
Hallucinations are inevitable but statistically negligible

Atsushi Suzuki¹ Yulan He^{2,3} Feng Tian⁴ Zhongyuan Wang⁵

Abstract

Hallucinations, a phenomenon where a language model (LM) generates nonfactual content, pose a significant challenge to the practical deployment of LMs. While many empirical methods have been proposed to mitigate hallucinations, a recent study established a computability-theoretic result showing that any LM will inevitably generate hallucinations on an infinite set of inputs, regardless of the quality and quantity of training datasets and the choice of the language model architecture and training and inference algorithms. Although the computability-theoretic result may seem pessimistic, its significance in practical viewpoints has remained unclear. In contrast, we present a positive theoretical result from a probabilistic perspective. Specifically, we prove that hallucinations can be made statistically negligible, provided that the quality and quantity of the training data are sufficient. Interestingly, our positive result coexists with the computability-theoretic result, implying that while hallucinations on an infinite set of inputs cannot be entirely eliminated, their probability can always be reduced by improving algorithms and training data. By evaluating the two seemingly contradictory results through the lens of information theory, we argue that our probability-theoretic positive result better reflects practical considerations than the computability-theoretic negative result.

1. Introduction

A language model (LM), in a broad sense, is a computer program to solve a task whose input and/or output are natural language sentences. Typically, both the input and output of the task are formulated as natural language sentences. For example, in scenarios like translation or chatbots, the task is to receive natural language sentence input that users type or chat and generate a natural language

¹The University of Hong Kong ²King's College London, United Kingdom ³The Alan Turing Institute, United Kingdom ⁴Duke Kunshan University, China ⁵Wuhan University, China.

sentence output that meets the users' desire described in the input sentences. Early approaches relied on rule-based pattern matching, e.g., ELIZA (Weizenbaum, 1966), PARRY (Colby et al., 1971), ALICE (Wallace, 2009), etc. or statistical language models based on Markov theories, e.g., (Chen and Goodman, 1999; Hiemstra, 1998; Kuhn and De Mori, 1990). However, the introduction of artificial neural networks in LMs, pioneered by, e.g., (Bengio et al., 2000; Elman, 1990; Mahoney, 2000; Rumelhart et al., 1986), has led to a paradigm shift over the past two decades, as advances in techniques and hardware have enabled large-scale neural models. The techniques supporting the success include effective neural network architectures, e.g., long short term memory (Gers et al., 2000; Hochreiter et al., 1997), the encoder-decoder model (Cho et al., 2014), the attention architecture (Bahdanau et al., 2015), Transformer (Vaswani, 2017), etc., pretraining strategies, e.g., BERT (Devlin et al., 2019), and learning strategies human feedback, e.g., (Ouyang et al., 2022). Those large-scale neural language models, often simply called large language models (LLMs), have impacted academia and society, represented by the launch of powerful chatbots, e.g., ChatGPT (Achiam et al., 2023; Brown et al., 2020; Radford et al., 2019), Gemini (Gemini Team et al., 2023; 2024), LLaMA (Dubey et al., 2024; Touvron et al., 2023a; 2023b), Claude (Anthropic, 2024), Qwen (Bai et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2024a; 2024b), DeepSeek (Guo et al., 2025; Liu et al., 2024), etc., as well as success in the fields of machine translation (Wu et al., 2016), search engine (Microsoft, 2023), recommendation systems (Gao et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023). For more details of language models, refer to, e.g., (Dam et al., 2024; Minaee et al., 2024; W. X. Zhao et al., 2023).

As LLMs have impacted society, *hallucinations* have been identified as crucial issues, complicating their practical deployment in applications (Huang et al., 2023). Here, hallucinations are defined as a phenomenon where a LM generates nonfactual content (Huang et al., 2023) or content nonsensical or unfaithful to the provided source (Ji et al., 2023). The root causes of hallucinations have generally been categorized (Huang et al., 2023; Ji et al., 2023) into data, training, and inference, and many empirical methods have been proposed to mitigate hallucinations, e.g., by exploiting knowledge bases (Shuster et al., 2021; R. Zhao et

al., 2023) or refining the requirement on LMs (Dhuliawala et al., 2023; Wei et al., 2022). However, based on computability theory, a recent study (Xu et al., 2024) has proved that in a certain ground truth setting, any LM—regardless of its training and inference algorithms or training dataset employed—will inevitably produce hallucinations on an infinite set of input strings. This theoretical result may seem fatally pessimistic for practitioners since hallucinations on infinite input instances sound like an insurmountable obstacle in practice. However, generally speaking, the implications of computability-theoretic theorems need to be carefully discussed from practical viewpoints. For example, although there exist uncountably infinite non-computable mathematical functions, computers have been significantly useful in computing plenty of practical functions. Hence, it is crucial to know what the theoretical result by (Xu et al., 2024) actually implies from more practical viewpoints.

To address this question, we present a contrastive, positive theoretical result from a probabilistic perspective on a problem setting compatible with the previous work (Xu et al., 2024). Specifically, we show that under a mild assumption on prior knowledge about the input length, we can reduce the probability of hallucinations arbitrarily close to zero, provided that the training data is of sufficient quality and quantity and certain training and inference algorithms are employed. Crucially, our positive result mathematically coexists with the negative result of (Xu et al., 2024) under a wide range of settings. We also solve the paradox behind the coexistence, recalling that an infinite set equipped with a probability measure can have an infinite subset with an arbitrarily small probability. In other words, even though we cannot avoid hallucinations on infinite input instances, it is still possible to reduce the **probability** of hallucinations arbitrarily close to zero by improving training data and training and inference algorithms. The practical significance of hallucinations occurring only on infinite input sets with arbitrarily small probability can ultimately depend on the application domain. Still, using Shannon’s coding theorem as an example, we point out that, in the field of information theory, errors occurring on subsets with arbitrarily small probabilities are often considered negligible in practice. Thus, based on our theoretical result, we can conclude that hallucinations are practically negligible in domains where information theory has been successfully applied without practical issues, provided the quality and quantity of training data are sufficient.

We remark that the only assumption on the ground truth required by our main theorem is the availability of information about the lower bound of the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of input string lengths. In other words, no assumptions are made regarding the grammatical or

semantic structure of natural language or the nature of the ground truth mapping. This is a significant advantage of our theorems since natural languages are not considered to satisfy mathematically convenient conditions completely. We also show that our theorem is optimal in that its assumptions regarding the training data size and the availability of an input length CDF lower bound cannot be removed. We conclude the paper by pointing out that the optimality of our theorem enlightens future work directions.

The contributions of the paper are listed as follows:

- We show in the discrete setting reflecting natural language processing that hallucinations are statistically negligible with an appropriate algorithm and the quality and quantity of training data, provided prior knowledge about the input length distribution is available.
- We evaluate the statistical negligibility and inevitability of hallucinations through the lens of information theory, arguing that the statistical negligibility better reflects practical considerations.
- We show that our theorem is optimal by proving that the conditions on the input length distribution knowledge and the training data size are necessary for the statistical negligibility of hallucinations. Our theorem’s optimality implies the necessity of reflecting the nature of natural languages in future work in theories and applications.

1.1. Related work

Our work is directly inspired by (Xu et al., 2024), stating that any language model hallucinates on infinite input instances. While they evaluate hallucinations on computability theory only, our work evaluates hallucinations from both computability and probability perspectives to clarify the theories’ implications from practical viewpoints. (Kalai and Vempala, 2024) clarified that hallucinations are inevitable when the real-world distribution and the training data distribution are different. However, such situations are out of our scope since we are interested in the situation where training data is qualified, where the computability-theoretic limitation still holds.

Some work has focused on specific neural network architectures based on Transformer (Vaswani, 2017) in the continuous function approximation context. For example, (Yun et al., 2020) and (Zaheer et al., 2020) have proved that Transformers are universal approximators of continuous sequence-to-sequence functions with compact support, though they suffer from the curse of dimensionality under their assumptions. Transformers have been known to avoid the curse of dimensionality with stronger assumptions on the function space, such as sparse boolean functions (Edelman et al., 2022), hierarchical compositions (Gurevych et al., 2022), and shift-invariant and piecewise smooth

functions (Kim et al., 2024; Takakura and Suzuki, 2023). However, the continuous function framework in these studies is different from the discrete set framework that (Xu et al., 2024) and our work consider to be modeling natural language tokens directly. Since the computability-based limitation proved by (Xu et al., 2024) comes essentially from the discrete set setting, the theoretical framework must be based on the same setting with minimal assumptions so that we can compare the result with the limitation proved by (Xu et al., 2024). We also point out a similar problem setting is intensively considered by (Agarwal et al., 2020), while their motivation is in how the probably approximately correct (PAC) learnable changes where we restrict the hypothesis class to computable functions rather than in evaluating the probability of hallucinations caused by the computability limitation.

Technically, our theorems are straightforwardly derived from either computability theory, intensively used in (Xu et al., 2024), or the classical no-free-lunch theorem in statistical learning theory in, e.g., (Shalev-Shwartz and Ben-David, 2014). Our technical contribution lies in providing an integrated framework to discuss LMs from the two completely different theories at the same time, rather than novel proof techniques.

The remainder of the paper is organised as follows. Section 2 provides preliminaries. Section 3 reviews the computability-theoretic limitation of the LM. Section 4 formally states that we can make hallucinations statistically negligible. Section 5 solves the paradoxical conflict between the statements provided by Section 3 and Section 4 through information theory’s lens, clarifying that our statement in Section 4 is more relevant to practical perspectives. Section 6 investigates the assumptions of our positive result in Section 4, showing our simple proof strategy and that our theorem is optimal in the sense that its assumptions cannot be removed. Section 7 concludes the paper.

1.2. Notation

We write (LHS) := (RHS) to define the left-hand side by the right-hand side. We denote the set of real numbers, the set of integers, and the set of nonnegative integers by \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{Z} , and $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, respectively. We denote the floor function and ceiling function by $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ and $\lceil \cdot \rceil$, respectively, i.e., for $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lfloor a \rfloor := \max\{a' \in \mathbb{Z} \mid a' \leq a\}$ and $\lceil a \rceil := \min\{a' \in \mathbb{Z} \mid a' \geq a\}$. For a nonnegative integer n and a set A , we denote the direct product set of n copies of A by A^n (e.g., $A^3 = A \times A \times A$). For a set A , 2^A denotes the power set of A , i.e., the set of all subsets of A . Also, $|A|$ denotes the cardinality of A . In particular, the cardinality $|A|$ equals the number of elements in the set A if A is a finite set.

2. Preliminaries

Definition 1. (String and the set of strings) Let Σ be the set of input symbols. For example, $\Sigma = \{‘A’, ‘B’, \dots, ‘Z’, ‘a’, ‘b’, \dots, ‘z’, ‘.’, ‘:’, ‘!’, ‘?’, ‘ ’\}$ in the typical English language setting. A finite-length sequence of symbols is called a *string*. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we denote by Σ^n the direct product set of the n copies of Σ , i.e., the set of strings of length n . We denote by Σ^* the set of strings, i.e., $\Sigma^* := \Sigma^0 \cup \Sigma^1 \cup \dots$

For example, “language” $\in \Sigma^8$ as the word consists of 8 alphabet letters. Likewise, “language model” $\in \Sigma^{14}$ as the phrase consists of 14 letters including a space letter.

