

Condition numbers for the Moore-Penrose inverse and the least squares problem involving rank-structured matrices

Sk. Safique Ahmad^{†*} Pinki Khatun[†]

June 22, 2023

Abstract

Perturbation theory plays a crucial role in sensitivity analysis, which is extensively used to assess the robustness of numerical techniques. To quantify the relative sensitivity of any problem, it becomes essential to investigate structured condition numbers (CNs) via componentwise perturbation theory. This paper address and analyze structured mixed condition number (MCN) and componentwise condition number (CCN) for the Moore-Penrose (M-P) inverse and the minimum norm least squares (MNLS) solution involving rank-structured matrices, which include the Cauchy-Vandermonde (CV) matrices and $\{1, 1\}$ -quasiseparable (QS) matrices. A general framework has been developed first to compute the upper bounds for MCN and CCN of rank deficient parameterized matrices. This framework leads to faster computation of upper bounds of structured CNs for CV and $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrices. Furthermore, comparisons of obtained upper bounds are investigated theoretically and experimentally. In addition, the structured effective CNs for the M-P inverse and the MNLS solution of $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrices are presented. Numerical tests reveal the reliability of the proposed upper bounds as well as demonstrate that the effective CNs are computationally less expensive and can be substantially smaller compared to the unstructured CNs.

Keywords. Rank-structured matrices · Condition number · Moore-Penrose inverse · Minimum norm least squares solution · Cauchy-Vandermoned matrices · Quasiseparable matrices

AMS subject classification. 15A09 · 15A12 · 65F20 · 65F35

1 Introduction

Condition numbers (CNs) are the most important tool in matrix computation since they are widely employed to investigate the stability and accuracy of numerical algorithms; see [16]. It measures how sensitive, in the worst-case scenario, a problem is to a slight change in input data and is crucial in determining whether a numerical solution makes sense. On the other hand, the backward error is used to find a nearly perturbed problem with minimal magnitude perturbations so that the calculated solution becomes an actual solution to the perturbed problem. One can estimate the forward error of an approximate solution by combining the backward error with the CN (see [2] for more on CNs).

[†]Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Technology Indore, Khandwa Road, Indore, 452020, Madhya Pradesh, India.

*Corresponding author. *Email addresses:* safique@iiti.ac.in, safique@gmail.com (Sk. Safique Ahmad), phd2001141004@iiti.ac.in, pinki996.pk@gmail.com (Pinki Khatun)

Most likely, for the first time, Rice [24] introduced the classical theory of CNs. Normwise perturbation theory has been extensively considered in the literature, in which the input and output data errors were quantified using the norms. This condition number has the drawback of ignoring the input and output data structures when the data is poorly scaled or sparse. This can lead minor relative normwise perturbations to produce large relative perturbations on small or zero entries, as well as affect the sparsity of data. To overcome this, componentwise perturbation analysis [26, 25] comes into the picture. Generally, two types of CNs were studied; the former one measures the input perturbations componentwise and the output errors using norms, whereas the latter one measures both the error in output data and the input perturbations componentwisely. They were termed in [12] as mixed CN (MCN) and componentwise CN (CCN), respectively.

In the past few years, rank-structured matrices have attracted much attention because of their wide application in various fields. Many fast algorithms have been recently developed for various problems involving rank-structured matrices, such as computing eigenvalues and singular values [31, 39], solving a linear system [30], the linear least squares (LS) problem, and computing the Moore-Penrose (M-P) inverse [4, 17]. There are several types of rank-structured matrices, including low-rank structured matrices and consecutive-rank-descending matrices. A class of matrices known as low-rank structured matrices is one in which the rank of large submatrices is significantly less than the matrix size. Tridiagonal matrices, band matrices, semiseparable matrices, and a wider family of these matrices known as quasiseparable (QS) matrices are examples of popular low-rank structured matrices, arise in many applications, e.g., boundary value problem [13, 14, 19, 27], acoustic and electromagnetic scattering theory [5]. On the other hand, a consecutive-rank-descending matrix is any matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ that satisfies: $\text{rank}(M(k+1:r+1, 1:s)) \leq \text{rank}(M(k:r, 1:s))$ for all $r \geq s, r-s+1 \leq k \leq r$ and $\text{rank}(M(1:r, k+1:s+1)) \leq \text{rank}(M(1:r, k:s))$ for all $r \geq s, s-r+1 \leq k \leq s$. Here, $M(r:s, k:l)$ represents the submatrix of $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ having rows and columns listed from r to s and k to l , respectively, for $1 \leq r \leq s \leq m$ and $1 \leq k \leq l \leq n$. There are several consecutive-rank-descending matrices, including Cauchy matrices, Vandermonde matrices, Cauchy-Vandermonde (CV) matrices, and Bernstein Vandermonde matrices. These matrices occur in numerous applications in rational and Lagrange interpolation problems [22], numerical quadrature [36], control system [23], computer-aided graphic design [3], rational models of regression and E-optimal design [15, 18].

One of the striking properties of the aforementioned matrices is that they are parameterized by $\mathcal{O}(m+n)$ parameters rather than mn entries. Based on this property, fast algorithms with lower computational costs have been developed, e.g., a linear system costs $\mathcal{O}(n)$ to solve, whereas an eigenvalue problem costs $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$, for an $n \times n$ matrix. As a consequence, it is more sensible to investigate structured CNs by addressing perturbations on the parameters rather than directly on the matrix entries and to identify which set of parameters will be more suited for the development of fast algorithms. Plenty of works involving rank-structured matrices have been done in recent years to investigate the structured CCN, such as for eigenvalue problem [9] and generalized eigenvalue problem [8], solution of a linear system having a single as well as multiple right-hand sides [10, 21] with QS matrices. In [37], MCN and CCN are considered in the structured case for matrix inversion and solution of a linear system for linearly and nonlinearly structured matrices (which includes the Cauchy and Vandermonde matrices).

For a rectangular matrix or rank deficient, it is required to compute the M-P inverse and solve the corresponding LS problem rather than solving a linear system. For the M-P inverse

and the LS problem, MCN and CCN are investigated in [7], which is concerned with full rank unstructured matrix, while full column rank structured matrices are considered in [6]. However, for rank deficient matrices, main issue in analyzing the above CNs is that slight changes in the matrix can generate enormous variations in the calculated M-P inverse. As a consequence, normwise CNs for rank deficient unstructured matrices have been investigated in [33, 35], and for linearly structured matrices in [38] under the assumptions: $\mathcal{R}(\Delta M) \subset \mathcal{R}(M)$ and $\mathcal{R}(\Delta M^T) \subset \mathcal{R}(M^T)$, on the perturbation matrix ΔM in M , where $\mathcal{R}(M)$ denotes the range of M . In [34], upper bounds are investigated for CCN for unstructured matrices under the above assumptions. The primary objective of this study is to investigate for the M-P inverse and LS problem with rank-structured matrices, their structured MCN and CCN under the minimal rank constraint, $\text{rank}(M + \Delta M) = \text{rank}(M)$ on the perturbation matrix ΔM , which includes a larger class of perturbation matrices.

The following are the key contributions of this work:

- Two problems, the M-P inverse and the MNLS solution of the LS problem involving rank deficient CV and $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrices, which are special cases of rank-structured matrices having two different rank structures, are considered.
- By considering matrix entries to be differentiable functions of a set of real parameters, we develop a general framework for computing the upper bounds of the MCN and CCN of the M-P inverse and LS problem for rank deficient parameterized matrices. Exact expressions in full column rank cases of the above mentioned CNs are also obtained.
- For the CV and $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrices, compact upper bounds are obtained for structured MCN and CCN. Two important representations for $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrices are considered: the nonunique *QS representation* [11] and the essentially unique *Givens-vector representation (GVR)* [29].
- For $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrices, structured effective CNs are proposed and shown that they can reliably estimate the upper bounds of actual conditioning of these matrices. Numerical experiments are reported to demonstrate that structured CNs are significantly smaller compared to unstructured CNs.

The remaining part of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 provides a few notations and preliminary results, which help us in the construction of the major findings of the paper. In Section 3, for the M-P inverse and the MNLS solution, we develop general expressions of upper bounds of MCN and CCN for a class of matrices having entries that are differentiable functions of some real parameters. These frameworks are utilized in Sections 4 and 5 to derive the bounds for structured MCN and CCN for CV and $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrices. Further, Section 5 studies comparison results between different structured and unstructured CNs. In Section 6, numerical experiments are performed to illustrate our findings. Section 7 ends with conclusions and a line of future research.

2 Notation and preliminaries

2.1 Notation

The following notation will be adopted throughout this work. $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ denote the collection of all $m \times n$ matrices, and \mathbb{R}^m denotes the space of all column vectors of dimension m , where m, n

are positive integers. To indicate the M-P inverse and transpose of any matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, respectively, M^\dagger and M^T are used. The i -th column of the identity matrix I_m of order m is denoted as e_i^m . For $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, set $\mathbf{E}_M := I_m - MM^\dagger$ and $\mathbf{F}_M := I_n - M^\dagger M$. Denote $\mathbf{0}$ as the zero matrix with conformal dimension. The Hadamard product of $M = [m_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $N = [n_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is defined by $M \odot N := [m_{ij}n_{ij}]$. For any column vector $x = [x_i] \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the infinity norm is defined by $\|x\|_\infty := \max_i |x_i|$ and for any matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, the max norm is defined by $\|M\|_{\max} := \max_{i,j} |m_{ij}|$. We denote $E_{ij}^{mn} = e_i e_j^T$ as the matrix with ij -element is 1 and zero elsewhere. The notation $i = 1 : n$ indicates that i takes the values from $1, 2, \dots, n$. For any $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, let $|M| = [|m_{ij}|]$. For matrices $M, N \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $|M| \leq |N|$ means $|m_{ij}| \leq |n_{ij}|$ for $i = 1 : m$, and $j = 1 : n$. We define M/N as $(M/N)_{ij} = n_{ij}^\dagger m_{ij}$, where for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $a^\dagger = \frac{1}{a}$ when $a \neq 0$, otherwise $a^\dagger = 1$. $\Theta_x = \text{diag}(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is the diagonal matrix, where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. For any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $\text{sign}(a) := \frac{a}{|a|}$ for $a \neq 0$ and $\text{sign}(a) := 0$ for $a = 0$, and $\text{sign}(M) := [\text{sign}(m_{ij})]$. The i -th row and the j -th column of M , are represented as $M(i, :)$ and $M(:, j)$, respectively.

2.2 Preliminaries

In this subsection, the definition of the M-P inverse is revisited first, after which we discuss some of its important properties. The M-P inverse was introduced for a rectangular or rank deficient matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. It is the unique matrix $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ that satisfy the following equations [28]

$$MYM = M, YMY = Y, (MY)^T = MY, (YM)^T = YM.$$

Typically, it is denoted by $Y = M^\dagger$. The following lemma states that for a full column rank matrices M , its M-P inverse is a continuous function of its data entries.

Lemma 2.1. [32] *Let $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with full column rank and $\{E_j\}$ is a collection of real $m \times n$ matrices satisfying $\lim_{j \rightarrow 0} E_j = \mathbf{0}$. Then, $(M + E_j)$ has full column rank when j is large enough and $\lim_{j \rightarrow 0} (M + E_j)^\dagger = M^\dagger$.*

However, they do not share the above property when M is singular or rank deficient. Slight modification ΔM on M can produce the computed results far from the actual solution. To tackle this situation, perturbation theory for the M-P inverse has been studied in certain specific constraints. An ‘acute’ perturbation $\tilde{M} = M + \Delta M$ of M is a perturbed matrix for which $\|MM^\dagger - \tilde{M}\tilde{M}^\dagger\|_2 < 1$ and $\|M^\dagger M - \tilde{M}^\dagger \tilde{M}\|_2 < 1$, where $\|\cdot\|_2$ means the matrix 2-norm. Proposition 2.1 provides an if and only if condition for the continuity of M^\dagger of any matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. Consider the set $\mathcal{S}^1(M) = \{\Delta M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} : \|M^\dagger\|_2 \|\Delta M\|_2 \leq 1\}$. Then $\lim_{\Delta M \rightarrow \mathbf{0}} (M + \Delta M)^\dagger = M^\dagger$ if and only if $\text{rank}(M + \Delta M) = \text{rank}(M)$, where $\Delta M \in \mathcal{S}^1(M)$.*

Proof. For $\Delta M \in \mathcal{S}^1(M)$, we have $\|M^\dagger\|_2 \|\Delta M\|_2 \leq 1$. Then $M + \Delta M$ is an acute perturbation of M if and only if $\text{rank}(M + \Delta M) = \text{rank}(M)$ [20, Lemma 1]. Since, on the set of acute perturbations of M , its M-P inverse M^\dagger is a continuous function about M [28, Page 140]. Therefore, it follows that M^\dagger is continuous on the set $\mathcal{S}^1(M)$ if and only if $\text{rank}(M + \Delta M) = \text{rank}(M)$. Hence, the proof is completed. \square

Remark 2.1. When M has full column rank (or row rank), from Lemma 2.1, the rank condition in Proposition 2.1 holds trivially.

3 MCN and CCN for general parameterized matrices

In this part, initially, we define structured MCN and CCN for the M-P inverse and the unique MNLS solution for a general class of parameterized matrices. Suppose that each entry of $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is differentiable function of a set of real parameters $\Psi = [\psi_1, \psi_2, \dots, \psi_p]^T \in \mathbb{R}^p$, and write the matrix as $M(\Psi)$. We employ this notation for the rest of the paper. Due to the fact that a number of important classes of matrices are parameterized by a collection of parameters, it is reasonable to consider perturbations on the parameters rather than directly on their entries. Let $\Delta\Psi \in \mathbb{R}^p$ be the perturbation on the parameters set $\Psi \in \mathbb{R}^p$, we consider the admissible perturbation in the matrix $M(\Psi)$ as $M(\Psi + \Delta\Psi) - M(\Psi) = \Delta M(\Psi)$. For maintaining the continuity property for $M^\dagger(\Psi)$, according to the Proposition 2.1, we restrict the perturbation on Ψ to the following set

$$\mathcal{S}(\Psi) := \left\{ \Delta\Psi \in \mathbb{R}^p : \text{rank}(M(\Psi)) = \text{rank}(M(\Psi + \Delta\Psi)) = r, \|M^\dagger(\Psi)\|_2 \|\Delta M(\Psi)\|_2 < 1 \right\}. \quad (3.1)$$

3.1 Moore-Penrose inverse of general parameterized matrices

For a general class of matrices, by considering each entry of the matrix to be a differentiable function of a set of real parameters, for the M-P inverse, we introduce its structured MCN and CCN in Definition 3.1. We provide general expressions for the upper bounds of these CNs in Theorem 3.1. Also, we present exact formulae for these CNs in Theorem 3.2 for full column rank matrices.

