

Relating and contrasting plain and prefix Kolmogorov complexity

Bruno Bauwens*

Abstract

In [3] a short proof is given that some strings have maximal plain Kolmogorov complexity but not maximal prefix-free complexity. We argue that the proof technique is useful to simplify existing proofs and to solve open questions.

We present a short proof of Solovay's result [21] relating plain and prefix complexity:

$$\begin{aligned} K(x) &= C(x) + CC(x) + O(CCC(x)) \\ C(x) &= K(x) - KK(x) + O(KKK(x)), \end{aligned}$$

(here $CC(x)$ denotes $C(C(x))$, etc.).

We show that there exist ω such that $\liminf C(\omega_1 \dots \omega_n) - C(n)$ is infinite and $\liminf K(\omega_1 \dots \omega_n) - K(n)$ is finite, i.e. the infinitely often C -trivial reals are not the same as the infinitely often K -trivial reals (i.e. [1, Question 1]).

We answer a question from Laurent Bienvenu: some 2-random sequence have a family of initial segments with bounded plain deficiency (i.e. $|x| - C(x)$ is bounded) and unbounded prefix deficiency (i.e. $|x| + K(|x|) - K(x)$ is unbounded).

Finally, we show that there exists no monotone relation between probability and expectation bounded randomness deficiency, i.e. [6, Question 1].

1 Introduction

Plain Kolmogorov complexity $C(x)$ of a bitstring x was independently defined by Ray Solomonoff [20] and later by Andrei Kolmogorov [11] as the minimal length of a program that produces x on a Turing machine. In both definitions programs are strings of zeros and ones written on a work tape; the beginning and end of the program is marked by blank symbols. During the execution, the Turing machine (which we call *plain* machine) can scan the beginning and end of the program and use its length as additional information during the computation. After the computation, the output string should appear on the work tape, again the beginning and end should be marked by blank symbols (see [14, 10] for details). Kolmogorov complexity on such a machine is called *plain* complexity. It is currently the most popular notion of Kolmogorov complexity.

*LORIA, Université de Lorraine. I thank Paul Vitányi and Alexander (Sasha) Shen for useful discussion (especially on section 3). I thank Mathieu Hoyrup for encouragement to write down these results (and for arranging funding).

A closely related notion of complexity was introduced by Leonid Levin [12, 13] and Gregory Chaitin [7] and has many applications in the study of algorithmic randomness. Imagine a Turing machine on which programs are presented on a separate 2-symbol input tape. The tape does not have blank symbols, only zeros and ones. During the execution more input is scanned until the machine reaches a halting state, after which an output x is defined. We write $U(p) = x$ if p is the minimal initial segment of the input tape that contains all scanned cells and if the result of the computation is x . During the computation, the length of p is no longer available. Programs on such a machine are also called *self-delimiting*. Note that the set of programs on which U halts is prefix-free. The minimal length of a program outputting x on such a machine is called *prefix complexity* $K(x)$.

Prefix complexity is larger (up to an $O(1)$ constant) than plain complexity and the difference is at most $O(\log |x|)$, where $|x|$ denotes the length of x . For many applications this difference is not important. However, for applications in the theory of algorithmic randomness, often $O(1)$ -precise relations are used, and often one raises the question what happens when plain and prefix complexity are exchanged in a result or a definition. The goal of the paper is two-fold. First, we present a simple proof on a result that relates plain and prefix complexity. Secondly, we refine a proof-technique (from [3]) to build strings where plain and prefix complexity behave differently, and apply it to solve three open questions.

Several results are related to one of the oldest questions in algorithmic randomness, raised by Robert Solovay [21] (see [8, page 263]). The maximal plain complexity of a string of length n is $n + O(1)$ and we say that a string has c -maximal complexity if $C(x) \geq |x| - c$. Martin-Löf observed that for no c and no infinite sequence all initial segments x have c -maximal complexity. On the other hand, the class of sequences for which some c and infinitely many initial segments x exist with $C(x) \geq |x| - c$ has measure one. Similar observations hold for prefix complexity, (where the maximal complexity is $n + K(n) + O(1)$). Solovay's question is whether the classes of sequences with infinitely often maximal plain and prefix complexity are the same; in other words, is $\liminf_{x \sqsubseteq \omega} |x| - C(x)$ finite iff $\liminf_{x \sqsubseteq \omega} K(|x|) + |x| - K(x)$ is finite?

To answer this question, Solovay investigated whether there was a monotone relation between $C(\cdot)$ and $K(\cdot)$. He found that this was approximately the case by showing

$$\begin{aligned} K(x) &= C(x) + CC(x) + O(CCC(x)) \\ C(x) &= K(x) - KK(x) + O(KKK(x)), \end{aligned}$$

where complexity of a number n is the complexity of the n -bit string $00 \dots 0$ and where $CC(x)$, $KK(x)$, etc, be short for $C(C(x))$, $K(K(x))$, etc. The proof in [21] is cumbersome and Joseph Miller [16] made some simplifications using symmetry of information for prefix complexity. Here we use this technique to give an even much simpler proof. (Readers only interested in this result can directly go to sections 2 and 3.)

Solovay showed that the continuation of the first equation with terms up to $O(CCCC(x))$ does not hold. He also showed that maximal prefix complexity implies maximal plain complexity, but the reverse is not true: there exist infinitely many n and x of length n such that $n - C(x) \leq O(1)$ and

$$K(n) + n - K(x) \geq \log^{(2)} n - O(\log^{(3)} n). \quad (1)$$

In [3] a simple proof (and generalizations) are presented. Here we further develop the proof technique to solve several open questions.

Despite this negative result, Miller [15, 17] showed a positive answer for Solovay's question: the sequences that have infinitely many initial segments with maximal plain and prefix complexity are the same. The proof is indirect: it shows that both classes coincide with the class of 2-random sequences, i.e. Martin-Löf random sequences relative to the halting problem (the equivalence of the first class with 2-randomness was also shown in [18]). Miller raised the question whether an (elegant) direct proof exists. In [2] simple proofs of these equivalences with 2-randomness are given, but still no direct proof. It is also shown that

$$\liminf_{x \sqsubset \omega} [|x| - C(x)] = \liminf_{x \sqsubset \omega} [K(|x|) + |x| - K(x)] + O(1),$$

by showing both sides equal 2-randomness deficiency (see further). Laurent Bienvenu [5] asked whether for a 2-random sequence, the initial segments for which plain and prefix-free complexity are maximal are the same; more precisely, for 2-random ω , does there exist c and d such that for all n : $n - C(\omega_1 \dots \omega_n) \leq c$ implies $K(n) + n - K(\omega_1 \dots \omega_n) \leq d$? (For some c and d the reverse implication is always true.) We show that this is not the case: for every 3-random sequence (a subset of the 2-random sequences) there are infinitely many initial segments x with $|x| - C(x) \leq O(1)$ for which (1) holds. This makes the existence of a simple direct proof unlikely. We refer to section 6 for the proof of this result.