Below, we define a language model, which is our main focus in this paper. Since our ultimate motivation is to compare our results with those in (Xu et al., 2024), we adopt the discrete set framework in the chatbot context as they did. The framework is also compatible with the nature of natural language processing, where discrete natural language tokens are processed.

Definition 2. (Language model (LM)) A (deterministic) computable map $h : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ is called a *language model (LM)*. Here, we say a map h is *computable* if there exists a Turing machine halts with just $h(s)$ on its tape for every input s . We denote the set of all LMs by \mathcal{H} . Specifically, $\mathcal{H} := \{h : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^* \mid h \text{ is computable}\}$.

Refer to, e.g. (Sipser, 2012), for rigorous definitions of, e.g., Turing machines.

Remark 3. (All LLMs are LMs.) The definition of the computability of a function is invariable even if we replace the Turing machine in the definition with another well-known computation model such as the λ -calculus, μ -recursive function, or a modern computer with unlimited amounts of time and storage space. No matter what computing device, training and inference algorithms, and datasets for pre-training and fine-tuning datasets we use, the resulting LM h is computable thus in the set \mathcal{H} as long as it is deterministic. In particular, every LLM (**large** LM) is also in \mathcal{H} . The computability of LMs plays a crucial role in the discussion in the following section. In contrast, since the largeness of a LM itself does not directly matter in this paper, we only use the term LM, not LLM, in the remainder of this paper. Nevertheless, all the discussions concerning LMs in this paper apply to any LLM.

Take examples to be familiar with notation. If we input “What is language?” $\in \Sigma^{17} \subset \Sigma^*$ to a LM h_1 , then it may output “A system of communication.” $\in \Sigma^{26} \subset \Sigma^*$. In this case, $h_1(\text{“What is language?”}) = \text{“A system of communication.”}$ Note that we consider

a deterministic map as a LM, so the output of this LM h_1 with the input “What is language?” is always “A system of communication.” and the LM h_1 has no stochastic behavior.

Remark 4. (Reason for considering deterministic LMs only) LMs are often defined as a conditional probability mass function $P(w_t|w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{t-1})$, which eventually defines the conditional probability mass function of the output string defined on the output space Σ^* . This definition sees a LM as a stochastic algorithm. Nevertheless, for simplicity, we focus on deterministic LMs only, which are special cases of stochastic LMs. The reasons why this simple discussion suffices in this paper are the following:

- To show the existence of a LM satisfying desirable conditions, which is the main goal of this paper, it suffices to raise a special case.
- If we aim to avoid hallucinations, it is a reasonable strategy to make the best output that is known not to be a hallucination, rather than having a possibility of output multiple strings against the given input.
- In practice, even when we define a LM as a stochastic algorithm, it often works in practice as a deterministic output algorithm through, e.g., the beam-search algorithm.
- It is in line with the setting in (Xu et al., 2024), so it allows us to focus on the essential difference between the previous work and our results.

It is, still, interesting to consider the compatibility of reducing hallucinations and output diversity, in which case considering stochastic LMs is beneficial. However, we leave such discussion to future work.

Remark 5. (Σ^* and \mathcal{H} are countable.) Both Σ^* and \mathcal{H} are *countably infinite* sets. Here, we say an infinite set A is countably infinite if there is a injective map from A to the set of nonnegative integers $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. The set $\Sigma^* = \Sigma^0 \cup \Sigma^1 \cup \dots$ of finite-length strings is countably infinite since it is the countably infinite union of finite sets. The set \mathcal{H} of computable maps are also countably infinite since there exists a universal Turing machine, which emulates any Turing machine from a string describing the machine, so \mathcal{H} can be identified as an infinite subset of Σ^* . The countability of Σ^* and \mathcal{H} play a core role in [Section 3](#), in particular in the proof of [Theorem 8](#).

We formally define hallucinations. Our definition of hallucinations is not semantic but rather formal so that it is in line with the previous work (Xu et al., 2024). We begin by defining an acceptable output set for each possible input and

define hallucinations for each input as the complement set of the acceptable output set.

Definition 6. (Acceptable outputs and hallucinations) An *acceptable output set map* is a map $F_0 : \Sigma^* \rightarrow 2^{\Sigma^*}$, i.e., a map taking a string as an input returning a set of strings. When we fix an acceptable output set map F_0 , for a string $s \in \Sigma^*$ we call $F_0(s)$ the *acceptable output set* for the input string s . We can regard F_0 as a formulation of the **ground truth**, and we say that an LM $h \in \mathcal{H}$ *hallucinates* on the input $s \in \Sigma^*$ with respect to F_0 if $h(s) \notin F_0$.

Remark 7. When ignore the change of acceptable outputs depending on the era, we can **fix** an acceptable output set map F_0 , but we will never **know** the map completely. Hence, our theoretical interest is in worst-case analysis with respect to the F_0 . Obviously, it is trivial that we cannot avoid a hallucination for the input s if $F_0(s) = \{\}$, so we omit those cases from the consideration. For some input instances, it has been proved that we cannot directly answer them. For example, it is known to be impossible to answer by yes/no the question “Is the continuum hypothesis true?” under a widely used axiomatic system (e.g., ZFC) of set theory. Even in that case, we would say

“It can be neither proved nor disproved under ZFC.” $\in F_0$ (“Is the continuum hypothesis true?”).

Hence, we can assume the existence of F_0 such that its return value is always nonempty, regardless of Gödel’s incompleteness theorems or the existence of undecidable problems in computability theory.

3. Innate computability limitation of LMs

We first formally state the innate limitation of the LMs in the computability aspect.

The following theorem is a modified version of Theorems 2 and 3 in (Xu et al., 2024).

Theorem 8. *There exists an acceptable map $F_0 : \Sigma^* \rightarrow 2^{\Sigma^*}$ such that*

- $|F_0(s)| > 0$ for every $s \in \Sigma^*$, and
- For any $h \in \mathcal{H}$, h hallucinates on infinitely many inputs, i.e., $\{s \in \Sigma^* \mid h(s) \notin F_0(s)\}$ is an infinite set.

Proof. See [Appendix A](#). □

[Theorem 8](#) claims that in the worst case with respect to the acceptable map F_0 , no matter what LM we use, it hallucinates on infinitely many input strings. Note that this negative result holds regardless of our choice of neural network architecture, algorithms, and training data.

Remark 9. [Theorem 8](#) is similar to Theorems 2 and 3 in (Xu et al., 2024) both in its statement and its proof strategy but technically stronger than those for the following senses:

- Our [Theorem 8](#) claims the existence of a map F_0 for which all the LMs hallucinates on infinitely many input sequences. In particular, F_0 does not depend on the choice of h . Theorem 2 in (Xu et al., 2024) does not consider the whole LMs in \mathcal{H} and Theorem 3 in (Xu et al., 2024) allows the dependency of F_0 on the choice of the learning procedure. Nevertheless, if we note that \mathcal{H} is a countable set, the modification from Theorems 2 and 3 in (Xu et al., 2024) to our [Theorem 8](#) is straightforward.
- Our proof avoids using the axiom of choice. See [Appendix A](#) for details, including why it matters in computer science, not in the context of pure mathematics.

[Theorem 8](#) may look fatally negative to practitioners at one glance as it states that infinite hallucinations are inevitable. However, our main claim is that this result itself is not a practical issue, as we explain below.

4. Hallucinations are statistically negligible

As a preliminary, we first formalize a training data sequence and a LM trainer, which receives a training data sequence and returns a LM.

Definition 10. (training dataset and language model trainer) An input-output string pair $(s, y) \in \Sigma^* \times \Sigma^*$ is called a *training data point*. Also, a finite sequence $(s_1, y_1), (s_2, y_2), \dots, (s_m, y_m) \in (\Sigma^* \times \Sigma^*)^*$ of training data points is called a *training data sequence* or *training dataset*. A map $\mathfrak{A} : (\Sigma^* \times \Sigma^*)^* \rightarrow (\Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*)$, taking a training data sequence as and input and returning a LM, is called a *language model trainer (LMT)*.

Remark 11. Any practical LM can be regarded as an output of a computable LMT. This includes cases where a neural network is pretrained first on a general corpus to make a general next token predictor and fine-tuned on input-output string pairs (a training dataset) to modify the neural network model to one for a chat-bot. In practice, it is sufficient to consider **computable** LMTs. Nevertheless, we do not assume the computability of a LMT to clarify that the computability does not essentially matter in the following statistical results. Obviously, the theoretical results holding on general LMTs also apply to computable LMTs.

In this paper, we are interested in the probability of hallucinations happening, rather than the number of input instances causing hallucinations. Hence, we formally define the hallucination probability.

Definition 12. (Hallucination probability) We define the *hallucination probability* $\text{HP}_\mu(h) \in [0, 1]$ of a LM h on a probability measure μ on Σ^* by

$$\text{HP}_\mu(h) := \Pr(h(S) \notin F_0(S)), \quad (1)$$

where the right-hand side is the probability with respect to the random variable S generated by μ .

Remark 13. The hallucination probability is often called the *0-1 risk* in a general statistical learning theory context.

We are interested in the behavior of the hallucination probability of a LM provided by a LMT with some training data sequence T . As it is clearly dependent on the stochastic behavior of the training data sequence T , we are to define the expected behavior of the training data sequence T below.

Definition 14. (Qualified random training data sequence) Assume that $F_0(s) \neq \{\}$ for all $s \in \Sigma^*$ and let μ be a probability measure on Σ . Then, a $(\Sigma^* \times \Sigma^*)^m$ -valued random variable $T = ((S_1, Y_1), (S_2, Y_2), \dots, (S_m, Y_m))$ is called a length- m *qualified random training data sequence* compatible with F_0 generated by μ if T is generated as follows:

- S_1, S_2, \dots, S_m are Σ^* -valued random variables independently and identically generated by μ .
- For $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$, the distribution of the Σ^* -valued random variable Y_i is determined only by the value of S_i and $Y_i \in F_0(S_i)$ is satisfied in probability 1.

Remark 15. (Strength of the assumption regarding Qualified random training data sequence) From practical aspects, it is a strong assumption to presume $Y_i \in F_0(S_i)$ is satisfied in probability 1. In fact, the following discussion essentially holds as long as the most frequently appearing output string is in the acceptable set. However, this extension bring to discussion complexity unnecessary for our motivation, which is to clarify the computability-based limitation of LMs is not a practical issue. Hence, we omit such an extension.

Then, we formally define statistical negligibility. Our definition is inspired by the framework of probably approximately correct (PAC) learning, but its viewpoint is rather from hallucinations, rather than from the hypothesis set. This is to make easier its comparison to the result in [Section 3](#).

Definition 16. (Statistical negligibility of hallucinations) Assume that $F_0(s) \neq \{\}$ for all $s \in \Sigma^*$ and let μ be a probability measure on Σ . We say that hallucinations of a LMT \mathfrak{A} are *statistically negligible* on μ with respect to F_0 if for any $\varepsilon_H, \varepsilon_T \in (0, 1]$ there exists a $\bar{m} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that for any $m \geq \bar{m}$ and any length- m qualified random training data sequence T compatible with F_0 generated by

μ , the hallucination probability satisfies $\text{HP}_\mu(\mathfrak{A}(T)) < \varepsilon_H$ in probability (with respect to T) at least $1 - \varepsilon_T$.

