

The Computational Content of the Hahn-Banach Theorem: Some Known Results – Some Open Questions

Vasco Brattka

Universität der Bundeswehr München, Germany University of Cape Town, South Africa



third CORE meeting LMU München – January 2018

Let X be a normed space and $Y \subseteq X$ a linear subspace. Every linear bounded functional $f : Y \to \mathbb{R}$ admits a linear bounded extension $g : X \to \mathbb{R}$ such that ||f|| = ||g||.

Here $||f|| := \sup_{||x|| \le 1} |f(x)|$ denotes the usual operator norm.

We are interested in questions such as:

- ► How difficult is it to find some suitable g, given f, i.e., how difficult is it to compute the map f → g?
- If we fix a computable f, how difficult can a suitable g be to compute?
- ► How does all this depend on properties of the space X and the subspace Y?

Let X be a normed space and $Y \subseteq X$ a linear subspace. Every linear bounded functional $f : Y \to \mathbb{R}$ admits a linear bounded extension $g : X \to \mathbb{R}$ such that ||f|| = ||g||.

Here $||f|| := \sup_{||x|| \le 1} |f(x)|$ denotes the usual operator norm.

We are interested in questions such as:

- ► How difficult is it to find some suitable g, given f, i.e., how difficult is it to compute the map f → g?
- If we fix a computable f, how difficult can a suitable g be to compute?
- ► How does all this depend on properties of the space X and the subspace Y?

The following are equivalent:

- The Hahn-Banach Theorem (for separable spaces).
- Weak Kőnig's Lemma.

This "equivalence" was proved in the following settings:

- ▶ Over RCA₀ in reverse mathematics (Brown, Simpson 1986).
- ▶ In Bishop's style constructive analysis (Ishihara 1990).
- ▶ In the Weihrauch lattice (Gherardi, Marcone 2009).

resource sensitivity

reverse mathematics

computable analysis

constructive analysis

uniformity

The following are equivalent:

- The Hahn-Banach Theorem (for separable spaces).
- Weak Kőnig's Lemma.

This "equivalence" was proved in the following settings:

- ▶ Over RCA₀ in reverse mathematics (Brown, Simpson 1986).
- In Bishop's style constructive analysis (Ishihara 1990).
- ► In the Weihrauch lattice (Gherardi, Marcone 2009).

resource sensitivity reverse mathematics constructive analysis

uniformity

The following are equivalent:

- The Hahn-Banach Theorem (for separable spaces).
- Weak Kőnig's Lemma.

This "equivalence" was proved in the following settings:

- ▶ Over RCA₀ in reverse mathematics (Brown, Simpson 1986).
- ▶ In Bishop's style constructive analysis (Ishihara 1990).
- ► In the Weihrauch lattice (Gherardi, Marcone 2009).

resource sensitivity

reverse mathematics

computable analysis

constructive analysis

uniformity



Let $f :\subseteq X \rightrightarrows Y$, $g :\subseteq Z \rightrightarrows W$ be problems.



- ▶ *f* is Weihrauch reducible to *g*, $f \leq_W g$, if there are computable $H :\subseteq X \times W \Rightarrow Y$, $K :\subseteq X \Rightarrow Z$ such that $H(id_X, gK) \sqsubseteq f$.
- ▶ *f* is strongly Weihrauch reducible to *g*, $f \leq_{sW} g$, if there are computable $H :\subseteq W \Rightarrow Y$, $K :\subseteq X \Rightarrow Z$ such that $HgK \sqsubseteq f$.
- Equivalences $f \equiv_W g$ and $f \equiv_{sW} g$ are defined as usual.



Let $f :\subseteq X \rightrightarrows Y$, $g :\subseteq Z \rightrightarrows W$ be problems.



- ▶ *f* is Weihrauch reducible to *g*, $f \leq_W g$, if there are computable $H :\subseteq X \times W \rightrightarrows Y$, $K :\subseteq X \rightrightarrows Z$ such that $H(\operatorname{id}_X, gK) \sqsubseteq f$.
- *f* is strongly Weihrauch reducible to *g*, *f* ≤_{sW} *g*, if there are computable *H* :⊆ *W* ⇒ *Y*, *K* :⊆ *X* ⇒ *Z* such that *HgK* ⊑ *f*.
- Equivalences $f \equiv_W g$ and $f \equiv_{sW} g$ are defined as usual.



