# Real Computation with Few Discrete Advice: A Complexity Theory of Nonuniform Computability

Martin Ziegler\*

University of Paderborn, GERMANY

Abstract. It is folklore particularly in numerical and computer sciences that, instead of solving some general problem  $f: A \to B$ , additional structural information about the input  $x \in A$  (that is any kind of promise that x belongs to a certain subset  $A' \subseteq A$ ) should be taken advantage of. Some examples from real number computation show that such discrete advice can even make the difference between computability and uncomputability. We turn this into a both topological and combinatorial complexity theory of information, investigating for several practical problems how much advice is necessary and sufficient to render them computable. Specifically, finding a nontrivial solution to a homogeneous equation  $A \cdot x = 0$  for a given singular real  $n \times n$ -matrix A is possible when knowing rank $(A) \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$ ; and we show this to be best possible.

1	Motivating Examples	1
	1.1 Complexity Measure of Non-Uniform Computability	3
	1.2 Related Work	4
<b>2</b>	Properties of the Complexity of Non-uniform Computability	5
	2.1 Witness of k-wise Discontinuity	5
	2.2 Further Remarks	8
3	Relations / Multivalued Functions	10
	3.1 Continuity for Multivalued Mappings	10
	3.2 Witness of <i>d</i> -wise Discontinuity	12
4	Applications	13
	4.1 Linear Equation Solving	13
Re	eferences	15

## **1** Motivating Examples

While Recursive Analysis is generally considered a very realistic model of real number computation, it often receives criticism for rendering uncomputable even the simplest discontinuous functions like, e.g., Heaviside's: An easy observation, sometimes called the *Main Theorem*, reveals that finite approximations to the argument x do not allow to determine the value f(x) any closer than the size of the gap  $\limsup_{t\to x} f(t) - \liminf_{t\to x} f(t)$  in case x is a point of discontinuity of f. In particular, any discrete-valued function on reals is uncomputable for information-theoretic (as opposed to recursion-theoretic) reasons. On the other hand, many discontinuous functions do become easily computable when providing, in addition to approximations to x, some discrete 'advice': in the case of Heaviside's function simply one

<sup>\*</sup> Supported by DFG grant Zi 1009/1-2.

bit indicating for instance whether x = 0 or  $x \neq 0$ . Some less trivial examples, many problems in analysis involving compact (and hence bounded) sets are discontinuous but become computable when providing some integer bound; compare e.g. [Weih00, SECTION 5.2].

For a more involved illustration from computational linear algebra, we report from [ZiBr04, SECTION 3.5] the following

**Example 1.** Given a real symmetric  $d \times d$  matrix A (in form of approximations  $A_n \in \mathbb{Q}^{d \times d}$  with  $|A - A_n| \leq 2^{-n}$ ), it is generally impossible, for lack of continuity and even in the multivalued sense, to compute (approximations to) some basis of eigenvectors of A.

However when providing, in addition to A itself, the number of distinct eigenvalues (i.e. not counting multiplicities) of A, finding a spectral resolution does become computable.

Another case study on the benefit of additional discrete advice to uniform computability is taken from [RoZi08, LEMMA 2.8]:

**Example 2.** A closed subset  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  is called  $\psi^d_{\geq}$ -computable if one can, given  $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , approximate the distance

$$d_A(\boldsymbol{x}) = \min\left\{\|\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{a}\|_2 : \boldsymbol{a} \in A\right\}$$
(1)

from below; more formally: upon input of a sequence  $\mathbf{q}_n \in \mathbb{Q}^d$  with  $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{q}_n\| \leq 2^{-n}$ , output a sequence  $p_m \in \mathbb{Q}$  with  $\sup_m p_m = d_A(\mathbf{x})$ ; compare [Weih00, SECTION 5.1]. similarly  $\psi_{\leq}^d$ computability of A means approximation of  $d_A$  from above.

- a) A finite set  $A = \{v_1, \ldots, v_N\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  is  $\psi_{<}^d$ -computable iff it is  $\psi_{>}^d$ -computable iff each element  $v_i$  is computable.
- b) Neither of the three non-uniform equivalences in a) holds uniformly.
- c) However if the cardinality of A is given as additional information,  $\psi_{<}^{d}$ -computability becomes uniformly equivalent to computability of A's members
- d) whereas  $\psi_{>}^{d}$ -computability still remains uniformly strictly weaker than the other two.



Fig. 1. The convex hull of some points in 2D. Infinitesimal perturbation can heavily affect the subset of extreme points without changing their number.

Our third example treats a standard problem from computational geometry:

**Example 3.** For a set  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , its convex hull is the least convex set containing S:

$$\operatorname{chull}(S) := \bigcap \left\{ C : S \subseteq C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d, C \text{ convex} \right\}$$

A polytope is the convex hull of finitely many points,  $chull(\{p_1, \ldots, p_N\})$ . For a convex set C, point  $p \in C$  is called extreme if it does not lie on the interior of some line segment contained in C:

$$oldsymbol{p} = \lambda \cdot oldsymbol{x} + (1 - \lambda) \cdot oldsymbol{y} \wedge oldsymbol{x}, oldsymbol{y} \in C \wedge 0 < \lambda < 1$$
 :  $oldsymbol{x} = oldsymbol{y}$  .

The problem

$$\mathbb{R}^{N \times d} \ni (\boldsymbol{x}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{x}_N) \mapsto \{ \boldsymbol{y} \text{ extreme point of } \operatorname{chull}(\boldsymbol{x}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{x}_N) \}$$

of identifying the extreme d points of the polytope spanned by given  $\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_N$  is discontinuous (and hence uncomputable) with respect to all,  $\psi_{<}^d$ ,  $\psi_{>}^d$ , and  $\psi_{<}^d$ , for  $d, N \geq 2$ .

It remains so for  $d \ge 2$  and  $N \ge 5$  even when providing in addition the number of extreme points of chull $(x_1, \ldots, x_N)$ , see Figure 1.

However when providing, in addition to approximations to  $(\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_N)$ , an indication of which input points which are going to be extreme (i.e. in binary an integer between 0 and  $2^N - 1$ ), the problem trivially becomes  $\psi_{\leq}^d$ -computable,  $\psi_{\geq}^d$ -computable, and  $\psi^d$ -computable.

### 1.1 Complexity Measure of Non-Uniform Computability

For reasons of general applicability to arbitrary spaces of continuum cardinality, we borrow from Weihrauch's TTE framework [Weih00, SECTION 3] the concept of so-called *representations*. A *notation* is basically a representation of a countable set.

- **Definition 4.** a) A function  $f :\subseteq A \to B$  between topological spaces A and B is k-wise continuous if there exists a partition (equivalently: a covering)  $\Delta$  of dom $(f) = \bigcup_{D \in \Delta} D$ with Card $(\Delta) = k$  such that  $f|_D$  is continuous for each  $D \in \Delta$ .
  - $Call^{\dagger} \mathfrak{C}_t(f) := \inf\{k : f \text{ is } k \text{-wise continuous}\}\ the \ cardinal \ of \ discontinuity \ of \ f.$
- b) A function  $f :\subseteq A \to B$  between represented spaces  $(A, \alpha)$  and  $(B, \beta)$  is  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -computable with k-wise advice if there exists an at most countable partition  $\Delta$  and a notation  $\delta$  of  $\Delta$ such that the mapping  $f_{\Delta} : (a, D) \mapsto f(a)$  is  $(\alpha, \delta, \beta)$ -computable on dom $(f_{\Delta}) := \{(a, D) :$  $a \in D \in \Delta\}.$

Call  $\mathfrak{C}_c(f) = \mathfrak{C}_c(f, \alpha, \beta) := \min\{k : f \text{ is } (\alpha, \beta) - computable with k-wise advise}\}$  the complexity of non-uniform  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -computability of f.