In algorithmic information theory, many relations are known between highly random sequences and highly compressible sequences [1, Section 3.5]. The second application of our technique considers one such class called *the infinitely often K -trivial sequences*: the sequences ω for which there exist c and infinitely many n such that $K(\omega_1 \dots \omega_n) \leq K(n) + c$, i.e.

$$\liminf_n [K(\omega_1 \dots \omega_n) - K(n)] \leq O(1)$$

This class contains the computably enumerable sequences and the (weakly) 1-generic sequences. Similar observations hold for the infinitely often C -trivial sequences, i.e. the sequences for which

$$\liminf_n [C(\omega_1 \dots \omega_n) - C(n)] \leq O(1).$$

Question 1 in [1] asks whether both classes coincide. We show that this is not the case.

A last application of the proof technique concerns randomness deficiency for infinite sequences. Suppose one million zeros are prepended before a random string. The new string is still random, but one might argue that it is somehow "less random". Randomness deficiency quantifies the amount of structure in a random sequence (see [14, Section 3.6.2] and [6]). Let $\mu(\omega)$ denote the uniform measure. Two closely related notions of deficiency exist in literature.

- A lower semicomputable¹ function $f : \{0, 1\}^\infty \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}^+$ (i.e. \mathbb{R}^+ extended with $+\infty$) is a *probability bounded randomness test* if for each k

$$\mu \{ \omega : f(\omega) \geq k \} \leq k, .$$

¹ A non-negative rational function f on $\{0, 1\}^\infty$ is *basic* if $f(\omega)$ is determined by a finite prefix of ω . A function f into $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^+$, is *lower-semicomputable* if there exist a uniformly computable series of (non-negative) basic functions f_i such that $f = \sum_i f_i$.

- A measurable function $f : \{0, 1\}^\infty \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}^+$ is an *expectation bounded randomness test* if

$$\int_{\{0,1\}^\infty} f(\omega) d\omega \leq 1.$$

The first notion is inspired by to the notion of confidence in statistical hypothesis testing, while the second is closely related, but mathematically more convenient to handle. There exists a lower semicomputable expectation bounded test f_E that exceeds any other such test g within a constant factor, i.e. for all g there exist c such that $g \leq cf_E$. The logarithm of such a universal test is called *expectation bounded randomness deficiency* d_E . The deficiency depends on the choice of the universal test, but this choice affects the deficiency by at most an additive constant. Similar for probability bounded tests and *probability bounded deficiency* d_P . Both deficiencies are related: $d_E = d_P + O(\log d_P)$, and both deficiencies are finite iff the sequence is Martin-Löf random. We argue that the relation between plain and prefix complexity is very similar to the relation between d_P and d_E .

Question 1 in [6] asks whether there exists a monotone relation between probability bounded deficiency and expectation bounded deficiency that holds within additive $O(1)$ terms. If this is not the case then there exist two families of sequences ω_i and ω'_i such that

$$d_P(\omega_i) - d_P(\omega'_i) \rightarrow +\infty$$

for increasing i , and

$$d_E(\omega_i) - d_E(\omega'_i) \rightarrow -\infty, .$$

In Section 7, we translate the main proof technique to deficiencies and construct such sequences. Hence, no monotone relation exists between the deficiencies.

The paper is organized as follows: first we discuss two old results which will be used throughout the paper: Levin's formula relating plain and prefix complexity and Levin's formula for symmetry of information. In the next section we present a simple proof for Solovay's formulas relating C and K . All further results in the paper demonstrate different behaviour of C and K and the proofs have a common structure. In section 4, we repeat the simplest such proof by showing that some strings have maximal plain but non-maximal prefix complexity. Afterwards, in section 5, we show that the class of infinitely often C and K trivial sequences are different. In section 6, we show that each 3-random sequence has infinitely many initial segments with maximal plain complexity but non-maximal prefix complexity. Finally, in section 7, we show that no monotone relationship exists between plain and prefix randomness deficiency. Section 3, sections 4, 5, 6, and section 7 can be read independently.

2 Prerequisites

Two results are central in most proofs. The first is Levin's symmetry of information [9]: for all x, y

$$K(x) + K(y|x, K(x)) = K(x, y).$$

The conditional variant is given by

$$K(x|z) + K(y|x, K(x|z), z) = K(x, y|z).$$

The second result relates plain and prefix complexity for random strings. For all n -bit x : $C(x) = n + O(1)$ iff $K(x|n) = n + O(1)$. We will use a more general variant.

Lemma 1 (Folklore). *For all j and x*

$$|j - C(x)| = \Theta(|j - K(x|j)|)$$

Proof. The Lemma implies Levin's formula

$$C(x) = K(x|C(x)) + O(1),$$

and in fact, it is equivalent to it: for any j it implies $K(x|j) = C(x)$ up to terms $O(\log |j - C(x)|)$, and by the triangle inequality:

$$|j - K(x|j)| = |j - C(x)| + O(\log |j - C(x)|). \quad \square$$

3 Relating plain and prefix complexity

Recall that $KK(x)$, $CC(x)$, etc, are short for $K(K(x))$, $C(C(x))$, etc.

Theorem 2.

$$\begin{aligned} K(x) &= C(x) + CC(x) + O(CCC(x)) \\ C(x) &= K(x) - KK(x) + O(KKK(x)). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Proof. Using symmetry of information we have

$$K(x) = K(x, K(x)) = KK(x) + K(x|K(x), KK(x)) + O(1).$$

The last term equals $K(x|K(x) - KK(x)) + O(KKK(x))$. For $j = K(x) - KK(x)$ the equality is

$$j = K(x|j) + O(KKK(x)).$$

Thus $C(x) = j + O(KKK(x))$ by Lemma 1, i.e. (2).

We obtain the first equation of the theorem from the second by showing that

$$CC(x) = KK(x) + O(KKK(x)) \quad (3)$$

$$KKK(x) \leq O(CCC(x)). \quad (4)$$

For (3), note that $a = b - c + O(d)$ implies $C(a) = C(b) + O(K(c) + d)$. Applying this to (2) we obtain

$$C(C(x)) = C(K(x)) + O(K(KK(x)) + KKK(x)).$$

Substituting $x \leftarrow K(x)$ in (2) gives

$$C(K(x)) = K(K(x)) + KK(K(x)) + O(KKK(x)).$$

Combining both equations implies (3).