Let $f :\subseteq X \rightrightarrows Y$, $g :\subseteq Z \rightrightarrows W$ be problems.



- ► *f* is Weihrauch reducible to *g*, $f \leq_W g$, if there are computable $H :\subseteq X \times W \Rightarrow Y$, $K :\subseteq X \Rightarrow Z$ such that $H(\operatorname{id}_X, gK) \sqsubseteq f$.
- ▶ *f* is strongly Weihrauch reducible to *g*, $f \leq_{sW} g$, if there are computable $H :\subseteq W \Rightarrow Y$, $K :\subseteq X \Rightarrow Z$ such that $HgK \sqsubseteq f$.
- Equivalences $f \equiv_W g$ and $f \equiv_{sW} g$ are defined as usual.



Let $f :\subseteq X \rightrightarrows Y$, $g :\subseteq Z \rightrightarrows W$ be problems.



- ▶ *f* is Weihrauch reducible to *g*, $f \leq_W g$, if there are computable $H :\subseteq X \times W \rightrightarrows Y$, $K :\subseteq X \rightrightarrows Z$ such that $H(\operatorname{id}_X, gK) \sqsubseteq f$.
- *f* is strongly Weihrauch reducible to *g*, *f* ≤_{sW} *g*, if there are computable *H* :⊆ *W* ⇒ *Y*, *K* :⊆ *X* ⇒ *Z* such that *HgK* ⊑ *f*.
- Equivalences $f \equiv_W g$ and $f \equiv_{sW} g$ are defined as usual.



Let $f :\subseteq X \rightrightarrows Y$, $g :\subseteq Z \rightrightarrows W$ be problems.



- ▶ *f* is Weihrauch reducible to *g*, $f \leq_W g$, if there are computable $H :\subseteq X \times W \rightrightarrows Y$, $K :\subseteq X \rightrightarrows Z$ such that $H(\operatorname{id}_X, gK) \sqsubseteq f$.
- *f* is strongly Weihrauch reducible to *g*, *f* ≤_{sW} *g*, if there are computable *H* :⊆ *W* ⇒ *Y*, *K* :⊆ *X* ⇒ *Z* such that *HgK* ⊑ *f*.
- Equivalences $f \equiv_W g$ and $f \equiv_{sW} g$ are defined as usual.

Algebraic Operations in the Weihrauch Lattice

For $f :\subseteq X \rightrightarrows Y$ and $g :\subseteq W \rightrightarrows Z$ we define:

- ► $f \times g :\subseteq X \times W \Rightarrow Y \times Z$, $(x, w) \mapsto f(x) \times g(w)$ (Product)
- ► $f \sqcup g :\subseteq X \sqcup W \Rightarrow Y \sqcup Z, z \mapsto \begin{cases} f(z) \text{ if } z \in X \\ g(z) \text{ if } z \in W \end{cases}$ (Coproduct)
- ► $f \sqcap g :\subseteq X \times W \Rightarrow Y \sqcup Z$, $(x, w) \mapsto f(x) \sqcup g(w)$ (Sum)
- $\blacktriangleright f^* :\subseteq X^* \rightrightarrows Y^*, f^* = \bigsqcup_{i=0}^{\infty} f^i$ (Star)
- $\bullet \ \widehat{f} :\subseteq X^{\mathbb{N}} \rightrightarrows Y^{\mathbb{N}}, \widehat{f} = X_{i=0}^{\infty} f$ (Parallelization)
- ► $f * g := \max\{f_0 \circ g_0 : f_0 \leq_W f, g_0 \leq_W g\}$ (Compos. product)

Theorem (B., Gherardi, Pauly)

- Weihrauch reducibility induces a lattice with the coproduct ⊔ as supremum and the sum ⊓ as infimum.
- Parallelization ^ and star operation * are closure operators in the Weihrauch lattice.