We are interested in whether or not there exists a LMT of which hallucinations are statistically negligible. Here, we need to note that we cannot know μ or F_0 in advance. Hence, we want a fixed LMT to make hallucinations negligible on a probability measure μ and an acceptable output set map F_0 in broad classes. In other words, the LMT should not have a dependency on μ and F_0 and it should receive the information about μ and F_0 only through the training data sequence T .

Interestingly, it is impossible that hallucinations of a fixed \mathfrak{A} are negligible on all possible μ , as we discuss later. However, if we know some lower bound of the cumulative distribution function of the input length, we can design a LMT of which hallucinations are negligible for any probability measure satisfying the lower bound. Below, we define the cumulative distribution function of the input length.

Definition 17. (Cumulative distribution function of the input length) For a probability measure μ on Σ^* , we denote by $\text{CDF}_{\text{len}\#\mu}$ the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of the length of a random variable generated by μ . Specifically, $\text{CDF}_{\text{len}\#\mu} : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is defined by $\text{CDF}_{\text{len}\#\mu}(n) := \Pr(\text{len}(S) \leq n)$, where S is generated by μ .

Remark 18. In our positive results later, for the true distribution μ , we assume that we know some lower bound of $\text{CDF}_{\text{len}\#\mu}$, but no other pieces of information about μ . We remark that this does not require us to know any information about natural language’s grammar or syntax.

Now, we are ready to state our main result.

Theorem 19. (Hallucinations are statistically negligible with input length CDF lower bound) *Assume that $F_0(s) \neq \{\}$ for all $s \in \Sigma^*$. Fix a non-decreasing function $\overline{\text{CDF}} : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ that satisfies $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \overline{\text{CDF}}(n) = 1$. Then, there exist a LMT $\mathfrak{A} : (\Sigma^* \times \Sigma^*)^* \rightarrow (\Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*)$ such that hallucinations of \mathfrak{A} are statistically negligible in the sense of Definition 16 on any distribution μ on Σ^* that satisfies $\text{CDF}_{\text{len}\#\mu}(n) \geq \overline{\text{CDF}}(n)$ for all n .*

Proof. Immediate from Proposition 24, which is stated later. \square

Remark 20. (Summary of the assumptions for Theorem 19) For benefits of readers, we summarize the assumptions of Theorem 19. Theorem 19 claims that hallucinations are statistically negligible regardless of F_0 and μ if a certain LMT is used, when all of the following conditions are met.

- We know some lower bound of the input length CDF.
- Training data is qualified in the sense of Definition 14.
- Training data is sufficient in the sense that it is more than \overline{m} in Definition 16.

Again, note that the first bullet point requires NO information about the grammar or syntax of natural languages.

Remark 21. Although specific data size \overline{m} is not mentioned in the statement of Theorem 19, \overline{m} can be huge, which we discuss in Section 6.3.

Now, we have provided Theorem 19 stating that the probability of hallucinations can be arbitrarily small, which is a positive result from the probability theory aspect. However, the negative result Theorem 8, stating that hallucinations happen on infinite input instances still holds even in this case. The above positive and negative results seem to contradict each other. How do we interpret these seemingly contradicting two results from the viewpoint of practice? The following section answers this question.

5. Paradox and solution: infinite input instances causing hallucinations but with arbitrarily small probability

5.1. Why can those seemingly contradicting results co-exist?

One might feel the negative result of Theorem 8 and the positive statement of Theorem 19 contradict each other. Indeed, since Theorem 8 makes no assumption on the data distribution, it still applies to the setting of Theorem 19. Hence, under the same setting, Theorem 8 states that every LM hallucinates on infinite input instances, whereas Theorem 19 states that there is a LM, of which hallucinations are statistically negligible. In fact, they do not contradict each other mathematically. Since the support Σ^* of the probability measures that we consider is an infinite set, the infinite subset on which a LM hallucinates can have little probability. An intuitive example of an infinite set having an arbitrarily small probability is the set $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq m} = \{m, m + 1, \dots\}$ that has probability $(\frac{1}{2})^m$ when nonnegative integer i has probability mass $(\frac{1}{2})^i$. Here, $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq m}$ is an infinite set for any fixed m , but its probability converges to 0 as m increases. Likewise, for fixed m , the set of input instances on which a LM hallucinates is an infinity set as stated in Theorem 8, but we can make the **probability** of the set converge to zero as m increases, as suggested by Theorem 19.

5.2. Infinite set, but with arbitrarily small probability. Which matters in practice?

Now, what should be discussed is whether the infinite but arbitrarily small probability errors are accepted in practice.

This is no longer a mathematical discussion and can ultimately depend on the domain. Nevertheless, we still claim that it has practically been negligible in information theory, where Shannon’s source coding theorem is one of its foundations. Here, one of the most fundamental versions of Shannon’s source coding theorem states the following.

Theorem 22. (Shannon’s source coding theorem (appearing in, e.g., (MacKay, 2003))) *Consider a probability measure μ on a finite set \mathcal{X} and suppose that its entropy is H bits. Denote the product set of the m copies of \mathcal{X} by \mathcal{X}^m and the product measure of m copies of μ by μ^m . In other words, μ^m is the probability measure generating a random variable sequence $X_1 X_2 \dots X_m$, where X_i is generated by μ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$. Given $\varepsilon > 0$ and $0 < \delta < 1$, there exists a positive integer m_0 such that for any positive integer $m > m_0$, there exists a set $A_m \subset \mathcal{X}^m$ such that*

- $|\frac{1}{m} \log_2 |A_m| - H| < \varepsilon$, and
- $\mu^m(A_m) > 1 - \delta$.

Here, the first bullet point in [Theorem 22](#) indicates that the number of elements in A_m is smaller than $2^{m(H+\varepsilon)}$ and so $\lceil m(H + \varepsilon) \rceil$ bits are sufficient to code every element in A_m . The second bullet point indicates that the elements not in A_m appear in probability at most δ . Here, note that the number of elements of the set A_m is much smaller than that of \mathcal{X}^m . As we can set ε and δ arbitrarily, the theorem has been understood as follows.

Theorem 23. (Shannon’s source coding theorem (verbal statement, first half) in (MacKay, 2003)) *m i.i.d. random variables each with entropy H can be compressed into more than mH bits with negligible risk of information loss, as $m \rightarrow \infty$.*

The above common understanding of Shannon’s source coding theorem implies that, if we can make the probability of some unpreferred event arbitrarily small, the event is considered to be practically negligible in information theory even if the number of elements in the event is large.

Therefore, we can conclude that, **although infinite hallucinations are inevitable in the sense of [Theorem 8](#), they can be practically negligible under the loose conditions of [Theorem 19](#) in the application domains where information theory does not cause a practical issue.**

6. Proof and optimality of [Theorem 19](#)

In this section, we discuss the assumptions of our main theorem [Theorem 19](#). [Theorem 19](#) assumes that the input length CDF lower bound is available and also that the training data size, as we see in detail later. We first go through our proof strategy based on constructing a trivial algorithm

to see intuitively where those assumptions come from. Then, we theoretically show that those assumptions are necessary. The implication is significant since it means that no matter what algorithms we use, the worst-case data size is almost the same as that with which a trivial algorithm can succeed. We conclude this section by remarking that our result implies that we must not try to universally succeed under loose assumptions and rather should make stronger assumptions reflecting the nature of natural languages.

6.1. Proof strategy for [Definition 16](#)

We construct a trivial algorithm [Algorithm 1](#), named Finite Length Rote Memorizer, to prove [Theorem 19](#), stating that hallucinations can be statistically negligible. The algorithm gives us intuition behind the assumptions of [Theorem 19](#). The idea of the algorithm is simple. We first find an input length threshold \bar{n} only depending on m and $\overline{\text{CDF}}$, and we simply rote-memorize the input-output pairs with an input shorter than \bar{n} in the training data sequence, where \bar{n} should be so short that all the input strings shorter than \bar{n} appear in high probability in training data and so long that the probability of the input length longer than \bar{n} is small. The pseudocode of the straightforward algorithm is given in [Algorithm 1](#). Note that we do NOT insist that [Algorithm 1](#) should be used in practice. It is rather a tool for the proof.

Algorithm 1 FiniteLengthRoteMemorizer (FLRM)
Note that this algorithm depends on $\overline{\text{CDF}}$.

```

FINITELENGTHROTEMEMORIZER(
((s1, y1), (s2, y2), ..., (sm, ym)) ∈ (Σ*, Σ*)*):
1  m ← len((s1, y1), (s2, y2), ..., (sm, ym))
2  n ← max{ n' | m >  $\frac{|\Sigma|^{n'+1}}{1 - \overline{\text{CDF}}(n')} \ln \frac{|\Sigma|^{n'+1}}{2(1 - \overline{\text{CDF}}(n'))}$  }
3  Initialize an empty dictionary d
4  for i ← 1, 2, ..., m:
5      if len(si) ≤ n:
6          d[si] ← yi
7  def TRIVIALRECALLER (s ∈ Σ*):
8      if d[s] is defined:
9          return d[s] ∈ Σ*
10     else:
11         return "" ∈ Σ*
12 return TRIVIALRECALLER
    
```

With the help of [Algorithm 1](#), we can show the following, which immediately gives us [Theorem 19](#).

Proposition 24. Assume that $F_0(s) \neq \{\}$ for all $s \in \Sigma^*$. Fix a non-decreasing function $\overline{\text{CDF}} : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ that satisfies $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \overline{\text{CDF}}(n) = 1$. Then, hallucinations of \mathfrak{A} given by Algorithm 1 are statistically negligible in the sense of Definition 16 on any distribution μ on Σ^* that satisfies $\text{CDF}_{\text{len}_{\#}\mu}(n) \geq \overline{\text{CDF}}(n)$ for all n . Here, \overline{m} in the definition of statistical negligibility is given by $\overline{m} = \left\lceil \frac{|\Sigma^*|^{\overline{n}+1}}{1 - \overline{\text{CDF}}(\overline{n})} \ln \frac{|\Sigma^*|^{\overline{n}+1}}{2(1 - \overline{\text{CDF}}(\overline{n}))} \right\rceil$, where \overline{n} is an integer that satisfies $1 - \overline{\text{CDF}}(\overline{n}) < \frac{1}{2} \min\{\varepsilon_H, \varepsilon_T\}$. Note that such a \overline{n} exists by the definition of $\overline{\text{CDF}}$.

Proof. See Appendix B. \square

We can see that Proposition 24 requires

- the input length CDF lower bound and
- the huge size $\overline{m} = \left\lceil \frac{|\Sigma^*|^{\overline{n}+1}}{1 - \overline{\text{CDF}}(\overline{n})} \ln \frac{|\Sigma^*|^{\overline{n}+1}}{2(1 - \overline{\text{CDF}}(\overline{n}))} \right\rceil$ of training data, which is exponential with respect to \overline{n} depending on $\overline{\text{CDF}}$.