It remains to show that (3) implies (4). Using $K(a) \leq K(b) + K(b - a) + O(1)$:

$$K(KK(x)) \leq K(CC(x)) + K(KK(x) - CC(x)) + O(1)$$

The first term at the right is bounded by $2C(CC(x)) + O(1)$. For the second, note that $K(d) \leq O(\log d)$ for any number d , hence

$$KKK(x) \leq 2CCC(x) + O(\log KKK(x)), \quad (5)$$

i.e. (4). \square

Remark 1. The proof implies that $K(x) = C(x) + O(CC(x))$ and $KK(x) = CC(x) + O(CCC(x))$. Alexander Shen raised the question whether $KKK(x) = CCC(x) + O(CCCC(x))$? This does not hold. The proof is cumbersome and uses a topological argument from [19], see appendix A.²

4 Contrasting maximal plain and prefix complexity

To get used to the main proof technique for the remainder of this paper, we start by showing the subsequent variant of Solovay's theorem.

Theorem 3 (Solovay [21], Bauwens and Shen [3]). *There exist infinitely many x such that $|x| - C(x) \leq O(1)$ and $K(|x|) + |x| - K(x) \geq \log^{(2)} |x| - O(1)$.*

The main technique is to combine the two results from Section 2 with a third result: Peter Gács' quantification of incomputability of Kolmogorov complexity [9]. He showed that for all lengths, there are x such that $K(K(x)|x)$ is close to $\log |x|$ (and similar for plain complexity); if complexity were computable, then this would be bounded by $O(1)$. The following tight variant from [3] will be used:

Theorem 4. *For some c and all l there exist an n such that $\log n = 2^l$, $K(n) \geq (\log n)/2$ and $K(K(n)|n) \geq l - c$.*

Lemma 5. *If n satisfies the conditions of Theorem 4, then*

$$\log^{(2)} n = \log K(n) + O(1) = K(K(n)|n) + O(1).$$

² For later use in the appendix, note that the proof above also implies

$$CC(x), CK(x), KC(x), KK(x),$$

are all equal within error $O(CCC(x))$ and error $O(KKK(x))$. (Indeed, to relate $KK(x)$ to $KC(x)$, apply $K(\cdot)$ to (2).) Moreover, for all $U, V, W, X, Y, Z \in \{C, K\}$ we have that $UVW(x) \leq O(XYZ(x))$. Indeed, by applying $C(a) = C(b) + O(\log(a - b))$ on the equalities above, we obtain that $CYZ(x) = CCC(x) + O(\log CCC(x))$. In the same way one shows that $KYZ(x) = KKK(x) + O(\log KKK(x))$. The result follows now from (5).

Proof. Indeed, dropping additive $O(1)$ terms, the left equality follows from

$$\log^{(2)} n \leq \log((\log n)/2) \leq \log K(n) \leq \log(2 \log n) \leq \log^{(2)} n.$$

It remains to show that $K(K(n)|n) \leq \log^{(2)} n$. Indeed, $K(K(n)|n) \leq K(K(n)|\log^{(2)} n)$. and using $\log^{(2)} n = \log K(n)$ this follows from $K(i|\log i) \leq \log i$.³ \square

We informally explain why some strings have maximal plain complexity but non-maximal prefix complexity. There exist plain machines U for which a string w exist such that $U(wx) = x$ for all x . If x has $O(1)$ -maximal plain complexity, then wx is an $O(1)$ -shortest program for x . In a similar way, there exist a prefix machine V such that for some w we have $V(wx|x) = x$ for all x ; indeed, V just copies the input from the program tape and uses the condition $|x|$ to know when to stop this operation.

If the length of x is not available in the condition, no such trivial programs might exist. To decide when to halt the copying procedure, the length of x must somehow be represented in the program in self-delimited form. If the length of the program is minimal (within an $O(1)$ constant), this encryption of the length should also be minimal. Mathematically, this corresponds to the following observations: $K(x) = K(n, x)$, (here and below we omit $O(1)$ terms); and by symmetry of information

$$K(n, x) = K(n) + K(x|n, K(n)).$$

Thus, any shortest program for x can be reorganized into a concatenation of two self-delimiting programs: the first computes n and the second uses n and the length of the first program to compute x . The prefix deficiency is $K(n) + n - K(x) = n - K(x|n, K(n))$ and this is different from the plain deficiency which is close to $n - K(x|n)$ by Lemma 1. This explains why small prefix deficiency implies small plain deficiency, but not vice versa. In particular the deficiencies can only be different if $K(K(n)|n)$ is large, and this might indeed happen because of Theorem 4.

For appropriate n the discussion explains how we construct x , it should contain $K(n)$ and then be filled up further with bits independent from n and $K(n)$ until the plain complexity is n . This is the approach in [3], here we take advantage of the fact that the program with largest computation time of length at most n can also compute $K(n)$ from n . The proof below is even shorter than that of [3, Corrolary 6].

Proof. As discussed above, we choose n , the length of x , such that

$$K(K(n)|n) = \log^{(2)} n + O(1). \quad (6)$$

By Theorem 4 and Lemma 5, there exist infinitely many such n . Let $x = B(n)$ be the program of length at most n with maximal running time on a plain machine. We drop $O(1)$ terms. Note that $C(B(n)) = n = |B(n)|$. It remains to show $K(B(n)) \leq n + K(n) - \log^{(2)} n$ and this follows from

$$K(B(n)|n, K(n)) \leq n - \log^{(2)} n$$

³ For the proof in the appendix note that this argument implies $K(K(n)|\log^{(2)} n) = \log^{(2)} n$. By Lemma 1 this implies $C(K(n)) = \log^{(2)} n$.

(see above or note that $K(B(n)) = K(n, B(n)) = K(n) + K(B(n)|n, K(n))$). From n and $B(n)$ we can compute $K(n)$, thus $n = C(B(n)) = K(B(n)|n)$ also equals

$$K(K(n), B(n)|n) = K(K(n)|n) + K(B(n)|K(n), K(K(n)|n), n).$$

Applying (6) twice implies $n = \log^{(2)} n + K(B(n)|K(n), n)$. \square

Remark 2. As a corollary it follows that $K(x) = C(x) + CC(x) + CCC(x) + O(CCCC(x))$ is false. To show it contradicts Theorem 3 note that $CCCC(x) \leq O(\log^{(3)}(n))$. Let x satisfy the conditions of the theorem and choose y of length n with maximal plain and prefix complexity. Now $K(x) - K(y) \geq \log^{(2)} n - O(\log^{(3)} n)$.

For similar reasons the following inequality is not an equality

$$K(x) \leq K(C(x)) + C(x),$$

see also Remark 5 below.

Remark 3. Miller generalized Solovay's theorem [16]. The proof above also implies this generalization.

Theorem. If a co-enumerable set (i.e. the complement can be algorithmically enumerated) of strings contains a string of each length, then it also contains infinitely many strings x such that $K(|x|) + |x| - K(x) \geq \log^{(2)} |x| - O(1)$.

This theorem also implies that the set of strings with maximal prefix complexity is not co-enumerable.