So continuous functions are exactly the 1-wise continuous ones; and computability is equivalent to computability with 1-wise advice. Also we have, as an extension of the Main Theorem of Recursive Analysis, the following immediate

**Observation 5.** If  $\alpha, \beta$  are admissible representations, then every k-wise  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -computable function is k-wise continuous (but not vice versa); that is  $\mathfrak{C}_t(f) \leq \mathfrak{C}_c(f)$  holds. More precisely, every k-wise  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -computable possibly multivalued function  $f :\subseteq A \Longrightarrow B$  has a k-wise continuous  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -realizer in the sense of [Weih00, DEFINITION 3.1.3.4].

The above Examples illustrate some interesting discontinuous functions to be computable with k-wise advice for some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Specifically Example 1, diagonalization of real symmetric  $n \times n$ -matrices is (n + 1)-wise computable; and Theorem 24 shows this value n + 1 to be optimal.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup> The Continuum Hypothesis might be needed to make this infimum always well-defined. In the following examples, however, it will be either finite or countable.

*Remark 6.* We advertise Computability with Finite Advice as a very promising generalization of classical Recursive Analysis:

- a) It captures the concept of a hybrid approach to discrete&continuous computation.
- b) It complements Type-2 oracle computation:
- In the discrete realm, *every* function  $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$  becomes computable when employing an appropriate oracle; whereas in the Type-2 case, exactly the *continuous* functions  $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$  are computable relative to some oracle [Zieg05, COROLLARY 6]. On the other hand, 2-wise advice can make a continuous function computable with without advice has unbounded degree of uncomputability; see Proposition 7d).
- c) Discrete advice avoids a major point of criticism against Recursive Analysis, namely that even simplest discontinuous functions are uncomputable [Koep01];
- d) and such kind of advice is very practical: In applications additional discrete information about the input is often actually available and should be used. For instance a given real matrix may be known to be non-degenerate (as is often exploited in numerics) or, slightly more general, to have k eigenvalues coincide for some known  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

# 1.2 Related Work

Several approaches have been pursued in literature to make also discontinuous functions accessible for computability investigations.

Exact Geometric Computation considers the arguments x as exact rational numbers [LPY05].

Special encodings of discontinuous functions motivated by spaces in Functional Analysis, are treated e.g. in [ZhWe03]; however these do not admit evaluation. The same applies to [ChHo99,WeZh00].

A taxonomy of discontinuous functions, namely their *degrees* of Borel measurability, is investigated in [Brat05,Zie07a,Zie07b]:

Specifically, a function  $f :\subseteq A \to B$  is continuous  $(=\Sigma_1$ -measurable) iff, for every closed  $T \subseteq B$ , its preimage  $f^{-1}[T]$  is closed in dom $(f) \subseteq A$ ; and f is computable iff this mapping  $T \mapsto f^{-1}[T]$  on closed sets is  $(\psi_{>}^d, \psi_{>}^d)$ -computable. A degree relaxation, f is called  $\Sigma_2$ -measurable iff, for every closed  $T \subseteq B$ ,  $f^{-1}[T]$  is an  $F_{\delta}$ -set.

*Wadge degrees* of discontinuity are an (immense) refinement of the above, namely with respect to so-called *Wadge reducibility*; cf. e.g. [Weih00, SECTION 8.2].

Levels of discontinuity are studied in [HeWe94,Hert96,Hert96]:

Take the set  $X_0 \subseteq \text{dom}(f)$  of points of discontinuity of f; then the set  $X_1 \subseteq X_0$  of points of discontinuity of  $f|_{X_0}$  and so on: the least index k for which  $X_k$  is empty is f's level of discontinuity.

Our approach superficially resembles the third and the last one above. A minor difference, they correspond to *ordinal* measures whereas the size of the partition considered in Definition 4 is a *cardinal*. As a major difference we now establish these measures as logically largely independent:

**Proposition 7.** a) There exists a 2-wise computable function  $f : [0,1] \rightarrow \{0,1\}$  which is not measurable nor on any level of discontinuity.

- b) There exists a  $\Delta_2$ -measurable function  $f: [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]$  with is not k-wise continuous for any finite k.
- c) If f is on the k-th level of discontinuity, it is (k+1)-wise continuous.

Real Computation with Few Discrete Advice: A Complexity Theory of Nonuniform Computability

- d) There exists a continuous, 2-wise computable function  $f :\subseteq [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]$  which is not computable, even relative to any prescribed oracle.
- Proof. a) Consider a non Borel-measurable subset  $S \subseteq [0, 1]$ ; e.g. exceeding the Borel hierarchy [Hinm78,Mosc80] by being complete for  $\Delta_1^1$ . (Using the Axiom of Choice, S can even be chosen as non Lebesgue-measurable.) Then the characteristic function f of S is not measurable and totally discontinuous, hence  $\mathbb{R} = X_0 = X_1 = \dots$  But  $(S, \mathbb{R} \setminus S)$  gives a 2-wise decomposition of dom(f) with  $f|_S \equiv 1$  and  $f|_{\mathbb{R}\setminus S} \equiv 0$ .
- b) See Example 12b) below.
- c) By definition, f is continuous on dom $(f) \setminus X_0$ , on  $X_0 \setminus X_1$ , and so on until  $X_{k-1}$  on which f is continuous because  $X_k = \emptyset$ . Therefore  $\Delta = (\text{dom}(f) \setminus X_0, X_0 \setminus X_1, \dots, X_{k-1})$  is a partition with the desired properties.
- d) Fix any uncomputable  $t \in [0, 1]$  and consider

$$f :\subseteq [0,1] \to [0,1], \qquad f(x) := 0 \text{ for } x < t, \quad f(x) := 1 \text{ for } x > t, \quad f(t) := \bot$$

which is obviously continuous (because the 'jump' x = t is not part of dom(f)) and 2-wise computable (namely on [0, t) and (t, 1]). Since t is uncomputable,  $t \notin \mathbb{Q}$ . So if f were computable, we could evaluate it at any  $x \in \mathbb{Q}$  to conclude whether x < t or x > t; and apply bisection to compute t itself: contradiction. In fact we may choose t uncomputable relative to any prescribed oracle [ZhWe01,Barm03].

Coming from an entirely different direction, Darboux Functions have been classified according to their k-wise continuity [MaPa02,Marc07].

