

Two betting strategies that predict all compressible sequences

T. Petrović

tomeepx@gmail.com

Seventh International Conference on Computability, Complexity and Randomness (CCR 2012)

Outline



- Definition of Sequence-set Betting
- Comparison with Martingale Processes
- Comparison with Non-monotonic Betting

Algorithm that Constructs Two Betting Strategies

Definition of Sequence-set Betting

(using mass-distribution)

- Start with(S, m)
- Betting decision (S_0, m_0) , (S_1, m_1) $m_0 + m_1 = m$ $\lambda(S_0) = \lambda(S_1) = \frac{1}{2}\lambda(S)$
- Sequence in S₀, next is(S₀, m₀) otherwise start with (S₁, m₁)
- Success: capital $c = m/\lambda(S)$ rises unboundedly
- Decision tree descrbes betting strategy

S, m	
S ₀ , m ₀	S ₁ , m ₁

Definition of Sequence-set Betting

(using mass-distribution)

- Start with(S, m)
- Betting decision (S_0, m_0) , (S_1, m_1) $m_0 + m_1 = m$ $\lambda(S_0) = \lambda(S_1) = \frac{1}{2}\lambda(S)$
- Sequence in S₀, next is(S₀, m₀) otherwise start with (S₁, m₁)
- Success: capital $c = m/\lambda(S)$ rises unboundedly
- Decision tree describes betting strategy

S,	M
S ₀ , m ₀	S ₁ , m ₁
S ₁₀ m ₀	S ₁ , m ₁ S ₁ , m ₁ S ₁₀ , m ₁ S ₁₀ , m ₁

Martingale Processes

- Function *d* from words to reals
- Equivalence relation on words $\approx_d v \approx_d w$ if for $v' \leq v, w' \leq w, l(v') = l(w')$ we have d(v') = d(w')
- Fairness condition:

$$= \sum_{\substack{\{v:v\approx_d w\}\\ \{v:v\approx_d w\}}} d(v) d(v) d(v)$$



Modified Sequence-set Betting

- Replace $\lambda(S_0) = \lambda(S_1) = \frac{1}{2}\lambda(S)$ with $\lambda(S_0) + \lambda(S_1) = \lambda(S)$
- Betting game equivalent to martingale processes



Betting Strategy from Martingale Process

•
$$(S,m) \sim (V,d)$$
, $V = \{v : v \approx_d w\}$
 $S \prec \alpha \iff V \prec \alpha$ and $m = d(w)\lambda(V)$

- Find v' s.t. $v \prec v', \ d(v') \neq d(v)$
- d divides V into V_1, \ldots, V_n
- Make according betting decisions
- No such v', make no further bets



Martingale Process from Betting Strategy

- $(S,m) \sim (V,d)$, $V = \{v : v \approx_d w\}$ $S \prec \alpha \iff V \prec \alpha$ and $m = d(w)\lambda(V)$
- Betting decision (S_0, m_0) , (S_1, m_1)
- Find n' $n' > l(w), n' \ge max(l(w) : w \in S_0 \cup S_1)$
- Set $d(v') = m_0/\lambda(S_0)$ for $S_0 \leq v'$ and $d(v') = m_1/\lambda(S_1)$ for $S_1 \leq v'$ where l(v') = n'
- No betting decision for (S, m)
 Set d(v') = d(w) for V ≺ v'



Comparison with Non-monotonic Betting

- Add to req. $\lambda(S_0) = \lambda(S_1) = \frac{1}{2}\lambda(S)$ req. that for some n $w \in S_0 \Rightarrow w(n) = 0$ $w \in S_1 \Rightarrow w(n) = 1$
- Betting decision (S_0, m_0) , (S_1, m_1) places a bet on bit value at position n
- Next iteration choses different position since previously picked positions have all 0's or all 1's



Unpredictable Compressible Sequence

- Step1:For node (S, m) wait for a bet
- No betting decision, strategy fails
- Choose node with less mass
- If node small enough, compress all
- go to Step1



Algorithm Outline

- Algorithm constructs betting decision trees for strategies A and B
- The inputs are some word *s* and masses *ma*, *mb* assigned to that prefix by *A* and *B*
- Calculates k from (s, ma, mb)
- Runs UTM to enumerate first prefixes p that have inputs shorter by k
- For each p adds betting decisions, nodes that contain p', p ≺ p' contain only one word, same in A and B, for these start a new instance of algorithm
- If the set of prefixes is small, betting decisions such that either *A* or *B* double capital on that prefixes