Proof. Suppose n satisfies the conditions of Theorem 4. Let x be the lexicographically first string of length n in the set. We show that x can be computed from $B(n+c)$ for some constant c , and this suffices because we know from the proof above that $K(BB(n+c)) \leq n + K(n) - \log^{(2)} n + O(c)$.

Consider a list of all strings of length n and remove the strings outside the set using an enumeration of its complement. The moment the last string was removed can be computed with a program of length $n + O(1)$ on a plain machine (by the total number of removed strings prepended with zeros to have an n -bit number). Thus, this moment must be before $B(n+c)$ for large c . \square

Remark 4. The proof above can be used to contrast *computational depth* with plain and prefix complexity. In [4, Tentative⁴ definition 1] the computational depth of a string x with precision c is given by the minimal computation time of a plain program for x of length at most $C(x) + c$:

$$depth_{C,c}(x) = \min \{t : |p| \leq C(x) + c \text{ and } U(p) = x \text{ in } t \text{ steps}\}.$$

In a similar way, computational depth $depth_{K,c}(x)$ with prefix machines can be defined.⁵ With this assumption it follows easily that there exist a computable f such that

⁴ Although it was called "tentative" definition, this version is simpler than the others and is more often used in literature.

⁵ We assume in all these definitions that the machine U is universal in the sense that for each other machine V there exist w such that $U(wp) = V(p)$ each time $V(p)$ is defined and that simulating V by U in this way increases the computation time by a computable function.

$depth_{K,c+2\log|x|}(x) \leq f(depth_{C,c}(x))$ and that $depth_{C,c+2\log|x|}(x) \leq f(depth_{K,c}(x))$ for x of large length. The subsequent proposition shows that with higher precision, the equivalence is not possible. Let $BB(n)$ be the maximal computation time of a program of length at most n on a plain machine (i.e. the computation time of $B(n)$).

Proposition. *There exist a c and infinitely many x such that $depth_{C,c}(x)$ is bounded by a computable function of x (and in fact bounded by a constant for an appropriate universal machine) and $depth_{K,\log^{(2)}|x|-c}(x)$ exceeds $BB(|x| - c)$.*

Proof. Consider the proof of Theorem 3. Rather than choosing x to be $B(n)$, we fix some appropriate c (see further), and choose x to be the lexicographically first n -bit string such that $C(x) \geq n - 2$ and no self-delimiting program of length $n + K(n) - c$ outputs x in at most $BB(n)$ steps. x exist because for large d there are at most $O(2^{n-d})$ strings of length n with complexity $n + K(n) - d$ (see [8, Theorem 3.7.6 p. 129], this also follows from the coding theorem). By construction $C(x) \geq n - O(1)$ thus a trivial program of x on a plain machine is shortest within $O(1)$. Hence, the depth of x is small on a plain machine. Because x can be computed from $B(n)$, the proof above guarantees that for infinitely many n we have $K(x) \leq K(B(n)) + O(1) \leq n + K(n) - \log^{(2)}n + O(1)$. Fix such an n . To have $depth_{K,\log^{(2)}n-e}(x) < BB(n)$, we need a program for x that computes x in time less than $BB(n)$ of length $n + K(n) - \log^{(2)}n + O(1) + (\log^{(2)}n - e) = n + K(n) + O(1) - e$. For large e this contradicts the choice of x , and hence the depth is at least $BB(n - O(1))$. \square

Remark 5. There exist infinitely many x such that $K(K(x)|x, C(x)) \geq \log^{(2)}n - O(1)$. Indeed, let n be as in Theorem 4. Let x of length n have maximal prefix (and hence plain) complexity such that $K(K(n)|x, n) \geq K(K(n)|n) - O(1)$. This implies

$$K(K(x)|x, C(x)) = K(n + K(n)|x, n) = K(K(n)|x, n) \geq K(K(n)|n) \geq \log^{(2)}n$$

up to $O(1)$ terms.

On the other hand $K(C(x)|x, K(x))$ must be very small and it is an *open question* whether it is bounded by a constant. In particular this would imply that the inequality

$$K(x) \leq K(C(x)) + K(x|C(x), K(C(x)))$$

is an equality, which is also an *open question*.

5 Infinitely often C and K trivial sequences

In the previous section we argued why a shortest self-delimiting program for a string can contain more information than a shortest plain program. This suggest that the classes of infinitely often C and K trivial sequences might be different. The following theorem illustrates this.

Theorem 6. *There exists a sequence ω for which $K(\omega_1 \dots \omega_N) - K(N) \leq O(1)$ for infinitely many N , and for which $C(\omega_1 \dots \omega_N) - C(N)$ tends to infinity.*




Figure 1: Construction of ω in the proof of Theorem 6.

Proof. Recall that $B(n)$ is a program of length at most n with maximal running time on a plain machine. ω consists of zeros, except at small neighborhoods before indexes 2^n for all large n , and in these neighborhoods strings $w_n = B(n + \log^{(2)} n)$ are placed, see Figure 1; more precisely $\omega_{2^n - |w_n|} \dots \omega_{2^n} = 1w_n$ (the prepended one in $1w_n$ allows us to identify the beginning of w_n).

We show that $C(\omega_1 \dots \omega_N) - C(N) \geq \log^{(3)} N - O(1)$ for all N , which obviously tends to infinity. Fix any N and let n be such that $2^n \leq N < 2^{n+1}$. The initial segment $\omega_1 \dots \omega_N$ computes w_n , thus $C(\omega_1 \dots \omega_N) \geq C(w_n) \geq n + \log^{(2)} n$ (here and below we omit terms $O(1)$). On the other hand we have $C(N) \leq \log N = n$, hence

$$C(\omega_1 \dots \omega_N) - C(N) \geq (n + \log^{(2)} n) - n = \log^{(2)} n = \log^{(3)} N.$$

It remains to construct c and infinitely many N such that $K(\omega_1 \dots \omega_N) \leq K(N) + c$. The idea is to choose for infinitely many n some N such that $2^n \leq N < 2^{n+1} - |w_{n+1}|$ and such that some shortest program for N can compute w_n with $O(1)$ of information; thus it can also compute w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{n-1} and $\omega_1 \dots \omega_N$ with $O(1)$ bits of information.

As one might guess, we choose n such that $K(K(n)|n) = \log^{(2)} n$. Let us compute $K(w_n|n, K(n))$ in a similar way as before. We drop $O(1)$ terms:

$$\begin{aligned} n + \log^{(2)} n &= C(w_n) = K(w_n|n) = K(K(n), w_n|n) \\ &= K(K(n)|n) + K(w_n|K(n), K(K(n)|n), n) \\ &= \log^{(2)} n + K(w_n|K(n), n). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $K(w_n|n, K(n)) = n$.