Algebraic Operations in the Weihrauch Lattice

For $f :\subseteq X \rightrightarrows Y$ and $g :\subseteq W \rightrightarrows Z$ we define:

- ► $f \times g :\subseteq X \times W \Rightarrow Y \times Z$, $(x, w) \mapsto f(x) \times g(w)$ (Product)
- ► $f \sqcup g :\subseteq X \sqcup W \Rightarrow Y \sqcup Z, z \mapsto \begin{cases} f(z) \text{ if } z \in X \\ g(z) \text{ if } z \in W \end{cases}$ (Coproduct)
- ► $f \sqcap g :\subseteq X \times W \Rightarrow Y \sqcup Z$, $(x, w) \mapsto f(x) \sqcup g(w)$ (Sum)
- $\blacktriangleright f^* :\subseteq X^* \rightrightarrows Y^*, f^* = \bigsqcup_{i=0}^{\infty} f^i$ (Star)
- $\bullet \ \widehat{f} :\subseteq X^{\mathbb{N}} \rightrightarrows Y^{\mathbb{N}}, \widehat{f} = X_{i=0}^{\infty} f$ (Parallelization)
- $f * g := \max\{f_0 \circ g_0 : f_0 \leq_W f, g_0 \leq_W g\}$ (Compos. product)

Theorem (B., Gherardi, Pauly)

- ► Weihrauch reducibility induces a lattice with the coproduct as supremum and the sum as infimum.
- Parallelization ^ and star operation * are closure operators in the Weihrauch lattice.

Definition

 $C_X :\subseteq A_-(X) \rightrightarrows X, A \mapsto A$ with $dom(C_X) := \{A : A \neq \emptyset\}$ is called the choice problem of a computable metric space X.

We consider the following restrictions of choice:

- UC_X is C_X restricted to singletons
- CC_X is C_X restricted to connected sets (connected choice)
- ► XC_X is C_X restricted to convex sets

(unique choice) (connected choice) (convex choice)

Theorem (B. and Gherardi)

- ► $C_2 \equiv_{sW} LLPO$,
- $\blacktriangleright C_{2^{\mathbb{N}}} \equiv_{\mathrm{sW}} C_{[0,1]} \equiv_{\mathrm{sW}} \widehat{C_2} \equiv_{\mathrm{sW}} \mathsf{WKL},$
- $\blacktriangleright \mathsf{XC}_{[0,1]} = \mathsf{CC}_{[0,1]} \equiv_{\mathrm{sW}} \mathsf{IVT}.$

Definition

 $C_X :\subseteq A_-(X) \Longrightarrow X, A \mapsto A$ with $dom(C_X) := \{A : A \neq \emptyset\}$ is called the choice problem of a computable metric space X.

We consider the following restrictions of choice:

- UC_X is C_X restricted to singletons
- CC_X is C_X restricted to connected sets (connected choice)
- ► XC_X is C_X restricted to convex sets

(unique choice) (connected choice) (convex choice)

Theorem (B. and Gherardi)

- ► $C_2 \equiv_{sW} LLPO$,
- $\blacktriangleright C_{2^{\mathbb{N}}} \equiv_{\mathrm{sW}} C_{[0,1]} \equiv_{\mathrm{sW}} \widehat{C_2} \equiv_{\mathrm{sW}} \mathsf{WKL},$
- $\blacktriangleright \mathsf{XC}_{[0,1]} = \mathsf{CC}_{[0,1]} \equiv_{\mathrm{sW}} \mathsf{IVT}.$

Definition

 $C_X :\subseteq A_-(X) \Longrightarrow X, A \mapsto A$ with $dom(C_X) := \{A : A \neq \emptyset\}$ is called the choice problem of a computable metric space X.