Definition 3.1. Let $M(\Psi) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $\text{rank}(M(\Psi)) = r \leq \min\{m, n\}$. Then, we define structured MCN and CCN for $M^\dagger(\Psi)$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}^\dagger(M(\Psi)) &:= \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \frac{\|M^\dagger(\Psi + \Delta\Psi) - M^\dagger(\Psi)\|_{\max}}{\varepsilon \|M^\dagger(\Psi)\|_{\max}} : \|\Delta\Psi/\Psi\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon, \Delta\Psi \in \mathcal{S}(\Psi) \right\}, \\ \mathcal{C}^\dagger(M(\Psi)) &:= \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left\| \frac{M^\dagger(\Psi + \Delta\Psi) - M^\dagger(\Psi)}{M^\dagger(\Psi)} \right\|_{\max} : \|\Delta\Psi/\Psi\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon, \Delta\Psi \in \mathcal{S}(\Psi) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

To derive the general expressions for the upper bounds of the CNs proposed in Definition 3.1, next we provide a perturbation expression for $M^\dagger(\Psi)$.

Lemma 3.1. Let $M(\Psi) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $\text{rank}(M(\Psi)) = r$. Suppose $\Delta\Psi \in \mathcal{S}(\Psi)$ is the perturbation on the parameter set Ψ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} M^\dagger(\Psi + \Delta\Psi) - M^\dagger(\Psi) &= \sum_{k=1}^p \left(-M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} M^\dagger + M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T \mathbf{E}_M \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbf{F}_M \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger \right) \Delta\psi_k + \mathcal{O}(\|\Delta\Psi\|^2), \end{aligned}$$

where $\|\Delta\Psi\|$ is any norm of $\Delta\Psi$.

Proof. Given that the elements of $M(\Psi)$ are differentiable functions of $\Psi = [\psi_1, \psi_2, \dots, \psi_p]^T$, using differential calculus, we can write for an infinitesimal change in $M(\Psi)$

$$\Delta M(\Psi) = M(\Psi + \Delta\Psi) - M(\Psi) = \sum_{k=1}^p \frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \Delta\psi_k + \mathcal{O}(\|\Delta\Psi\|^2), \quad (3.2)$$

where $\Delta\Psi = [\Delta\psi_1, \dots, \Delta\psi_p]^T$. Since $\Delta\Psi \in \mathcal{S}(\Psi)$, using the perturbation expression in [28, Page 150, eqn 3.35], we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta M^\dagger(\Psi) &= M^\dagger(\Psi + \Delta\Psi) - M^\dagger(\Psi) = -M^\dagger \Delta M(\Psi) M^\dagger + M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} (\Delta M(\Psi))^T \mathbf{E}_M \\ &\quad + \mathbf{F}_M (\Delta M(\Psi))^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger + \mathcal{O}(\|\Delta\Psi\|^2). \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Using (3.2) in (3.3), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta M^\dagger(\Psi) &= -M^\dagger \left(\sum_{k=1}^p \frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \Delta\psi_k \right) M^\dagger + M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \left(\sum_{k=1}^p \frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \Delta\psi_k \right)^T \mathbf{E}_M \\ &\quad + \mathbf{F}_M \left(\sum_{k=1}^p \frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \Delta\psi_k \right)^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger + \mathcal{O}(\|\Delta\Psi\|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the desired expression is obtained. \square

In Theorem 3.1, for $M^\dagger(\Psi)$, we derive general expressions for upper bounds of the proposed CNs when $\text{rank}(M(\Psi)) = r$.

Theorem 3.1. *For $M(\Psi) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with $\text{rank}(M(\Psi)) = r$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}^\dagger(M(\Psi)) &\leq \frac{1}{\|M^\dagger\|_{\max}} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^p \left(\left| M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} M^\dagger \right| + \left| M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T \mathbf{E}_M \right| \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \left| \mathbf{F}_M \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger \right| \right) |\psi_k| \right\|_{\max} := \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi)), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^\dagger(M(\Psi)) &\leq \left\| \frac{1}{M^\dagger} \left(\sum_{k=1}^p \left(\left| M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} M^\dagger \right| + \left| M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T \mathbf{E}_M \right| \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \left| \mathbf{F}_M \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger \right| \right) |\psi_k| \right\|_{\max} := \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M(\Psi)). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. From Lemma 3.1 and using the properties of absolute values, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| M^\dagger(\Psi + \Delta\Psi) - M^\dagger(\Psi) \right| &\leq \sum_{k=1}^p \left(\left| M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} M^\dagger \right| + \left| M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T \mathbf{E}_M \right| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left| \mathbf{F}_M \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger \right| \right) |\Delta\psi_k| + \mathcal{O}(\|\Delta\Psi\|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Now, the given condition $\|\Delta\Psi/\Psi\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon$ implies that $|\Delta\psi_k| \leq \varepsilon|\psi_k|$ for all $k = 1, 2, \dots, p$, and using the properties of the norm, easily one can find that

$$\begin{aligned} \|M^\dagger(\Psi + \Delta\Psi) - M^\dagger(\Psi)\|_{\max} &\leq \varepsilon \left\| \sum_{k=1}^p \left(\left| M^\dagger \frac{\partial M}{\partial \psi_k} M^\dagger \right| + \left| M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \left(\frac{\partial M}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T \mathbf{E}_M \right| \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \left| \mathbf{F}_M \left(\frac{\partial M}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger \right| \right) |\psi_k| \right\|_{\max} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2). \end{aligned}$$

Then, if we take $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, and from Definition 3.1, we get the desired result of the first claim. In a similar manner, one can obtain the second part of the claim. \square

In the next corollary, we obtain bounds for the CNs for M^\dagger in unstructured case.

Corollary 3.1. *Suppose $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with $\text{rank}(M) = r$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M) &= \frac{1}{\|M^\dagger\|_{\max}} \left\| \left| M^\dagger \|M\| M^\dagger \right| + \left| M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \|M^T\| \mathbf{E}_M \right| + \left| \mathbf{F}_M \|M^T\| M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger \right| \right\|_{\max}, \\ \tilde{\mathcal{C}}^\dagger(M) &= \left\| \frac{1}{\|M^\dagger\|} \left(\left| M^\dagger \|M\| M^\dagger \right| + \left| M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \|M^T\| \mathbf{E}_M \right| + \left| \mathbf{F}_M \|M^T\| M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger \right| \right) \right\|_{\max}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For any $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and any two column vectors a and b , we have

$$\frac{\partial M}{\partial m_{ij}} = e_i^m (e_j^n)^T \quad \text{and} \quad |ab^T| = |a||b^T|. \quad (3.4)$$

By considering the parameters are the entries of M itself, i.e., $\Psi = [\{m_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^{m,n}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{mn}$, and using (3.4), one can write the sum expression in Theorem 3.1 as:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\left| M^\dagger \frac{\partial M}{\partial m_{ij}} M^\dagger \right| + \left| M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \left(\frac{\partial M}{\partial m_{ij}} \right)^T \mathbf{E}_M \right| + \left| \mathbf{F}_M \left(\frac{\partial M}{\partial m_{ij}} \right)^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger \right| \right) |m_{ij}| \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\left| M^\dagger e_i^m (e_j^n)^T M^\dagger \right| + \left| M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} e_j^n (e_i^m)^T \mathbf{E}_M \right| + \left| \mathbf{F}_M e_j^n (e_i^m)^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger \right| \right) |m_{ij}|. \quad (3.5) \end{aligned}$$

Again using (3.4), we can write (3.5) as

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\left| M^\dagger(:, i) \|m_{ij}\| M^\dagger(j, :) \right| + \left| M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}(:, j) \|m_{ij}\| \mathbf{E}_M(i, :) \right| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left| \mathbf{F}_M(:, j) \|m_{ij}\| M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger(i, :) \right| \right) \\ &= \left| M^\dagger \|M\| M^\dagger \right| + \left| M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \|M^T\| \mathbf{E}_M \right| + \left| \mathbf{F}_M \|M^T\| M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger \right|. \quad (3.6) \end{aligned}$$

The desired upper bounds will be obtained by substituting (3.6) in Theorem 3.1. \square

Next, we deduce the results for the matrices having full column rank. This result is the same as obtained by Cucker et al. in [7].

Corollary 3.2. For any full column rank matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M) &= \frac{\left\| |M^\dagger| |M| |M^\dagger| + |(M^T M)^{-1}| |M^T| |\mathbf{E}_M| \right\|_{\max}}{\|M^\dagger\|_{\max}}, \\ \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M) &= \left\| \frac{|M^\dagger| |M| |M^\dagger| + |(M^T M)^{-1}| |M^T| |\mathbf{E}_M|}{M^\dagger} \right\|_{\max}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since M is of full column rank matrix, substituting $M^\dagger M = I_n$ and $M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} = (M M^T)^{-1}$ in Corollary 3.1, we get the desired results. \square

Next, we estimate the bounds for CNs under the constrains $\mathcal{R}(\Delta M(\Psi)) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(M(\Psi))$ and $\mathcal{R}(\Delta M^T(\Psi)) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(M^T(\Psi))$.

Proposition 3.1. Let $M(\Psi) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ be such that $\text{rank}(M(\Psi)) = r$. Suppose $\Delta\Psi \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the perturbation on the parameter set Ψ satisfying the conditions, $\|M^\dagger\|_2 \|\Delta M(\Psi)\|_2 \leq 1$, $\mathcal{R}(\Delta M(\Psi)) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(M(\Psi))$, and $\mathcal{R}(\Delta M^T(\Psi)) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(M^T(\Psi))$. Then

$$M^\dagger(\Psi + \Delta\Psi) - M^\dagger(\Psi) = - \sum_{k=1}^p M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} M^\dagger \Delta\psi_k + \mathcal{O}(\|\Delta\Psi\|^2).$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi)) &= \frac{\|\sum_{k=1}^p |M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} M^\dagger| |\Delta\psi_k|\|_{\max}}{\|M^\dagger\|_{\max}}, \\ \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M(\Psi)) &= \left\| \frac{1}{M^\dagger} \sum_{k=1}^p |M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} M^\dagger| |\Delta\psi_k| \right\|_{\max}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. If $M(\Psi), \Delta M(\Psi) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ satisfies the assumptions $\mathcal{R}(\Delta M(\Psi)) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(M(\Psi))$ and $\mathcal{R}(\Delta M^T(\Psi)) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(M^T(\Psi))$, then

$$M M^\dagger \Delta M(\Psi) = \Delta M(\Psi), \quad M^T M^{\dagger T} \Delta M(\Psi) = \Delta M(\Psi). \quad (3.7)$$

In addition, if $\|M^\dagger\|_2 \|\Delta M(\Psi)\|_2 < 1$ holds, it is shown in [1] that

$$M^\dagger(\Psi + \Delta\Psi) = (I_n + M^\dagger \Delta M(\Psi))^{-1} M^\dagger. \quad (3.8)$$

Now, (3.7) implies $\Delta M^T(\Psi) \mathbf{E}_M = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{F}_M \Delta M^T(\Psi) = \mathbf{0}$. Again, (3.8) implies that $\text{rank}(M(\Psi + \Delta\Psi)) = \text{rank}(M(\Psi))$. Therefore, $\Delta\Psi \in \mathcal{S}$. Hence from Lemma 3.1, we get the desired expression.

Proof of the second part follows from the obtained perturbation expansion and Theorem 3.1. \square

Remark 3.1. Using the Proposition 3.1, and in an analogous way to Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.1, we can recover the bounds obtained in [34].

For the matrices with full column rank, the next theorem provides exact expressions of CNs for M^\dagger , introduced in Definition 3.1.

Theorem 3.2. For $M(\Psi) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with full column rank, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}^\dagger(M(\Psi)) &= \frac{\left\| \sum_{k=1}^p \left| M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} M^\dagger - (M^T M)^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T \mathbf{E}_M \right| |\psi_k| \right\|_{\max}}{\|M^\dagger\|_{\max}}, \\ \mathcal{E}^\dagger(M(\Psi)) &= \left\| \frac{\sum_{k=1}^p \left| M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} M^\dagger - (M^T M)^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T \mathbf{E}_M \right| |\psi_k|}{M^\dagger} \right\|_{\max}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since $M(\Psi)$ is of full column rank matrix, applying Remark 2.1 on Lemma 3.1, we get following perturbation expression for $M^\dagger(\Psi)$

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta M^\dagger(\Psi) = M^\dagger(\Psi + \Delta\Psi) - M^\dagger(\Psi) &= \sum_{k=1}^p \left(-M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} M^\dagger + (M^T M)^{-1} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T \mathbf{E}_M \right) \Delta\psi_k + \mathcal{O}(\|\Delta\Psi\|^2).\end{aligned}\quad (3.9)$$

Now, using a similar technique to the proof of Theorem 3.1, by the given condition $\|\Delta\Psi/\Psi\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon$, one can obtain the following bound

$$\mathcal{M}^\dagger(M(\Psi)) \leq \frac{\left\| \sum_{k=1}^p \left| M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} M^\dagger - (M^T M)^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T \mathbf{E}_M \right| |\psi_k| \right\|_{\max}}{\|M^\dagger\|_{\max}}.\quad (3.10)$$

On the other hand, from Lemma 2.1 and Remark 2.1, it follows that we can choose arbitrary perturbation $\Delta\Psi \in \mathbb{R}^p$ on the parameter set Ψ . Choose

$$\Delta\psi_k = -\varepsilon \text{sign}(M_k)_{lq} \text{sign}(\psi_k) \psi_k,\quad (3.11)$$

where $M_k = M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} M^\dagger - (M^T M)^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T \mathbf{E}_M$, for $k = 1, 2, \dots, p$, $(M_k)_{lq}$ denotes the lq -th entry of the matrix M_k , and the indices l and q are such that

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^p |M_k| |\psi_k| \right\|_{\max} = \left(\sum_{k=1}^p |M_k| |\psi_k| \right)_{lq}.$$

The upper bound in (3.10) is obtained by inserting the values of (3.11) in the perturbation expression (3.9) and from the Definition 3.1. Hence the proof of the first part of the claim follows.

The second part of the claim can be obtained in a similar way. \square

In the following corollary, we deduce expressions for unstructured CNs for full column rank matrix. These results are the same as obtained in [7, 6]

Corollary 3.3. For $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ having full column rank, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}^\dagger(M) &= \frac{\left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n |m_{ij}| \left| M^\dagger E_{ij}^{mn} M^\dagger - (M^T M)^{-1} (E_{ij}^{mn})^T \mathbf{E}_M \right| \right\|_{\max}}{\|M^\dagger\|_{\max}}, \\ \mathcal{E}^\dagger(M) &= \left\| \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n |m_{ij}| \left| M^\dagger E_{ij}^{mn} M^\dagger - (M^T M)^{-1} (E_{ij}^{mn})^T \mathbf{E}_M \right|}{M^\dagger} \right\|_{\max}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. By considering the parameters set $\Psi = [\{m_{i,j}\}_{i,j=1}^{m,n}]^T$ in Theorem 3.2, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n |M^\dagger \frac{\partial M}{\partial m_{ij}} M^\dagger - (M^T M)^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial M}{\partial m_{i,j}} \right)^T \mathbf{E}_M| |m_{ij}| \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n |M^\dagger E_{ij}^{mn} M^\dagger - (M^T M)^{-1} (E_{ij}^{mn})^T \mathbf{E}_M| |m_{ij}|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the desired expressions are obtained by substituting the above expression in Theorem 3.2. \square

3.2 MNLS solution for general parameterized coefficient matrices

Let us consider LS problem

$$\min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^n} \|M(\Psi)z - b\|_2, \quad (3.12)$$

where $M(\Psi) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with entries that are differentiable function of Ψ with $\text{rank}(M(\Psi)) = r \leq \min\{m, n\}$, and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$. When $M(\Psi)$ is rank deficient, the LS problem has infinitely many solutions, and the set of all solutions forms a closed and convex set. Therefore, the set has a unique element with minimum 2-norm, and the unique MNLS solution is provided by $\mathbf{x} = M(\Psi)^\dagger b$. Moreover, when $M(\Psi)$ is rank deficient, \mathbf{x} is not even a continuous function of the data, and small changes in $M(\Psi)$ can produce large changes in \mathbf{x} . This happens as a result of the behavior of the M-P inverse of any rank deficient matrix. Thus, according to Proposition 2.1, if we consider the perturbation $\Delta\Psi \in \mathcal{S}(\Psi)$ for the parameters, then the perturbed problem

$$\min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^n} \|M(\Psi + \Delta\Psi)z - (b + \Delta b)\|_2$$

has the MNLS solution $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = M(\Psi + \Delta\Psi)^\dagger (b + \Delta b)$. Consider $\Delta\mathbf{x} = \tilde{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}$.