Let N in binary be the first $n - 2$ bits of a program witnessing this equation (i.e. a program of length at most $n + O(1)$ computing w_n from n and $K(n)$) prepended with the string “10”. Prepending “10” guarantees that $2^n \leq N < 2^{n+1} - |w_{n+1}|$ for large n . By construction, if n and $K(n)$ are given, N can compute w_n with $O(1)$ bits of information. Thus it also computes w_1, \dots, w_{n-1} and $\omega_1 \dots \omega_N$. On the other hand, every shortest program for N can also compute n and $K(n)$ with $O(1)$ bits of information. Indeed,

$$K(N) = K(N, n) = K(n) + K(N|n, K(n));$$

thus on a universal prefix machine, there exist a $O(1)$ -shortest program for N that is the concatenation of two self-delimiting programs and the length of the first is $K(n)$. Together:

$$K(N) = K(n, K(n), N) = K(w_1, \dots, w_n, n, K(n), N) \geq K(\omega_1 \dots \omega_N). \quad \square$$

6 Contrasting plain and prefix complexity in 3-random sequences

Theorem 7. *For every 3-random sequence ω there are a c and infinitely many j such that $j - C(\omega_1 \dots \omega_j) \leq c$ and $K(j) + j - K(\omega_1 \dots \omega_j) \geq \log^{(2)} j - c$.*

We conjecture that the result holds for all 2-random sequences. It is possible to present the proof in game structure, but both the game and the strategy are quite complicated. We give a proof that has the same core structure as the other proofs above. In the proof we use two lemmas. The first roughly states that randomness deficiency of a string is bounded by the deficiency of an initial segment.

Lemma 8. *Let $j = |x|$ and $n = |xy|$*

$$j - K(x|j) \leq n - K(xy|j, n) + O(1)$$

Proof. We omit $O(1)$ terms. Observe that $K(xy|j, n) = K(x, y|j, n)$, and this is bounded by

$$\leq K(x|j, n) + K(y|x, j, n) \leq K(x|j) + n - j,$$

because $K(y|y) \leq |y|$ for all strings y and $|y| = n - j$ is computable from the condition. The inequality of the lemma follows after rearranging. \square

Let a and b be two strings of the same length. Let $XOR(a, b)$ denote the bitwise XOR operator on these strings. The following lemma states that if a is incompressible, and b is incompressible given a , then also b is incompressible relative to $XOR(a, b)$. In fact, we will use a generalization which states that if an extension bw is incompressible given a , then this extension is incompressible given $XOR(a, b)$.

Lemma 9. *Let a and b be strings of equal length ℓ , let w be any string, let $n = |bw|$, and let i be any number. If*

$$K(a|\ell, n, i) \geq \ell - c \quad \text{and} \quad K(bw|a, n, i) \geq n - c,$$

then

$$K(bw|XOR(a, b), n, i) \geq n - O(c).$$

Proof. In the lemma all complexities are conditional to i . The proof of the conditional form follows the unconditional one, presented here. We first consider the case where w is the empty string, the proof for non-empty w follows the same structure and will be presented afterwards. We need to show that for all c, ℓ, a, b such that $|a| = |b| = \ell$, $K(a|\ell) \geq \ell - c$ and $K(b|a) \geq \ell - c$ we have

$$K(b|XOR(a, b)) \geq \ell + O(c). \tag{7}$$

Indeed,

$$K(a, b|\ell) = K(a|\ell) + K(b|a, \ell, K(a|\ell)) + O(1).$$

By assumption $K(a|\ell) \geq \ell - c$, thus $K(a|\ell) = \ell + O(c)$ and the last term simplifies to $K(b|a, \ell) + O(c)$ and this equals $\ell + O(c)$. Hence $K(a, b|\ell) = 2\ell + O(c)$. Let $xor = XOR(a, b)$. Because $a = XOR(b, xor)$ we have up to additive terms $O(c)$:

$$2\ell = K(a, b|\ell) \leq K(xor, b|\ell) \leq K(xor|\ell) + K(b|xor, \ell) \leq \ell + K(b|xor),$$

and this implies (7).

We modify the equations above for the case where w is not empty. Let $n = |bw|$ and remind that $|a| = \ell$. We start with

$$K(a, b, w|\ell, n) = K(a|\ell, n) + K(b, w|a, K(a|\ell, n), n) \geq \ell + n - O(c).$$

Note that because $\ell = |b|$ we have $K(bw, \dots | \ell, \dots) = K(b, w, \dots | \ell, \dots)$. The left-hand also equals

$$K(xor, b, w|\ell, n) \leq K(xor|\ell, n) + K(b, w|xor, \ell, n) \leq \ell + K(b, w|xor, n),$$

hence $K(b, w|xor, n) \geq n - O(c)$. □

Proof of Theorem 7. Let ω be 3-random. By Lemma 1, it suffices to construct infinitely many j such that

$$K(\omega_1 \dots \omega_j | j) \geq j - O(1) \tag{8}$$

and $K(\omega_1 \dots \omega_j | j, K(j)) \leq j - \log^{(2)} j + O(1)$. (Indeed, the last inequality implies $K(\dots) \leq j + K(j) - \log^{(2)} j + O(1)$ for the same reasons as in the proof of Theorem 3.) The second inequality follows from

$$K(\omega_1 \dots \omega_{\log^{(2)} j} | j, K(j)) \leq O(1). \tag{9}$$

Sketch of the proof. As usual, we construct j such that $K(K(j)|j) \geq \log^{(2)} j - O(1)$. For technical reasons, we start with an index i that will have almost the same information as j and that satisfies $K(K(i)|i) \geq \log^{(2)} i - O(1)$. We also show that i can be chosen such that i and $K(i)$ are independent from $\omega_1 \dots \omega_n$ for an initial segment with maximal plain complexity (for this we need that ω is 3-random). The main idea is to use $K(i)$ to encrypt the first $\log K(i)$ bits of ω (using the bitwise XOR operator). Let q be this encryption. We show (using Lemma 9) that

$$K(\omega_1 \dots \omega_n | i, q, n) \geq n - O(1).$$

But with our encryption key $K(i)$, we can decrypt the initial segment of ω , thus

$$K(\omega_1 \dots \omega_{\log K(i)} | i, q, K(i)) \leq O(1).$$

Finally, we define $j \leq n$ by applying a bijective computable function of i and q . Thus the pair (q, i) contains the same information as j , i.e. $K(\omega_1 \dots \omega_n | i, q, n) = K(\omega_1 \dots \omega_n | j, n) + O(1)$. Thus $K(\omega_1 \dots \omega_j | j, n) \geq j - O(1)$ by Lemma 8. On the other hand, the construction implies that $\log^{(2)} j = \log K(i) + O(1)$ and that $K(i)$ and $K(j)$ carry the same information. Hence

$$K(\omega_1 \dots \omega_{\log^{(2)} j} | j, K(j)) = K(\omega_1 \dots \omega_{\log K(i)} | i, q, K(i)) + O(1) \leq O(1),$$

and this finishes the proof.