From the construction of Algorithm 1, we can intuitively understand why Proposition 24 requires these two. Since we only have finite memory, for the rote memorization to work, we need to limit the input length. Without the lower bound of the input length CDF, we cannot find a length threshold such that we can safely ignore inputs whose length is larger than the threshold. Also, since it tries to rote-memorize all the strings shorter than \overline{n} , it is natural that it requires the training data size exponential to \overline{n} .

A natural question is whether or not we can omit these two assumptions from Proposition 24 (or Theorem 19) by applying possible cleverer algorithms than the trivial Algorithm 1. Interestingly, neither of them can be omitted, as we will see for the input length CDF lower bound in Section 6.2 and for a huge training data size in Section 6.3.

6.2. The input length CDF lower bound is necessary

The following theorem formally states that we cannot omit the input length CDF lower bound condition, no matter what algorithms we consider. Note that in the following, \mathbb{E}_T and Pr_T denote the operators returning the expectation and probability over the length- m qualified random training data sequence T .

Theorem 25. (No free lunch theorem in LM context) For any LMT $\mathfrak{A} : (\Sigma^* \times \Sigma^*)^* \rightarrow (\Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*)$, any training data sequence length $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, and any $\lambda_H \in (0, 1)$, there exist a map $F_0 : \Sigma^* \rightarrow 2^{\Sigma^*}$ satisfying $F_0(s) \neq \{\}$ for all $s \in \Sigma^*$ and a probability distribution μ on Σ^* such that the hallucination probability satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_T \text{HP}_{\text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}}), f_0}(\mathfrak{A}(T)) &\geq \frac{1}{2}, \\ \text{Pr}_T(\text{HP}_{\text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}}), f_0}(\mathfrak{A}(T)) \geq \lambda_H) &\geq \lambda_T := \frac{1 - 2\lambda_H}{2 - 2\lambda_H}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where T is the length- m qualified random training data sequence.

See Appendix C for the proof of Theorem 25. It uses a variant of the no-free-lunch theorem, which we state in Appendix C as Theorem 31 (Shalev-Shwartz and Ben-David, 2014).

Remark 26. For example, if $\lambda_H = \frac{1}{4}$, then $\lambda_T = \frac{1}{3}$. Hence, Theorem 25 states that $\text{HP}(\mathfrak{A}(T)) > \frac{1}{4}$ happens in probability at least $\frac{1}{3} - \varepsilon$ (for an arbitrarily small ε) over the choice of the training data T in the worst case on the choice of $F_0(s)$ and μ .

Despite its negative statement, we do not consider Theorem 25 to be implying issues from a practical perspective, since the lower bound could be easily obtained as it is nothing but a probability distribution of a scalar random variable without any information about syntax or semantics of natural languages. Nevertheless, Theorem 25 is theoretically interesting as proof of an optimality of Theorem 19.

6.3. Discussion on training data size

Proposition 24 suggests that a training data size that is exponential to \overline{m} , which depends on $\overline{\text{CDF}}$, is **sufficient** to make hallucinations statistically negligible. The following theorem states its converse in some sense. Specifically, it says that a training data size that is exponential to \underline{m} , another variable depending on $\overline{\text{CDF}}$, is **necessary**.

Theorem 27. (No free lunch theorem in LM context) Fix a non-decreasing function $\overline{\text{CDF}} : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ that satisfies $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \overline{\text{CDF}}(n) = 1$, and define

$$\underline{n} := \underset{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}{\text{argmin}} \frac{|\Sigma|^{n+1} - 1}{(|\Sigma| - 1) \overline{\text{CDF}}(n)}, \underline{m} := \left\lceil \frac{|\Sigma|^{\underline{n}+1} - 1}{(|\Sigma| - 1) \overline{\text{CDF}}(\underline{n})} \right\rceil \quad (3)$$

For any LMT $\mathfrak{A} : (\Sigma^* \times \Sigma^*)^* \rightarrow (\Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*)$, any training data sequence length $m \leq \underline{m}$, and $\lambda_H \in (0, 1)$, there exist a map $F_0 : \Sigma^* \rightarrow 2^{\Sigma^*}$ satisfying $F_0(s) \neq \{\}$ for all $s \in \Sigma^*$ and a probability distribution μ on Σ^* such that the hallucination probability satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_T \text{HP}_{\text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}}), f_0}(\mathfrak{A}(T)) &\geq \frac{1}{2}, \\ \text{Pr}_T(\text{HP}_{\text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}}), f_0}(\mathfrak{A}(T)) \geq \lambda_H) &\geq \lambda_T := \frac{1 - 2\lambda_H}{2 - 2\lambda_H}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where T is the length- m qualified random training data sequence.

See [Appendix C](#) for the proof of [Theorem 27](#). Again, it uses the no-free-lunch theorem [Theorem 31](#) (Shalev-Shwartz and Ben-David, 2014), which we state in [Appendix C](#).

Remark 28. (Implications of [Theorem 27](#)) The huge data sizes that appear in [Proposition 24](#) and [Theorem 27](#) do NOT imply that such vast quantities of training data are necessary for language models to succeed in practice. Rather, it enlightens future work directions, suggesting the necessity of stronger assumptions reflecting the behavior of natural languages. Specifically, from a theoretical perspective, [Theorem 27](#) suggests that such assumptions are required to prove the success of LMs with practical training data size, as they were in the continuous function approximation setting, e.g., (Kim et al., 2024; Takakura and Suzuki, 2023; Yun et al., 2020). From a practical perspective, [Theorem 27](#) suggests that we must give up trying to succeed in general settings and actively use properties of natural languages; otherwise, the performance will be at the same level as the trivial [Algorithm 1](#). Having said that, since finding mathematically tractable assumptions that natural languages satisfy is hard in general, our [Theorem 19](#) and [Proposition 24](#), holding under mild assumptions, are still significant as a fundamental guarantee.

7. Conclusion, limitations, and future work

We have shown that hallucinations are statistically negligible with prior knowledge of the input length and an appropriate algorithm if the quality and quantity of the training data are sufficient, even in the worst scenario with respect to the ground truth. While hallucinations on an infinite set of inputs cannot be entirely eliminated, their probability can always be reduced by improving algorithms and training data. [Section 5](#) has also pointed out that the hallucination probability reflects practical considerations.

As discussed in [Section 6.3](#), a huge training data size is required to make hallucinations statistically negligible under our assumptions. This could be regarded as a limitation of our work. Nevertheless, as discussed in [Theorem 27](#), it is an almost optimal result, and it rather enlightens our future work directions as discussed in [Remark 28](#).

Acknowledgment

The research results of this article are sponsored by the Kunshan Municipal Government research funding. Yulan He was supported by the UK Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) through a Turing AI Fellowship (grant no. EP/V020579/1, EP/V020579/2).

Impact Statement

This paper presents work whose goal is to advance the field of Machine Learning. There are many potential societal consequences of our work, none of which we feel must be specifically highlighted here.

References

- Achiam, J., Adler, S., Agarwal, S., Ahmad, L., Akkaya, I., Aleman, F. L., Almeida, D., Altschmidt, J., Altman, S., Anadkat, S., and others. GPT-4 technical report. *Arxiv Preprint Arxiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- Agarwal, S., Ananthakrishnan, N., Ben-David, S., Lechner, T., and Urner, R. On learnability with computable learners. *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, 48–60, 2020.
- Anthropic. *The Claude 3 Model Family: Opus, Sonnet, Haiku*, 2024. https://www-cdn.anthropic.com/de8ba9b01c9ab7cbabf5c33b80b7bbc618857627/Model_Card_Claude_3.pdf
- Bahdanau, D., Cho, K., and Bengio, Y. Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate. *The 3rd International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2015.
- Bai, J., Bai, S., Chu, Y., Cui, Z., Dang, K., Deng, X., Fan, Y., Ge, W., Han, Y., Huang, F., and others. Qwen technical report. *Arxiv Preprint Arxiv:2309.16609*, 2023.
- Bengio, Y., Ducharme, R., and Vincent, P. A neural probabilistic language model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 13, 2000.
- Brown, T., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J. D., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., and others. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 1877–1901, 2020.
- Chen, S. F., and Goodman, J. An empirical study of smoothing techniques for language modeling. *Computer Speech & Language*, 13(4), 359–394, 1999.
- Cho, K., Merriënboer, B. van, Gülçehre, Ç., Bahdanau, D., Bougares, F., Schwenk, H., and Bengio, Y. Learning Phrase Representations using RNN Encoder–Decoder for Statistical Machine Translation. *Proceedings of the*

- 2014 *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, 1724–1734, 2014.
- Colby, K. M., Weber, S., and Hilf, F. D. Artificial paranoia. *Artificial Intelligence*, 2(1), 1–25, 1971.
- Dam, S. K., Hong, C. S., Qiao, Y., and Zhang, C. A complete survey on llm-based ai chatbots. *Arxiv Preprint Arxiv:2406.16937*, 2024.
- Devlin, J., Chang, M.-W., Lee, K., and Toutanova, K. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *Proceedings of 2019 Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 1(2), 2019.
- Dhuliawala, S., Komeili, M., Xu, J., Raileanu, R., Li, X., Celikyilmaz, A., and Weston, J. Chain-of-verification reduces hallucination in large language models. *Arxiv Preprint Arxiv:2309.11495*, 2023.
- Dubey, A., Jauhri, A., Pandey, A., Kadian, A., Al-Dahle, A., Letman, A., Mathur, A., Schelten, A., Yang, A., Fan, A., and others. The llama 3 herd of models. *Arxiv Preprint Arxiv:2407.21783*, 2024.
- Edelman, B. L., Goel, S., Kakade, S., and Zhang, C. Inductive biases and variable creation in self-attention mechanisms. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 5793–5831, 2022.
- Elman, J. L. Finding structure in time. *Cognitive Science*, 14(2), 179–211, 1990.
- Gao, Y., Sheng, T., Xiang, Y., Xiong, Y., Wang, H., and Zhang, J. Chat-rec: Towards interactive and explainable llms-augmented recommender system. *Arxiv Preprint Arxiv:2303.14524*, 2023.
- Gemini Team, Anil, R., Borgeaud, S., Alayrac, J.-B., Yu, J., Soricut, R., Schalkwyk, J., Dai, A. M., Hauth, A., Millican, K., and others. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *Arxiv Preprint Arxiv:2312.11805*, 2023.
- Gemini Team, Georgiev, P., Lei, V. I., Burnell, R., Bai, L., Gulati, A., Tanzer, G., Vincent, D., Pan, Z., Wang, S., and others. Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context. *Arxiv Preprint Arxiv:2403.05530*, 2024.
- Gers, F. A., Schmidhuber, J., and Cummins, F. Learning to forget: Continual prediction with LSTM. *Neural Computation*, 12(10), 2451–2471, 2000.
- Guo, D., Yang, D., Zhang, H., Song, J., Zhang, R., Xu, R., Zhu, Q., Ma, S., Wang, P., Bi, X., and others. DeepSeek-R1: Incentivizing Reasoning Capability in LLMs via Reinforcement Learning. *Arxiv Preprint Arxiv:2501.12948*, 2025.
- Gurevych, I., Kohler, M., and Şahin, G. G. On the Rate of Convergence of a Classifier Based on a Transformer Encoder. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 68(12), 8139–8155, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2022.3191747>
- Herrlich, H. *Axiom of choice* (Vol. 1876). Springer, 2006.
- Hiemstra, D. A linguistically motivated probabilistic model of information retrieval. *Research and Advanced Technology for Digital Libraries: Second European Conference, Ecdl'98 Heraklion, Crete, Greece September 21–23, 1998 Proceedings 2*, 569–584, 1998.
- Hochreiter, S., Schmidhuber, J. urgen, and Elvezia, C. LONG SHORT-TERM MEMORY. *Neural Computation*, 9(8), 1735–1780, 1997.
- Huang, L., Yu, W., Ma, W., Zhong, W., Feng, Z., Wang, H., Chen, Q., Peng, W., Feng, X., Qin, B., and others. A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions. *Arxiv Preprint Arxiv:2311.05232*, 2023.
- Ji, Z., Lee, N., Frieske, R., Yu, T., Su, D., Xu, Y., Ishii, E., Bang, Y. J., Madotto, A., and Fung, P. Survey of hallucination in natural language generation. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(12), 1–38, 2023.
- Kalai, A. T., and Vempala, S. S. Calibrated language models must hallucinate. *Proceedings of the 56th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, 160–171, 2024.
- Kim, J., Nakamaki, T., and Suzuki, T. Transformers are minimax optimal nonparametric in-context learners. *Arxiv Preprint Arxiv:2408.12186*, 2024.
- Kuhn, R., and De Mori, R. A cache-based natural language model for speech recognition. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 12(6), 570–583, 1990.
- Kunen, K. *Set theory an introduction to independence proofs*. Elsevier, 2014.
- Li, J., Zhang, W., Wang, T., Xiong, G., Lu, A., and Medioni, G. GPT4Rec: A generative framework for personalized recommendation and user interests interpretation. *Arxiv Preprint Arxiv:2304.03879*, 2023.
- Liu, A., Feng, B., Xue, B., Wang, B., Wu, B., Lu, C., Zhao, C., Deng, C., Zhang, C., Ruan, C., and others. Deepseek-v3 technical report. *Arxiv Preprint Arxiv:2412.19437*, 2024.