ELE NOO

Notation

$$\mathsf{A} = \mathsf{a}_{i}: \overbrace{\mathsf{S},\mathsf{ms+me}}^{} - \mathsf{L} = \cdots = \mathsf{a}_{i}: \overbrace{\mathsf{S},\mathsf{ms+me}}^{} - \mathsf{L} = \mathsf{B} = \mathsf{b}_{i}: \overbrace{\mathsf{S},\mathsf{ms+me}}^{} - \mathsf{L} = \cdots = \mathsf{b}_{j}: \overbrace{\mathsf{S},\mathsf{ms+me}}^{} - \mathsf{L}$$

- Only the leaf nodes of b.d.t. that don't contain sequences on which another instance of algorithm was started are considered
- For each node (a_i, S, m) , (b_j, S, m) two additional values are used
- Mass reserved to ensure that no node has mass 0, me
- The portion of size of the so far found prefixes belonging to the node L
- Mass ms is used for doubling the capital on compressible prefixes, mass assigned to node in b.d.t. m = ms + me
- Denote indexes of considered leaf nodes of $A a_1, \ldots, a_x$, of $B b_1, \ldots, b_y$
- (a_i, S, ms, me, L) S^{a_i}, ms^{a_i}, me^{a_i}, L^{a_i}
- (b_j, S, ms, me, L) $S_{b_j}, ms_{b_j}, me_{b_j}, L_{b_j}$

Initialization

(s,ma,mb)

A a₁: S,ms+me-L

b₁: S,ms+me-L

В

- The input for the algorithm instance is (*s*, *ma*, *mb*)
- Set mass used for doubling the capital m = min(ma, mb)/2
- Set for $A \ S^{a_1} = \{s\}, \ ms^{a_1} = m, \ me^{a_1} = ma m, \ L^{a_1} = 0$ for $B \ S_{b_1} = \{s\}, \ ms_{b_1} = m, \ me_{b_1} = mb - m, \ L_{b_1} = 0$
- The capital for compressible prefixes will be $c = 4(ma+mb)/\lambda(s)$ • set k such that $2^{-k} < m^2(1-cs)/2\lambda(s)c^2(1+cs)^2$
- The *cs* is some constant 0 < cs < 1, in all iterations $S^{a_i} \cap S_{b_j} = \{\}$ or $\lambda(s)\lambda(S^{a_i} \cap S_{b_j})$ is between $(1 \pm cs)(\lambda(S^{a_i}) + L^{a_i})(\lambda(S_{b_j}) + L_{b_j})$
- The construction of b.d.t. starts by running the algorithm for $(\varepsilon, 1, 1)$

A = A = A

Preparation Step

- Find next $p, S^{a_i} \cap S_{b_j} \cap p \neq \{\}$
- If for all $a_i, b_j \ S^{a_i} \cap S_{b_j} \cap p = \{\}$ or $S^{a_i} \cap S_{b_j} \setminus p = \{\}$ skip rest
- For nodes a_i, b_j make n betting decisions, 2ⁿ new leaf nodes a_{ig}, b_{jh}
- Evenly distribute mass and L
- Extend words not in intersection by *n*, distribute them ammong leaf nodes
- Extend words in intersection and distribute them to have $S^{a_{ig}} \cap S_{b_{jh}} \cap p = \{\}$ or $S^{a_{ig}} \cap S_{b_{jh}} \setminus p = \{\}$

If $\lambda(S^{a_i} \cap S_{b_j}) = r(\lambda(S^{a_i}) + L^{a_i})(\lambda(S_{b_j}) + L_{b_j})$ then $\lambda(S^{a_{ig}} \cap S_{b_{jh}}) = r(\lambda(S^{a_{ig}}) + L^{a_{ig}})(\lambda(S_{b_{jh}}) + L_{b_{jh}})$

Preparation Step

- Find next $p, S^{a_i} \cap S_{b_j} \cap p \neq \{\}$
- If for all $a_i, b_j \ S^{a_i} \cap S_{b_j} \cap p = \{\}$ or $S^{a_i} \cap S_{b_j} \setminus p = \{\}$ skip rest
- For nodes a_i, b_j make n betting decisions, 2ⁿ new leaf nodes a_{ig}, b_{jh}
- Evenly distribute mass and L
- Extend words not in intersection by *n*, distribute them ammong leaf nodes
- Extend words in intersection and distribute them to have $S^{a_{ig}} \cap S_{b_{jh}} \cap p = \{\}$ or $S^{a_{ig}} \cap S_{b_{ih}} \setminus p = \{\}$