Requirements for n, i and q . We choose infinitely many triples (n, i, q) and start with formulating five requirements from which equations (8) and (9) follow. Let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ be a computable bijective pairing function from numbers and strings to numbers. For later use we assume that $\log \langle k, x \rangle = \log k + O(|x|)$ for all k and x .

Equation (8) with $j = \langle i, q \rangle$, follows from

- (a) $K(\omega_1 \dots \omega_n | i, q, n) \geq n - O(1)$,
- (b) $\langle i, q \rangle \leq n$ for large n ,

and Lemma 8. Equation (9) follows from:

- (A) $K(\omega_1 \dots \omega_{\log K(i)} | K(i), q) \leq O(1)$,
- (B) $\log K(i) = \log^{(2)} \langle i, q \rangle + O(1)$,
- (C) $K(i, q) = K(i) + \log K(i) + O(1)$.

Indeed, for all z , (C) implies $K(z|i, q, K(i)) = K(z|i, q, K(j)) + O(1)$.

Construction of n and i . We use the characterization of 2-random sequences with plain complexity:

Theorem (Joseph Miller [15], Nies–Stephan–Terwijn [18]). *A sequence ω is Martin–Löf random relative to the Halting problem if and only if there exist a c and infinitely many n such that $C(\omega_1 \dots \omega_n) \geq n - c$.*

The proof of this theorem relativizes to the halting problem $\mathbf{0}'$, i.e., a sequence is 3-random if and only if there are a c and infinitely many n such that $C^{\mathbf{0}'}(\omega_1 \dots \omega_n) \geq n - c$. Fix such an n . By Lemma 1:

$$K^{\mathbf{0}'}(\omega_1 \dots \omega_n | n) \geq n - O(1). \quad (10)$$

From now on we only use complexities that are conditional to n . For notational simplicity we drop n from the condition, thus $K(a) \equiv K(a|n)$, $K(a|b) \equiv K(a|b, n)$, etc.

Let i be the largest number such that

- (i) $K(K(i)|i) \geq \log^{(2)} i - c$ and $K(i) \geq (\log i)/2$, where c is the constant from Theorem 4.
- (ii) $\langle i, x \rangle \leq n$ for all x of length at most $1 + \log^{(2)} i$.

Such i exists because also the conditional version of Theorem 4 holds. In fact, for increasing choices of n , we find infinitely many such i . By Lemma 5, the first condition implies

$$\log K(i) = \log^{(2)} i + O(1). \quad (11)$$

Note that i and $K(i)$ can be computed from $\mathbf{0}'$ and n , hence (10) implies

$$K(\omega_1 \dots \omega_n | i, K(i)) \geq n - O(1). \quad (12)$$

Construction of q . q is given by the bitwise XOR-function of $K(i)$ in binary, and the initial segment of ω with the same length:

$$q = \text{XOR}(\omega_1 \dots \omega_{\log K(i)}, \langle K(i) \rangle) .$$

Because $\text{XOR}(a, \text{XOR}(a, b)) = b$ this implies (A).

Recall that all complexities implicitly have n in the condition and that $K(K(i)|i) \geq \log^{(2)} i + O(1)$. Together with (12), this can be applied to Lemma 9 (with $l = \log K(i) = \log^{(2)} i + O(1)$, $bw = \omega_1 \dots \omega_n$ and $a = \langle K(i) \rangle$) and we conclude that $K(\omega_1 \dots \omega_n | i, q, n) \geq n - O(1)$, i.e. condition (a).

For large n , we have large i , and hence $|q| = \log K(i) \leq \log(2 \log i) = 1 + \log^{(2)} i$. By choice of i (the second condition) this implies (b). We assumed that the pairing function satisfies $\log \langle i, q \rangle = \log i + O(|q|) = \log i + O(\log^{(2)} i)$. Thus $\log^{(2)} \langle i, q \rangle = \log^{(2)} i + O(1)$. By (11) this implies (B).

It remains to show (C). Note that

$$K(i, q) = K(i) + K(q|i, K(i)) .$$

The last term equals $K(\omega_1 \dots \omega_{\log K(i)} | i, K(i))$. By (12) and Lemma 8 this is at least $\log K(i) + O(1)$, and in fact it is equal to this, because $K(z|z) \leq |z|$ for all z . \square

7 Contrasting expectation and probabilistically bounded deficiency

Recall from the introduction that there exist two different notions of randomness deficiency for a sequence ω . We start by showing that the two notions are related.

Proposition 10.

$$d_P(\omega) = \sup\{k : d_E(\omega|k) \geq k\} + O(1) \quad ^6$$

This characterization is closely related to a characterization of plain complexity in terms of prefix complexity (see [14, Lemma 3.1.1 p. 203]):

$$C(x) = \min\{k : K(x|k) \leq k\} + O(1) .$$

Many results relating and contrasting prefix and plain complexity on one side, can be translated to results about expectation and probability bounded deficiency. (In these results $d_E(\cdot)$ corresponds to $K(\cdot)$ and $d_P(\cdot)$ to $C(\cdot)$.)

Proof. For the \geq -direction we need to show that the exponent of the supremum defines a lower-semicomputable probability bounded test. d_E is lower semicomputable, thus also the supremum is lower semicomputable, and it remains to show that the measure where it

⁶ Conditional probability bounded deficiency is defined in the natural way: it is the logarithm of a multiplicatively maximal function $f(\cdot|k)$ that is lower semicomputable uniformly in k , such that for each k the function is a probability bounded test.

exceeds ℓ is bounded by $O(2^{-\ell})$. By definition we have $\int 2^{d_E(\omega|k)} d\omega \leq 1$ for all k , thus the measure of ω such that $d_E(\omega|k) \geq k$ is at most 2^{-k} . If the supremum exceeds ℓ for some ω , then $d_E(\omega|k) \geq k$ for some $k \geq \ell$. The total measure for which this can happen is at most $2^{-\ell} + 2^{-\ell-1} + \dots \leq O(2^{-\ell})$.

For the \leq -direction note that every probability bounded test f defines a family of expectation bounded tests $g(\cdot|k)$ such that $g(\omega|k) = 2^k$ iff $f(\omega) \geq 2^k$. Indeed the condition implies $\int f(\omega|k) d\omega \leq 2^k \cdot 2^{-k} = 1$. Obviously, if f is lower semicomputable, the tests $g(\cdot|k)$ are lower semicomputable uniformly in k . If f is the universal test corresponding to d_P , then $d_P(\omega) \geq k$ implies $f(\omega) \geq 2^k$, which implies $g(\omega|k) \geq 2^k$ thus $d_E(\omega|k) \geq k - O(1)$. \square

The question was raised in [6, Question 1] whether the two deficiencies are related by a monotone function, or *does there exist two families of sequences ω^ℓ and ω'^ℓ such that*

$$d_A(\omega^\ell) - d_A(\omega'^\ell) \rightarrow \infty$$

for $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$d_P(\omega^\ell) - d_P(\omega'^\ell) \rightarrow -\infty.$$

We show this is indeed the case.