In Definition 3.2, for the MNLS solution \mathbf{x} , we introduce its structured MCN and CCN.

Definition 3.2. Let $M(\Psi) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $\text{rank}(M(\Psi)) = r$, and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Then, we define structured MCN and CCN of \mathbf{x} as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}^\dagger(M(\Psi), b) &:= \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \frac{\|\Delta\mathbf{x}\|_\infty}{\varepsilon \|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty} : \|\Delta\Psi/\Psi\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon, \|\Delta b/b\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon, \Delta\Psi \in \mathcal{S}(\Psi), \Delta b \in \mathbb{R}^m \right\}, \\ \mathcal{C}^\dagger(M(\Psi), b) &:= \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left\| \frac{\Delta\mathbf{x}}{\mathbf{x}} \right\|_\infty : \|\Delta\Psi/\Psi\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon, \|\Delta b/b\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon, \Delta\Psi \in \mathcal{S}(\Psi), \Delta b \in \mathbb{R}^m \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Our main objective of this section is to find general expressions of bounds for the CNs defined in Definition 3.2, and the following lemma provides us with the perturbation expansion for the MNLS solution.

Lemma 3.2. Let $M(\Psi) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with $\text{rank}(M(\Psi)) = r$, and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Suppose $\Delta\Psi \in \mathcal{S}(\Psi)$ and $\Delta b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and set $\mathbf{r} := b - M(\Psi)\mathbf{x}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\mathbf{x} &= \sum_{k=1}^p \left(-M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \mathbf{x} + M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T \mathbf{r} + \mathbf{F}_M \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{x} \right) \Delta\psi_k \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^m M^\dagger e_i^m \Delta b_i + \mathcal{O}(\|(\Delta\Psi, \Delta b)\|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since

$$\Delta \mathbf{x} = M^\dagger(\Psi + \Delta\Psi)(b + \Delta b) - M^\dagger(\Psi)b$$

and $\Delta\Psi \in \mathcal{S}(\Psi)$, using Lemma 3.1, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \mathbf{x} = & \left(\sum_{k=1}^p \left(-M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} M^\dagger + M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T \mathbf{E}_M \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + \mathbf{F}_M \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger \right) \Delta \psi_k + M^\dagger(\Psi) \right) (b + \Delta b) - M^\dagger(\Psi)b + \mathcal{O}(\|\Delta\Psi\|^2) \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

$$\begin{aligned} = & \sum_{k=1}^p \left(-M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \mathbf{x} + M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T \mathbf{r} + \mathbf{F}_M \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{x} \right) \Delta \psi_k \\ & + M^\dagger(\Psi) \Delta b + \mathcal{O}(\|(\Delta\Psi, \Delta b)\|^2). \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

On the other hand, for the perturbation Δb in b , we can write $\Delta b = \sum_{i=1}^m e_i^m \Delta b_i$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \mathbf{x} = & \sum_{k=1}^p \left(-M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \mathbf{x} + M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T \mathbf{r} + \mathbf{F}_M \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{x} \right) \Delta \psi_k \\ & + M^\dagger \sum_{i=1}^m e_i^m \Delta b_i + \mathcal{O}(\|(\Delta\psi, \Delta b)\|^2), \end{aligned}$$

and hence the desired result is obtained. \square

In Theorem 3.3, we provide general expressions for the upper bounds of $\mathcal{M}^\dagger(M(\Psi), b)$ and $\mathcal{E}^\dagger(M(\Psi), b)$.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $M(\Psi) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ be a matrix having $\text{rank}(M(\Psi)) = r$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}^\dagger(M(\Psi), b) \leq & \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^p \left(\left| M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \mathbf{x} \right| + \left| M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T \mathbf{r} \right| \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + \left| \mathbf{F}_M \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{x} \right| \right) |\psi_k| + |M^\dagger| |b| \right\|_\infty := \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi), b), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^\dagger(M(\Psi), b) \leq & \left\| \Theta_{\mathbf{x}^\dagger} \left(\sum_{k=1}^p \left(\left| M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \mathbf{x} \right| + \left| M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T \mathbf{r} \right| \right. \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + \left| \mathbf{F}_M \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{x} \right| \right) |\psi_k| + |M^\dagger| |b| \right\|_\infty := \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M(\Psi), b), \end{aligned}$$

where $\Theta_{\mathbf{x}^\dagger} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{x}^\dagger)$.

Proof. From Lemma 3.2 and with the help of the properties of absolute values, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta \mathbf{x}| \leq & \sum_{k=1}^p \left(\left| M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \mathbf{x} \right| + \left| M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T \mathbf{r} \right| + \left| \mathbf{F}_M \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{x} \right| \right) |\Delta \psi_k| \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^m |M^\dagger| |\Delta b_i| + \mathcal{O}(\|(\Delta\psi, \Delta b)\|^2). \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

Now, the given conditions $\|\Delta\Psi/\Psi\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon$ and $\|\Delta b/b\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon$ implies that for $k = 1 : p$, $|\Delta\psi_k| \leq \varepsilon|\psi_k|$, and for $i = 1 : m$, $|\Delta b_i| \leq \varepsilon|b_i|$, respectively, and taking infinity norm in (3.15), we deduced that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta\mathbf{x}\|_\infty &\leq \varepsilon \left\| \sum_{k=1}^p \left(\left| M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \mathbf{x} \right| + \left| M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T \mathbf{r} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \left| \mathbf{F}_M \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{x} \right| \right) |\psi_k| + |M^\dagger| |b| \right\|_\infty + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2). \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

Then, if we take $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ in (3.16) and from Definition 3.2, one can obtain the desired result of the first claim. The second claim follows similarly, since we can write $\left\| \frac{\Delta\mathbf{x}}{\mathbf{x}} \right\|_\infty = \|\Theta_{\mathbf{x}^\dagger} \Delta\mathbf{x}\|_\infty$. \square

Next, we discuss the bounds of the CNs for the MNLS solution of the LS problem (3.12) corresponding to unstructured matrices.

Corollary 3.4. *For $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ having $\text{rank}(M) = r$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M, b) &:= \frac{\left\| |M^\dagger| |M| |\mathbf{x}| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |M^T| |\mathbf{r}| + |\mathbf{F}_M| |M^T| |M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{x}| + |M^\dagger| |b| \right\|_\infty}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty}, \\ \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M, b) &:= \left\| \Theta_{\mathbf{x}^\dagger} \left(|M^\dagger| |M| |\mathbf{x}| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |M^T| |\mathbf{r}| + |\mathbf{F}_M| |M^T| |M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{x}| + |M^\dagger| |b| \right) \right\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof follows in an analogous way to the Corollary 3.1 by considering $\Psi = [\{m_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^{m,n}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{mn}$ in Theorem 3.3 and using (3.4). \square

Since for a matrix with full column rank corresponding LS problem (3.12) has a unique solution, it is also given by $\mathbf{x} = M^\dagger(\Psi)b$, next we deduce the upper bounds of CNs when the matrix has no special structure. These results are the same as obtained in [7].

Corollary 3.5. *For $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ having full column rank and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, we get*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M, b) &= \frac{\left\| |M^\dagger| |M| |\mathbf{x}| + (M^T M)^{-1} |M^T| |\mathbf{r}| \right\|_\infty}{\|M^\dagger\|_\infty}, \\ \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M, b) &= \left\| \frac{|M^\dagger| |M| |\mathbf{x}| + (M^T M)^{-1} |M^T| |\mathbf{r}|}{M^\dagger} \right\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. In Corollary 3.4, if we consider M has rank n , this implies $\mathbf{F}_M = \mathbf{0}$ and $M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} = (M^T M)^{-1}$, and hence we get the desired upper bounds. \square

The next theorem offers explicit formulae of structured CNs for the unique LS solution for full column rank matrices.

Theorem 3.4. *For $M(\Psi) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ having full column rank and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, we get*

$$\mathcal{M}^\dagger(M(\Psi), b) = \frac{\left\| \sum_{k=1}^p \left| M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \mathbf{x} - (M^T M)^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T \mathbf{r} \right| |\psi_k| + |M^\dagger| |b| \right\|_\infty}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty},$$

$$\mathcal{E}^\dagger(M(\Psi), b) = \left\| \Theta_{\mathbf{x}^\dagger} \left(\sum_{k=1}^p \left| M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \mathbf{x} - (M^T M)^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T \mathbf{r} \right| |\psi_k| + |M^\dagger| |b| \right) \right\|_\infty.$$

Proof. In Lemma 3.2, using the fact that for any full column rank matrix $\mathbf{F}_M = \mathbf{0}$, we have

$$\Delta \mathbf{x} = \sum_{k=1}^p \left(-M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \mathbf{x} + M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T \mathbf{r} \right) \Delta \psi_k + \sum_{i=1}^m M^\dagger e_i^m \Delta b_i + \mathcal{O}(\|\Delta \Psi\|^2). \quad (3.17)$$

Now, by following the proof method to Theorem 3.2, and given conditions $\|\Delta \Psi / \Psi\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon$ and $\|\Delta b / b\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon$, we obtain

$$\mathcal{M}^\dagger(M(\Psi), b) \leq \frac{\left\| \sum_{k=1}^p \left| M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \mathbf{x} - (M^T M)^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T \mathbf{r} \right| |\psi_k| + |M^\dagger| |b| \right\|_\infty}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty}. \quad (3.18)$$

From Lemma 2.1 and Remark 2.1, we can choose the perturbation $\Delta \Psi$ on the parameters set Ψ arbitrarily from \mathbb{R}^p . If we consider the perturbations

$$\Delta b = \varepsilon \Theta_{M^\dagger} \Theta_b b,$$

where Θ_{M^\dagger} , Θ_b are the diagonal matrices having diagonal entries $\Theta_{M^\dagger}(i, i) = \text{sign}(M^\dagger(l, i))$, and $\Theta_b(i, i) = \text{sign}(b_i)$ for $i = 1 : m$, respectively, and

$$\Delta \psi_k = -\varepsilon \text{sign}(M_{\mathbf{x},k})_l \text{sign}(\psi_k) \psi_k,$$

where $M_{\mathbf{x},k} := M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \mathbf{x} - (M^T M)^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi)}{\partial \psi_k} \right)^T \mathbf{r}$ and l is the index so that

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^p |M_{\mathbf{x},k}| |\psi_k| + |M^\dagger| |b| \right\|_\infty = \left(\sum_{k=1}^p |M_{\mathbf{x},k}| |\psi_k| + |M^\dagger| |b| \right)_l.$$

The upper bound in (3.18) will be attained by substituting these perturbations in (3.17) and from Definition 3.2, and hence the desired expression is attained.

Analogously, one can obtain the expression for the componentwise condition number. \square

Next, we deduce condition number expressions for the MNLS solution corresponding to unstructured matrices. These expressions are the same as obtained in [7, 6].

Corollary 3.6. *For $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ having full column rank and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, we obtain*

$$\mathcal{M}^\dagger(M, b) = \frac{\left\| \sum_{i,j=1}^{m,n} |m_{ij}| \left| M^\dagger E_{ij}^{mn} \mathbf{x} - (M^T M)^{-1} (E_{ij}^{mn})^T \mathbf{r} \right| + |M^\dagger| |b| \right\|_\infty}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty},$$

$$\mathcal{E}^\dagger(M, b) = \left\| \Theta_{\mathbf{x}^\dagger} \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^{m,n} |m_{ij}| \left| M^\dagger E_{ij}^{mn} \mathbf{x} - (M^T M)^{-1} (E_{ij}^{mn})^T \mathbf{r} \right| + |M^\dagger| |b| \right) \right\|_\infty.$$

Proof. Considering the parameters set $\Psi = [\{m_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^{m,n}]$ in Theorem 3.4, we get the desired expressions. \square

4 CV matrices

In this section, we start by reviewing the definition of the CV matrix. Following that, we provide the derivative expressions for the entries of this matrix with respect to its parameter set, which helps to derive computable upper bounds for the structured CNs of the M-P inverse and the solution of the LS problem for a rank deficient CV matrix given in Theorems 4.1 and 4.3, respectively. Explicit formulations for these CNs are also provided in the Theorems 4.2 and 4.4, respectively, when the matrix has full column rank.

Definition 4.1. [17] Let $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. Then M is called a CV matrix if for $c = [c_1, c_2, \dots, c_m]^T \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $d = [d_1, d_2, \dots, d_l]^T \in \mathbb{R}^l$ with $c_i \neq d_j$ where $i = 1 : m$ and $j = 1 : l$, where $0 \leq l \leq n$, it can be represented as follows:

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{c_1-d_1} & \frac{1}{c_1-d_2} & \cdots & \frac{1}{c_1-d_l} & 1 & c_1 & c_1^2 & \cdots & c_1^{n-l-1} \\ \frac{1}{c_2-d_1} & \frac{1}{c_2-d_2} & \cdots & \frac{1}{c_2-d_l} & 1 & c_2 & c_2^2 & \cdots & c_2^{n-l-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \frac{1}{c_m-d_1} & \frac{1}{c_m-d_2} & \cdots & \frac{1}{c_m-d_l} & 1 & c_m & c_m^2 & \cdots & c_m^{n-l-1} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.1)$$

For a CV matrix of the form (4.1), $\Psi_{\text{CV}} := [\{c_i\}_{i=1}^m, \{d_i\}_{i=1}^l]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{m+l}$ represents its parameter set. We use the notation $M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})$ to refer a CV matrix parametrized by Ψ_{CV} . These parameters satisfies the condition, $\{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_m\} \cap \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_m\} = \phi$. $M(\Psi)$ becomes the well-known Vandermonde matrix when $l = 0$, and the Cauchy matrix when $l = n$.