If
$$\lambda(S^{a_i} \cap S_{b_j}) = r(\lambda(S^{a_i}) + L^{a_i})(\lambda(S_{b_j}) + L_{b_j})$$
 then
 $\lambda(S^{a_{ig}} \cap S_{b_{jh}}) = r(\lambda(S^{a_{ig}}) + L^{a_{ig}})(\lambda(S_{b_{jh}}) + L_{b_{jh}})_{a_{ig}}$

Mass Assignment Step



- Pick $S^{a_i} \cap S_{b_j}$, $S^{a_i} \cap S_{b_j} \setminus p = \{\}$, assign mass d^{a_i} , d_{b_j} from ms^{a_i} , ms_{b_j} • $d^{a_i} + d_{b_i} = c\lambda(S^{a_i} \cap S_{b_i})$
- If $(ms^{a_i} c\lambda(S^{a_i} \cap S_{b_j}))/(\lambda(S^{a_i}) + L^{a_i}) \ge ms_{b_j}/(\lambda(S_{b_j}) + L_{b_j})$ then $d_{b_i} = 0$
- If $(ms_{b_j} c\lambda(S^{a_i} \cap S_{b_j}))/(\lambda(S_{b_j}) + L_{b_j}) \ge ms^{a_i}/(\lambda(S^{a_i}) + L^{a_i})$ then $d^{a_i} = 0$
- otherwise find

$$(ms^{a_i} - d^{a_i})/(\lambda(S^{a_i}) + L^{a_i}) = (ms_{b_j} - d_{b_j})/(\lambda(S_{b_j}) + L_{b_j})$$

Betting Decisions Step



- Add the size of all words of a node that are extensions of p to L
- For nodes that contain words p' s.t. $p \prec p'$ add betting decisions:
- Leaf nodes with extensions of *p* contain only one word, assign mass from previous step, start another instance of the algorithm
- Distribute words unrelated to *p* ammong remaining leaf nodes. Distribute *L* and the remainder of mass evenly ammong the remaining leaf nodes.
- For the remaining nodes we have S^{a_i} ∩ S_{b_j} = {} or
 λ(s)λ(S^{a_i} ∩ S_{b_j}) between (1±cs)(λ(S^{a_i}) + L^{a_i})(λ(S_{b_j}) + L_{b_j})

Proof Sketch

•
$$\Delta ms^{a_i} = ms^{a_i} - ms'^{a_i}$$

 $f = \frac{\lambda(s)}{m}ms^{a_i}/(\lambda(S^{a_i}) + L^{a_i})$
 $f' = \frac{\lambda(s)}{m}ms'^{a_i}/(\lambda(S^{a_i}) + L^{a_i})$
 $\Delta ms^{a_i} = \frac{m}{\lambda(s)}(f - f')(\lambda(S^{a_i}) + L^{a_i})$
• $\Delta ms^{a_i} \le c\lambda(S^{a_i} \cap S_{b_j})$
 $\lambda(S^{a_i} \cap S_{b_j})$ is close to
 $\frac{1}{\lambda(s)}(\lambda(S^{a_i}) + L^{a_i})(\lambda(S_{b_j}) + L_{b_j})$
• $g = \frac{\lambda(s)}{m}ms_{b_j}/(\lambda(S_{b_j}) + L_{b_j})$
 $cL_{b_j} \ge (1 - g)\frac{m}{\lambda(s)}(\lambda(S_{b_j}) + L_{b_j})$
Assume that $g \le f'$
• $L_{b_j} \ge const.m^2(1 - f')(f - f')$
• $\sum_{i=1}^{Z} 2^{-l(p_i)} \ge const.m^2/2 \ge 2^{-k}$



三日 のへの

References



📎 M. Li, P. Vitanyi

An Introduction to Kolmogorov Complexity and Its Applications, second edition Springer, 1997.

CCR 2012

17 / 17

J.M.Hitchcock, J.H. Lutz Why Computational Complexity Requires Stricter Martingales Theory of Computing Systems, 2006.

W. Merkle, N. Mihailović, T.A. Slaman Some results on effective randomness Theory of Computing Systems, 2006.