We consider the following restrictions of choice:

- ► UC_X is C_X restricted to singletons
- CC_X is C_X restricted to connected sets (connected choice)
- ► XC_X is C_X restricted to convex sets

(unique choice) (connected choice) (convex choice)

Theorem (B. and Gherardi)

• $C_2 \equiv_{sW} LLPO$,

$$\blacktriangleright C_{2^{\mathbb{N}}} \equiv_{\mathrm{sW}} C_{[0,1]} \equiv_{\mathrm{sW}} \widehat{C_2} \equiv_{\mathrm{sW}} \mathsf{WKL},$$

• $XC_{[0,1]} = CC_{[0,1]} \equiv_{sW} IVT.$

Choice in the Weihrauch Lattice





$\mathsf{HBT}(X,Y,f):=\{g\in\mathcal{C}(X,\mathbb{R}):g\;\mathsf{linear},g|_Y=f,||g||=||f||\}.$

Theorem (Gherardi and Marcone 2009)

$HBT \equiv_W WKL.$

Proof. (Idea.)

- ► "≤_W": There is a computable version of the Banach-Alaoglu Theorem, that states that the unit ball in X* is compact with respect to the weak* topology (B. 2008).
- ► The set of solutions HBT(X, Y, f) of the extension problem can be seen as a closed subset of this compact space.
- Hence finding an extension can be reduced to finding a point in a compact set, which is known to be reducible to WKL.
- ► "≥_W": the authors adapt a construction of Brown and Simpson (1990) that reduces the separation problem (equivalent to WKL) to HBT.
- ► This construction requires the construction of a Banach space that depends on the instance of the problem.



$\mathsf{HBT}(X,Y,f):=\{g\in\mathcal{C}(X,\mathbb{R}):g\;\mathsf{linear},g|_Y=f,||g||=||f||\}.$

Theorem (Gherardi and Marcone 2009)

 $HBT \equiv_W WKL.$

- Proof. (Idea.)
 - ► "≤_W": There is a computable version of the Banach-Alaoglu Theorem, that states that the unit ball in X* is compact with respect to the weak* topology (B. 2008).
 - ► The set of solutions HBT(X, Y, f) of the extension problem can be seen as a closed subset of this compact space.
 - Hence finding an extension can be reduced to finding a point in a compact set, which is known to be reducible to WKL.
 - ► "≥_W": the authors adapt a construction of Brown and Simpson (1990) that reduces the separation problem (equivalent to WKL) to HBT.
 - ► This construction requires the construction of a Banach space that depends on the instance of the problem.



$\mathsf{HBT}(X,Y,f):=\{g\in\mathcal{C}(X,\mathbb{R}):g\;\mathsf{linear},g|_Y=f,||g||=||f||\}.$

Theorem (Gherardi and Marcone 2009)

 $HBT \equiv_W WKL.$

- Proof. (Idea.)
 - ► "≤_W": There is a computable version of the Banach-Alaoglu Theorem, that states that the unit ball in X* is compact with respect to the weak* topology (B. 2008).
 - ► The set of solutions HBT(X, Y, f) of the extension problem can be seen as a closed subset of this compact space.
 - Hence finding an extension can be reduced to finding a point in a compact set, which is known to be reducible to WKL.
 - ► "≥_W": the authors adapt a construction of Brown and Simpson (1990) that reduces the separation problem (equivalent to WKL) to HBT.
 - This construction requires the construction of a Banach space that depends on the instance of the problem.



$\mathsf{HBT}(X,Y,f):=\{g\in\mathcal{C}(X,\mathbb{R}):g\;\mathsf{linear},g|_Y=f,||g||=||f||\}.$

Theorem (Gherardi and Marcone 2009)

 $HBT \equiv_W WKL.$

We immediately obtain the following non-uniform counter example.

Corollary (Metakides, Nerode and Shore 1985)

There exists a computable normed space X with a computably separable closed linear subspace $Y \subseteq X$ and a computable linear $f : Y \to \mathbb{R}$ with computable norm ||f|| such that every computable linear extension $g : X \to \mathbb{R}$ of f has norm ||g|| > ||f||.

A set Y is called *computably separable closed* in X if there is a computable sequence $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in X with $Y = \overline{\{x_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}}$.