For the M-P inverse and the MNLS solution involving the CV matrix, our objective is to estimate the structured CNs. Lemma 4.1 accomplishes our claim. Before that, we will construct the following matrices. For any positive integers p, q and any vector $y = [y_1, y_2, \dots, y_p]^T \in \mathbb{R}^p$, define the matrices

$$\mathcal{Q}_{y,i}^{pq} := [\mathbf{1}, \dots, \mathbf{1}, y, \mathbf{1}, \dots, \mathbf{1}] \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q},$$

for $i = 1 : q$, with the i -th column is y and $\mathbf{1}$ is the column vector having all entries equal to 1. Also, set

$$\mathcal{M}_1 := [-M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})(:, 1:l) \ \mathbf{0} \ M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})(:, l+2:n)] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}, \quad (4.2)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_2 := [M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})(:, 1:l) \ \mathbf{0}] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}, \quad (4.3)$$

where $\mathbf{0}$ is the zero matrix with conformal dimensional.

In Lemma 4.1, we give the derivative expressions of a CV matrix for the parameter set Ψ_{CV} .

Lemma 4.1. Suppose $M(\Psi_{\text{CV}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ having rank r , represented by a set of real parameter $\Psi_{\text{CV}} = [\{c_i\}_{i=1}^m, \{d_i\}_{i=1}^l]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{m+l}$, where $c_i \neq d_j$, $i = 1 : m$ and $j = 1 : l$. Then each entry of $M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})$ is a differentiable function of Ψ_{CV} , and

1. $\frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})}{\partial c_i} = e_i^m (\mathcal{M}_1 \odot (\mathcal{Q}_{c'_i,i}^{nm})^T)(i, :)$ for $i = 1 : m$,

2. $\frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})}{\partial d_j} = (\mathcal{M}_2 \odot \mathcal{Q}_{d'_j,j}^{mn})(:, j)(e_j^n)^T$ for $j = 1 : l$,

where

$$c'_i := \left[\frac{1}{c_i - d_1}, \frac{1}{c_i - d_2}, \dots, \frac{1}{c_i - d_l}, 1, \frac{1}{c_i}, \frac{2}{c_i}, \dots, \frac{(n-l-1)}{c_i} \right]^T \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

$$\mathbf{d}'_j := \left[\frac{1}{c_1 - d_j}, \frac{1}{c_2 - d_j}, \dots, \frac{1}{c_m - d_j} \right]^T \in \mathbb{R}^m,$$

for $i = 1 : m$ and $j = 1 : l$.

Proof. By observing that, when $c_i \neq d_j$, where $i = 1 : m$ and $j = 1 : l$, partial derivatives corresponding to the parameters $\{c_i\}_{i=1}^m$ will be

$$\frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})}{\partial c_i} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \frac{-1}{(c_i - d_1)^2} & \cdots & \frac{-1}{(c_i - d_l)^2} & 0 & 1 & 2c_i & \cdots & (n - l - 1)c_i^{n-l-2} \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Now, on the right-hand side, taking Hadamard product with the matrix $(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{c}'_i, i}^{nm})^T$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})}{\partial c_i} &= \left(e_i^m [-M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})(i, 1 : l) \ 0 \ M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})(i, l + 2 : n)] \right) \odot (\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{c}'_i, i}^{nm})^T \\ &= \left(e_i^m \mathcal{M}_1(i, \cdot) \right) \odot (\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{c}'_i, i}^{nm})^T \\ &= e_i^m (\mathcal{M}_1 \odot (\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{c}'_i, i}^{nm})^T)(i, \cdot). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, proof of the first statement follows.

In a similar argument, one can prove the second part of the claim. \square

For the structured CNs, readily computable upper bounds are provided in the following theorem for $M^\dagger(\Psi_{\text{CV}})$ addressed in Definition 3.1.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose $M(\Psi_{\text{CV}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with $\text{rank}(M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})) = r$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})) &= \frac{1}{\|M^\dagger\|_{\max}} \left\| |M^\dagger| |\Theta_c| |(\mathcal{M}_1 \odot \mathcal{Q})M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} (\mathcal{M}_1 \odot \mathcal{Q})^T| |\Theta_c| \mathbf{E}_M \right. \\ &\quad + |\mathbf{F}_M (\mathcal{M}_1 \odot \mathcal{Q})^T| |\Theta_c| |M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger (\mathcal{M}_2 \odot \mathcal{M}_2)| |\Theta_{d'}| |M^\dagger| \\ &\quad \left. + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |\Theta_{d'}| |(\mathcal{M}_2 \odot \mathcal{M}_2)^T \mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M| |\Theta_{d'}| |(\mathcal{M}_2 \odot \mathcal{M}_2)^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| \right\|_{\max}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})) &= \left\| \frac{1}{M^\dagger} \left(|M^\dagger| |\Theta_c| |(\mathcal{M}_1 \odot \mathcal{Q})M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} (\mathcal{M}_1 \odot \mathcal{Q})^T| |\Theta_c| \mathbf{E}_M \right. \right. \\ &\quad + |\mathbf{F}_M (\mathcal{M}_1 \odot \mathcal{Q})^T| |\Theta_c| |M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger (\mathcal{M}_2 \odot \mathcal{M}_2)| |\Theta_{d'}| |M^\dagger| \\ &\quad \left. \left. + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |\Theta_{d'}| |(\mathcal{M}_2 \odot \mathcal{M}_2)^T \mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M| |\Theta_{d'}| |(\mathcal{M}_2 \odot \mathcal{M}_2)^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| \right) \right\|_{\max}, \end{aligned}$$

where $d' = [d_1, \dots, d_l, 0, \dots, 0]^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\mathcal{Q} = [\mathbf{c}'_1^T, \mathbf{c}'_2^T, \dots, \mathbf{c}'_m^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2$ as defined in (4.2) and (4.3), respectively.

Proof. To derive the desired expressions for $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{CV}}))$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{CV}}))$, first we find for each subset of parameters its contribution to the expressions given in Theorem 3.1 as follows. For the parameters $\{c_i\}_{i=1}^l$, using Lemma 4.1 we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_c &:= \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\left| M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})}{\partial c_i} M^\dagger \right| + \left| M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})}{\partial c_i} \right)^T \mathbf{E}_M \right| \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left| \mathbf{F}_M \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})}{\partial c_i} \right)^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger \right| \right) |c_i| \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\left| M^\dagger e_i^m ((\mathcal{Q}_{c'_i, i}^{nm})^T \odot \mathcal{M}_1)(i, :) M^\dagger \right| + \left| M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \left(e_i^m ((\mathcal{Q}_{c'_i, i}^{nm})^T \odot \mathcal{M}_1)(i, :) \right)^T \mathbf{E}_M \right| \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left| \mathbf{F}_M \left(e_i^m ((\mathcal{Q}_{c'_i, i}^{nm})^T \odot \mathcal{M}_1)(i, :) \right)^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger \right| \right) |c_i|. \tag{4.4}
\end{aligned}$$

Using (3.4), (4.4) equivalently expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_c &:= \sum_{i=1}^m \left(|M^\dagger(:, i)| |c_i| |((\mathcal{Q}_{c'_i, i}^{nm})^T \odot \mathcal{M}_1)(i, :) M^\dagger| \right. \\
&\quad + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} (\mathcal{Q}_{c'_i, i}^{nm})^T \odot \mathcal{M}_1)^T(i, :)| |c_i| |\mathbf{E}_M(i, :)| \\
&\quad \left. + |\mathbf{F}_M (\mathcal{Q}_{c'_i, i}^{nm})^T \odot \mathcal{M}_1)^T(i, :)| |c_i| |M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger(i, :)| \right) \\
&= |M^\dagger| |\Theta_c| |(\mathcal{M}_1 \odot \mathcal{Q}) M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} (\mathcal{M}_1 \odot \mathcal{Q})^T| |\Theta_c| |\mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M (\mathcal{M}_1 \odot \mathcal{Q})^T| |\Theta_c| |M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger|.
\end{aligned}$$

Analogously, for the parameters $\{d_i\}_{i=1}^l$, using Lemma 4.1, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_d &= \sum_{i=1}^l \left(\left| M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})}{\partial d_i} M^\dagger \right| + \left| M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})}{\partial d_i} \right)^T \mathbf{E}_M \right| \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left| \mathbf{F}_M \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})}{\partial d_i} \right)^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger \right| \right) |d_i| \\
&= |M^\dagger (\mathcal{M}_2 \odot \mathcal{M}_2)| |\Theta_d| |M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} (\mathcal{M}_2 \odot \mathcal{M}_2)^T| |\Theta_d| |(\mathcal{M}_2 \odot \mathcal{M}_2)^T \mathbf{E}_M| \\
&\quad + |\mathbf{F}_M| |\Theta_d| |(\mathcal{M}_2 \odot \mathcal{M}_2)^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger|.
\end{aligned}$$

By using Theorem 3.1 gives us

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})) = \frac{\|\mathcal{E}_d + \mathcal{E}_c\|_{\max}}{\|M^\dagger\|_{\max}}, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})) = \left\| \frac{\mathcal{E}_d + \mathcal{E}_c}{M^\dagger} \right\|_{\max}.$$

Hence, the proof is completed. \square

To deduce the explicit formulations for structured CNs of $M^\dagger(\Psi_{\text{CV}})$ by considering $M(\Psi)$ has full column rank, we now use Theorem 3.2, which is presented next.

Theorem 4.2. *Suppose $M(\Psi_{\text{CV}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ has full column rank. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})) &= \frac{1}{\|M^\dagger\|_{\max}} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \left| M^\dagger E_{ii}^{mm} (\mathcal{M}_1 \odot \mathcal{Q}) M^\dagger - (M^T M)^{-1} (E_{ii}^{mm} (\mathcal{M}_1 \odot \mathcal{Q}))^T \mathbf{E}_M \right| |c_i| \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{i=1}^l \left| M^\dagger (\mathcal{M}_2 \odot \mathcal{M}_2) E_{jj}^{nn} M^\dagger - (M^T M)^{-1} ((\mathcal{M}_2 \odot \mathcal{M}_2) E_{jj}^{nn})^T \mathbf{E}_M \right| |d_i| \right\|_{\max},
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})) &= \left\| \frac{1}{M^\dagger} \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \left| M^\dagger E_{ii}^{mm}(\mathcal{M}_1 \odot \mathcal{Q}) M^\dagger - (M^T M)^{-1} (E_{ii}^{mm}(\mathcal{M}_1 \odot \mathcal{Q}))^T \mathbf{E}_M \right| |c_i| \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \sum_{i=1}^l \left| M^\dagger(\mathcal{M}_2 \odot \mathcal{M}_2) E_{jj}^{nn} M^\dagger - (M^T M)^{-1} ((\mathcal{M}_2 \odot \mathcal{M}_2) E_{jj}^{nn})^T \mathbf{E}_M \right| |d_i| \right) \right\|_{\max}, \end{aligned}$$

where $E_{ij}^{mn} = e_i^m (e_j^n)^T$ and \mathcal{Q} is as defined in Theorem 4.1.

Proof. From the expression given in Theorem 3.2, we compute the expressions for each subset of parameters in an analogous method to the proof of Theorem 4.1. For the parameters $\{c_i\}_{i=1}^m$, using Lemma 4.1 we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}'_c &:= \sum_{i=1}^m \left| M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})}{\partial c_i} M^\dagger - (M^T M)^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})}{\partial c_i} \right)^T \mathbf{E}_M \right| |c_i| \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \left| M^\dagger \left(e_i^m(\mathcal{M}_1 \odot (\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{c}'_i, i}^{nm})^T)(i, :) \right) M^\dagger - (M^T M)^{-1} \left(e_i^m(\mathcal{M}_1 \odot (\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{c}'_i, i}^{nm})^T)(i, :) \right)^T \mathbf{E}_M \right| |c_i| \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \left| M^\dagger E_{ii}^{mm}(\mathcal{M}_1 \odot \mathcal{Q}) M^\dagger - (M^T M)^{-1} (E_{ii}^{mm}(\mathcal{M}_1 \odot \mathcal{Q}))^T \mathbf{E}_M \right| |c_i|. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for the parameters $\{d_i\}_{i=1}^l$, using Lemma 4.1, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}'_d &:= \sum_{i=1}^l \left| M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})}{\partial d_i} M^\dagger - (M^T M)^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})}{\partial d_i} \right)^T \mathbf{E}_M \right| |d_i| \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^l \left| M^\dagger(\mathcal{M}_2 \odot \mathcal{M}_2) E_{jj}^{nn} M^\dagger - (M^T M)^{-1} ((\mathcal{M}_2 \odot \mathcal{M}_2) E_{jj}^{nn})^T \mathbf{E}_M \right| |d_i|. \end{aligned}$$

From Theorem 3.2 we have

$$\mathcal{M}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})) = \frac{\|\mathcal{E}'_c + \mathcal{E}'_d\|_{\max}}{\|M^\dagger\|_{\max}}, \quad \mathcal{E}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})) = \left\| \frac{\mathcal{E}'_c + \mathcal{E}'_d}{M^\dagger} \right\|_{\max},$$

and hence our proof is completed. \square

In the above result, if we consider $l = 0$, i.e., M is a Vandermonde matrix, then in this case parameter set will be $\Psi_{\text{V}} := [c_1, \dots, c_m]^T \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Then we get the following

Corollary 4.1. *For any Vandermonde matrix $M(\Psi_{\text{V}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with full column rank, we get*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{V}})) &= \frac{1}{\|M^\dagger\|_{\max}} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \left| M^\dagger E_{ii}^{mm}(\mathcal{M}_1 \odot \mathcal{Q}) M^\dagger \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - (M^T M)^{-1} (E_{ii}^{mm}(\mathcal{M}_1 \odot \mathcal{Q}))^T \mathbf{E}_M \right| |c_i| \right\|_{\max}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathcal{E}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{V}})) = \left\| \frac{1}{M^\dagger} \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \left| M^\dagger E_{ii}^{mm}(\mathcal{M}_1 \odot \mathcal{Q}) M^\dagger - (M^T M)^{-1} (E_{ii}^{mm}(\mathcal{M}_1 \odot \mathcal{Q}))^T \mathbf{E}_M \right| |c_i| \right) \right\|_{\max},$$

where $\mathcal{Q} = [\mathbf{c}'_1{}^T, \mathbf{c}'_2{}^T, \dots, \mathbf{c}'_m{}^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $\mathbf{c}'_i = [1, \frac{1}{c_i}, \frac{2}{c_i}, \dots, \frac{(n-1)}{c_i}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

After some easy calculation, it is easy to see that the above results are the same as obtained in [6] for $M(\Psi_{\mathbb{V}})^T$. Similarly, we can recover the results for Cauchy matrices just by taking $l = n$ in Theorem 4.2.

Next, we consider the LS problem (3.12) corresponding to a rank deficient CV matrix. Using the expressions given in Theorem 3.3, we deduce upper bounds for structured CNs of \mathbf{x} , presented next.