### 2 Properties of the Complexity of Non-uniform Computability

- **Lemma 8.** a) Let  $f : A \to B$  be d-wise continuous (computable) and  $A' \subseteq A$ . Then the restriction  $f|_{A'}$  is again d-wise continuous (computable).
- b) Let  $f : A \to B$  be d-wise continuous (computable) and  $g : B \to C$  be k-wise continuous (computable). Then  $g \circ f : A \to C$  is  $d \cdot k$ -wise continuous (computable).
- *Proof.* a) Obviously, any partition  $\Delta$  of A induces one  $\Delta' := \{D \cap A' : D \in \Delta\}$  of A' of at most the same cardinality.
- b) If f is continuous (computable) on  $A_i \subseteq A$  and g is continuous (computable) on  $B_j \subseteq B$ , then  $g \circ f$  is continuous (computable) on  $A_i \cap f^{-1}[B_j]$ : f is on any subset of  $A_i$ ; and so is g on any subset of  $B_j$ , particularly on the image of  $A_i \cap f^{-1}[B_j] \subseteq B_j$  under f.  $\Box$

### 2.1 Witness of k-wise Discontinuity

Recall that the partition  $\Delta$  in Definition 4 need not satisfy any (e.g. topological regularity) conditions. The following notion turns out as useful in lower bounding the cardinality of such a partition:

**Definition 9.** a) A d-dimensional flag  $\mathcal{F}$  in a topological Hausdorff space X is a collection

$$x, (x_n)_n, (x_{n,m})_{n,m}, (x_{n,m,\ell})_{n,m,\ell}, \dots (x_{n_1,\dots,n_d})_{n_1,\dots,n_d}$$

#### $\mathbf{6}$ Martin Ziegler

of a point and of (multi-)sequences<sup>‡</sup> in X such that, for each (possibly empty) multi-index  $\bar{n} \in \mathbb{N}^k \ (0 \le k < d), \ it \ holds \ x_{\bar{n}} = \lim_{m \to \infty} x_{\bar{n},m}.$ 

- b)  $\mathcal{F}$  is uniform if furthermore, again for each  $\bar{n} \in \mathbb{N}^k$   $(0 \le k < d)$  and for each  $1 \le \ell \le d-k$ , it holds  $x_{\bar{n}} = \lim_{m \to \infty} x_{\bar{n}, \underbrace{m, \dots, m}}$
- ltimes c) For  $f :\subseteq X \to Y$  and  $x \in dom(f)$  a witness of discontinuity of f at x is a sequence  $x_n \in \text{dom}(f)$  such that  $\lim_{n \to \infty} f(x_n)$  exists but differs from f(x). d) For  $f :\subseteq X \to Y$ , a witness of d-wise discontinuity of f is a uniform d-dimensional flag
- $\mathcal{F}$  in dom(f) such that, for each  $k = 0, 1, \ldots, d-1$  and for each  $\bar{n} \in \mathbb{N}^k$  and for each  $1 \leq \ell \leq d-k, \ \left(x_{\bar{n}, \underline{m}, \dots, \underline{m}}\right)_m \ is \ a \ witness \ of \ discontinuity \ of \ f \ at \ x_{\bar{n}}.$

Observe that, since d is finite, we may always (although not effectively) proceed from a flag to a uniform one by iteratively taking appropriate subsequences. In fact, sub(multi)sequences of d-flags and of witnesses of discontinuity are again d-flags and witnesses of discontinuity.

Example 10 (Witness of discontinuity for the rank function). Consider the space  $\mathbb{R}^{N \times M}$  of rectangular matrices and let  $d := \min(N, M)$ . For  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, d\}$  write

$$E_{i} := \sum_{j=1}^{i} \left( (0, \cdots, 0, \underbrace{1}_{i-th}, 0, \cdots, \underbrace{0}_{n-th})^{\dagger} \otimes (0, \cdots, 0, \underbrace{1}_{i-th}, 0, \cdots, \underbrace{0}_{m-th}) \right) = \left( \begin{array}{cccccc} 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{array} \right) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M}$$

$$X := 0, \qquad X_{n_{1}, \dots, n_{i}} := E_{1}/n_{1} + E_{2}/n_{2} + \dots + E_{i}/n_{i}$$

has  $\lim_{m\to\infty} X_{n_1,\dots,n_i,m,\dots,m} = X_{n_1,\dots,n_i}$ , hence constitutes a uniform d-dimensional flag. More-over,  $\operatorname{rank}(E_i) = i = \operatorname{rank}(X_{n_1,\dots,n_i}) \neq i + \ell = \operatorname{rank}(X_{n_1,\dots,n_i,m,\dots,m})$  shows it to be a witness 

of d-wise discontinuity of rank :  $\mathbb{R}^{N \times M} \to \{0, 1, \dots, d\}.$ 

Observe that rank is trivially (d + 1)-wise continuous, namely continuous on each  $D_i =$  $\operatorname{rank}^{-1}(i), i = 0, 1, \ldots, d$ . In fact d + 1 is best possible as we have, justifying the notion introduced in Definition 9c), the following

**Lemma 11.** Let X, Y be Hausdorff,  $f: X \to Y$  a function, and suppose there exists a witness of d-wise discontinuity of f. Then  $\mathfrak{C}_t(f) > d$ .

**Example 12.** Fix some bijection  $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ ,  $(x, y) \mapsto \langle x, y \rangle$ : e.g.  $\langle x, y \rangle := 2^x \cdot (1 + 2y)$ .

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>‡</sup> The generally more appropriate concept is that of a *Moore-Smith* sequence or *net*. However, being interested in second countable spaces, we may and shall restrict to ordinary sequences. Similarly, the Hausdorff condition is invoked for mere convenience.



Fig. 2. Schematic illustration of the topology of the subspaces of rank-k matrices, k = 0, 1, 2, 3.

- a) For n
   ∈ N\*, let ⟨n⟩ := ∑<sub>i</sub> 2<sup>-⟨i,n<sub>i</sub>⟩</sup>; and map the empty tuple to 0. This mapping ⟨·⟩: N\* → [0,1] is injective, and surjective onto dyadic rationals. For each k ∈ N, the range ⟨N<sup>k</sup>⟩ belongs to Δ<sub>2</sub>; ⟨N<sup>≤k</sup>⟩ is even closed a subset of [0,1].
- b) Consider  $f : [0,1] \to [0,1]$  well-defined by f(x) := 1/k for  $x = \langle \bar{n} \rangle$  with  $\bar{n} \in \mathbb{N}^k$ ; f(x) := 0 for non-dyadic x. Then f is  $\Delta_2$ -measurable but not d-wise continuous for any  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Proof (Example 12).

a) Since the sum  $\sum_{i \leq k}$  is finite for  $\bar{n} \in \mathbb{N}^k$ , its value indeed amounts to a dyadic rational. Conversely each dyadic rational  $x \in [0,1]$  has a unique finite (!) binary expansion  $x = \sum_{j \in J} 2^{-J}$ ; and to each k-element  $J \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  belongs exactly one k-tuple  $(n_1, \ldots, n_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k$  with  $J = \{\langle i, n_i \rangle : 1 \leq i \leq k\}$ .

 $\langle \mathbb{N}^k \rangle$  is a countable set and therefore in  $\Delta_2$ . The set of all dyadic rationals in [0, 1] that admit a binary expansion containing the digit 1 at most k times, is closed and coincides with  $\langle \mathbb{N}^{\leq k} \rangle$ .

b) Well-definition of f follows from a). Moreover,  $f^{-1}(k) = \langle \mathbb{N}^k \rangle$  is in  $\Delta_2$ . Since range $(f) = \{1/k : k \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{0\}$ , the preimage  $f^{-1}[V]$  of any open set  $V \not\supseteq 0$  is a union of finitely many  $f^{-1}(k)$  and therefore in  $\Delta_2$ , too; Whereas the preimage of open  $V \supseteq 0$  misses finitely many  $f^{-1}(k)$  and thus also belongs to  $\Delta_2$ . Let x := 0,  $x_n := 2^{-\langle 1,n \rangle}$ ,  $x_{n,m} := 2^{-\langle 1,n \rangle} + 2^{-\langle 2,m \rangle}$ ,  $\ldots$ ,  $x_{n_1,\ldots,n_d} := \sum_{i=1}^d 2^{-\langle i,n_i \rangle}$ . This

many  $f^{-1}(k)$  and thus also belongs to  $\Delta_2$ . Let x := 0,  $x_n := 2^{-\langle 1,n \rangle}$ ,  $x_{n,m} := 2^{-\langle 1,n \rangle} + 2^{-\langle 2,m \rangle}$ , ...,  $x_{n_1,\ldots,n_d} := \sum_{i=1}^d 2^{-\langle i,n_i \rangle}$ . This constitutes a uniform *d*-dimensional flag. And  $f(x_{n_1,\ldots,n_k}) = k \neq k + \ell = f(x_{n_1,\ldots,n_k}, \underbrace{m,\ldots,m}_{\ell \text{times}})$  shows it to be a witness of *d*-wise discontinuity of *f*.