$\mathsf{HBT}(X,Y,f):=\{g\in\mathcal{C}(X,\mathbb{R}):g\;\mathsf{linear},g|_Y=f,||g||=||f||\}.$

Theorem (Gherardi and Marcone 2009)

 $HBT \equiv_W WKL.$

We immediately obtain the following non-uniform positive result.

Corollary

Let X be a computable normed space X with a computably separable closed linear subspace $Y \subseteq X$ and a computable linear $f : Y \to \mathbb{R}$ with computable norm ||f||. Then f has a low bounded linear extension $g : X \to \mathbb{R}$ with ||g|| = ||f||.

That $g: X \to \mathbb{R}$ is *low* means here that it is low as a point in $\mathcal{C}(X, \mathbb{R})$ which means that it has a low name $p \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$. A $p \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is called *low* if $p' \leq_{\mathrm{T}} 0'$.



$\mathsf{HBT}(X,Y,f) := \{g \in \mathcal{C}(X,\mathbb{R}) : g \text{ linear}, g|_Y = f, ||g|| = ||f||\}.$

Theorem (Gherardi and Marcone 2009)

 $HBT \equiv_W WKL.$

Let us denote by HBT_X the problem HBT for a fixed space X.

Question

Is there a computable Banach space X with $HBT_X \equiv_W WKL$?

As an example we denote the Banach Inverse Mapping Theorem by

 $\mathsf{BIM}_X :\subseteq \mathcal{C}(X,Y) \to \mathcal{C}(Y,X), T \mapsto T^{-1},$

i.e., BIM is defined for bijective linear T. We obtain:

- ▶ $BIM_{X,Y} \leq_W C_N$ for all computable Banach spaces X, Y.
- ► $BIM_{\ell_2,\ell_2} \equiv_W C_N$.
- ▶ BIM_{X,Y} is computable for finite-dimensional computable Banach spaces X, Y.



 $\mathsf{HBT}(X,Y,f) := \{g \in \mathcal{C}(X,\mathbb{R}) : g \text{ linear}, g|_Y = f, ||g|| = ||f||\}.$

Theorem (Gherardi and Marcone 2009)

 $HBT \equiv_W WKL.$

Let us denote by HBT_X the problem HBT for a fixed space X.

Question

Is there a computable Banach space X with $HBT_X \equiv_W WKL$?

As an example we denote the Banach Inverse Mapping Theorem by

 $\mathsf{BIM}_X :\subseteq \mathcal{C}(X,Y) \to \mathcal{C}(Y,X), T \mapsto T^{-1},$

i.e., BIM is defined for bijective linear T. We obtain:

- ▶ $BIM_{X,Y} \leq_W C_N$ for all computable Banach spaces X, Y.
- ► $\mathsf{BIM}_{\ell_2,\ell_2} \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \mathsf{C}_{\mathbb{N}}.$
- ► BIM_{X,Y} is computable for finite-dimensional computable Banach spaces X, Y.

The Unique Case



Proposition (B. and Gherardi)

 $UC_{2^{\mathbb{N}}}$ is computable.

- (Y, || ||) is called *strictly convex*, if ||x + y|| < ||x|| + ||y|| holds for all linearly independent x, y ∈ Y.
- A normed spaces X has a strictly convex dual space X* if and only if all linear bounded functionals f : Y → ℝ have unique extensions g : X → ℝ with ||f|| = ||g||.

Corollary (B. 2008)

- ► Examples of strictly convex spaces are l_p for 1
- ► All Hilbert spaces are strictly convex.
- The spaces c_0, ℓ_1, ℓ_∞ are not strictly convex.



Proposition (B. and Gherardi)

 $UC_{2^{\mathbb{N}}}$ is computable.

- (Y, || ||) is called *strictly convex*, if ||x + y|| < ||x|| + ||y|| holds for all linearly independent x, y ∈ Y.
- A normed spaces X has a strictly convex dual space X* if and only if all linear bounded functionals f : Y → ℝ have unique extensions g : X → ℝ with ||f|| = ||g||.

Corollary (B. 2008)

- Examples of strictly convex spaces are ℓ_p for 1 .
- ► All Hilbert spaces are strictly convex.
- The spaces c_0, ℓ_1, ℓ_∞ are not strictly convex.