Theorem 4.3. *Suppose $M(\Psi_{\text{CV}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with rank r and represented by the real parameters $\Psi_{\text{CV}} = [\{c_i\}_{i=1}^m, \{d_i\}_{i=1}^l]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{m+l}$, and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Set $\mathbf{r} := b - M(\Psi_{\text{CV}})x$. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{CV}}), b) &= \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty} \left\| |M^\dagger| |b| + |M^\dagger| |\Theta_c| |(\mathcal{M}_1 \odot \mathcal{Q})\mathbf{x}| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} (\mathcal{M}_1 \odot \mathcal{Q})^T| |\Theta_c| |\mathbf{r}| \right. \\ &\quad + |\mathbf{F}_M (\mathcal{M}_1 \odot \mathcal{Q})^T| |\Theta_c| |M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{x}| + |M^\dagger (\mathcal{M}_2 \odot \mathcal{M}_2)| |\Theta_{d'}| |x| \\ &\quad \left. + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |\Theta_{d'}| |(\mathcal{M}_2 \odot \mathcal{M}_2)^T \mathbf{r}| + |\mathbf{F}_M| |\Theta_{d'}| |(\mathcal{M}_2 \odot \mathcal{M}_2)^T M^{\dagger T} x| \right\|_\infty, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{CV}}), b) &= \left\| \Theta_{x^\dagger} \left(|M^\dagger| |b| + |M^\dagger| |\Theta_c| |(\mathcal{Q} \odot \mathcal{M}_1)\mathbf{x}| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} (\mathcal{Q} \odot \mathcal{M}_1)^T| |\Theta_c| |\mathbf{r}| \right. \right. \\ &\quad + |\mathbf{F}_M (\mathcal{Q} \odot \mathcal{M}_1)^T| |\Theta_c| |M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{x}| + |M^\dagger (\mathcal{M}_2 \odot \mathcal{M}_2)| |\Theta_{d'}| |\mathbf{x}| \\ &\quad \left. \left. + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |\Theta_{d'}| |(\mathcal{M}_2 \odot \mathcal{M}_2)^T \mathbf{r}| + |\mathbf{F}_M| |\Theta_{d'}| |(\mathcal{M}_2 \odot \mathcal{M}_2)^T M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{x}| \right) \right\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By evaluating in an analogous method to the proof of Theorem 4.1, for each subset of parameters using the expressions given in Theorem 3.3, the proof is followed. Hence, we omit the proof. \square

The structured CNs to the LS problem (3.12) corresponding to a full column rank CV matrix are stated next.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $M(\Psi_{\text{CV}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Set $\mathbf{r} := b - Mx$. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{CV}}), b) &= \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \left| M^\dagger E_{ii}^{mm} (\mathcal{M}_1 \odot \mathcal{Q})\mathbf{x} - (M^T M)^{-1} (E_{ii}^{mm} (\mathcal{M}_1 \odot \mathcal{Q}))^T \mathbf{r} \right| |c_i| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{i=1}^l \left| M^\dagger (\mathcal{M}_2 \odot \mathcal{M}_2) E_{jj}^{nn} \mathbf{x} - (M^T M)^{-1} ((\mathcal{M}_2 \odot \mathcal{M}_2) E_{jj}^{nn})^T \mathbf{r} + |M^\dagger| |b| \right| \right\|_\infty, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{CV}}), b) &= \left\| \Theta_{x^\dagger} \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \left| M^\dagger E_{ii}^{mm} (\mathcal{M}_1 \odot \mathcal{Q})\mathbf{x} - (M^T M)^{-1} (E_{ii}^{mm} (\mathcal{M}_1 \odot \mathcal{Q}))^T \mathbf{r} \right| |c_i| \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \sum_{i=1}^l \left| M^\dagger (\mathcal{M}_2 \odot \mathcal{M}_2) E_{jj}^{nn} \mathbf{x} - (M^T M)^{-1} ((\mathcal{M}_2 \odot \mathcal{M}_2) E_{jj}^{nn})^T \mathbf{r} + |M^\dagger| |b| \right| \right) \right\|_\infty, \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since the proof follows in an analogous method to the proof of Theorem 4.2, by finding the contribution of each parameter set in the expressions of Theorem 3.4. Hence, we omit the proof. \square

5 QS matrices

The outset of this section begins with a quick introduction to QS matrices, which is a specific type of low-rank structured matrices. Specifically, CNs are investigated for two important representations known as QS representation and GVR. Upper bounds for the CNs of the M-P inverse and the MNLS solution are obtained corresponding to QS representation in Section 5.1 and for the GVR in Section 5.2. The relationship between different CNs is also investigated in Section 5.3.

For the first time, QS matrices were investigated in [11]. Let M be in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. If every submatrix of M completely contained in the strictly lower triangular (resp. upper triangular) section is of rank at most n_L (resp. n_U) and there is at least one of these submatrices has rank equal to n_L (resp. n_U), then M is called a $\{n_L, n_U\}$ -QS matrix. Equivalently, we can write: $\max_i \text{rank}(M(i+1:n, 1:i)) = n_L$ and $\max_i \text{rank}(M(1:i, i+1:n)) = n_U$. For simplicity, we only take into account $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrices in this work.

5.1 CNs corresponding to QS representation

In [11], the QS representation was initially proposed for $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrices. In this subsection, we first recall this representation and then discuss the structured MCN and CCN.

Definition 5.1. [11] *A matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is said to be a $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrix if it can be parameterized by the following set of $7n - 8$ real parameters,*

$$\Psi_{\text{QS}} = \left[\{\mathbf{a}_i\}_{i=2}^n, \{\mathbf{e}_i\}_{i=2}^{n-1}, \{\mathbf{b}_i\}_{i=2}^{n-1}, \{\mathbf{d}_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{\mathbf{f}_i\}_{i=1}^{n-1}, \{\mathbf{g}_i\}_{i=2}^{n-1}, \{\mathbf{h}_i\}_{i=2}^n \right]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{7n-8}, \quad (5.1)$$

as follows,

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{d}_1 & \mathbf{f}_1 \mathbf{h}_2 & \mathbf{f}_1 \mathbf{g}_2 \mathbf{h}_3 & \cdots & \mathbf{f}_1 \mathbf{g}_2 \cdots \mathbf{g}_{n-1} \mathbf{h}_n \\ \mathbf{a}_2 \mathbf{b}_1 & \mathbf{d}_2 & \mathbf{f}_2 \mathbf{h}_3 & \cdots & \mathbf{f}_2 \mathbf{g}_3 \cdots \mathbf{g}_{n-1} \mathbf{h}_n \\ \mathbf{a}_3 \mathbf{e}_2 \mathbf{b}_1 & \mathbf{a}_3 \mathbf{b}_2 & \mathbf{d}_3 & \cdots & \mathbf{f}_3 \mathbf{g}_4 \cdots \mathbf{g}_{n-1} \mathbf{h}_n \\ \mathbf{a}_4 \mathbf{e}_3 \mathbf{e}_2 \mathbf{b}_1 & \mathbf{a}_4 \mathbf{e}_3 \mathbf{b}_2 & \mathbf{a}_4 \mathbf{b}_3 & \cdots & \mathbf{f}_4 \mathbf{g}_5 \cdots \mathbf{g}_{n-1} \mathbf{h}_n \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{a}_n \mathbf{e}_{n-1} \cdots \mathbf{e}_2 \mathbf{b}_1 & \mathbf{a}_n \mathbf{e}_{n-1} \cdots \mathbf{e}_3 \mathbf{b}_2 & \mathbf{a}_n \mathbf{e}_{n-1} \cdots \mathbf{e}_4 \mathbf{b}_3 & \cdots & \mathbf{d}_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

The set of real parameters Ψ_{QS} as in (5.1) is called *QS representation* of M . We use the notation $M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})$ to refer a $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrix parameterized by the set Ψ_{QS} . For the rest part, we set

$$M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}) := L_M + D_M + U_M, \quad (5.2)$$

where L_M and U_M denotes the strictly lower and upper triangular part of $M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})$, respectively, and D_M denotes the diagonal part of $M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})$.

In Lemma 5.1, we recall the derivative expressions of a $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrix $M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})$ for the parameters in Ψ_{QS} provided in Definition 5.1, which will be useful to obtain the desired upper bounds for CNs. These results are discussed in [9].

Lemma 5.1. [9] *Let $M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})$ be a $n \times n$ $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrix. Then $M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})$ has entries that are differentiable functions of Ψ_{QS} , and*

1. $\frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})}{\partial \mathbf{d}_i} = \mathbf{e}_i^n (\mathbf{e}_i^n)^T$, for $i = 1 : n$.

2. $\mathbf{a}_i \frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})}{\partial \mathbf{a}_i} = e_i^n \mathbf{L}_M(i, :)$, for $i = 2 : n$.
3. $\mathbf{e}_i \frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})}{\partial \mathbf{e}_i} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})(i+1 : n, 1 : i-1) & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} := \mathcal{F}_i$, for $i = 2 : n-1$.
4. $\mathbf{b}_i \frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})}{\partial \mathbf{b}_i} = \mathbf{L}_M(:, i)(e_i^n)^T$, for $i = 1 : n-1$.
5. $\mathbf{g}_i \frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})}{\partial \mathbf{g}_i} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})(1 : i-1, i+1 : n) \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} := \mathcal{G}_i$, for $i = 2 : n-1$.
6. $\mathbf{f}_i \frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})}{\partial \mathbf{f}_i} = e_i^n \mathbf{U}_M(i, :)$, for $i = 1 : n-1$.
7. $\mathbf{h}_i \frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})}{\partial \mathbf{h}_i} = \mathbf{U}_M(i, :)(e_i^n)^T$, for $i = 2 : n$.

Next, we use the derivative expressions given in Lemma 5.1 and Theorem 3.1 to compute the bounds of the structured CNs for $M^\dagger(\Psi_{\text{QS}})$.

Theorem 5.1. For $M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with $\text{rank}(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})) = r$, we have

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})) = \frac{\|\mathcal{W}(M)\|_{\max}}{\|M^\dagger\|_{\max}}, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{C}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})) = \left\| \frac{\mathcal{W}(M)}{M^\dagger} \right\|_{\max},$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}(M) := & |M^\dagger| |\mathbf{D}_M| |M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |\mathbf{D}_M| |\mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M| |\mathbf{D}_M| |M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger| |\mathbf{L}_M M^\dagger| \\ & + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{L}_M^T| |\mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M \mathbf{L}_M^T| |M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger \mathbf{L}_M| |M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |\mathbf{L}_M^T \mathbf{E}_M| \\ & + |\mathbf{F}_M| |\mathbf{L}_M^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger| |\mathbf{U}_M M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{U}_M^T| |\mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M \mathbf{U}_M^T| |M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| \\ & + |M^\dagger \mathbf{U}_M| |M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |\mathbf{U}_M^T \mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M| |\mathbf{U}_M^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| \\ & + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} \left(|M^\dagger \mathcal{F}_i M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \mathcal{F}_i^T \mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M \mathcal{F}_i^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| \right) \\ & + \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} \left(|M^\dagger \mathcal{G}_j M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \mathcal{G}_j^T \mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M \mathcal{G}_j^T M M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| \right), \end{aligned}$$

and $\mathcal{F}_i, \mathcal{G}_i$ defined as in Lemma 5.1.

Proof. The proof of the claim is followed by finding for each subset of parameters its contribution in the expressions given in Theorem 3.1. Using 1. of Lemma 5.1 for the parameters $\{\mathbf{d}_i\}_{i=1}^n$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{\mathbf{d}} := & \sum_{i=1}^n \left(|M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})}{\partial \mathbf{d}_i} M^\dagger| |\mathbf{d}_i| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})}{\partial \mathbf{d}_i} \right)^T \mathbf{E}_M| |\mathbf{d}_i| \right. \\ & \left. + |\mathbf{F}_M \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})}{\partial \mathbf{d}_i} \right)^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| |\mathbf{d}_i| \right) \\ = & \sum_{i=1}^n \left(|M^\dagger e_i^n (e_i^n)^T M^\dagger| |\mathbf{d}_i| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} e_i^n (e_i^n)^T \mathbf{E}_M| |\mathbf{d}_i| + |\mathbf{F}_M e_i^n (e_i^n)^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| |\mathbf{d}_i| \right). \quad (5.3) \end{aligned}$$

Using (3.4) in (5.3), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{d}} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left(|M^\dagger(\cdot, i)| |\mathbf{d}_i| |M^\dagger(i, \cdot)| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}(\cdot, i)| |\mathbf{d}_i| |\mathbf{E}_M(i, \cdot)| + |\mathbf{F}_M(\cdot, i)| |\mathbf{d}_i| |M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger(i, \cdot)| \right) \\ &= |M^\dagger| |\mathbf{D}_M| |M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |\mathbf{D}_M| |\mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M| |\mathbf{D}_M| |M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger|.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for $\{\mathbf{a}_i\}_{i=2}^n$ and using 2. of Lemma 5.1, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{a}} &:= \sum_{i=2}^n \left(|M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})}{\partial \mathbf{a}_i} M^\dagger| |\mathbf{a}_i| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})}{\partial \mathbf{a}_i} \right)^T \mathbf{E}_M| |\mathbf{a}_i| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |\mathbf{F}_M \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})}{\partial \mathbf{a}_i} \right)^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| |\mathbf{a}_i| \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=2}^n \left(|M^\dagger e_i^n L_M(i, \cdot) M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} L_M^T(\cdot, i) (e_i^n)^T \mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M L_M^T(\cdot, i) (e_i^n)^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| \right) \\ &= |M^\dagger| |L_M M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} L_M^T| |\mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M L_M^T| |M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger|.\end{aligned}$$

For the parameters $\{\mathbf{b}_i\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ and using 4. of Lemma 5.1, we deduce that:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{b}} &:= \sum_{i=2}^n \left(|M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})}{\partial \mathbf{b}_i} M^\dagger| |\mathbf{b}_i| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})}{\partial \mathbf{b}_i} \right)^T \mathbf{E}_M| |\mathbf{b}_i| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |\mathbf{F}_M \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})}{\partial \mathbf{b}_i} \right)^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| |\mathbf{b}_i| \right) \\ &= |M^\dagger L_M| |M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} L_M^T| |\mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M| |L_M^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger|.\end{aligned}$$

For the parameters $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}_{i=2}^{n-1}$, using 3. of Lemma 5.1, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{e}} &:= \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} \left(|M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})}{\partial \mathbf{e}_i} M^\dagger| |\mathbf{e}_i| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})}{\partial \mathbf{e}_i} \right)^T \mathbf{E}_M| |\mathbf{e}_i| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |\mathbf{F}_M \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})}{\partial \mathbf{e}_i} \right)^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| |\mathbf{e}_i| \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} \left(|M^\dagger \mathcal{F}_i M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \mathcal{F}_i^T \mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M \mathcal{F}_i^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| \right).\end{aligned}$$

In a similar way, for the parameters $\{\mathbf{f}_i\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$, $\{\mathbf{g}_i\}_{i=2}^{n-1}$ and $\{\mathbf{h}_i\}_{i=2}^{n-1}$, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{f}} &:= \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left(|M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})}{\partial \mathbf{f}_i} M^\dagger| |\mathbf{f}_i| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})}{\partial \mathbf{f}_i} \right)^T \mathbf{E}_M| |\mathbf{f}_i| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |\mathbf{F}_M \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})}{\partial \mathbf{f}_i} \right)^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| |\mathbf{f}_i| \right) \\ &= |M^\dagger| |U_M M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} U_M^T| |\mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M U_M^T| |M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger|.\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_h &:= \sum_{i=2}^n \left(|M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})}{\partial \mathbf{h}_i} M^\dagger| |\mathbf{h}_i| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})}{\partial \mathbf{h}_i} \right)^T \mathbf{E}_M| |\mathbf{h}_i| \right. \\
&\quad \left. + |\mathbf{F}_M \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})}{\partial \mathbf{h}_i} \right)^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| |\mathbf{h}_i| \right) \\
&= |M^\dagger \mathbf{U}_M| |M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger| |M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{U}_M^T \mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M| |U_M^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger|. \\
\mathcal{E}_g &:= \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} \left(|M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})}{\partial \mathbf{g}_i} M^\dagger| |\mathbf{g}_i| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})}{\partial \mathbf{g}_i} \right)^T \mathbf{E}_M| |\mathbf{g}_i| \right. \\
&\quad \left. + |\mathbf{F}_M \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})}{\partial \mathbf{g}_i} \right)^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| |\mathbf{g}_i| \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} \left(|M^\dagger \mathcal{G}_i M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \mathcal{G}_i^T \mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M \mathcal{G}_i^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Now, it is straightforward from Theorem 3.1 that

$$\mathcal{W}(M) = \mathcal{E}_d + \mathcal{E}_a + \mathcal{E}_b + \mathcal{E}_e + \mathcal{E}_f + \mathcal{E}_g + \mathcal{E}_h,$$

and hence the proof is completed. \square

When $M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})$ is a $n \times n$ nonsingular $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrix, we have $\mathbf{E}_M = \mathbf{0}$. Then, using the expressions in Theorem 3.2, and an analogous way to Theorem 5.1, exact formulae of the structured CNs can be deduced for the inverse matrix of $M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})$, which are given in following.