Proof (Lemma 11). Suppose dom $(f) = \biguplus_{i=1}^{d} D_i$  is a partition such that  $f|_{D_i}$  is continuous; w.l.o.g.  $x \in D_1$ .

Now consider the sequence  $(x_n)$  in the flag:  $x_n \in \bigcup_{i=1}^d D_i$  implies by pigeonhole that some  $D_i$  contains infinitely many  $x_n$ ; and  $f(\lim_n x_n) = f(x) \neq \lim_{n \to \infty} f(x_n)$  requires  $i \neq 1$  in order for  $f|_{D_i}$  to be continuous. W.l.o.g. i = 2.

We proceed to the double sequence  $(x_{n,m})$  in the flag: For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , some  $D_{i(n)} \ni x_{n,m}$  for infinitely many m; and  $f(\lim_m x_{n,m}) = f(x_n) \neq \lim_m f(x_{n,m})$  requires  $i(n) \neq 2$  for  $f|_{D_{i(n)}}$  to be continuous. Moreover some i = i(n) for infinitely many n; hence  $f(\lim_m f(x_{m,m}) = f(x) \neq \lim_m f(x_{m,m})$  also requires  $i \neq 1$ . W.l.o.g. i = 3. And so on until  $i \neq 1, 2, 3, \ldots, d$ : contradiction.

### 2.2 Further Remarks

For some time the author had felt that when dom(f) is sufficiently 'nice' and for  $x \in dom(f)$ , the cardinal of discontinuity of f could be lower bounded in terms of the number of distinct limits of f at x, that is the cardinality of

$$\operatorname{Lim}(f, x) := \left\{ \lim_{n \to \infty} f(x_n) : \operatorname{dom}(f) \ni x_n \to x \right\} .$$

However the following example (cf. also the right part of Figure 3) shows that this is not the case:

 $f: [-1,1] \to [0,1], \qquad 2^{-n} \cdot 3^{-m} \mapsto 3^{-m} \quad (n,m \in \mathbb{N}), \qquad f(x) :\equiv 0 \text{ otherwise }.$ 

Here Lim(f, 0) is infinite but f is continuous on  $D_1 := \{2^{-n} \cdot 3^{-m} : n, m \in \mathbb{N}\}$  (because the latter set contains no accumulation point) and  $f \equiv 0$  on  $D_2 := [-1, 1] \setminus D_1$ ; hence  $\mathfrak{C}_t(f) = 2$ .



**Fig. 3.** Left: the cardinal of discontinuity cannot be lower bounded by the number of limit points. Right: A 2-wise continuous function which, after identifying arguments x = 0 and x = 1, exhibits mere 3-wise continuity.

Remark 13. Recalling Observation 5, k-wise  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -continuity of  $f :\subseteq A \to B$  implies the existence of a k-wise continuous  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -realizer  $F :\subseteq \Sigma^{\omega} \to \Sigma^{\omega}$  in the sense of [Weih00, DEFINITION 3.1.3]; where k-wise  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -continuity is defined by the existence of a partition  $\Delta$  of dom(f) of Card $(\Delta) = k$  such that  $f|_D$  is  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -continuous on each  $D \in \Delta$ .

However conversely and as opposed to the classical case k = 1, the existence of a 2-wise continuous  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -realizer F in generally does not imply 2-wise  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -continuity. Basically the reason is that a partition of dom(f) yields a partition of dom(F); whereas a partition  $\Delta$  of dom(F) need not be compatible with the representation in that different  $\alpha$  names for the same argument a may belong to different elements of  $\Delta$ :

**Example 14.** Consider the following function depicted to the right of Figure 3

 $f:[0,1] \to [-1,+1], \qquad [0,1) \cap \mathbb{Q} \ni x \mapsto x =: g(x), \quad \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q} \ni x \mapsto x - 1 =: h(x), \quad f(1) := 0.$ 

It is continuous on both  $\mathbb{Q} \cap [0,1)$  and on  $\{1\} \cup \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ ; hence 2-wise continuous, and admits a 2-wise continuous  $(\rho, \rho)$ -realizer.

Now proceed from [0,1] to  $S^1$ , i.e. identify x = 0 with x = 1; formally, consider the representation  $\tilde{\rho} := \alpha \circ \rho :\subseteq \Sigma^{\omega} \to S^1$  where  $\alpha(x) := x$  on (0,1) and  $\alpha(0) := 0 =: \alpha(1)$ . Since f(0) = 0 = f(1), this induces a well-defined function  $\tilde{f} : S^1 \to [-1,+1]$ ; which admits a 2-wise continuous  $(\tilde{\rho},\rho)$ -realizer: namely the 2-wise continuous  $(\rho,\rho)$ -realizer of f. But  $\tilde{f}$  itself is not 2-wise continuous:

Suppose  $S^1 = D_1 \uplus D_2$  where  $\tilde{f}|_{D_1}$  and  $\tilde{f}|_{D_2}$  are both continuous. W.l.o.g.  $0 \in D_1$ . Observe that  $\tilde{f}(0) = 0 = g(0) \neq h(0) = -1$ . Hence, as  $\mathbb{Q}$  is dense and because continuous h is different from continuous g, continuity of  $\tilde{f}|_{D_1}$  requires it to coincide with g: first just locally at x = 0, but then also globally—which implies  $\lim_{x \nearrow 1} \tilde{f}|_{D_1}(x) = g(1) = 1$ , contradicting  $\tilde{f}|_{D_1}(1) = 0$ .  $\Box$ 

Example 14 illustrates (cf. Remark 13) that the implication from k-wise  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -continuity to a k-wise continuous  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -realizer cannot be reversed; and *admissibility* [Weih00, DEFI-NITION 3.2.7] of the representations  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  does not help: In fact  $\tilde{\rho}$  from Example 14 is (equivalent to) the Cauchy representation of  $S^1$  considered as an effective metric space: by mere construction and because  $\rho$  is (equivalent to) the Cauchy representation of [0, 1]; cf. [Weih00, SECTION 4.1].

In order to apply Lemma 11 for proving k-wise discontinuity of a function  $f : A \to B$ , it may help to compactify the co-domain:

**Example 15.** Consider  $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ ,  $0 \mapsto 0$ ,  $0 < x \mapsto 1/x$ . Then f admits no witness of 1-wise discontinuity; whereas  $\tilde{f} : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  does admit such a witness.

The crucial point is of course that x := 0 and  $x_n := 1/n$  constitutes a witness of 1-wise discontinuity only for  $\tilde{f}$ , because  $0 = f(x) \neq \lim_n f(x_n) = +\infty$  exists only in  $\mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ .

We also observe that Lemma 11 does not admit a converse, even for total functions between compact spaces:

**Observation 16.** The function  $\tilde{f}: S^1 \to [-1, +1]$  from Example 14 is not 2-wise continuous yet has no witness of 2-wise discontinuity.