Proposition (B. and Gherardi)

 $UC_{2^{\mathbb{N}}}$ is computable.

- (Y, || ||) is called *strictly convex*, if ||x + y|| < ||x|| + ||y|| holds for all linearly independent x, y ∈ Y.
- A normed spaces X has a strictly convex dual space X* if and only if all linear bounded functionals f : Y → ℝ have unique extensions g : X → ℝ with ||f|| = ||g||.

Corollary (B. 2008)

- Examples of strictly convex spaces are ℓ_p for 1 .
- All Hilbert spaces are strictly convex.
- The spaces c_0, ℓ_1, ℓ_∞ are not strictly convex.



Proposition (B. and Gherardi)

 $UC_{2^{\mathbb{N}}}$ is computable.

- (Y, || ||) is called *strictly convex*, if ||x + y|| < ||x|| + ||y|| holds for all linearly independent x, y ∈ Y.
- A normed spaces X has a strictly convex dual space X* if and only if all linear bounded functionals f : Y → ℝ have unique extensions g : X → ℝ with ||f|| = ||g||.

Corollary (B. 2008)

- ► Examples of strictly convex spaces are lp for 1
- All Hilbert spaces are strictly convex.
- The spaces c_0, ℓ_1, ℓ_∞ are not strictly convex.

Lemma (Folklore)

Let (X, || ||) be a normed space, $Y \subseteq X$ a linear subspace, $x \in X$ and Z the linear subspace generated by $Y \cup \{x\}$. Let $f : Y \to \mathbb{R}$ be a linear functional with ||f|| = 1. A linear $g : Z \to \mathbb{R}$ with $g|_Y = f|_Y$ extends f with ||g|| = 1, if and only if

$$\sup_{u\in Y} (f(u) - ||x - u||) \le g(x) \le \inf_{v\in Y} (f(v) + ||x - v||).$$

By HBT_n we denote the Hahn-Banach Theorem HBT restricted to subspaces Y of codimension $\leq n$.

Corollary

Lemma (Folklore)

Let (X, || ||) be a normed space, $Y \subseteq X$ a linear subspace, $x \in X$ and Z the linear subspace generated by $Y \cup \{x\}$. Let $f : Y \to \mathbb{R}$ be a linear functional with ||f|| = 1. A linear $g : Z \to \mathbb{R}$ with $g|_Y = f|_Y$ extends f with ||g|| = 1, if and only if

$$\sup_{u\in Y} (f(u) - ||x - u||) \le g(x) \le \inf_{v\in Y} (f(v) + ||x - v||).$$

By HBT_n we denote the Hahn-Banach Theorem HBT restricted to subspaces Y of codimension $\leq n$.

Corollary

$$\mathsf{HBT}_n \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \underbrace{\mathsf{CC}_{[0,1]} * \dots * \mathsf{CC}_{[0,1]}}_{n-times}.$$

Finite Dimensional Extensions

Corollary

 $\mathsf{HBT}_n \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \underbrace{\mathsf{CC}_{[0,1]} * \ldots * \mathsf{CC}_{[0,1]}}_{\bullet}.$ n-times

 $CC_{[0,1]}$ is non-uniformly computable, i.e., every connected co-c.e. closed subset $A \subseteq [0,1]$ contains a computable point.

Corollary (Metakides and Nerode 1985)

Let X be a finite-dimensional computable Banach space with some closed linear subspace $Y \subseteq X$. For any computable linear functional $f : Y \to \mathbb{R}$ with computable norm ||f|| there exists a computable linear extension $g : X \to \mathbb{R}$ with ||g|| = ||f||.

Corollary

 $\mathsf{HBT}_n \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \underbrace{\mathsf{CC}_{[0,1]} * \dots * \mathsf{CC}_{[0,1]}}_{n-times}.$

 $CC_{[0,1]}$ is non-uniformly computable, i.e., every connected co-c.e. closed subset $A \subseteq [0,1]$ contains a computable point.