Theorem 11. *There exist families of sequences ω^ℓ and ω'^ℓ such that for infinitely many ℓ*

$$|d_P(\omega^\ell) - d_P(\omega'^\ell)| \leq O(1)$$

if $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$d_E(\omega^\ell) - d_E(\omega'^\ell) \geq \ell - O(1).$$

The positive answer to the question above follows by prepending $\ell/2$ zeros to ω'^ℓ for all ℓ . This decreases the complexities in the definition of $d_P(\omega'^\ell)$ and $d_E(\omega'^\ell)$ by $\ell/2 + O(\log \ell)$ and hence increases these deficiencies by the same amount; and this is enough for the question.

Before presenting the proof, we show two lemmas that play the same role as symmetry of information and Levin's result relating plain and prefix complexity (i.e. Lemma 1).

Lemma 12 (Symmetry of deficiency). *For all ω and all x that belong to a prefix-free computably enumerable set, we have*

$$d_E(x\omega) = |x| - K(x) + d_E(\omega|x, K(x)) + O(1),$$

here $x\omega$ denotes concatenation of x and ω . The $O(1)$ -term depends on the choice of the computably enumerable set.

The proof uses a characterization of expectation bounded deficiency in terms of prefix Kolmogorov complexity (see for example [6, Proposition 2.22]):

Theorem. $d_E(\omega|z) = \sup_n \{n - K(\omega_1 \dots \omega_n|z)\} + O(1)$

Proof of Lemma 12. Let x be a member of the prefix-free computably enumerable set. From xy we can compute x by enumerating the prefix-free set until an initial segment of xy and this segment can only be x . Symmetry of information implies

$$K(xy) = K(x, y) + O(1) = K(x) + K(y|x, K(x)) + O(1),$$

i.e.

$$|xy| - K(xy) = |x| - K(x) + |y| - K(y|x, K(x)).$$

If we take on both sides the supremum of y over all prefixes of ω , we *almost* obtain the equation of the lemma; the problem is that in the definition of $d_E(x\omega)$ we also need to consider prefixes z of x . It remains to verify that

$$|z| - K(z) \leq |x| - K(x) + O(1)$$

for all prefixes z of x . In general this is false, but for x in a prefix-free enumerable set it holds. For any z and x , let $P(x|z) = 2^{-|x|-|z|}$ if x is an extension of z that belongs to the prefix-free set, otherwise let $P(x|z) = 0$. Note that $\sum_x P(x|z) \leq 1$ and $P(x|z)$ is lower-semicomputable, hence the coding theorem implies $K(x|z) \leq -\log P(x|z) + O(1) \leq |x| - |z| + O(1)$. Symmetry of information implies

$$K(x) \leq K(x, z) \leq K(z) + K(x|z) + O(1) \leq K(z) + |x| - |z| + O(1),$$

and this implies the equation above. \square

The analogue of Lemma 1 for deficiencies of sequences is

Lemma 13. For all j and ω

$$|j - d_E(\omega|j)| = \Theta |j - d_P(\omega)|.$$

Proof. For fixed random ω , the map $t \rightarrow d_E(\omega|t)$ maps points at distance d to points at distance $O(\log d)$. Hence, the map has a unique fixed point t within precision $O(1)$, i.e. $d_E(\omega|t) = t + O(1)$ for some t . This implies that t is $O(1)$ -close to the minimal s such that $d_E(\omega|s) \geq s$, i.e. $d_P(\omega)$. Our observation implies that $d_E(\omega|t + d) = t + O(\log d)$, thus for $j = t + d$ we have $j - d_E(\omega|j) = j - d_P(\omega) + O(\log(j - d_P(\omega)))$, and this implies the lemma. \square

Proof of Theorem 11. For each ℓ we choose a k such that $\log^{(2)} k \leq \ell$ and $K(K(k)|k) \geq \log^{(2)} k - c$ where c is the constant from Theorem 4. By Lemma 5

$$\ell = \log^{(2)} k = \log K(k) + O(1). \quad (13)$$

We choose ω such that

$$d_P(\omega|k, K(k)) \leq O(1).$$

Let $0^k 1 \omega$ be the sequence that starts with k zeros, followed by a one and followed by ω . Let $0^k 1 \langle K(k) \rangle \omega$ be $0^k 1$ followed by $K(k)$ in binary, followed by ω . The theorem follows from the values of the expectation and probability bounded deficiencies of these strings, given in the table below:

α	$d_E(\alpha)$	$d_P(\alpha)$
$0^k 1 \omega$	$k - K(k) + O(1)$	$k + O(1)$
$0^k 1 \langle K(k) \rangle^l \omega$	$k - K(k) + \ell + O(1)$	$k + O(1)$

It remains to prove that the values in the table are correct.

The values of $d_E(\cdot)$ in the first column are obtained from Lemma 12. In the first case, the prefix-free set is the set of strings $0^m 1$ for all m , thus

$$d_E(0^k 1 \omega) = k - K(k) + d_E(\omega|k, K(k)) + O(1).$$

In the second case, the prefix-free set is the set of all strings $0^m 1 z$ for all m and all z of length $\log^{(2)} m$. Recall that $K(k, K(k)) = K(k) + O(1)$, thus

$$d_E(0^k 1 \langle K(k) \rangle \omega) = k + \log^{(2)} k - K(k) + d_E(\omega|k, K(k)) + O(1).$$

To evaluate $d_P(\cdot)$ we use Lemma 13. Hence, let us compute $d_E(0^k 1 \omega|k)$. Again we use Lemma 12:

$$d_E(0^k 1 \omega|k) = k - K(0^k 1|k) + d_E(\omega|K(0^k 1|k), k) + O(1) = k + d_E(\omega|k) + O(1).$$

This implies $d_P(0^k 1 \omega) = k + O(1)$. For the second case, note that $K(0^k 1 \langle K(k) \rangle|k) = K(K(k)|k) + O(1) = \log^{(2)} k + O(1)$ by choice of k . With similar reasoning we determine $d_P(0^k 1 \langle K(k) \rangle \omega)$:

$$d_E(0^k 1 \langle K(k) \rangle \omega|k) = (k + \log^{(2)} k) - K(K(k)|k) + d_E(\omega|K(k), k) + O(1).$$

This equals $k + O(1)$ by (13). □

References

- [1] G. Barmpalias. Algorithmic randomness and measures of complexity. *The Bulletin of Symbolic Logic*, 19(3), Sept. 2013.
- [2] B. Bauwens. Prefix and plain Kolmogorov complexity characterizations of 2-randomness: simple proofs. *ArXiv e-prints*, October 2013. Submitted, presented at Computability, Complexity and Randomness conference in July 2012 Cambridge.
- [3] B. Bauwens and A. Shen. Complexity of complexity and maximal plain versus prefix-free Kolmogorov complexity. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 2013. Accepted for publication.
- [4] C.H. Bennett. *Logical depth and physical complexity*, pages 227–257. Oxford University Press, Inc., New York, NY, USA, 1988.
- [5] L. Bienvenu. Personal communication, Nov 2011.
- [6] L. Bienvenu, P. Gács, M. Hoyrup, C. Rojas, and A. Shen. Algorithmic tests and randomness with respect to a class of measures. *Proceedings of the Steklov Institute of Mathematics*, 274(1):34–89, 2011.
- [7] G.J. Chaitin. A theory of program size formally identical to information theory. *J. Assoc. Comput. Mach.*, 22(3):329–340, 1975.