*Proof.* Suppose  $\{x, (x_n), (x_{n,m})\}$  is a witness of 2-wise discontinuity of  $\tilde{f}$ . First consider the

- case  $x \in (0,1) \cap \mathbb{Q}$ . Since  $x_n \to x$  and  $x = \tilde{f}(x) \neq \lim_n \tilde{f}(x_n)$ , w.l.o.g.  $0 < x_n < 1$ and  $x_n \notin \mathbb{Q}$ : otherwise proceed to an appropriate subsequence. Now  $\lim_m x_{n,m} = x_n$ and  $\lim_m \tilde{f}(x_{n,m}) \neq \tilde{f}(x_n) = x_n - 1$  requires, by definition of  $\tilde{f}$ ,  $\tilde{f}(x_{n,m}) = x_{n,m}$  for almost all m and n: contradicting that a witness of discontinuity is required to satisfy  $\lim_m \tilde{f}(x_{m,m}) \neq \tilde{f}(x)$  and  $\lim_m x_{m,m} = x$ .
- Case  $x \in (0, 1) \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ : similarly.
- Case  $x = 0 \equiv 1$ : As  $x_n \to x$  and since  $0 \neq \tilde{f}(x) \neq \lim_n \tilde{f}(x_n)$  exists, we may consider two subcases:

- 10Martin Ziegler
- Subcase  $x_n \in (1/2, 1) \cap \mathbb{Q}$  for almost all n: Now  $x_n = \lim_m x_{n,m}$  and  $x_n = \tilde{f}(x_n) \neq \lim_m \tilde{f}(x_{n,m})$  requires, by definition of  $\tilde{f}$ ,  $\tilde{f}(x_{n,m}) = x_{n,m} - 1$  for almost all m and n: contradicting  $\lim_{m \to \infty} x_{m,m} = x$  and  $\lim_{m \to \infty} \tilde{f}(x_{m,m}) \neq 0$ f(x) = 0.
- Subcase  $x_n \in (0, 1/2) \setminus \mathbb{Q}$  for almost all *n*: similarly.

Finally we remark that the notation  $\delta$  in Definition 4b) is usually straight-forward and natural; although an artificially bad choice is possible even for 2-wise computable functions:

**Example 17.** The characteristic function  $\chi_H : \mathbb{N} \to \{0,1\}$  of the Halting problem  $H \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  is obviously 2-wise  $(\nu,\nu)$ -computable by virtue of  $\Delta = \{H, \mathbb{N} \setminus H\}$ , namely for  $\delta :\subseteq \Sigma^* \to \Delta$ with  $1 \mapsto H$  and  $0 \mapsto \mathbb{N} \setminus H$ .

Whereas with respect to the following notation  $\tilde{\delta}$ ,  $\chi_H$  is equally obviously not  $(\nu, \tilde{\delta}, \nu)$ -computable:

 $\delta: \Sigma^* \to \Delta, \qquad \bar{x} \mapsto H \text{ for } \bar{x} \in H, \quad \bar{x} \mapsto \mathbb{N} \setminus H \text{ for } \bar{x} \notin H.$ 

### 3 **Relations / Multivalued Functions**

Many applications involve functions which are 'non-deterministic' in the sense that, for a given input argument x, several values y are acceptable as output. For instance in linear algebra, given a singular matrix A, we want to find some (say normed) vector  $\boldsymbol{v}$  such that  $A \cdot v = 0$ . This is reflected by relaxing the mapping  $f : x \to y$  to be not a function but a relation (also called multivalued function); writing  $f: X \Rightarrow Y$  instead of  $f: X \to 2^Y \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ to indicate that for an input  $x \in X$ , any output  $y \in f(x)$  is acceptable. Many practical problems have been shown computable as multivalued functions but admit no computable single-valued so-called *selection*; cf. e.g. [Weih00, EXERCISE 5.1.13], [ZiBr04, LEMMA 12 or **PROPOSITION** 17], and the left of Figure 4 below. On the other hand, even relations often lack computability merely for reasons of continuity—and appropriate additional discrete advice renders them computable, recall Example 1 above.

Now Definition 4 of the complexity of non-uniform computability straight-forwardly extends from single-valued to multivalued functions; and Observation 5 relates them to (singlevalued) realizers; which can then be treated using Lemma 11. However a direct generalization of Lemma 11 to multivalued mappings turns out to be more convenient. This approach requires a notion of (dis-)continuity for relations rather than for functions.

### 3.1Continuity for Multivalued Mappings

Like single-valued computable functions (recall the Main Theorem), also computable relations satisfy certain topological conditions. However for such multivalued mappings, literature knows a variety of easily confusable notions. *Hemicontinuity* for instance is not necessary for real computability; cf. Example 19a) below; see also [Spre08]. Other authors consider strengthened notions computability Section [Brat03, SECTION 7]—which however are inappropriate for the purposes of our applications. Instead, we generalize Definition 9 as follows:

**Definition 18.** Fix some possibly multivalued mapping  $f :\subseteq X \Rightarrow Y$  and write dom(f) := $\{x \in X : f(x) \neq \emptyset\}.$ 

a) Call f continuous at  $x \in X$  if there is some  $y \in f(x)$  such that for every open neighbourhood V of y there exists a neighbourhood U of x intersecting f(z) for all  $z \in U$ .



**Fig. 4.** Left: A  $(\rho, \rho)$ -computable relation which is not hemicontinuous nor admits a continuous selection. Middle: Quantification over all  $y \in f(x)$  is generally necessary to capture discontinuity of a multivalued function.

For ordinary (i.e. single-valued) functions f, dom(f) amounts to the usual notion; and such f is obviously continuous (at x) iff it is continuous (at x) in the original sense.

**Example 19.** a) Consider the left of Figure 4, i.e. the multivalued function

 $f:[0,1] \rightrightarrows [0,1], \qquad 1/3 > x \mapsto \{0\}, \quad [1/3,2/3) \ni x \mapsto \{0,1\}, \quad 2/3 \le x \mapsto \{1\}$ 

Then f is neither lower nor upper hemicontinuous—yet  $(\rho, \rho)$ -continuous, even computable: Given  $(q_n) \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$  with  $|x - q_n| \leq 2^{-n}$ , test  $q_3$ : if  $q_3 \leq 1/2$  output 0, otherwise output 1. Indeed,  $|x - q_3| \leq 1/8$  implies  $x \leq 5/8 < 2/3$  for  $q_3 \leq 1/2$ , hence  $0 \in f(x)$ ; whereas  $q_3 > 1/2$  implies  $x \geq 3/8 > 1/3$ , hence  $1 \in f(x)$ .

b) Referring to the middle part of Figure 4, the multivalued function

$$g: [-1,1] \rightrightarrows [0,1], \qquad [-1,0) \ni x \mapsto \{0\}, \quad 0 \mapsto [0,1], \quad (0,1] \ni x \mapsto \{1\}$$

is not continuous at 0 w.r.t. any  $y \in f(0) = [0,1]$  although f(0) itself does intersect f(z) for all z.

c) Consider the right part of Figure 4, i.e. the multivalued function

$$h: [-1, +1] \rightrightarrows [0, 1], \qquad 0 \ge x \mapsto [0, 1), \quad 0 < x \mapsto \{1\}$$
.

Then  $x_n := 2^{-n}$  constitutes a witness of discontinuity of h at x = 0 in the sense of Definition 21a) below: For every  $y \in h(x) = [0,1), V := (0, y/2 + 1/2) \ni y$  is an open neighbourhood of y disjoint from  $h(x_n) = \{1\}$  for all n.