- MacKay, D. J. *Information theory, inference and learning algorithms*. Cambridge university press, 2003.
- Mahoney, M. V. Fast Text Compression with Neural Networks. *FLAIRS*, 230–234, 2000.
- Microsoft. *The new Bing: Our approach to Responsible AI*, 2023. <https://blogs.microsoft.com/wp-content/uploads/prod/sites/5/2023/04/RAI-for-the-new-Bing-April-2023.pdf>
- Minaee, S., Mikolov, T., Nikzad, N., Chenaghlu, M., Socher, R., Amatriain, X., and Gao, J. Large language models: A survey. *Arxiv Preprint Arxiv:2402.06196*, 2024.
- Ouyang, L., Wu, J., Jiang, X., Almeida, D., Wainwright, C., Mishkin, P., Zhang, C., Agarwal, S., Slama, K., Ray, A., and others. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35, 27730–27744, 2022.
- Radford, A., Wu, J., Child, R., Luan, D., Amodei, D., Sutskever, I., and others. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *Openai Blog*, 1(8), 9, 2019.
- Rumelhart, D. E., Hinton, G. E., and Williams, R. J. Learning internal representations by error propagation, parallel distributed processing, explorations in the microstructure of cognition, ed. de rumelhart and j. mclelland. vol. 1. 1986. *Biometrika*, 71(599–607), 6, 1986.
- Shalev-Shwartz, S., and Ben-David, S. *Understanding machine learning: From theory to algorithms*. Cambridge university press, 2014.
- Shuster, K., Poff, S., Chen, M., Kiela, D., and Weston, J. Retrieval augmentation reduces hallucination in conversation. *Arxiv Preprint Arxiv:2104.07567*, 2021.
- Sipser, M. *Introduction to the Theory of Computation*. Cengage Learning, 2012.
- Takakura, S., and Suzuki, T. Approximation and estimation ability of transformers for sequence-to-sequence functions with infinite dimensional input. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 33416–33447, 2023.
- Touvron, H., Lavril, T., Izacard, G., Martinet, X., Lachaux, M.-A., Lacroix, T., Rozière, B., Goyal, N., Hambro, E., Azhar, F., and others. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *Arxiv Preprint Arxiv:2302.13971*, 2023a.
- Touvron, H., Martin, L., Stone, K., Albert, P., Almahairi, A., Babaei, Y., Bashlykov, N., Batra, S., Bhargava, P., Bhosale, S., and others. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *Arxiv Preprint Arxiv:2307.09288*, 2023b.
- Vaswani, A. Attention is all you need. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017.
- Wallace, R. S. *The anatomy of ALICE*. Springer, 2009.
- Wei, J., Wang, X., Schuurmans, D., Bosma, M., Xia, F., Chi, E., Le, Q. V., Zhou, D., and others. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35, 24824–24837, 2022.
- Weizenbaum, J. ELIZA—a computer program for the study of natural language communication between man and machine. *Communications of the ACM*, 9(1), 36–45, 1966.
- Wu, Y., Schuster, M., Chen, Z., Le, Q. V., Norouzi, M., Macherey, W., Krikun, M., Cao, Y., Gao, Q., Macherey, K., and others. Google’s neural machine translation system: Bridging the gap between human and machine translation. *Arxiv Preprint Arxiv:1609.08144*, 2016.
- Xu, Z., Jain, S., and Kankanhalli, M. Hallucination is inevitable: An innate limitation of large language models. *Arxiv Preprint Arxiv:2401.11817*, 2024.
- Yang, A., Yang, B., Hui, B., Zheng, B., Yu, B., Zhou, C., Li, C., Li, C., Liu, D., Huang, F., and others. Qwen2 Technical Report. *Arxiv Preprint Arxiv:2407.10671*, 2024a.
- Yang, A., Yang, B., Zhang, B., Hui, B., Zheng, B., Yu, B., Li, C., Liu, D., Huang, F., Wei, H., and others. Qwen2.5 Technical Report. *Arxiv Preprint Arxiv:2412.15115*, 2024b.
- Yun, C., Bhojanapalli, S., Rawat, A. S., Reddi, S., and Kumar, S. Are Transformers universal approximators of sequence-to-sequence functions?. *The 8th International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- Zaheer, M., Guruganesh, G., Dubey, K. A., Ainslie, J., Alberti, C., Ontanon, S., Pham, P., Ravula, A., Wang, Q., Yang, L., and others. Big bird: Transformers for longer sequences. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 17283–17297, 2020.
- Zhao, R. et al. Verify-and-edit: A knowledge-enhanced chain-of-thought framework. *Arxiv Preprint Arxiv:2305.03268*, 2023.
- Zhao, W. X. et al. A survey of large language models. *Arxiv Preprint Arxiv:2303.18223*, 2023.

A. Regarding the proof of Theorem 8

We first give the proof of Theorem 8, then explain the difference between our proof strategy and the previous work's.

A.1 Proof of Theorem 8

Proof of Theorem 8. We prove the theorem by constructing a specific $F_0 : \Sigma^* \rightarrow 2^{\Sigma^*}$. Since each of \mathcal{H} and Σ^* is a countably infinite set, we can order each of them to obtain an infinite sequence $h_1, h_2, \dots \in \mathcal{H}$ and $s_1, s_2, \dots \in \Sigma^*$. For example, we can order them in ascending order with respect to the Godel number. For $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, define $\Delta_i \subset \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ by

$$\Delta_i := \{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \mid \forall i' = 1, 2, \dots, i, s_k \neq h_{i'}(s_i)\}. \quad (5)$$

Here, Δ_i is NOT empty since we can construct it by excluding at most finite elements from $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, which is an infinite set. Hence, we can define $\psi : \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ by $\psi(i) := \min \Delta_i$. Define $f_0 : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ by $f_0(s_i) := s_{\psi(i)}$ and F_0 by $F_0(s) = \{f_0(s)\}$. Then, clearly, $|F_0(s)| > 0$, and from the construction of ψ , for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ the inequality $h_k(s_i) \neq s_{\psi(i)} = f_0(s_i)$ holds. In other words, h_k hallucinates on infinitely many strings $s_k, s_{k+1}, s_{k+2}, \dots$, which completes the proof. \square

A.2 Motivation of avoiding depending on the axiom of choice (AC)

We remark that our proof of Theorem 8 does not use the axiom of choice (AC), while the previous work's proof (Xu et al., 2024) depends on the AC. In this subsection, we discuss its significance.

As an axiomatic system of set theory, most mathematicians use either ZF (Zermelo–Fraenkel set theory) or ZFC, which consists of all the axioms of ZF combined with the axiom of choice (AC), as an axiomatic system of set theory. We leave the details of the axioms of ZF to textbooks, e.g., (Kunen, 2014) and below show a version of the AC (Definition 1.1., (Herrlich, 2006)).

Definition 29. For each family $(A_i)_{i \in I}$ of non-empty sets A_i , the product set $\prod_{i \in I} A_i$ is non-empty.

We remark that the statement can be proved from ZF when the index set I is a finite set. Hence, the difference lies in the cases where the index set I is an infinite set.

At one glance, the statement of the AC should be true, and on ZF, the axiom is equivalent to useful propositions, such as Zorn's lemma, the well-ordering theorem, the existence of basis in every linear space, etc. However, we can also prove some "counterintuitive results," such as the Banach–Tarski paradox from the AC. For this reason, both ZF and ZFC have been intensively studied in the field of axiomatic set theory, while most fields of mathematics, like algebra and analysis, tend to assume the AC implicitly.

However, our interest is in the physical behavior of computers, not in differences coming from axiomatic systems. Since the discussion around Theorem 8 is about the physical behavior of computing devices, the results should not depend on the choice of an axiomatic system as long as the axiom system is consistent with physical phenomena. In other words, any purely computer-related theorem should be proved, regardless of the choice of a widely used axiom system. This is why we are interested in avoiding our proof's dependence on the AC.

A.3 The dependency of the previous work's proof on the AC and how we avoided it

Now, let us see how the previous work's proof uses the AC and how we have avoided it. Specifically, when constructing ψ , the previous work's proof (Xu et al., 2024) *arbitrarily* chose an element from each of Δ_i from $i = 1, 2, \dots$. Since i is in the infinite set $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, such a construction of ψ is not guaranteed to exist without the axiom of choice. Specifically, if $\prod_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}} \Delta_i$ is empty, such a ψ does not exist. Hence, we must construct such a function ψ or prove $\prod_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}} \Delta_i$ in another way. On the other hand, our proof fixed the order of Σ^* and \mathcal{H} beforehand, and constructed a specific ψ using the min operator. Hence, our proof is valid even without the axiom of choice.

