\tilde{\lambda}_{d,i} = \lambda_{d,i} / \lambda_{d,1}$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the initial error of \tilde{T}_d equals 1 such that f in Proposition 3 does not depend on p . That is, we can choose $f(d) = \lceil C d^q \rceil + 1$ for some $q \geq 0$ in both the assertions. In order to see why we even can take $f(d) \equiv 1$ in the first point and for the sake of completeness we also add a direct proof for this proposition.

Proof. If $\{T_d\}$ is polynomially tractable with respect to the normalized error criterion then there exist constants $C, p > 0$ and $q \geq 0$ such that for all $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon' \in (0, 1]$

$$n(\varepsilon' \cdot \varepsilon_d^{\text{init}}, d) = n(\varepsilon' \cdot \varepsilon_d^{\text{init}}, d; F_d) \leq C \cdot (\varepsilon')^{-p} \cdot d^q.$$

As before the quantity $\varepsilon_d^{\text{init}} = \sqrt{\lambda_{d,1}} > 0$ denotes the initial error of T_d and ε' is the (multiplicative) improvement of it. Since $e(n, d) = \sqrt{\lambda_{d,n+1}}$ it is $n(\varepsilon, d) = \#\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid \lambda_{d,i} > \varepsilon^2\}$

where $\varepsilon = \varepsilon' \cdot \varepsilon_d^{\text{init}}$. Therefore, $\lambda_{d,n(\varepsilon' \cdot \varepsilon_d^{\text{init}},d)+1} \leq (\varepsilon')^2 \cdot \lambda_{d,1}$. Hence, the non-increasing ordering of $(\lambda_{d,i})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ implies in this setting

$$\lambda_{d, \lfloor C(\varepsilon')^{-p} d^q \rfloor + 1} \leq (\varepsilon')^2 \cdot \lambda_{d,1}.$$

If we set $i = \lfloor C(\varepsilon')^{-p} d^q \rfloor + 1$ and vary $\varepsilon' \in (0, 1]$ then i takes the values $\lfloor Cd^q \rfloor + 1, \lfloor Cd^q \rfloor + 2$ and so on. Again we have $1 \leq i \leq C(\varepsilon')^{-p} d^q + 1$ on the other hand, which is equivalent to $(\varepsilon')^2 \leq (Cd^q/(i-1))^{2/p}$ if $i \geq 2$. Thus,

$$\lambda_{d,i} \leq \lambda_{d,n(\varepsilon' \cdot \varepsilon_d^{\text{init}},d)+1} \leq (\varepsilon')^2 \cdot \lambda_{d,1} \leq \left(\frac{Cd^q}{i-1} \right)^{2/p} \cdot \lambda_{d,1} \quad \text{for all } i \geq \max\{2, \lfloor Cd^q \rfloor + 1\}.$$

Choosing $\tau \geq 0$ and $f^*(d) = \lceil (1+C)d^q \rceil \geq \max\{2, \lfloor Cd^q \rfloor + 1\}$ we conclude here

$$\sum_{i=f^*(d)}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\lambda_{d,i}}{\lambda_{d,1}} \right)^\tau \leq \sum_{i=f^*(d)}^{\infty} \left(\frac{Cd^q}{i-1} \right)^{2\tau/p} \leq (Cd^q)^{2\tau/p} \cdot \zeta\left(\frac{2\tau}{p}\right),$$

where ζ again is the Riemann zeta function. On the other hand, it is obvious that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{f^*(d)-1} \left(\frac{\lambda_{d,i}}{\lambda_{d,1}} \right)^\tau \leq f^*(d) - 1 \leq (1+C)d^{q \cdot 2\tau/p},$$

because $\lambda_{d,i} \leq \lambda_{d,1}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, if $\tau > p/2$,

$$\frac{1}{d^{2\tau q/p}} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\lambda_{d,i}}{\lambda_{d,1}} \right)^\tau \leq 1 + C + C^{2\tau/p} \cdot \zeta\left(\frac{2\tau}{p}\right) < \infty$$

for all $d \in \mathbb{N}$. This proves the assertion setting $r \geq 2q/p$.

The proof of the second point again works like for Proposition 3. Assume that (37) holds with $f(d) = \lceil Cd^q \rceil$, where $C > 0$ and $q \geq 0$. That is, for some $r \geq 0$ and $\tau > 0$ we have

$$C_\tau = \sup_{d \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{d^r} \left(\sum_{i=f(d)}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\lambda_{d,i}}{\lambda_{d,1}} \right)^\tau \right)^{1/\tau} < \infty.$$

Since $(\lambda_{d,i})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is assumed to be non-increasing the same also holds for the rescaled sequence $(\lambda_{d,i}/\lambda_{d,1})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\sum_{i=f(d)}^n (\lambda_{d,i}/\lambda_{d,1})^\tau \geq (\lambda_{d,n}/\lambda_{d,1})^\tau \cdot (n - f(d) + 1)$ for $n \geq f(d)$. Hence,

$$\frac{\lambda_{d,n}}{\lambda_{d,1}} \cdot (n - f(d) + 1)^{1/\tau} \leq \left(\sum_{i=f(d)}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\lambda_{d,i}}{\lambda_{d,1}} \right)^\tau \right)^{1/\tau} \leq C_\tau d^r,$$

or, respectively, $\lambda_{d,n+1} \leq C_\tau d^r \cdot ((n+1) - f(d) + 1)^{-1/\tau} \cdot \lambda_{d,1}$ for all $n \geq f(d) - 1$. As before we have $C_\tau d^r \cdot ((n+1) - f(d) + 1)^{-1/\tau} \leq (\varepsilon')^2$, for $\varepsilon' \in (0, 1]$, if and only if

$$n \geq n^* = \left\lceil \left(\frac{C_\tau d^r}{(\varepsilon')^2} \right)^\tau \right\rceil + f(d) - 2.$$

In particular, $\lambda_{d,n+1} \leq (\varepsilon')^2 \cdot \lambda_{d,1}$ at least for $n \geq \max\{n^*, f(d) - 1\}$. Therefore, we conclude in this setting for all $\varepsilon' \in (0, 1]$ and every $d \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} n(\varepsilon' \cdot \varepsilon_d^{\text{init}}, d; F_d) &\leq \max\{n^*, f(d) - 1\} \leq f(d) - 1 + \left(\frac{C_\tau d^r}{(\varepsilon')^2} \right)^\tau \leq C d^q + C_\tau^\tau (\varepsilon')^{-2\tau} d^{r\tau} \\ &\leq (C + C_\tau^\tau) \cdot (\varepsilon')^{-2\tau} \cdot d^{\max\{q, r\tau\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the problem is polynomially tractable. Furthermore, strong polynomial tractability holds if $r = q = 0$. ■