Lemma 8a) literally applies also to multivalued mappings  $f : A \rightrightarrows B$ . Similarly generalizing Lemma 8b) is quite cumbersome: For  $B = \bigcup_i B_i$ , the preimages  $f^{-1}[B_i]$ 

- if defined as  $\{a \in A : f(a) \subseteq B_i\}$ , need not cover A
- if defined as  $\{a \in A : f(a) \cap B_i \neq \emptyset\}$ , need not be mapped to within  $B_i$  by f.

On the other hand, already the following partial generalization of Lemma 8b) turns out as useful:

**Lemma 20.** a) Let  $f : A \to B$  be single-valued and  $g : B \rightrightarrows C$  multivalued. If f is d-wise continuous (computable) and g is k-wise continuous (computable), then  $g \circ f : A \rightrightarrows C$  is  $d \cdot k$ -wise continuous (computable).

- 12 Martin Ziegler
- b) Let  $f : A \rightrightarrows B$  and  $g : B \rightrightarrows C$  be multivalued. If f is d-wise continuous (computable) and g is continuous (computable), then  $g \circ f : A \rightrightarrows C$  is again d-wise continuous (computable).
- *Proof.* a) Since f is single-valued, the set  $A_i \cap f^{-1}[B_j]$  is unambigious and mapped by f to a subset of  $B_j$ ; that is the proof of Lemma 8b) carries over.
- b) If f is continuous (computable) on each  $A_i$ , then so is  $g \circ f$ .

## 3.2 Witness of *d*-wise Discontinuity

- **Definition 21.** a) For  $x \in \text{dom}(f)$ , a witness of discontinuity of f at x is a sequence  $(x_n) \in \text{dom}(f)$  converging to x such that, for every  $y \in f(x)$  there is some open neighbourhood V of y disjoint from  $f(x_n)$  for all but finitely many  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .
- b) A uniform d-dimensional flag  $\mathcal{F}$  in X is a witness of d-wise discontinuity of f if, for each  $0 \leq k < d$  and for each  $\overline{n} \in \mathbb{N}^k$  and for each  $1 \leq \ell \leq d-k$  and for each  $y \in f(x_{\overline{n}})$ ,  $(x_{\overline{n},\underline{m},\dots,\underline{m}})_m$  is a witness of discontinuity of f at  $x_{\overline{n}}$ .

If multivalued f admits a witness of discontinuity at x, then f is not continuous; Conversely, if X is first countable, discontinuity of f at x yields to the existence of a witness of discontinuity at x. Also, witnesses of 1-wise discontinuity coincide with witnesses of discontinuity; and they generalize the definition from the single-valued case. Lemma 22 below extends Lemma 11 in showing that a witness of d-wise discontinuity of f inhibits d-wise computability.

**Lemma 22.** Let  $(A, \alpha)$  and  $(B, \beta)$  be effective metric spaces<sup>§</sup> with corresponding Cauchy representations and  $f :\subseteq A \Rightarrow B$  a possibly multivalued mapping.

- a) If f admits a witness of discontinuity, then it is not  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -continuous.
- b) If f admits a witness of d-wise discontinuity, then it is not d-wise  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -continuous.
- Proof. a) Suppose  $F :\subseteq \Sigma^{\omega} \to \Sigma^{\omega}$  is a continuus  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -realizer of f. It maps some  $\alpha$ -name  $\bar{\sigma}$  of x to a  $\beta$ -name  $\bar{\tau}$  of some  $y \in f(x)$ . Now consider the neighbourhood  $V \ni y$  according to Definition 18b). By definition of the Cauchy representation  $\beta$ , some finite initial part  $(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_M) =: \bar{\tau}|_{\leq M}$  of  $\bar{\tau}$  restricts y to belong to V; and by continuity of F, this  $\bar{\tau}|_{\leq M}$  depends on some finite initial part  $\bar{\sigma}|_{\leq N}$  of  $\bar{\sigma}$ . On the other hand  $\bar{\sigma}|_{\leq N}$  is also initial part of an  $\alpha$ -name of some element  $x_n$  of the witness of discontinuity; in fact of all  $x_m, m \geq n$ . But for m sufficiently large,  $f(x_m)$  was supposed to not meet V; that is  $\bar{\tau}|_{\leq M}$  is not initial part of a  $\beta$ -name of any  $y' \in f(x_m)$ : contradiction.
- b) combines the arguments for a) with the proof of 11.

In comparison with the single-valued case, a witness of discontinuity of a multivalued mapping involves one additional quantifier ranging universally over all  $y \in f(x)$ ; and Example 19b) shows that this is generally also necessary. Nevertheless, the following tool gives a (weaker yet) simpler condition to be applied in Section 4.

**Lemma 23.** Fix metric spaces  $(A, \alpha)$  and  $(B, \beta)$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$ , and  $f :\subseteq A \rightrightarrows B$ .

a) For  $S, T \subseteq A$ ,  $B(S, \epsilon) := \{a \in A | \exists s \in S : d_A(a, s) < \epsilon\}$  is disjoint from T iff  $B(T, \epsilon)$  is disjoint from S, and implies  $B(S, \epsilon/2) \cap B(T, \epsilon/2) = \emptyset$ .

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>§</sup> Cf. [Weih00, SECTION 8.1] for a formal definition and imagine Euclidean spaces  $\mathbb{R}^k$  as major examples and focus of interest for our purpose.

- b) Let  $u_n$  and  $v_n$  denote sequences in dom(f) with  $\lim_n u_n = x = \lim_n v_n$  such that  $B(f(u_n), \epsilon)$  is disjoint from  $f(v_n)$  for all but finitely many n. Then at least one of the sequences is a witness of discontinuity of f at x.
- c) For  $r \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $1 \leq i \leq m$  let  $(x_n^{(i)})_n$  denote sequences in dom(f) with  $\lim_n x_n^{(i)} = x$  such that  $\bigcap_{i=1}^r B(f(x_n^{(i)}), \epsilon) = \emptyset$  holds for all but finitely many n. Then, for some i,  $(x_n^{(i)})_n$  is a witness of discontinuity of f at x.
- d) Fix  $r, d \in \mathbb{N}$  and consider a family of (multi-)sequences

$$x, \quad x_{n_1}^{(i_1)}, \quad x_{n_1, n_2}^{(i_1, i_2)}, \quad \dots, \quad x_{n_1, \dots, n_d}^{(i_1, \dots, n_d)}, \qquad n_1, \dots, n_d \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \le i_1, \dots, i_d \le r$$

such that, for each  $\bar{\imath} \in \{1, \ldots, r\}^d$ ,  $(x, x_{n_1}^{(i_1)}, x_{n_1, n_2}^{(i_1, i_2)}, \ldots, x_{n_1, \ldots, n_d}^{(i_1, \ldots, n_d)})$  constitutes a uniform *d*-dimensional flag. Furthermore suppose that, for each  $\bar{n} \in \mathbb{N}^k$   $(0 \le k < d)$  and for each  $1 \le \ell \le d-k$ ,

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^{r} f\left(x_{\bar{n}, \underbrace{m, \dots, m}_{\ell times}}\right) = \emptyset$$

for all but finitely many  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then this family contains a witness of d-wise discontinuity of f.