A.4 Other parts of this paper and the AC

We do not investigate dependency on the AC in the other parts of the paper, especially when we consider the probability theory. As mentioned above, we often assume the AC in many fields of mathematics implicitly, and probability theory is no exception. This is natural since probability theory allows, e.g., probability mass functions whose value takes non-computable real numbers, which cannot be physically realized by a computer, so such a strong axiom is often necessary to

Hallucinations are inevitable but statistically negligible

induct results. Generally speaking, totally excluding the dependency of theories in those areas on the AC is quite demanding and does not make a difference in the implication of the real physical world. Therefore, we only consider the dependency of the purely computability-theoretic part, i.e., [Section 3](#) on the AC, and we do not make an effort to remove the dependency of the other parts on the AC.

B. Proof of Proposition 24

Proof of Proposition 24. Recall that $n = \max\left\{n' \mid m > \frac{|\Sigma^{*n'+1}|}{1 - \overline{\text{CDF}}(n')} \ln \frac{|\Sigma^{*n'+1}|}{2(1 - \overline{\text{CDF}}(n'))}\right\}$. We prove the following lemma.

Lemma 30. *Let \mathfrak{A} be the FLRM algorithm in Algorithm 1. Then, $\text{HP}_\mu(\mathfrak{A}(T)) < \varepsilon'_H$ holds in probability at least $1 - \varepsilon'_T$ over choice of training data sequence (S_1, S_2, \dots, S_m) , where $\varepsilon'_H = \varepsilon'_T = 2(1 - \overline{\text{CDF}}(n))$.*

Once this lemma is proved, then for any $\varepsilon_H, \varepsilon_T \in (0, 1)$, we obtain that $\text{HP}_\mu(\mathfrak{A}(T)) < \varepsilon_H$ holds in probability at least $1 - \varepsilon_T$ over choice of training data sequence if $m > \frac{|\Sigma^{*\bar{n}+1}|}{1 - \overline{\text{CDF}}(\bar{n})} \ln \frac{|\Sigma^{*\bar{n}+1}|}{2(1 - \overline{\text{CDF}}(\bar{n}))}$, where \bar{n} is an integer that satisfies $1 - \overline{\text{CDF}}(\bar{n}) < \frac{1}{2} \min\{\varepsilon_H, \varepsilon_T\}$, which completes the proof of Proposition 24. Note that such a \bar{n} exists since $\overline{\text{CDF}}$ is non-decreasing and $\lim_{n' \rightarrow +\infty} \overline{\text{CDF}}(n') = 1$ by assumptions.

Now, we prove Lemma 30. Denote the set of strings no longer than n by $\Sigma^{\leq n}$, defined by $\Sigma^{\leq n} := \Sigma^0 \cup \Sigma^1 \cup \dots \cup \Sigma^n$. Also, define $k := |\Sigma^{\leq n}| \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Note that $k := |\Sigma^{\leq n}| = |\Sigma^0 \cup \Sigma^1 \cup \dots \cup \Sigma^n| = \frac{|\Sigma|^{n+1} - 1}{|\Sigma| - 1} \leq |\Sigma|^n$ holds. We index all the elements in $\Sigma^{\leq n}$ in the descending order with respect to its probability. In other words, $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k \in \Sigma^{\leq n}$ satisfy $s_j \neq s_{j'}$ and $\Pr(S = s_j) \geq \Pr(S = s_{j'})$ for any j, j' satisfying $1 \leq j < j' \leq k$ and any random variable S generated by the distribution μ . For $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$, define $p_j = \Pr(S = s_j)$. Also, define $j^* := \min\left\{j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\} \mid \sum_{j'=j+1}^k p_{j'} < \frac{\varepsilon'_H}{2}\right\}$. In other words, j^* is the unique index that satisfies $\sum_{j'=j^*}^k p_{j'} \geq \frac{\varepsilon'_H}{2}$ and $\sum_{j'=j^*+1}^k p_{j'} < \frac{\varepsilon'_H}{2}$. Let S_1, S_2, \dots, S_m be mutually independent random variables, all generated by the distribution μ . Here, if $\{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_m\} = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{j^*}\}$ holds, then from the output of Algorithm 1 does not hallucinate on any inputs in $\{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{j^*}\}$, which leads to $\text{HP}_\mu(\mathfrak{A}(T)) \leq \Pr(S \in \{s_{j^*+1}, s_{j^*+2}, \dots, s_k\}) + \Pr(\text{len}(S) > n) < \frac{\varepsilon'_H}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon'_H}{2} = \varepsilon'_H$. Here, $\Pr(\text{len}(S) > n) \leq \frac{\varepsilon'_H}{2}$ is due to the definition of $\overline{\text{CDF}}$ and $\varepsilon'_H = 2(1 - \overline{\text{CDF}}(n))$. Hence, all we need to do is to upper bound the probability of the event $\{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_m\} \not\subseteq \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{j^*}\}$. We denote this event by $U_{\leq j^*}^m$. In the following, we evaluate $\Pr(U_{\leq j^*}^m)$.

Let U_j^m denote the event $(S_1 \neq s_j) \wedge (S_2 \neq s_j) \wedge \dots \wedge (S_m \neq s_j)$. Since $U_{\leq j^*}^m = \bigcup_{j=1}^{j^*} U_j^m$ holds, we have that $\Pr(U_{\leq j^*}^m) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{j^*} \Pr(U_j^m)$. Recall that $p_j := \Pr(S_i \neq s_j)$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$. Since S_1, S_2, \dots, S_m are mutually independent, we have that $\Pr(U_j^m) = (1 - p_j)^m$. By the definition of the indexing order, $p_j \leq p_{j^*}$ holds for $j = j^*, j^* + 1, \dots, k$. Also, by the definition of j^* , we have that $\sum_{j=j^*}^k p_j \geq \frac{\varepsilon'_H}{2}$. Therefore, we obtain

$$p_{j^*} = \max\{p_{j^*}, p_{j^*+1}, \dots, p_k\} \geq \frac{\sum_{j=j^*}^k p_j}{k - j^* + 1} \geq \frac{\varepsilon'_H}{2(k - j^* + 1)} \geq \frac{\varepsilon'_H}{2k}. \quad (6)$$

Here, the second inequality comes from the fact that the maximum value is always larger than or equal to the mean. Thus, for $j = 1, 2, \dots, j^*$, we have that $p_j \geq \frac{\varepsilon'_H}{2k}$. Hence, we obtain $\Pr(U_j^m) = (1 - p_j)^m \leq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon'_H}{2k}\right)^m \leq \exp\left(-\frac{m\varepsilon'_H}{2k}\right)$, where the last inequality comes from the general inequality $1 + x \leq \exp(x)$. Therefore,

$$\Pr(U_{\leq j^*}^m) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{j^*} \Pr(U_j^m) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{j^*} \Pr(U_j^m) \exp\left(-\frac{m\varepsilon'_H}{2k}\right) \leq j^* \exp\left(-\frac{m\varepsilon'_H}{2k}\right) \leq k \exp\left(-\frac{m\varepsilon'_H}{2k}\right) \leq |\Sigma|^{n+1} \exp\left(-\frac{m\varepsilon'_H}{2|\Sigma|^{n+1}}\right).$$

From the above, we can see that $m > \frac{2|\Sigma|^{n+1}}{\varepsilon'_H} \ln \frac{|\Sigma|^{n+1}}{\varepsilon'_T}$ is a sufficient condition for $\Pr(U_{\leq j^*}^m) < \varepsilon'_T$ to hold. This completes the proof of Lemma 30. \square

C. Proof strategy for LM limitations and no-free-lunch-theorem

Theorem 19, essentially obtained by **Proposition 24**, was proved by a specific algorithm. To prove such a positive result, constructing an algorithm suffices. On the other hand, to prove negative results such as **Theorem 25** and **Theorem 27**, we need to show that the negative events happen no matter what algorithm we use. Thus, a simple construction-based proof does not work, and instead, we rely on the no-free-lunch theorem.

Indeed, we can prove **Theorem 25** and **Theorem 27** by the following no free lunch theorem proved in (Shalev-Shwartz and Ben-David, 2014).

Theorem 31. (General no free lunch theorem) *Consider a learning problem from a domain set \mathcal{X} to a codomain set \mathcal{Y} such that $|\mathcal{Y}| \geq 1$, i.e., $\mathcal{Y} \neq \{\}$. For a probability measure μ on \mathcal{X} , a ground truth map $f_0 : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$, denote the hallucination probability (0-1 risk) of a hypothesis map $h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ on μ and f_0 by $\text{HP}_{\mu, f_0}(h)$, which is defined by $\text{HP}_{\mu, f_0}(h) = \Pr(h(X) \neq f_0(X))$. Then, for any map (learning algorithm) $\mathfrak{A} : (\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})^* \rightarrow (\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y})$, any nonnegative integer (training data size) m that satisfies $m \leq \frac{1}{2}|\mathcal{X}|$, any finite positive integer p satisfying $1 \leq p \leq |\mathcal{Y}|$, and any $\lambda_H \in (0, 1)$, there exist a computable map $f_0 : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ and a finite subset $\underline{\mathcal{X}} \subset \mathcal{X}$ such that both the following inequalities hold.*

$$\mathbb{E}_T \text{HP}_{\text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}}), f_0}(\mathfrak{A}(T)) \geq \mu := \frac{p-1}{2p}, \quad \Pr_T(\text{HP}_{\text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}}), f_0}(\mathfrak{A}(T)) \geq \lambda_H) \geq \lambda_T := \frac{\mu - \lambda_H}{1 - \lambda_H} = \frac{p-1-2p\lambda_H}{2p-2p\lambda_H}. \quad (8)$$

Here, $T = ((\underline{X}_1, Y_1), (\underline{X}_2, Y_2), \dots, (\underline{X}_m, Y_m))$ is a length- m random training data sequence, where $\underline{X}_1, \underline{X}_2, \dots, \underline{X}_m$ are i.i.d. random variables generated by $\text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}})$, the uniform distribution on $\underline{\mathcal{X}}$, and $Y_i = f_0(\underline{X}_i)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ and the operators \mathbb{E}_T and \Pr_T return the expectation of the return value of the given function of the random variable T and the probability of the given condition depending on T being satisfied, respectively.

Remark 32. We are interested in the cases where $|\mathcal{Y}| \geq 2$ and we can take p so that $p \geq 2$. If $p \geq 2$, then $\mu \geq \frac{1}{4}$ and $\lambda_T \geq \frac{1-4\lambda_H}{4-4\lambda_H}$. Moreover, if $\lambda_H = \frac{1}{8}$, then $\lambda_T \geq \frac{1}{7}$.

Theorem 31 holds even where \mathcal{X} or \mathcal{Y} is infinite. If \mathcal{Y} is an infinite set, the following corollary is useful.