Proposition 5.1. *Let $M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be nonsingular. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}^{-1}(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})) &= \frac{1}{\|M^{-1}\|_{\max}} \left\| |M^{-1}| |\mathbf{D}_M| |M^{-1}| + |M M^{-1}| |\mathbf{L}_M M^{-1}| + |M^{-1} \mathbf{L}_M| |M^{-1}| \right. \\
&\quad \left. + |M^{-1}| |\mathbf{U}_M M^{-1}| + |M^{-1} \mathbf{U}_M| |M^{-1}| + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} |M^{-1} \mathcal{F}_i M^{-1}| + \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} |M^{-1} \mathcal{G}_j M^{-1}| \right\|_{\max},
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{C}^{-1}(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})) &= \left\| \frac{1}{M^\dagger} \left(|M^{-1}| |\mathbf{D}_M| |M^{-1}| + |M^{-1}| |\mathbf{L}_M M^{-1}| + |M^{-1} \mathbf{L}_M| |M^{-1}| \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + |M^{-1}| |\mathbf{U}_M M^{-1}| + |M^{-1} \mathbf{U}_M| |M^{-1}| + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} |M^{-1} \mathcal{F}_i M^{-1}| + \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} |M^{-1} \mathcal{G}_j M^{-1}| \right) \right\|_{\max}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since $M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})$ is nonsingular, we have $\mathbf{E}_M = \mathbf{0}$, and from Theorem 3.2, we get

$$\mathcal{M}^{-1}(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})) = \frac{\left\| \sum_{k=1}^p \left| M^{-1} \frac{\partial M}{\partial \psi_k} M^{-1} \right| |\psi_k| \right\|_{\max}}{\|M^{-1}\|_{\max}}. \quad (5.4)$$

We can deduce the desired expressions, in an analogous method to the proof of Theorem 5.1. Expressions for the componentwise condition number can be obtained similarly. \square

For any QS matrix $M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})$, we can have infinitely many QS representations [10]. The next result shows that $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}))$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}))$ does not depend on the choice of the representations.

Proposition 5.2. *For any two representations Ψ_{QS} and Ψ'_{QS} of a $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, we get*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})) = \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi'_{\text{QS}})), \quad \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})) = \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M(\Psi'_{\text{QS}})).$$

Proof. Observe that the formulae given in the Theorem 5.1 only depend on the entries of M , M^\dagger , \mathbf{E}_M and \mathbf{F}_M , but not on the parameter set, hence the proof follows. \square

In the next theorem, for the MNLS solution of the LS problem (3.12) corresponding to $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrices, we provide upper bounds of its structured CNs.

Theorem 5.2. *Let $M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be such that $\text{rank}(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})) = r$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Set $\mathbf{r} := b - M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})\mathbf{x}$. Then*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}), b) = \frac{\|\mathcal{W}(M, b) + |M^\dagger| |b|\|_\infty}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty}, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}), b) = \left\| \frac{\mathcal{W}(M, b) + |M^\dagger| |b|}{\mathbf{x}} \right\|_\infty,$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}(M, b) := & |M^\dagger| |\mathbf{D}_M| |\mathbf{x}| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |\mathbf{D}_M| |\mathbf{r}| + |\mathbf{F}_M| |\mathbf{D}_M| |M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{x}| + |M^\dagger| |\mathbf{L}_M \mathbf{x}| \\ & + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{L}_M^T| |\mathbf{r}| + |\mathbf{F}_M \mathbf{L}_M^T| |M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{x}| + |M^\dagger \mathbf{L}_M| |\mathbf{x}| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |\mathbf{L}_M^T \mathbf{r}| \\ & + |\mathbf{F}_M| |\mathbf{L}_M^T| |M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{x}| + |M^\dagger| |\mathbf{U}_M \mathbf{x}| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{U}_M^T| |\mathbf{r}| + |\mathbf{F}_M \mathbf{U}_M^T| |M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{x}| \\ & + |M^\dagger \mathbf{U}_M| |\mathbf{x}| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |\mathbf{U}_M^T \mathbf{r}| + |\mathbf{F}_M| |\mathbf{U}_M^T| |M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{x}| \\ & + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} \left(|M^\dagger \mathcal{F}_i \mathbf{x}| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \mathcal{F}_i^T \mathbf{r}| + |\mathbf{F}_M \mathcal{F}_i^T| |M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{x}| \right) \\ & + \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} \left(|M^\dagger \mathcal{G}_j \mathbf{x}| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \mathcal{G}_j^T \mathbf{r}| + |\mathbf{F}_M \mathcal{G}_j^T| |M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{x}| \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The statement can be easily verified using a similar justification to that of the proof of the Theorem 5.1 and using the Theorem 3.3. Hence we omit the proof. \square

Remark 5.1. *By considering the $M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})$ nonsingular, for $A(\Psi_{\text{QS}})\mathbf{x} = b$, in an analogous method to Proposition 5.1, we can obtain following expression for mixed condition number of \mathbf{x}*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}^{-1}(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}), b) = & \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty} \left\| |M^{-1}| |\mathbf{D}_M| |\mathbf{x}| + |M^{-1}| |\mathbf{L}_M \mathbf{x}| + |M^{-1} \mathbf{L}_M| |\mathbf{x}| + |M^{-1}| |\mathbf{U}_M \mathbf{x}| \right. \\ & \left. + |M^{-1} \mathbf{U}_M| |\mathbf{x}| + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} |M^{-1} \mathcal{F}_i \mathbf{x}| + \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} |M^{-1} \mathcal{G}_j \mathbf{x}| \right\|_{\max}. \end{aligned}$$

This result is the same as obtained by Dopico and Pomés [10].

5.2 CNs corresponding to GVR

The GVR, proposed initially in [29], is another essential representation for $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrices. This representation is used to enhance the stability of fast algorithms. In this subsection, we first review the GVR together with its minor variant called *GVR through tangent*. Then discuss the results for structured CNs corresponding to this representation.

Definition 5.2. Any $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is said to be a $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrix if it can be represented by the parameter set

$$\Psi_{\text{QS}}^{\mathcal{GV}} = \left[\{p_i, q_i\}_{i=2}^{n-1}, \{u_i\}_{i=1}^{n-1}, \{\mathbf{d}_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{v_i\}_{i=1}^{n-1}, \{r_i, s_i\}_{i=2}^{n-1} \right]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{7n-10}, \quad (5.5)$$

satisfying the following properties,

1. $\{p_i, q_i\}$ is a cosine-sine pair with $p_i^2 + q_i^2 = 1$, for every $i \in \{2 : n-1\}$,
2. $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$, $\{\mathbf{d}_i\}_{i=1}^n$, and $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ are independent parameters,
3. $\{r_i, s_i\}$ is a cosine-sine pair with $r_i^2 + s_i^2 = 1$, for every $i \in \{2 : n-1\}$,

as follows:

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{d}_1 & v_1 r_2 & v_1 s_2 r_3 & \cdots & v_1 s_2 \cdots s_{n-2} r_{n-1} & v_1 s_2 \cdots s_{n-1} \\ p_2 u_1 & \mathbf{d}_2 & v_2 r_3 & \cdots & v_2 s_3 \cdots s_{n-2} r_{n-1} & v_2 s_3 \cdots s_{n-1} \\ p_3 q_2 u_1 & p_3 u_2 & \mathbf{d}_3 & \cdots & v_3 s_4 \cdots s_{n-2} r_{n-1} & v_3 s_4 \cdots s_{n-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ p_{n-1} q_{n-2} \cdots q_2 u_1 & p_{n-1} q_{n-2} \cdots q_3 u_2 & p_{n-1} q_{n-2} \cdots q_4 u_3 & \cdots & \mathbf{d}_{n-1} & v_{n-1} \\ q_{n-1} \cdots q_2 u_1 & q_{n-1} \cdots q_3 u_2 & q_{n-1} \cdots q_4 u_3 & \cdots & u_{n-1} & \mathbf{d}_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note that the $\Psi_{\text{QS}}^{\mathcal{GV}}$ is a special case of Ψ_{QS} by considering $\{\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{e}_i\} = \{p_i, q_i\}$, $\{\mathbf{b}_i\} = \{u_i\}$, $\{\mathbf{d}_i\} = \{\mathbf{d}_i\}$, $\{\mathbf{f}_i\} = \{v_i\}$, $\{\mathbf{g}_i, \mathbf{h}_i\} = \{s_i, r_i\}$, and $\mathbf{a}_n = \mathbf{h}_n = 1$ with additional conditions on the parameters. Since the parameters p_i and q_i are dependent, when we give arbitrary perturbation to $\Psi_{\text{QS}}^{\mathcal{GV}}$, it will destroy the cosine-sine pairs and the same is true for r_i and s_i . Thus, it will be more sensible to restrict to a perturbation that preserves the cosine-sine pair. For these reasons, Dopico and Pomés in [10] introduced a new representation called *GVR through tangent* using their tangents.

Definition 5.3. For the GVR $\Psi_{\text{QS}}^{\mathcal{GV}}$ as in (5.5), the GVR through tangent is defined as

$$\Psi_{\mathcal{GV}} = [\{t_i\}_{i=2}^{n-1}, \{u_i\}_{i=1}^{n-1}, \{\mathbf{d}_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{v_i\}_{i=1}^{n-1}, \{w_i\}_{i=2}^{n-1}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{5n-6}, \quad (5.6)$$

where $p_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+t_i^2}}$, $q_i = \frac{t_i}{\sqrt{1+t_i^2}}$ and $r_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+w_i^2}}$, $s_i = \frac{w_i}{\sqrt{1+w_i^2}}$, for $i = 2, \dots, n-1$.

We employ the notation $M(\Psi_{\mathcal{GV}})$ to refer a $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrix parameterized by the set $\Psi_{\mathcal{GV}}$. The derivative expressions corresponding to the parameters in the representation $\Psi_{\mathcal{GV}}$ are revisited in the the next lemma:

Lemma 5.2. [9] Let $M(\Psi_{\mathcal{GV}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ having $\text{rank}(M(\Psi_{\mathcal{GV}})) = r$. Then each entry of $M(\Psi_{\mathcal{GV}})$ is differentiable functions of the elements in $\Psi_{\mathcal{GV}}$, and

$$1. \quad t_i \frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\mathcal{GV}})}{\partial t_i} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ -q_i^2 M(\Psi_{\mathcal{GV}})(i, 1 : i-1) & \mathbf{0} \\ p_i^2 M(\Psi_{\mathcal{GV}})(i+1 : n, 1 : i-1) & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} := \mathcal{K}_i, \text{ for } i = 2 : n-1.$$

$$2. w_i \frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{V}})}{\partial w_i} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & -s_i^2 M(\Psi_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{V}})(1:i-1, i) & r_i^2 M(\Psi_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{V}})(1:i-1, i+1:n) \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}$$

$:= \mathcal{L}_i, \text{ for } i = 2 : n - 1.$

Note: Partial derivative expressions corresponding to the parameters $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^{n-1}, \{\mathbf{d}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ are same as the expression for the parameters $\{\mathbf{b}_i\}_{i=1}^{n-1}, \{\mathbf{d}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{\mathbf{f}_i\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$, respectively, given in the Lemma 5.1.

In Theorem 5.3, we discuss compact upper bounds for the structured CNs introduced in Definition 3.1 corresponding to the representation $\Psi_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{V}}$.

Theorem 5.3. *Let $M(\Psi_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{V}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with $\text{rank}(M(\Psi_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{V}})) = r$, then*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{V}})) = \frac{\|\mathcal{Z}(M)\|_{\max}}{\|M^\dagger\|_{\max}}, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{C}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{V}})) = \left\| \frac{\mathcal{Z}(M)}{M^\dagger} \right\|_{\max},$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}(M) := & |M^\dagger| |\mathbf{D}_M| |M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |\mathbf{D}_M| |\mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M| |\mathbf{D}_M| |M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger \mathbf{L}_M| |M^\dagger| \\ & + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |\mathbf{L}_M^T \mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M| |\mathbf{L}_M^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger| |\mathbf{U}_M M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{U}_M^T| |\mathbf{E}_M| \\ & + |\mathbf{F}_M \mathbf{U}_M^T| |M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} \left(|M^\dagger \mathcal{K}_i M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \mathcal{K}_i^T \mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M \mathcal{K}_i^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| \right) \\ & + \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} \left(|M^\dagger \mathcal{L}_j M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \mathcal{L}_j^T \mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M \mathcal{L}_j^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| \right), \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{K}_i and \mathcal{L}_i are defined as in Lemma 5.2.

Proof. To proof of the claim, we need to find for each subset of parameters in $\Psi_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{V}}$, its contribution in the given expression of the Theorem 3.1. Since the derivative expressions for the parameters $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^{n-1}, \{\mathbf{d}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ are same as the expressions for the parameters $\{\mathbf{b}_i\}_{i=1}^{n-1}, \{\mathbf{d}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{\mathbf{f}_i\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$, respectively, given in the Lemma 5.1, contribution for these parameters in the expressions given in Theorem 3.1 are same as $\mathcal{E}_b, \mathcal{E}_d$ and \mathcal{E}_f , respectively. Therefore, we set $\mathcal{E}_u := \mathcal{E}_b$ and $\mathcal{E}_v := \mathcal{E}_f$.