- Proof. a) If  $t \in T \cap B(S, \epsilon)$ , there is some  $s \in S$  with  $d_A(s, t) < \epsilon$ ; hence  $s \in S \cap B(T, \epsilon)$ . So  $T \cap B(S, \epsilon) \neq \emptyset$  implies  $S \cap B(T, \epsilon) \neq \emptyset$ . The converse implication holds symmetrically. For  $x \in B(S, \epsilon/2) \cap B(T, \epsilon/2)$  there exist  $s \in S$  and  $t \in T$  with  $d(s, x), d(t, x) < \epsilon/2$ ; hence  $d(s, t) < \epsilon$  by triangle inequality and  $s \in S \cap B(T, \epsilon)$ .
- b) Suppose conversely that there exists some  $y \in f(x)$  such that  $V := B(y, \epsilon/2)$  intersects both  $f(u_n)$  and  $f(v_n)$  for all  $n \ge n_0$ . Then  $y \in B((f(u_n), \epsilon/2) \cap (f(v_n), \epsilon);$  hence by a),  $B(f(u_n), \epsilon)$  intersects  $f(v_n)$ : contradiction.
- c) similarly.
- d) The case r = 1 is that of c). We now treat r = 2, the cases of higher values proceed similarly.

By c) there is some *i* such that  $(x_n^{(i)})$  constitutes a witness of discontinuity of *f* at *x*. Now consider the sequences  $(x_{n,m}^{(i,j)})_m$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $1 \leq j \leq r$ . Again by c), to each *n* there is some  $j(n) \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$  such that  $(x_{n,m}^{(i,j)})_m$  is a witness of discontinuity of *f* at  $x_n^{(i)}$ . According to pigeonhole, j(n) = j for some *j* and for infinitely many *n*; hence we may proceed to an appropriate subsequence of  $x_n$  and presume that  $(x_{n,m}^{(i,j)})_m$  is a witness of discontinuity of *f* at  $x_n^{(i)}$  for one common *j*; and  $(x_{m,m}^{(i,j)})_m$  a witness of discontinuity of *f*.

## 4 Applications

Based on Lemma 11b), we now determine the complexity of non-uniform computability for several concrete functions including the examples from Section 1.

## 4.1 Linear Equation Solving

We first consider the problem of solving a system of linear equations; more precisely of finding a nonzero vector in the kernel of a given singular matrix. It is for mere notational convenience that we formulate for the case of real matrices: complex ones work just as well.

**Theorem 24.** Fix  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $d := \min(n, m)$ , and consider the space  $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  of  $n \times m$  matrices, considered as linear mappings from  $\mathbb{R}^m$  to  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Then the multivalued mapping

$$\operatorname{LinEq}: \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \setminus \operatorname{rank}^{-1}[d] \quad \ni \quad A \quad \mapsto \quad \operatorname{kernel}(A) \setminus \{0\}$$

has complexity  $\mathfrak{C}_t(\text{LinEq}) = \mathfrak{C}_c(\text{LinEq}, \rho^{n \times m}, \rho^m) = d.$ 

*Proof.* [ZiBr04, SECTION 3.3] has shown that knowing rank $(A) \in \{0, 1, \ldots, d-1\}$  suffices for computably finding a non-zero vector in (and even an orthonormal basis for) kernel(A); hence  $\mathfrak{C}_{t}(\operatorname{LinEq}) \leq \mathfrak{C}_{c}(\operatorname{LinEq}, \rho^{n \times m}, \rho^{m}) \leq d$ .

Conversely, we apply Lemma 23d) with r := m to assert *d*-wise discontinuity of LinEq. Start with  $A := 0^{n \times m}$ , i.e.  $\operatorname{LinEq}(A) = \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \{0\}$ . Now Lemma 25a) below yields *m* sequences  $A_N^{(1)}, \ldots, A_N^{(m)}$   $(N \in \mathbb{N})$  with  $\operatorname{rank}(A_N^{(i)}) \equiv 1$ , all converging to *A* and with  $\bigcap_i \operatorname{kernel}(A^{(i)}) = \{0\}$ ; hence  $\bigcap_i \operatorname{LinEq}(A^{(i)}) = \emptyset$ . However, Lemma 23c) requires  $\bigcap_i B(\operatorname{LinEq}(A^{(i)}), \epsilon) = \emptyset$  for some  $\epsilon > 0$ . On the other hand, observe that vector normalization

$$\operatorname{norm}: \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \ 
i \ oldsymbol{x} \ \mapsto \ oldsymbol{x} / \|oldsymbol{x}\| \ \in \ \mathcal{S}^{n-1}$$

is single-valued computable and continuous. Hence by Lemma 20b) it suffices to prove (*d*-wise) discontinuity of norm  $\circ$  LinEq. Notice that norm  $\circ$  LinEq $(A) = \text{LinEq}(A) \cap S^{n-1}$  is compact. Thus now  $\bigcap_i \text{LinEq}(A^{(i)}) = \emptyset$  does imply

$$\bigcap_{i} B\big(\operatorname{norm} \circ \operatorname{LinEq}(A^{(i)}), \epsilon\big) \subseteq B\big(\bigcap_{i} \operatorname{norm} \circ \operatorname{LinEq}(A^{(i)}), \delta\big) = \emptyset$$

for some appropriate  $\epsilon > 0$  according to (an inductive application of) Lemma 25b) below. Again applying Lemma 25a), we obtain rank-2 matrices  $A_{N,M}^{(i,j)}$   $(j = 1, \ldots, m-1; A_{N,M}^{(i,m)} := A_N^{(i)})$  with  $\lim_M A_{N,M}^{(i,j)} = A_N^i$  uniformly in j, N and with  $\bigcap_j \operatorname{kernel}(A_{N,M}^{(i,j)}) = \{0\}$ , hence again  $\bigcap B(\operatorname{norm} \circ \operatorname{LinEq}(A^{(i)}), \epsilon) = \emptyset$  for some  $\epsilon > 0$  according to Lemma 25b).

And we may continue this process until arriving at rank-d matrices  $A_{N_1,\dots,N_d}^{(i_1,\dots,i_d)}$ .

The following tool, in addition to completing the proof of Theorem 24, also gives further justification for Figure 2:

- **Lemma 25.** a) Let  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $d := \min(n, m)$ ,  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ ,  $r := \operatorname{rank}(A) < d$ , and  $\epsilon > 0$ . There exist  $A^{(1)}, \ldots, A^{(m-r)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  with  $\operatorname{rank}(A^{(i)}) = r + 1$ ,  $||A^{(i)} A|| < \epsilon$  and  $\bigcap_i \operatorname{kernel}(A^{(i)}) = \{0\}$ .
- b) Let X, Y be closed subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , X compact, and  $\delta > 0$ . Then there exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $B(X, \epsilon) \cap B(Y, \epsilon) \subseteq B(X \cap Y, \delta)$ .
- *Proof.* a) Since rank(A) < n, there exists some  $w \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \text{range}(A)$ . Moreover by the Rank-Nullity Theorem, dim kernel(A) = m r. So consider an orthonormal basis  $z_1, \ldots, z_{m-r} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  of kernel(A) and linear mappings

$$A^{(i)}: \mathbb{R}^m \ni \boldsymbol{x} \mapsto A \cdot \boldsymbol{x} + \epsilon \cdot \langle \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{z}_i \rangle \boldsymbol{w} :$$

These obviously satisfy  $||A^{(i)} - A|| < \epsilon$ . Moreover it holds  $\operatorname{range}(A^{(i)}) = \operatorname{range}(A) \oplus \operatorname{lspan}(\boldsymbol{w})$  and  $\operatorname{kernel}(A^{(i)}) = \operatorname{kernel}(A) \cap \boldsymbol{z}_i^{\perp}$ : because all  $\boldsymbol{z}_j$   $(j \neq i)$  are still mapped to 0. Hence  $\operatorname{rank}(A^{(i)}) = \operatorname{rank}(A) + 1$  and  $\bigcap_i \operatorname{kernel}(A^{(i)}) = \operatorname{kernel}(A) \bigcap_i \boldsymbol{z}_i^{\perp} = \{0\}$ . b) First consider the disjoint case  $X \cap Y = \emptyset$ . Then the distance function  $d_Y$  from Equation (1) is positive on X. Moreover  $d_Y$  is continuous and therefore, on compact X, bounded from below by some  $2\epsilon > 0$ . Hence  $B(X, \epsilon) \cap B(Y, \epsilon) = \emptyset$ .