Corollary (Metakides and Nerode 1985)

Let X be a finite-dimensional computable Banach space with some closed linear subspace $Y \subseteq X$. For any computable linear functional $f : Y \to \mathbb{R}$ with computable norm ||f|| there exists a computable linear extension $g : X \to \mathbb{R}$ with ||g|| = ||f||.

Corollary

$$\mathsf{HBT}_n \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \underbrace{\mathsf{CC}_{[0,1]} \ast \ldots \ast \mathsf{CC}_{[0,1]}}_{n-times}.$$

 $CC_{[0,1]}$ is non-uniformly computable, i.e., every connected co-c.e. closed subset $A \subseteq [0,1]$ contains a computable point.

Corollary (Metakides and Nerode 1985)

Let X be a finite-dimensional computable Banach space with some closed linear subspace $Y \subseteq X$. For any computable linear functional $f : Y \to \mathbb{R}$ with computable norm ||f|| there exists a computable linear extension $g : X \to \mathbb{R}$ with ||g|| = ||f||.

Corollary

$$\mathsf{HBT}_n \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \underbrace{\mathsf{CC}_{[0,1]} \ast \ldots \ast \mathsf{CC}_{[0,1]}}_{n-times}.$$

 $CC_{[0,1]}$ is non-uniformly computable, i.e., every connected co-c.e. closed subset $A \subseteq [0,1]$ contains a computable point.

Corollary (Metakides and Nerode 1985)

Let X be a finite-dimensional computable Banach space with some closed linear subspace $Y \subseteq X$. For any computable linear functional $f : Y \to \mathbb{R}$ with computable norm ||f|| there exists a computable linear extension $g : X \to \mathbb{R}$ with ||g|| = ||f||.

Is there a computable Banach space X with $HBT_X \equiv_W WKL$?

Some negative results on a possible X:

- ► X cannot have a strictly convex dual space X^{*},
- ▶ X cannot be a Hilbert space,
- X cannot be a space ℓ_p for 1 ,
- ► X cannot be finite-dimensional.

We recall $||x||_{\ell_p} = \sqrt[p]{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |x_i|^p}$.

Question

Is $HBT_{\ell_1} \equiv_W WKL$?

We definitely have LLPO $\equiv_{sW} C_2 \leq_W HBT_{\ell_1}$, hence HBT_{ℓ_1} is not computable.

Is there a computable Banach space X with $HBT_X \equiv_W WKL$?

Some negative results on a possible X:

- ► X cannot have a strictly convex dual space X*,
- X cannot be a Hilbert space,
- X cannot be a space ℓ_p for 1 ,
- X cannot be finite-dimensional.

We recall $||x||_{\ell_p} = \sqrt[p]{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |x_i|^p}$.

Question

Is $HBT_{\ell_1} \equiv_W WKL$?

We definitely have LLPO $\equiv_{sW} C_2 \leq_W \mathsf{HBT}_{\ell_1}$, hence HBT_{ℓ_1} is not computable.

Is there a computable Banach space X with $HBT_X \equiv_W WKL$?

Some negative results on a possible X:

- ► X cannot have a strictly convex dual space X*,
- X cannot be a Hilbert space,
- X cannot be a space ℓ_p for 1 ,
- ► X cannot be finite-dimensional.

We recall $||x||_{\ell_p} = \sqrt[p]{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |x_i|^p}$.

Question

Is $\mathsf{HBT}_{\ell_1} \equiv_{\mathrm{W}} \mathsf{WKL}$?

We definitely have LLPO $\equiv_{sW} C_2 \leq_W \mathsf{HBT}_{\ell_1}$, hence HBT_{ℓ_1} is not computable.

Is there a computable Banach space X with $HBT_X \equiv_W WKL$?

Some negative results on a possible X:

- ► X cannot have a strictly convex dual space X*,
- X cannot be a Hilbert space,
- X cannot be a space ℓ_p for 1 ,
- ► X cannot be finite-dimensional.

We recall $||x||_{\ell_p} = \sqrt[p]{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |x_i|^p}$.

Question

Is $HBT_{\ell_1} \equiv_W WKL$?