For the parameters $\{t_i\}_{i=2}^{n-1}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_t := & \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} \left(|M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{V}})}{\partial t_i} M^\dagger| |t_i| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{V}})}{\partial t_i} \right)^T \mathbf{E}_M| |t_i| \right. \\ & \left. + |\mathbf{F} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{V}})}{\partial t_i} \right)^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| |t_i| \right) \\ = & \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} \left(|M^\dagger \mathcal{K}_i M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \mathcal{K}_i^T \mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M \mathcal{K}_i^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| \right). \end{aligned}$$

For the parameters $\{t_i\}_{i=2}^{n-1}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_w &:= \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} \left(|M^\dagger \frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{V}})}{\partial w_i} M^\dagger| |w_i| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{V}})}{\partial w_i} \right)^T \mathbf{E}_M| |w_i| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |\mathbf{F} \left(\frac{\partial M(\Psi_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{V}})}{\partial w_i} \right)^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| |w_i| \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} \left(|M^\dagger \mathcal{L}_i M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \mathcal{L}_i^T \mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M \mathcal{L}_i^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| \right).\end{aligned}$$

Now, it is straightforward from Theorem 3.1 that

$$\mathcal{Z}(M) = \mathcal{E}_d + \mathcal{E}_u + \mathcal{E}_v + \mathcal{E}_t + \mathcal{E}_w,$$

and hence the proof follows. \square

In the next theorem, we give bounds of the structured CNs for the representation $\Psi_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{V}}$ for \mathbf{x} .

Theorem 5.4. *Let $M(\Psi_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{V}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with $\text{rank}(M(\Psi_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{V}})) = r$. Set $\mathbf{r} := b - M(\Psi_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{V}})\mathbf{x}$, then*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{V}}), b) = \frac{\|\mathcal{Z}(M, b) + |M^\dagger| |b|\|_\infty}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty}, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{C}}(M(\Psi_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{V}}), b) = \left\| \frac{\mathcal{Z}(M, b) + |M^\dagger| |b|}{\mathbf{x}} \right\|_\infty,$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Z}(M, b) &:= |M^\dagger| |\mathbf{D}_M| |\mathbf{x}| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |\mathbf{D}_M| |\mathbf{r}| + |\mathbf{F}_M| |\mathbf{D}_M| |M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{x}| + |M^\dagger \mathbf{L}_M| |\mathbf{x}| \\ &\quad + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |\mathbf{L}_M^T \mathbf{r}| + |\mathbf{F}_M| |\mathbf{L}_M^T M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{x}| + |M^\dagger| |\mathbf{U}_M \mathbf{x}| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |\mathbf{U}_M^T \mathbf{r}| \\ &\quad + |\mathbf{F}_M \mathbf{U}_M^T| |M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{x}| + \sum_{i=2}^n \left(|M^\dagger \mathcal{K}_i \mathbf{x}| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \mathcal{K}_i^T \mathbf{r}| + |\mathbf{F}_M \mathcal{K}_i^T M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{x}| \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=2}^n \left(|M^\dagger \mathcal{L}_i \mathbf{x}| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \mathcal{L}_i^T \mathbf{r}| + |\mathbf{F}_M \mathcal{L}_i^T M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{x}| \right),\end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{K}_i and \mathcal{L}_i are defined as in Lemma 5.2.

Proof. The proof is followed by the proof technique of Theorem 5.3. Hence we omit it. \square

5.3 Comparisons between different CNs for $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrices

We compare structured and unstructured CNs for the M-P inverse in Proposition 5.3 and the MNLS solution in Proposition 5.4 for $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrix. For unstructured CNs, we use the expressions given in Corollary 3.1 and Corollary 3.4. Relationships between the CNs for representations Ψ_{QS} and $\Psi_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{V}}$ are also investigated in Propositions 5.5 and 5.6.

The next result describes that structured CNs for the parameter set Ψ_{QS} is smaller than unstructured one for the M-P inverse up to a factor of n .

Proposition 5.3. *Let $M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be such that $\text{rank}(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})) = r$, then we get the following relations*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})) \leq n \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M) \text{ and } \tilde{\mathcal{C}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})) \leq n \tilde{\mathcal{C}}^\dagger(M).$$

Proof. Using the properties of absolute values and Theorem 5.1, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}(M) &\leq |M^\dagger| |\mathbf{D}_M| |M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |\mathbf{D}_M| |\mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M| |\mathbf{D}_M| |M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| \\
&\quad + 2|M^\dagger| |\mathbf{L}_M| |M^\dagger| + 2|M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |\mathbf{L}_M^T| |\mathbf{E}_M| + 2|\mathbf{F}_M| |\mathbf{L}_M^T| |M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| \\
&\quad + 2|M^\dagger| |\mathbf{U}_M| |M^\dagger| + 2|M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |\mathbf{U}_M^T| |\mathbf{E}_M| + 2|\mathbf{F}_M| |\mathbf{U}_M^T| |M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} \left(|M^\dagger| |\mathcal{F}_i| |M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |\mathcal{F}_i^T| |\mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M| |\mathcal{F}_i^T| |M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} \left(|M^\dagger| |\mathcal{G}_i| |M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |\mathcal{G}_i^T| |\mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M| |\mathcal{G}_i^T| |M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Using $|\mathcal{F}_i| \leq |\mathbf{L}_M|$ and $|\mathcal{G}_i| \leq |\mathbf{U}_M|$, we get

$$\mathcal{W}(M) \leq n \left(|M^\dagger| |M| |M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |M^T| |\mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M| |M^T| |M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| \right).$$

Therefore, the desired relations can be obtained from Theorem 5.1 and Corollary 3.1. \square

A similar kind of result also holds for the LS problem, which is given next. We remove the proof since it is analogous to Proposition 5.3.

Proposition 5.4. *Let $M(\Psi_{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{S}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be as in Proposition 5.3 and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Then we get the following relations*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{S}}), b) \leq n \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M, b), \quad \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{S}}), b) \leq n \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M, b).$$

Next theorem discusse about the relationship between the $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{S}}))$ with $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{V}}))$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{S}}))$ with $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{V}}))$.

Proposition 5.5. *For the representations $\Psi_{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{S}}$ and $\Psi_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{V}}$ of a $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with $\text{rank}(M) = r$, following holds:*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{V}})) \leq \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{S}})), \quad \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{V}})) \leq \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{S}})).$$

Proof. The proof will be followed by observing that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{K}_i &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ -q_i^2 M(i, 1 : i-1) & \mathbf{0} \\ p_i^2 M(i+1 : n, 1 : i-1) & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} = -q_i^2 \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ M(i, 1 : i-1) & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} + p_i^2 \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ M(i+1 : n, 1 : i-1) & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \\
&= -q_i^2 e_i^m \mathbf{L}_M(i, :) + p_i^2 \mathcal{F}_i.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, using the properties $|p_i|^2 \leq 1$ and $|q_i|^2 \leq 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=2}^{n-1} \left(|M^\dagger \mathcal{K}_i M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \mathcal{K}_i^T \mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M \mathcal{K}_i^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| \right) &\leq |M^\dagger| |\mathbf{L}_M M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{L}_M^T| |\mathbf{E}_M| \\
&\quad + |\mathbf{F}_M \mathbf{L}_M^T| |M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} \left(|M^\dagger \mathcal{F}_i M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \mathcal{F}_i^T \mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M \mathcal{F}_i^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can write

$$\mathcal{L}_i = -s_i^2 \mathbf{U}_M(:, i)(e_i^n)^T + r_i^2 \mathcal{G}_i.$$

Therefore, using $|s_i|^2 \leq 1$ and $|r_i|^2 \leq 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} \left(|M^\dagger \mathcal{L}_i M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \mathcal{L}_i^T \mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M \mathcal{L}_i^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| \right) &\leq |M^\dagger \mathbf{U}_M| |M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |U_M^T \mathbf{E}_M| \\ &+ |\mathbf{F}_M| |U_M^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} \left(|M^\dagger \mathcal{G}_i M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \mathcal{G}_i^T \mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M \mathcal{G}_i^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we get the desired relations from the above two inequalities, expressions in the Theorems 5.1 and 5.3. \square

Proposition 5.6 provides the relationship between CNs for LS problem (3.12) for any $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrix corresponding to the parameter sets Ψ_{QS} and $\Psi_{\mathcal{GV}}$.

Proposition 5.6. *For the representations Ψ_{QS} and $\Psi_{\mathcal{GV}}$ of a $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ having rank r and $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$, following holds:*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\mathcal{GV}}), b) \leq \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}), b), \quad \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\mathcal{GV}}), b) \leq \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}), b).$$

5.4 The effective CNs

The expressions in Theorems 5.1 and 5.2 can be computationally very expensive for large matrices due to the involvement of two sums. The effective condition number for $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrices was initially considered by Dopico and Pomés in [9, 10] for eigenvalue problem and linear system to reduce the computation complexity. In a similar fashion to avoid such problems, we propose in Definition 5.4, structured effective CNs $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}))$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}))$, which has similar contribution as $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}))$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}))$, respectively.

Definition 5.4. *Let $M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ having $\text{rank}(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})) = r$. Then for $M^\dagger(\Psi_{\text{QS}})$, we define structured mixed and componentwise effective CNs as*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})) := \frac{\|\mathcal{W}_f(M)\|_{\max}}{\|M^\dagger\|_{\max}}, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})) := \left\| \frac{\mathcal{W}_f(M)}{M^\dagger} \right\|_{\max},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_f(M) &:= |M^\dagger| |\mathbf{D}_M| |M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |\mathbf{D}_M| |\mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M| |\mathbf{D}_M| |M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger| |\mathbf{L}_M M^\dagger| \\ &+ |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{L}_M^T| |\mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M \mathbf{L}_M^T| |M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger \mathbf{L}_M| |M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |\mathbf{L}_M^T \mathbf{E}_M| \\ &+ |\mathbf{F}_M| |\mathbf{L}_M^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger| |\mathbf{U}_M M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{U}_M^T| |\mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M \mathbf{U}_M^T| |M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| \\ &+ |M^\dagger \mathbf{U}_M| |M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{U}_M^T| |\mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M| |\mathbf{U}_M^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger|. \end{aligned}$$

The following theorem demonstrates that the contribution of the sum terms in the expression of $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}))$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}))$ are negligible and reliably estimated up to a multiple n .

Theorem 5.5. *Under the same hypothesis as in Definition 5.4, following relations holds*

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})) &\leq \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})) \leq (n-1) \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})), \\ \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})) &\leq \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})) \leq (n-1) \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. The inequalities on the left side are trivial. For inequalities on the right side, we set

$$\begin{aligned}\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})(i+1:n, 1:i-1) & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ L_M(i+1:n, 1:i-1) & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ L_M(i+1:n, :) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & -L_M(i+1:n, i:n) \end{bmatrix}.\end{aligned}$$

By using the above, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\left(|M^\dagger \mathcal{F}_i M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \mathcal{F}_i^T \mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M \mathcal{F}_i^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger|\right) &\leq |M^\dagger| |L_M M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} L_M^T| |\mathbf{E}_M| \\ &\quad + |\mathbf{F}_M L_M^T| |M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger L_M| |M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |L_M^T \mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M| |L_M^T| |M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger|.\end{aligned}$$

Again,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & M(1:i-1, i+1:n) \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & U_M(:, i+1:n) \\ \mathbf{0} & -U_M(i:n, i+1:n) \end{bmatrix}.$$

By using the above, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\left(|M^\dagger \mathcal{G}_i M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \mathcal{G}_i^T \mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M \mathcal{G}_i^T M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger|\right) &\leq |M^\dagger| |U_M M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} U_M^T| |\mathbf{E}_M| \\ &\quad + |\mathbf{F}_M U_M^T| |M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger U_M| |M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |U_M^T \mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M| |U_M^T| |M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger|.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the desired result is straightforward from Definition 5.4. \square

Next, we compare the relation among effective CNs to the unstructured CNs given in Corollary 3.1.

Proposition 5.7. *Under the same hypothesis as in Definition 5.4, following relations holds*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})) \leq 2 \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M), \quad \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})) \leq 2 \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M).$$

Proof. By using properties of absolute values and expression of $\mathcal{W}_f(M)$ given the Definition 5.4, we have

$$\mathcal{W}_f(M) \leq 2 \left(|M^\dagger| |M| |M^\dagger| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |M^T| |\mathbf{E}_M| + |\mathbf{F}_M| |M^T| |M^{\dagger T} M^\dagger| \right).$$

Hence the desired results attained from Definition 5.4. \square

Next, similarly to the Definition 5.4, we define effective CNs for the MNLS solution.

Definition 5.5. *Let $M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ having $\text{rank}(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}})) = r$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Then, for the MNLS solution, we define structured mixed and componentwise effective CNs as follows:*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}), b) := \frac{\|\mathcal{W}_f(M, b)\|_\infty}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty}, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}), b) := \left\| \frac{\mathcal{W}_f(M, b)}{\mathbf{x}} \right\|_\infty,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}_f(M, b) := & |M^\dagger| |\mathbf{D}_M| |\mathbf{x}| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |\mathbf{D}_M| |\mathbf{r}| + |\mathbf{F}_M| |\mathbf{D}_M| |M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{x}| + |M^\dagger| |\mathbf{L}_M \mathbf{x}| \\
& + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{L}_M^T| |\mathbf{r}| + |\mathbf{F}_M \mathbf{L}_M^T| |M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{x}| + |M^\dagger \mathbf{L}_M| |\mathbf{x}| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |\mathbf{L}_M^T \mathbf{r}| \\
& + |\mathbf{F}_M| |\mathbf{L}_M^T M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{x}| + |M^\dagger| |\mathbf{U}_M \mathbf{x}| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{U}_M^T| |\mathbf{r}| + |\mathbf{F}_M \mathbf{U}_M^T| |M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{x}| \\
& + |M^\dagger \mathbf{U}_M| |\mathbf{x}| + |M^\dagger M^{\dagger T}| |\mathbf{U}_M^T \mathbf{r}| + |\mathbf{F}_M| |\mathbf{U}_M^T M^{\dagger T} \mathbf{x}|.
\end{aligned}$$

Similar results also hold for the MNLS solution as discussed in Theorem 5.5, which are given next.

Theorem 5.6. *Under the same hypothesis as in Definition 5.5, following relations holds*

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}), b) &\leq \tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}), b) \leq (n-1) \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}), b), \\
\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}), b) &\leq \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}), b) \leq (n-1) \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}), b).
\end{aligned}$$

6 Numerical experiments

We reported a few numerical experiments in this section to illustrate the theoretical findings covered in Sections 4 and 5, respectively. For all numerical computations, we have used MATLAB R2022b, with unit roundoff error 10^{-16} . Also, for structured and unstructured CNs, we give a comparison between their upper bounds. For unstructured CNs, we use the upper bounds for the M-P inverse and the MNLS solution given in Corollary 3.1 and 3.4, respectively. These examples reveal that structured CNs are significantly less than unstructured cases.

Example 1. Let $\Psi_{\text{CV}} = [c = \{1, 1, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{-1}{30}, \frac{1}{40}\}, d = \{12, -0.75 \times 10^7, 25 \times 10^3\}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^8$ be the parameter set of a 5×6 CV matrix M . For the M-P inverse, we compute the bounds for the structured MCN and CCN using Theorem 4.1. For the MNLS solution, we generate a random vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^5$ in MATLAB. The computed results for structured and unstructured CNs, comparison between their upper bounds are listed in Table 1. From Table 1, we observed that the bounds for the structured CNs are of order one whereas for unstructured case they are significantly large.