Corollary 33. *Under the setting of **Theorem 31**, if \mathcal{Y} is an infinite set, then for any map (learning algorithm) $\mathfrak{A} : (\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})^* \rightarrow (\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y})$, any nonnegative integer (training data size) m that satisfies $m \leq \frac{1}{2}|\mathcal{X}|$, and any $\lambda_H \in (0, 1)$, there exist a computable map $f_0 : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ and a finite subset $\underline{\mathcal{X}} \subset \mathcal{X}$ such that both the following inequalities hold:*

$$\mathbb{E}_T \text{HP}_{\text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}}), f_0}(\mathfrak{A}(T)) \geq \frac{1}{2}, \quad \Pr_T(\text{HP}_{\text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}}), f_0}(\mathfrak{A}(T)) \geq \lambda_H) \geq \lambda_T := \frac{1-2\lambda_H}{2-2\lambda_H}. \quad (9)$$

Proof. For any $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, we can prove that $\mathbb{E}_T \text{HP}_{\text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}}), f_0}(\mathfrak{A}(T)) \geq \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon$ by taking a sufficiently large p in **Theorem 31**. Hence, $\mathbb{E}_T \text{HP}_{\text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}}), f_0}(\mathfrak{A}(T)) < \frac{1}{2}$ cannot hold, which completes the proof of $\mathbb{E}_T \text{HP}_{\text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}}), f_0}(\mathfrak{A}(T)) \geq \frac{1}{2}$. We can prove $\Pr_T(\text{HP}_{\text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}}), f_0}(\mathfrak{A}(T)) \geq \lambda_H) \geq \lambda_T$ by applying **Lemma 37** with $c = 1$ and $a = \lambda_H$ to $\mathbb{E}_T \text{HP}_{\text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}}), f_0}(\mathfrak{A}(T)) \geq \frac{1}{2}$. \square

Remark 34. In **Corollary 33**, for example, if $\lambda_H = \frac{1}{4}$, then $\lambda_T = \frac{1}{3}$.

Remark 35. (Regarding the statement of **Theorem 31**) **Theorem 31** is a generalized version of the no free lunch theorem given as (Shalev-Shwartz and Ben-David, 2014, Theorem 5.1.) as **Theorem 31** provides a tighter bound when $|\mathcal{Y}| \geq 3$. However, the proof technique is essentially the same as that of Theorem 5.1. in (Shalev-Shwartz and Ben-David, 2014). We also remark that the computability of the map f_0 was pointed out by (Agarwal et al., 2020).

From **Theorem 31**, we obtain **Theorem 25** and **Theorem 27** as follows.

*Proof of **Theorem 25**.* For any m , consider a subset $\mathcal{X} \subset \Sigma^*$ such that $|\mathcal{X}| > 2m$. We obtain the theorem by applying **Theorem 31** to \mathcal{X} . \square

*Proof of **Theorem 27**.* First, the following lemma holds, whose proof is in Appendix.

Lemma 36. *We can construct a set $\mathcal{X} \subset \Sigma^*$ such that $|\mathcal{X}| = \left\lfloor \frac{|\Sigma|^{n+1}-1}{(|\Sigma|-1)\text{CDF}(n)} \right\rfloor$ and $\text{CDF}_{\text{len} \# \text{Uni}(\mathcal{X})}(n) \geq \overline{\text{CDF}}(n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.*

Once we admit [Lemma 36](#), then we obtain [Theorem 27](#) by applying [Theorem 31](#) to the set \mathcal{X} constructed by [Lemma 36](#), which completes the proof. \square

The proof of [Lemma 36](#) is given as follows.

Proof of Lemma 36. Recall that $\underline{n} := \operatorname{argmin}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} \frac{|\Sigma|^{n+1}-1}{(|\Sigma|-1) \overline{\text{CDF}}(n)}$. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, construct \mathcal{X}_n as follows.

- If $\frac{|\Sigma|^{n+1}-1}{|\Sigma|-1} \leq \frac{|\Sigma|^{\underline{n}+1}-1}{(|\Sigma|-1) \overline{\text{CDF}}(\underline{n})}$, then $\mathcal{X}_n := \Sigma^n$,
- If $\frac{|\Sigma|^{n+1}-1}{|\Sigma|-1} \leq \frac{|\Sigma|^{\underline{n}+1}-1}{(|\Sigma|-1) \overline{\text{CDF}}(\underline{n})} < \frac{|\Sigma|^{n+1}-1}{|\Sigma|-1}$, then construct \mathcal{X}_n by collecting arbitrary $\left\lfloor \frac{|\Sigma|^{\underline{n}+1}-1}{(|\Sigma|-1) \overline{\text{CDF}}(\underline{n})} \right\rfloor - \frac{|\Sigma|^n-1}{|\Sigma|-1}$ elements in Σ^n ,
- If $\frac{|\Sigma|^{n+1}-1}{(|\Sigma|-1) \overline{\text{CDF}}(\underline{n})} < \frac{|\Sigma|^n-1}{|\Sigma|-1}$, then $\mathcal{X}_n = \{\}$.

Then, the set $\mathcal{X} := \mathcal{X}_0 \cup \mathcal{X}_1 \cup \dots$ satisfies the following:

1. $|\mathcal{X}| = \left\lfloor \frac{|\Sigma|^{\underline{n}+1}-1}{(|\Sigma|-1) \overline{\text{CDF}}(\underline{n})} \right\rfloor$, and
2. Let X be a random variable generated by $\text{Uni}(\mathcal{X})$. For any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $\Pr(\text{len}(X) \leq n) = \frac{|\mathcal{X}_{\leq n}|}{|\mathcal{X}|} \geq \overline{\text{CDF}}(n)$, where $\mathcal{X}_{\leq n} := \mathcal{X}_0 \cup \mathcal{X}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{X}_n$,

which are the consequences of [Lemma 30](#). Hence, we can complete the proof by confirming the above two properties. Here, the first property is trivial. Noting that $|\mathcal{X}| \leq \frac{|\Sigma|^{\underline{n}+1}-1}{(|\Sigma|-1) \overline{\text{CDF}}(\underline{n})}$, the second property can be confirmed as follows.

- If $\frac{|\Sigma|^{n+1}-1}{|\Sigma|-1} \leq \frac{|\Sigma|^{\underline{n}+1}-1}{(|\Sigma|-1) \overline{\text{CDF}}(\underline{n})}$, then $\mathcal{X}_{\leq n} = \Sigma^{\leq n}$, so $|\mathcal{X}_{\leq n}| = \frac{|\Sigma|^{n+1}-1}{|\Sigma|-1}$. Hence

$$\frac{|\mathcal{X}_{\leq n}|}{|\mathcal{X}|} \geq \frac{|\Sigma|^{n+1}-1}{|\Sigma|-1} \cdot \frac{(|\Sigma|-1) \overline{\text{CDF}}(\underline{n})}{|\Sigma|^{\underline{n}+1}-1} \geq \frac{|\Sigma|^{n+1}-1}{|\Sigma|-1} \cdot \frac{(|\Sigma|-1) \overline{\text{CDF}}(n)}{|\Sigma|^{n+1}-1} = \overline{\text{CDF}}(n) \quad (10)$$

holds, where the second inequality is due to the definition of \underline{n} .

- If $\frac{|\Sigma|^{n+1}-1}{(|\Sigma|-1) \overline{\text{CDF}}(\underline{n})} < \frac{|\Sigma|^{\underline{n}+1}-1}{|\Sigma|-1}$, then since $\mathcal{X}_{\leq n} = \mathcal{X}$, the inequality $\frac{|\mathcal{X}_{\leq n}|}{|\mathcal{X}|} = 1 \geq \overline{\text{CDF}}(n)$ is trivial since $\overline{\text{CDF}}(n) \in [0, 1]$ by definition.

These complete the proof. \square

We conclude this section with a complete proof of [Theorem 31](#).

Proof of Theorem 31. The statement is trivial if $p = 1$. Hence, in the following, we assume that $|\mathcal{Y}| > 1$ and $1 < p \leq |\mathcal{Y}|$. Recall that for any positive integer a , we denote the set $\{1, 2, \dots, a\}$ by $[a]$. Recall that $m \leq \frac{1}{2}|\mathcal{X}|$. Define $\underline{\mathcal{X}} := \mathcal{X}$ if \mathcal{X} is a finite set and let $\underline{\mathcal{X}}$ be an arbitrary finite subset of \mathcal{X} satisfying $|\underline{\mathcal{X}}| = 2m$ if \mathcal{X} is an infinite set. In any case, $n := |\underline{\mathcal{X}}| \geq 2m$ is satisfied. Likewise, recall that $p \leq |\mathcal{Y}|$ and let $\underline{\mathcal{Y}}$ be a finite subset of \mathcal{Y} satisfying $|\underline{\mathcal{Y}}| = p$. Let $\mathcal{Y}^{\underline{\mathcal{X}}}$ denote the set of all the maps from $\underline{\mathcal{X}}$ to \mathcal{Y} . Likewise, let $\underline{\mathcal{Y}}^{\underline{\mathcal{X}}}$ denote the set of all the maps from $\underline{\mathcal{X}}$ to $\underline{\mathcal{Y}}$. Clearly, $|\underline{\mathcal{Y}}^{\underline{\mathcal{X}}}| = |\mathcal{Y}^{\underline{\mathcal{X}}}| = p^n$. In other words, there are $Q := p^n$ possible maps from $\underline{\mathcal{X}}$ to $\underline{\mathcal{Y}}$. We index these maps so that we have a sequence f_1, f_2, \dots, f_Q of distinct maps such that $\{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_Q\} = \underline{\mathcal{Y}}^{\underline{\mathcal{X}}}$. In the following, for $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m) \in \mathcal{X}^m$ and $f \in \mathcal{Y}^{\underline{\mathcal{X}}}$, let $f(\mathbf{x})$ denote $(f(x_1), f(x_2), \dots, f(x_m)) \in \mathcal{Y}^m$ and $(\mathbf{x}, f(\mathbf{x}))^\top$ denote $((x_1, f(x_1)), (x_2, f(x_2)), \dots, (x_m, f(x_m))) \in (\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})^m$. We are to prove that for any map $\mathfrak{A} : \mathcal{X}^m \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^{\mathcal{X}}$, the following holds:

$$\max_{q \in [Q]} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X} \sim \text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}})^m} \text{HP}_{\text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}}), f_q} \left(\mathfrak{A} \left((\mathbf{X}, f_q(\mathbf{X}))^\top \right) \right) \geq \frac{p-1}{2p}, \quad (11)$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X} \sim \text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}})^m}$ indicates the expectation operator with respect to the random variable sequence $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_m)$, a sequence of independent random variables, each of which is generated by the identical uniform distribution $\text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}})$. Note that since $\underline{\mathcal{X}}$ and $\underline{\mathcal{Y}}$ are finite sets, f_q is a computable map for all $q \in [Q]$. There are $D := |\underline{\mathcal{X}}|^m$ possible data sequences in $\underline{\mathcal{X}}^m$. We index these data sequences so that we have a sequence $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_D$ of distinct data sequences satisfying $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_D\} = \underline{\mathcal{X}}^m$. By the definition of the uniform distribution $\text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}})^m$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X} \sim \text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}})^m} \text{HP}_{\text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}}), f_q} \left(\mathfrak{A} \left((\mathbf{X}, f_q(\mathbf{X}))^\top \right) \right) = \frac{1}{D} \sum_{d=1}^D \text{HP}_{\text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}}), f_q} \left(\mathfrak{A} \left((\mathbf{x}_d, f_q(\mathbf{x}_d))^\top \right) \right). \quad (12)$$