In the general case,  $Z := X \cap Y$  is not necessarily empty but closed. Now consider  $X' := X \setminus B(Z, \delta/2)$  and  $Y' := Y \setminus B(Z, \delta/2)$ : X' is compact and disjoint from closed Y'; hence  $B(X', \epsilon) \cap B(Y', \epsilon) = \emptyset$  for some  $0 < \epsilon < \delta/2$  according to the first case. Since  $X \subseteq X' \cup B(Z, \delta/2)$ ,

$$B(X,\epsilon) \cap B(Y,\epsilon) \subseteq \left(B(X',\epsilon) \cup \underbrace{B(B(Z,\delta/2),\epsilon)}_{=B(Z,\delta/2+\epsilon)\subseteq B(Z,\delta)}\right) \cap \left(B(Y',\epsilon) \cup \underbrace{B(B(Z,\delta/2),\epsilon)}_{\subseteq B(Z,\delta)}\right)$$
$$\subseteq \left(\underbrace{B(X',\epsilon) \cap B(Y',\epsilon)}_{=\emptyset}\right) \cup \left(B(X',\epsilon) \cap B(Z,\delta)\right) \cup \left(B(Z,\delta) \cap B(Y,\epsilon)\right) \subseteq B(Z,\delta)$$

### References

- Barm03. G. BARMPALIAS: "A Transfinite Hierarchy of Reals", pp.163–172 in *Mathematical Logic Quarterly* vol.49(2) (2003).
- BrHe02. V. BRATTKA, P. HERTLING: "Topological Properties of Real Number Representations", pp.241–257 in *Theoretical Computer Science*
- Brat03. V. BRATTKA: "Computability over Topological Structures", pp.93–136 in *Computability and Models* (S.B.Cooper and S.S. Goncharov, Edts), Springer (2003).
- Brat05. V. BRATTKA: "Effective Borel measurability and reducibility of functions", pp.19–44 in *Mathematical Logic Quarterly* vol.51 (2005).
- Cenz01. D. CENZER: Lunch discussion during Dagstuhl seminar no.01461 (2001).
- ChHo99. T. CHADZELEK, G. HOTZ: "Analytic Machines", pp.151–165 in *Theoretical Computer Science* vol.**219**, Elsevier (1999).
- EKL05. A. EDALAT, A.A. KHANBAN, A. LIEUTIER: "Computability in Computational Geometry", pp.117– 127 in *Proc. 1st Conf. on Computability in Europe* (CiE'2005), Springer LNCS vol.**3526**.
- GeNe94. X. GE, A. NERODE: "On Extreme Points of Convex Compact Turing Located Sets", pp.114–128 in Logical Foundations of Computer Science, Springer LNCS vol.813 (1994).
- HeWe94. P. HERTLING, K. WEIHRAUCH: "Levels of Degeneracy and Exact Lower Complexity Bounds for Geometric Algorithms", pp.237–242 in Proc. 6th Canadian Conference on Computational Geometry (CCCG 1994).
- Hert96. P. HERTLING: "Unstetigkeitsgrade von Funktionen in der effektiven Analysis", Dissertation Fern-Universität Hagen, *Informatik-Berichte* **208** (1996).
- Hert96. P. HERTLING: "Topological Complexity with Continuous Operations", pp.315–338 in Journal of Complexity vol.12 (1996).
- Hinm78. P.G. HINMAN: "*Recursion-Theoretic Hierarchies*", Springer Perspectives in Mathematical Logic (1978).
- KMP\*04. L. KETTNER, K. MEHLHORN, S. PION, S. SCHIRRA, C.K. YAP: "Classroom Examples of Robustness Problems in Geometric Computations", pp.702–713 in Proc. 12th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA'2004), Springer LNCS vol.3221.
- Koep01. W. Koepf: "Besprechungen  $\mathbf{z}\mathbf{u}$ Büchern  $\operatorname{der}$ Computeralgebra: Klaus Weihrauch Computable Analysis", p.29 inComputer algebraRundbrief vol.29 (2001),http://www.fachgruppe-computeralgebra.de/CAR/CAR29/node19.html
- LPY05. C. LI, S. PION, C.K. YAP: "Recent Progress in Exact Geometric Computation", pp.85–111 in Journal of Logic and Algebraic Programming vol.64 (2005).
- MaPa02. M. MARCINIAK, R.J. PAWLAK: "On the Restrictions of Functions. Finitely Continuous Functions and Path Continuity", pp.65–77 in *Tatra Mountains Mathematical Publications* vol.24 (2002).
- Marc07. M. MARCINIAK: "On Finitely Continuous Darboux Functions and Strong Finitely Continuous Functions", pp.15–22 in *Real Analysis Exchange* vol.33:1 (2007).
- Mosc80. Y.N. MOSCHOVAKIS: "Descriptive Set Theory", North-Holland Studies in Logic (1980).

- 16 Martin Ziegler
- RoZi08. S. LE ROUX, M. ZIEGLER: "Singular Coverings and Non-Uniform Notions of Closed Set Computability", pp.545–560 in *Mathematical Logic Quarterly* vol.54 (2008).
- Spre08. D. SPREEN: "On the Continuity of Effective Multifunctions", pp.267–282 in Prof. Fifth Int. Conf. on Computability and Complexity in Analysis (CCA 2008), Informatik Berichte FernUniversität in Hagen vol.348 (August 2008).
- Weih00. K. WEIHRAUCH: "Computable Analysis", Springer (2000).
- WeZh00. K. WEIHRAUCH, X. ZHENG: "Computability on continuous, lower semi-continuous and upper semicontinuous real functions", pp.109–133 in *Theoretical Computer Science* vol.234 (2000).
- ZhWe01. X. ZHENG, K. WEIHRAUCH: "The Arithmetical Hierarchy of Real Numbers", pp.51–65 in Mathematical Logic Quarterly vol.47 (2001).
- ZiBr04. M. ZIEGLER, V. BRATTKA: "Computability in Linear Algebra", pp.187–211 in *Theoretical Computer Science* vol.**326** (2004).
- Zieg05. M. ZIEGLER: "Computability and Continuity on the Real Arithmetic Hierarchy and the Power of Type-2 Nondeterminism", pp.562–571 in Proc. 1st Conference on Computability in Europe (CiE'2005), Springer LNCS vol.3526.
- Zie07a. M. ZIEGLER: "Real Hypercomputation and Continuity", pp.177–206 in *Theory of Computing Systems* vol.41 (2007).
- Zie07b. M. ZIEGLER: "Revising Type-2 Computation and Degrees of Discontinuity", pp.255–274 in Proc. 3rd International Conference on Computability and Complexity in Analysis (CCA'06), Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science vol.167 (2007).
- ZhWe03. N. ZHONG, K. WEIHRAUCH: "Computability Theory of Generalized Functions", pp.469–505 in Journal of the ACM vol.50 (2003).