We definitely have LLPO $\equiv_{sW} C_2 \leq_W \mathsf{HBT}_{\ell_1}$, hence HBT_{ℓ_1} is not computable.

Question

Can $HBT_n \leq_W CC_{[0,1]} * ... * CC_{[0,1]}$ be improved?

A plausible candidate is the following:

Question

Is $HBT_n \leq_W XC_{[0,1]^n}$ or even $HBT_n \equiv_W XC_{[0,1]^n}$?

More specifically we can even ask:

Question

Is $\operatorname{HBT}_{\ell_1(n)} \equiv_{\operatorname{W}} \operatorname{XC}_{[0,1]^n}$?

Such a result would be nice since we have:

Theorem (Le Roux and Pauly)

 $\mathsf{XC}_{[0,1]^n} \leq_{\mathrm{W}} \mathsf{XC}_{[0,1]^{n+1}}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Question

Can $HBT_n \leq_W CC_{[0,1]} * ... * CC_{[0,1]}$ be improved?

A plausible candidate is the following:

Question

Is $HBT_n \leq_W XC_{[0,1]^n}$ or even $HBT_n \equiv_W XC_{[0,1]^n}$?

More specifically we can even ask:

Question

Is $\operatorname{HBT}_{\ell_1(n)} \equiv_{\operatorname{W}} \operatorname{XC}_{[0,1]^n}$?

Such a result would be nice since we have:

Theorem (Le Roux and Pauly)

 $\mathsf{XC}_{[0,1]^n} <_{\mathrm{W}} \mathsf{XC}_{[0,1]^{n+1}}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Question

Can $HBT_n \leq_W CC_{[0,1]} * ... * CC_{[0,1]}$ be improved?

A plausible candidate is the following:

Question

Is $HBT_n \leq_W XC_{[0,1]^n}$ or even $HBT_n \equiv_W XC_{[0,1]^n}$?

More specifically we can even ask:

Question

Is $HBT_{\ell_1(n)} \equiv_W XC_{[0,1]^n}$?

Such a result would be nice since we have:

Theorem (Le Roux and Pauly)

 $\mathsf{XC}_{[0,1]^n} <_{\mathrm{W}} \mathsf{XC}_{[0,1]^{n+1}}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Question

Can $HBT_n \leq_W CC_{[0,1]} * ... * CC_{[0,1]}$ be improved?

A plausible candidate is the following:

Question

Is $HBT_n \leq_W XC_{[0,1]^n}$ or even $HBT_n \equiv_W XC_{[0,1]^n}$?

More specifically we can even ask:

Question

Is $HBT_{\ell_1(n)} \equiv_W XC_{[0,1]^n}$?

Such a result would be nice since we have:

Theorem (Le Roux and Pauly)

 $\mathsf{XC}_{[0,1]^n} \mathop{<_{\mathrm{W}}} \mathsf{XC}_{[0,1]^{n+1}}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.



References

- Ale
- Stéphane Le Roux, Arno Pauly, Arno, Finite choice, convex choice and finding roots, Logical Meth. Comp. Sci. 11:4 (2015) 4:6, 31
- Guido Gherardi, Alberto Marcone, How Incomputable is the Separable Hahn-Banach Theorem?, Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic 50:4 (2009) 393–425
- Vasco Brattka, Borel Complexity and Computability of the Hahn-Banach Theorem, Archive Math. Logic 46:7-8 (2008) 547–564
- Hajime Ishihara, An omniscience principle, the König lemma and the Hahn-Banach theorem, Zeitschrift für Mathematische Logik und Grundlagen der Mathematik 36 (1990) 237–240
- Douglas K. Brown, Stephen G. Simpson, Which set existence axioms are needed to prove the separable Hahn-Banach theorem?, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic 31 (1986) 123–144.
- George Metakides, Anil Nerode, Richard A. Shore, Recursive limits on the Hahn-Banach theorem, in: M. Rosenblatt (ed.), Errett Bishop: Reflections on Him and His Research, vol. 39 of Cont. Math., AMS, Providence, 1985, pages 85–91