Since $(\text{maximum}) \geq (\text{mean})$ and $(\text{mean}) \geq (\text{minimum})$ holds, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \max_{q=1,2,\dots,Q} \frac{1}{D} \sum_{d=1}^D \text{HP}_{\text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}}), f_q} \left(\mathfrak{A} \left((\mathbf{x}_d, f_q(\mathbf{x}_d))^\top \right) \right) &\geq \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{q=1}^Q \frac{1}{D} \sum_{d=1}^D \text{HP}_{\text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}}), f_q} \left(\mathfrak{A} \left((\mathbf{x}_d, f_q(\mathbf{x}_d))^\top \right) \right) \\
 &= \frac{1}{D} \sum_{d=1}^D \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{q=1}^Q \text{HP}_{\text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}}), f_q} \left(\mathfrak{A} \left((\mathbf{x}_d, f_q(\mathbf{x}_d))^\top \right) \right) \\
 &\geq \min_{d=1,2,\dots,D} \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{q=1}^Q \text{HP}_{\text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}}), f_q} \left(\mathfrak{A} \left((\mathbf{x}_d, f_q(\mathbf{x}_d))^\top \right) \right) \quad (13) \\
 &= \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{q=1}^Q \text{HP}_{\text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}}), f_q} \left(\mathfrak{A} \left((\mathbf{x}_{d^*}, f_q(\mathbf{x}_{d^*}))^\top \right) \right) \\
 &= \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{q=1}^Q \text{HP}_{\text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}}), f_q} (h_q),
 \end{aligned}$$

where d^* is an any integer in $\text{argmin}_{d=1,2,\dots,D} \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{q=1}^Q \text{HP}_{\text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}}), f_q} \left(\mathfrak{A} \left((\mathbf{x}_d, f_q(\mathbf{x}_d))^\top \right) \right)$ and h_q is defined by $h_q := \mathfrak{A} \left((\mathbf{x}_{d^*}, f_q(\mathbf{x}_{d^*}))^\top \right)$ for notation simplicity. Let $\mathbf{x}_{d^*} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$. Define $R := |\underline{\mathcal{X}} \setminus \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\}|$. We index all the elements in $\underline{\mathcal{X}} \setminus \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\}$ to obtain a sequence of distinct elements $\bar{\xi}_1, \bar{\xi}_2, \dots, \bar{\xi}_R$ satisfying $\{\bar{\xi}_1, \bar{\xi}_2, \dots, \bar{\xi}_R\} = \underline{\mathcal{X}} \setminus \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\}$, where $R := |\underline{\mathcal{X}} \setminus \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\}|$ satisfies $R \geq |\underline{\mathcal{X}}| - m \geq \frac{1}{2}|\underline{\mathcal{X}}|$ by the definition of m . Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{HP}_{\text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}}), f_q} (h_q) &= \frac{1}{|\underline{\mathcal{X}}|} \sum_{\xi \in \underline{\mathcal{X}}} \mathbb{1}(h_q(\xi) \neq f_q(\xi)) \\
 &\geq \frac{1}{|\underline{\mathcal{X}}|} \sum_{r=1}^R \mathbb{1}(h_q(\bar{\xi}_r) \neq f_q(\bar{\xi}_r)) \quad (14) \\
 &\geq \frac{1}{2R} \sum_{r=1}^R \mathbb{1}(h_q(\bar{\xi}_r) \neq f_q(\bar{\xi}_r)).
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, using $(\text{mean}) \geq (\text{minimum})$ again, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{q=1}^Q \text{HP}_{\text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}}), f_q} (h_q) &\geq \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{q=1}^Q \frac{1}{2R} \sum_{r=1}^R \mathbb{1}(h_q(\bar{\xi}_r) \neq f_q(\bar{\xi}_r)) \\
 &= \frac{1}{2R} \sum_{r=1}^R \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{q=1}^Q \mathbb{1}(h_q(\bar{\xi}_r) \neq f_q(\bar{\xi}_r)) \quad (15) \\
 &\geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \min_{r=1,2,\dots,R} \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{q=1}^Q \mathbb{1}(h_q(\bar{\xi}_r) \neq f_q(\bar{\xi}_r)) \\
 &\geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{q=1}^Q \mathbb{1}(h_q(\bar{\xi}_{\bar{r}^*}) \neq f_q(\bar{\xi}_{\bar{r}^*})),
 \end{aligned}$$

where \bar{r}^* is a fixed integer in $\text{argmin}_{r=1,2,\dots,R} \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{q=1}^Q \mathbb{1}(h_q(\bar{\xi}_r) \neq f_q(\bar{\xi}_r))$. Now, evaluate the sum with respect to q . Index the elements of $\underline{\mathcal{X}}$ so that we get a sequence $\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n$ of distinct elements satisfying $\{\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n\} = \underline{\mathcal{X}}$. Define $r^* \in [n]$ so that $\xi_{r^*} = \bar{\xi}_{\bar{r}^*}$. For every $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{r-1}, y_{r+1}, y_{r+2}, \dots, y_n) \in \underline{\mathcal{Y}}^{n-1}$, define $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{y}} := \{q \in [Q] \mid f_q(\xi_j) = y_j \text{ for all } j \in [n] \text{ satisfying } j \neq r^*\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{y}} := \{f_q \mid q \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{y}}\} = \{f \in \underline{\mathcal{Y}}^{\underline{\mathcal{X}}} \mid f(\xi_j) = y_j \text{ for all } j \in [n] \text{ satisfying } j \neq r^*\}$. The index set $[Q]$ can be partitioned as $[Q] = \bigsqcup_{\mathbf{y} \in \underline{\mathcal{Y}}^{n-1}} \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{y}}$, where \bigsqcup is the disjoint union operator. In other words, $[Q] = \bigcup_{\mathbf{y} \in \underline{\mathcal{Y}}^{n-1}} \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{y}}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{y}} \cup \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{y}'} = \emptyset$ if $\mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{y}'$. This partition of $[Q]$ corresponds to the partition of $\underline{\mathcal{Y}}^{\underline{\mathcal{X}}}$ given by $\underline{\mathcal{Y}}^{\underline{\mathcal{X}}} = \bigsqcup_{\mathbf{y} \in \underline{\mathcal{Y}}^{n-1}} \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{y}}$. We remark the following two properties of $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbf{y}}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{y}}$. Recall that $\mathbf{x}_{d^*} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$.

1. The size (cardinality) is given by $|\mathcal{Q}_y| = |\mathcal{F}_y| = |\mathcal{Y}| = p$. It is because all the maps in \mathcal{F}_y return the same value y_j for the input ξ_j for each of $j \in [n] \setminus \{r^*\}$ but they return distinct values in \mathcal{Y} for the input ξ_{r^*} .
2. For any $q, q' \in \mathcal{Q}_y$, the maps h_q and $h_{q'}$ are identical, i.e., $\mathfrak{A}\left(\left(\mathbf{x}_{d^*}, f_q(\mathbf{x}_{d^*})\right)^\top\right) = \mathfrak{A}\left(\left(\mathbf{x}_{d^*}, f_{q'}(\mathbf{x}_{d^*})\right)^\top\right)$. It is because the equation $f_q(\mathbf{x}_{d^*}) = f_{q'}(\mathbf{x}_{d^*})$ holds since $\xi_{r^*} \notin \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\}$ as $\xi_{r^*} = \xi_{\bar{r}^*}$ is taken from $\underline{\mathcal{X}} \setminus \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\}$ by definition and $f_q(\xi) = f_{q'}(\xi)$ is satisfied for all $\xi \in \underline{\mathcal{X}} \setminus \{r^*\}$ by the definition of \mathcal{F}_y .

We can uniquely define h_y by $h_y \in \{h_q \mid q \in \mathcal{Q}_y\}$, where the right hand side is a one-point set according to the above property 2. Using the above partition, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{q=1}^Q \mathbb{1}(h_q(\bar{\xi}_{r^*}) \neq f_q(\bar{\xi}_{r^*})) &= \sum_{q=1}^Q \mathbb{1}(h_q(\xi_{r^*}) \neq f_q(\xi_{r^*})) \\
 &= \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \underline{\mathcal{Y}}^{n-1}} \sum_{q \in \mathcal{Q}_y} \mathbb{1}(h_q(\xi_{r^*}) \neq f_q(\xi_{r^*})) \\
 &= \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \underline{\mathcal{Y}}^{n-1}} \sum_{q \in \mathcal{Q}_y} \mathbb{1}(h_y(\xi_{r^*}) \neq f_q(\xi_{r^*})) \\
 &= \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \underline{\mathcal{Y}}^{n-1}} \sum_{\eta \in \underline{\mathcal{Y}}} \mathbb{1}(h_y(\xi_{r^*}) \neq \eta) \\
 &\geq p^{n-1}(p-1),
 \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where the last inequality is due to

$$\sum_{\eta \in \underline{\mathcal{Y}}} \mathbb{1}(h_y(\xi_{r^*}) \neq \eta) = \begin{cases} p-1 & \text{if } h_y(\xi_{r^*}) \in \underline{\mathcal{Y}}, \\ p^n & \text{if } h_y(\xi_{r^*}) \notin \underline{\mathcal{Y}}. \end{cases} \tag{17}$$

Note that $h_y(\xi_{r^*}) \notin \underline{\mathcal{Y}}$ may happen since $h_y \in \underline{\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathcal{X}}$ does not always hold while $h_y \in \mathcal{Y}^{\mathcal{X}}$ always holds. We obtain (11) by combining (12) (13) (14) (15) (16).

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \sum_{l=1}^p \sum_{f \in \mathcal{H}_{r,l}} \mathbb{1}(h(\bar{\xi}_r) \neq y_l) \\
 &= \sum_{l=1}^p p^{n-1} \mathbb{1}(h(\bar{\xi}_r) \neq y_l) \\
 &= \begin{cases} (p-1)p^{n-1} & \text{if } h(\bar{\xi}_r) \in \mathcal{Y}, \\ p^n & \text{if } h(\bar{\xi}_r) \notin \mathcal{Y}, \end{cases} \\
 &\geq (p-1)p^{n-1}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\frac{1}{Q} \sum_{q=1}^Q \text{HP}_{\text{Uni}(\underline{\mathcal{X}}), f_q}(h) \geq \frac{p-1}{2p}. \tag{19}$$

The following consequence of Markov's inequality completes the proof of [Theorem 31](#).

Lemma 37. *Let c be a positive real number and let Z be a random variable taking a value in $[0, c]$ and assume its expectation is given by $\mathbb{E}Z = \mu \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, for any real number $a \in (0, c)$, the following inequality holds:*

$$\Pr(Z > a) \geq \frac{\mu - a}{c - a}. \tag{20}$$

Proof. Noting that $Z \leq a$ is equivalent to $c - Z \geq c - a$ and that $c - Z$ is a nonnegative random variable whose expectation is $c - \mu$, we obtain the following evaluation by Markov's inequality:

$$\Pr(Z > a) = 1 - \Pr(Z \leq a) = 1 - \Pr(c - Z \geq c - a) \geq 1 - \frac{c - \mu}{c - a} = \frac{\mu - a}{c - a}, \quad (21)$$

where we applied Markov's inequality to the nonnegative random variable $c - Z$ to get the inequality. □

We complete the proof of [Theorem 31](#) by applying [Lemma 37](#) with $c = 1$ and $a = \lambda_H$ to (11). □