Table 1: Comparison between upper bounds of structured and unstructured CNs for $M^\dagger(\Psi_{\text{CV}})$ and $M^\dagger(\Psi_{\text{CV}}, b)$

$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M)$	$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{CV}}))$	$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M)$	$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{CV}}))$	$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M, b)$	$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{CV}}, b))$	$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M, b)$	$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{CV}}, b))$
1.9309e+4	8.4149	2.6103e+6	63.7873	3.9137e+4	12.3655	2.1903e+6	12.3655

Example 2. We consider a random QS matrix M . For that, we first fixed $n = 5$ and use command *randn* to generate the vectors:

$$\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}, \mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}, \mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}, \mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \text{ and } \mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}.$$

Using these vectors, we generate the $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrix. In Table 2, we see that the bounds for structured CNs corresponding to Ψ_{QS} and structured effective CNs are substantially smaller than the unstructured ones. This validates the results of Proposition 5.3, Theorem 5.5 and Proposition 5.7. Next, for the MNLS solution, we generate a random vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ by the

Table 2: Comparison between upper bounds of unstructured, structured and effective CNs for the M-P inverse of $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrices.

$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M)$	$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}))$	$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}))$	$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}^\dagger(M)$	$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}))$	$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}))$
817.7856	3	2	5.3877e+11	2.4189e+5	1.5682e+5

Table 3: Comparison between upper bounds of unstructured, structured and effective CNs for the MNLS solution for $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrices.

$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M, b)$	$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}), b)$	$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}), b)$	$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}^\dagger(M, b)$	$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}), b)$	$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}), b)$
1.7838e+3	4.0024	3.0016	2.3669e+3	8.8136	6.5184

command *randn*. Table 3 illustrates that the results obtained for the computed bounds for structured CNs, effective CNs are much smaller than the bounds for unstructured ones and consistent with Proposition 5.4 and Theorem 5.6.

Example 3. We consider several QS matrices of different orders. In fact, we choose $n = 5$, $n = 7$ and $n = 10$. We generate the random vectors $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}$, and \mathbf{h} by the command *randn* in MATLAB as the Example 2. After generating these vectors, we give following scaling

$$\mathbf{a} = a * 10^k, \quad \mathbf{e} = e * 10^k, \quad \mathbf{h} = h * 10^k,$$

where $k \in \{-1, -2, 0, 1, 2, 3\}$ to get unbalanced lower and upper right corner.

In Table 4, we compare $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}))$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}))$ with $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}^\dagger(M)$, respectively, for the M-P inverse with different values of n . For the MNLS solution, we take the

Table 4: Comparison between the upper bounds of unstructured, structured and effective CNs for the M-P inverse and the MNLS solution of $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrices.

n	$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M)$	$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}))$	$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}^\dagger(M)$	$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}))$	$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M, b)$	$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}), b)$	$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}^\dagger(M, b)$	$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}), b)$
5	1.4330e+4	2	2.1690e+12	910	9.333e+4	3.0030	1.1910e+5	4.5451
7	5.9139e+3	3.0246	9.2340e+8	74.2974	6.5311e+4	4.6655	2.0255e+ 4	6.7386
10	7.3293e+4	2.0101	1.5858e+10	94.0499	6.3988e+4	1.0127	2.5381e+5	11.1271

same M as above and generate a random vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for each choice of n . The computed bounds for the CNs is listed in Table 4.

Example 4. In this example, we compare structured mixed and componentwise CNs with respect to QS representation and GVR through tangent, structured effective CNs with their unstructured ones for M-P inverse and MNLS solution. For these, we generate the random vectors $t \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}, u \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}, v \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}, w \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ in MATLAB by the comand *randn* for the parameter set $\Psi_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{V}}$. We set $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and rescale the vector v as $v(1) = 0$ and $v(n-1) = 10^2$. Then, we compute the QS matrix M as in Definition 5.2. For different values of n , we generate 100 rank deficient QS matrices. We use formulae provided in Theorem 5.3 to compute upper bounds $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{V}}))$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\mathcal{G}\mathcal{V}}))$. Again, we use the formulae for $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}))$ and

Table 5: Comparison between upper bounds of unstructured, structured and effective CNs for M-P inverse of $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrices.

mean	n	$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M)$	$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{GV}}))$	$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}))$	$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}))$	$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M)$	$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{GV}}))$	$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}))$	$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}))$
	30	1.0667e+2	7.4873e+1	1.2388e+2	8.9215e+1	2.3780e+5	1.2730e+4	2.2102e+4	1.5815e+4
	40	1.1429e+2	7.4757e+1	1.2356e+2	8.9427e+1	6.1267e+8	1.4452e+5	2.3753e+5	1.7285e+5
	50	1.6711e+2	1.0323e+2	1.7182e+2	1.2296e+2	6.9215e+6	1.6133e+5	3.2430e+5	2.1980e+5
	60	3.2135e+2	1.8140e+2	2.9452e+2	2.1359e+2	2.7856e+7	3.0500e+5	5.2242e+5	3.9791e+5

Table 6: Comparison between upper bounds of unstructured, structured and effective CNs for the MNLS solution for $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrices.

mean	n	$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M, b)$	$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{GV}}, b))$	$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}, b))$	$\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}, b))$	$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M, b)$	$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{GV}}, b))$	$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}, b))$	$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}, b))$
	30	1.1278e+2	7.8851e+1	2.6113e+2	9.4414e+1	4.6667e+3	1.7445e+3	2.2102e+4	2.1646e+3
	40	1.1990e+2	7.7823e+1	2.4226e+2	9.3005e+1	7.3841e+3	4.1774e+3	2.3753e+5	5.2069e+3
	50	1.6512e+2	1.0080e+2	3.2184e+2	1.2072e+2	9.2143e+3	4.2351e+3	3.2430e+5	5.3584e+3
	60	3.3149e+2	1.8715e+2	7.6179e+2	2.2120e+2	7.0839e+4	5.9482e+4	5.2242e+5	7.2054e+4

$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_f^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}))$ presented in Definition 5.4, and for $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}))$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger(M(\Psi_{\text{QS}}))$ presented in Theorem 5.1. For the upper bounds of unstructured CNs, we consider the formulae given in Corollary 3.1.

We computed the above values for 100 randomly generated QS matrices for $n = 30, 40, 50$ and 60. In Table 5, their average values of each upper bounds of the CNs for M-P inverse of these QS matrices are listed.

Next, we generate a random vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$, for each value of n , and upper bounds for the structured CNs with respect to QS representation and GVR through tangent, effective CNs and unstructured CNs for the MNLS solution are listed in Table 6.

The computed results of Tables 5 and 6 shows the consistency of Propositions 5.3–5.7 and Theorems 5.5 and 5.6. We can observed that the upper bounds of CNs for GVR through tangent gives the more reliable bounds compares to the other CNs.

7 Conclusion

For the M-P inverse and the MNLS solution, we investigated structured MCN and CCN corresponding to a class of matrices, with each entry as a differentiable function of some real parameters. This framework has been used to derive upper bounds of structured CNs to CV and $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrices. QS representation and the GVR through tangent are considered for $\{1, 1\}$ -QS matrices to investigate its CNs. It is proved that upper bounds for CNs for GVR through tangent are always smaller than the QS representation. Numerical examples demonstrate that the proposed effective CN is significantly smaller in most cases. Our methodology can be applied to investigate CNs involving other rank-structured matrices. It would be interesting to generalize our findings to the weighted M-P inverse and weighted LS problems, as well as linear LS problems having multiple right-hand sides. Following that, research progress on the aforementioned topics will be reported elsewhere.

Acknowledgments

We gratefully acknowledge the financial assistance (File no. 09/1022(0098)/2020-EMR-I) provided as a fellowship to Pinki Khatun by the Council of Scientific & Industrial Research (CSIR), New Delhi, India.

Declarations

Conflict of interest The authors declare no competing interests.

References

- [1] A. Ben-Israel. On error bounds for generalized inverses. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 3: 585–592, 1966. ISSN 0036-1429.
- [2] P. Bürgisser and F. Cucker. *Condition: The Geometry of Numerical Algorithms*, volume 349. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [3] J. M. Carnicer and J. M. Peña. Shape preserving representations and optimality of the Bernstein basis. *Adv. Comput. Math.*, 1(2):173–196, 1993. ISSN 1019-7168.
- [4] S. Chandrasekaran, P. Dewilde, M. Gu, T. Pals, and A.-J. van der Veen. Fast stable solver for sequentially semi-separable linear systems of equations. In *International Conference on High-Performance Computing*, pages 545–554, Springer, 2002.
- [5] D. Colton and R. Kress. *Inverse acoustic and electromagnetic scattering theory*, volume 93 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 1998. ISBN 3-540-62838-X.
- [6] F. Cucker and H. Diao. Mixed and componentwise condition numbers for rectangular structured matrices. *Calcolo*, 44(2):89–115, 2007. ISSN 0008-0624.
- [7] F. Cucker, H. Diao, and Y. Wei. On mixed and componentwise condition numbers for Moore-Penrose inverse and linear least squares problems. *Math. Comp.*, 76(258):947–963, 2007. ISSN 0025-5718.
- [8] H.-A. Diao and Q.-L. Meng. Structured generalized eigenvalue condition numbers for parameterized quasiseparable matrices. *BIT*, 59(3):695–720, 2019. ISSN 0006-3835.
- [9] F. M. Dopico and K. Pomés. Structured eigenvalue condition numbers for parameterized quasiseparable matrices. *Numer. Math.*, 134(3):473–512, 2016. ISSN 0029-599X.
- [10] F. M. Dopico and K. Pomés. Structured condition numbers for linear systems with parameterized quasiseparable coefficient matrices. *Numer. Algorithms*, 73(4):1131–1158, 2016. ISSN 1017-1398.
- [11] Y. Eidelman and I. Gohberg. On a new class of structured matrices. *Integral Equations Operator Theory*, 34(3):293–324, 1999. ISSN 0378-620X.
- [12] I. Gohberg and I. Koltracht. Mixed, componentwise, and structured condition numbers. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 14(3):688–704, 1993. ISSN 0895-4798.

- [13] R. A. Gonzales, J. Eisert, I. Koltracht, M. Neumann, and G. Rawitscher. Integral equation method for the continuous spectrum radial Schrödinger equation. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 134(1):134–149, 1997. ISSN 0021-9991.
- [14] L. Greengard and V. Rokhlin. On the numerical solution of two-point boundary value problems. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 44(4):419–452, 1991. ISSN 0010-3640.
- [15] B. Heiligers. Totally positive regression: E -optimal designs. *Metrika*, 54(3):191–213 (2002), 2001. ISSN 0026-1335.
- [16] N. J. Higham. *Accuracy and Stability of Numerical Algorithms*. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, second edition, 2002. ISBN 0-89871-521-0.
- [17] R. Huang. Accurate solutions of weighted least squares problems associated with rank-structured matrices. *Appl. Numer. Math.*, 146:416–435, 2019. ISSN 0168-9274.
- [18] L. A. Imhof and W. J. Studden. E -optimal designs for rational models. *Ann. Statist.*, 29(3):763–783, 2001. ISSN 0090-5364.
- [19] J.-Y. Lee and L. Greengard. A fast adaptive numerical method for stiff two-point boundary value problems. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 18(2):403–429, 1997. ISSN 1064-8275.
- [20] Z. Li, Q. Xu, and Y. Wei. A note on stable perturbations of Moore-Penrose inverses. *Numer. Linear Algebra Appl.*, 20(1):18–26, 2013. ISSN 1070-5325.
- [21] Q. Meng, H. Diao, and Q. Yu. Structured condition number for multiple right-hand side linear systems with parameterized quasiseparable coefficient matrix. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 368:112527, 20, 2020. ISSN 0377-0427.
- [22] G. Mühlbach. Interpolation by Cauchy-Vandermonde systems and applications. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 122(1-2):203–222, 2000. ISSN 0377-0427. Numerical analysis 2000, Vol. II: Interpolation and extrapolation.
- [23] A. Ribalta. State space realizations of rational interpolants with prescribed poles. *Systems Control Lett.*, 43(5):379–386, 2001. ISSN 0167-6911.
- [24] J. R. Rice. A theory of condition. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 3:287–310, 1966. ISSN 0036-1429.
- [25] J. Rohn. New condition numbers for matrices and linear systems. *Computing*, 41(1-2):167–169, 1989. ISSN 0010-485X.
- [26] R. D. Skeel. Scaling for numerical stability in Gaussian elimination. *J. Assoc. Comput. Mach.*, 26(3):494–526, 1979. ISSN 0004-5411.
- [27] H. P. Starr Jr. *On the numerical solution of one-dimensional integral and differential equations*. Ph.D. Thesis, Yale University, 1992.
- [28] G. W. Stewart and J. G. Sun. *Matrix Perturbation Theory*. Computer Science and Scientific Computing. Academic Press, Inc., Boston, MA, 1990. ISBN 0-12-670230-6.

- [29] R. Vandebril, M. Van Barel, and N. Mastronardi. A note on the representation and definition of semiseparable matrices. *Numer. Linear Algebra Appl.*, 12(8):839–858, 2005. ISSN 1070-5325.
- [30] R. Vandebril, M. Van Barel, and N. Mastronardi. *Matrix Computations and Semiseparable Matrices. Vol. 1.* Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD, 2008. ISBN 978-0-8018-8714-7; 0-8018-8714-3. Linear systems.
- [31] R. Vandebril, M. Van Barel, and N. Mastronardi. *Matrix Computations and Semiseparable Matrices. Vol. II.* Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD, 2008. ISBN 978-0-8018-9052-9; 0-8018-9052-7. Eigenvalue and singular value methods.
- [32] G. Wang, Y. Wei, and S. Qiao. *Generalized Inverses: Theory and Computations*, volume 53 of *Developments in Mathematics*. Springer, Singapore; Science Press Beijing, Beijing, second edition, 2018. ISBN 978-981-13-0145-2; 978-981-13-0146-9.
- [33] Y. Wei and D. Wang. Condition numbers and perturbation of the weighted Moore-Penrose inverse and weighted linear least squares problem. *Appl. Math. Comput.*, 145(1):45–58, 2003. ISSN 0096-3003.
- [34] Y. Wei, W. Xu, S. Qiao, and H. Diao. Componentwise condition numbers for generalized matrix inversion and linear least squares. *Numer. Math. J. Chinese Univ. (English Ser.)*, 14(3):277–286, 2005. ISSN 1004-8979.
- [35] Y. Wei, H. Diao, and S. Qiao. Condition number for weighted linear least squares problem. *J. Comput. Math.*, 25(5):561–572, 2007. ISSN 0254-9409.
- [36] J. A. C. Weideman and D. P. Laurie. Quadrature rules based on partial fraction expansions. *Numer. Algorithms*, 24(1-2):159–178, 2000. ISSN 1017-1398. Computational methods from rational approximation theory (Wilrijk, 1999).
- [37] H. Xiang and Y. Wei. Structured mixed and componentwise condition numbers of some structured matrices. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 202(2):217–229, 2007. ISSN 0377-0427.
- [38] W. Xu, Y. Wei, and S. Qiao. Condition numbers for structured least squares problems. *BIT*, 46(1):203–225, 2006. ISSN 0006-3835.
- [39] Z. Yang. Accurate computations of eigenvalues of quasi-Cauchy-Vandermonde matrices. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 622:268–293, 2021. ISSN 0024-3795.