- [8] R.G. Downey and D.R. Hirschfeldt. *Algorithmic Randomness and Complexity*. Theory and Applications of Computability. Springer, 2010.
- [9] P. Gács. On the symmetry of algorithmic information. *Soviet Math. Dokl.*, 15:1477–1480, 1974.
- [10] P. Gács. Lecture notes on descriptonal complexity and randomness. <http://www.cs.bu.edu/faculty/gacs/papers/ait-notes.pdf>, 1988–2011.
- [11] A.N. Kolmogorov. Three approaches to the quantitative definition of information. *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii*, 1(1):3–11, 1965.
- [12] L. A. Levin. Laws of information conservation (nongrowth) and aspects of the foundation of probability theory. *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii*, 10(3):30–35, 1974.
- [13] L.A. Levin. The various measures of the complexity of finite objects (an axiomatic description). *Soviet Mathematics Doklady*, 17(2):522–526, 1976.
- [14] M. Li and P.M.B. Vitányi. *An Introduction to Kolmogorov Complexity and Its Applications*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2008.
- [15] J.S. Miller. Every 2-random real is Kolmogorov random. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 69(3):907–913, 2004.
- [16] J.S. Miller. Contrasting plain and prefix-free Kolmogorov complexity. unpublished, 2006.
- [17] J.S. Miller. The K -degrees, low for K -degrees, and weakly low for K sets. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, 50(4):381–391, 2009.
- [18] A. Nies, F. Stephan, and S.A. Terwijn. Randomness, relativization and turing degrees. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 70(2):515–535, 2005.
- [19] A. Shen and A. Romashchenko. Topological arguments for kolmogorov complexity. In *AUTOMATA'2012: 18th International Workshop on Cellular Automata and Discrete Complex Systems*, pages 127–132, 2012.
- [20] R. J. Solomonoff. A formal theory of inductive inference. Part I. *Information and Control*, 7(1):1–22, March 1964.
- [21] R.M. Solovay. Draft of a paper (or series of papers) on Chaitin’s work. 215 pp., unpublished, May 1975.

A $KKK(x) = CCC(x) + O(CCCC(x))$ does not hold

Proposition 14. *There exist infinitely many x such that $CCCC(x) \leq O(\log^{(5)} |x|)$ and*

$$|CCC(x) - KKK(x)| \geq \Omega(\log^{(4)} |x|).$$

We use our main technique to contrast $C(\cdot)$ and $K(\cdot)$ to disprove that $KKK(x) = CCC(x) + O(CCCC(x))$. However, we will use the variant presented in the proof of [3, Corollary 6]. It is combined with a topological argument which was inspired by [19]. We start with a definition and a lemma.

Definition 1. A set S of numbers is c -dense in a superset A if for each $a \in A$ there is an $s \in S$ such that $|a - s| \leq c$.

Lemma 15. If S is c -dense in an interval of size k , then the set

$$\{K(k) : k \in S\}$$

is $O(\log c)$ -dense in some interval of size $\Omega(\log k - \log c)$.

Proof of Proposition 14. Let T be the set defined by the lemma. Note that the function $K(\cdot)$ maps points at distance d to points at distance $O(\log d)$, hence T is $O(\log c)$ -dense in $[\min T, \max T]$. It remains to show that the maximum of this set differs from its minimum by at least $\log k - O(\log c + \log^{(2)} k)$. Let r be the minimal number in the interval of size k (in which S is dense) that ends with $\log k - 2$ zeros. By assumption r is at c distance of an element in S . On the other side, if the $\log k - 2$ last zeros of r are changed, the corresponding number remains always in the interval of size k , and for one such change the complexity of r must increase by at least $\log k - O(\log^{(2)} k)$. (Otherwise, too many short descriptions exist of such modified r and we could use this to obtain a shorter description for r .) This element is c -close to an element in S , thus the difference of the minimum and the maximum of $K(k)$ over S is at least $\log k - O(\log c + \log^{(2)} k)$. \square

Proof of Proposition 14. For infinitely many n we construct strings x_i of length n such that

1. The values $K(x_i)$ are dense in an interval of size $\Omega(\log^{(2)} n)$, while all values $C(x)$ are contained in an interval of size $O(\log^{(3)} n)$.
2. The values $KKK(x_i)$ are dense in an interval of size at least $\Omega(\log^{(4)} n)$, while all values $CCC(x_i)$ are contained in an interval of size $O(\log^{(5)} n)$.
3. $CCCC(x_i) \leq O(\log^{(5)} n)$.

2 and 3 imply Proposition 14. By Lemma 15 we can already observe that 1 implies 2, thus it remains to show 1 and 3.

We start the construction by identifying two strings y and z of length n such that $K(y) - K(z) \geq \log^{(2)} n$ and $C(y) = C(z) = n$ (here and below we omit $O(1)$ terms). More specifically our construction implies $K(y) = K(n) + n - \log^{(2)} n$ and $K(z) = K(n) + n$. We use the construction of [3, Corollary 6] (which slightly differs from the proof of Theorem 3). Let us repeat this construction. As usual, let n be such that $K(K(n)|n) \geq \log^{(2)} n$. For the proof of item 3, note that n exist for all values of $\log^{(2)} n$, and we choose such values that satisfy

$$C(\log^{(2)} n) \leq O(\log^{(5)} n) \tag{14}$$

(there exist infinitely many such n). Let z of length n be such that $C(z|K(n), n) \geq n$. Let y be the concatenation of $K(n)$ in binary and the last $n - \log^{(2)} n$ bits of z . By Lemma 5, the

length of $K(n)$ in binary is $\log^{(2)} n$, thus $|y| = n$. The string y is the same constructed string as in the proof of [3, Corollary 6], and there it is shown using symmetry of information that $C(y) = n$ and $K(y) = K(n) + n - \log^{(2)} n$.

What happens if for some $i \leq \log^{(2)} n$ in this construction only the last i bits from $K(n)$ and the first $n - i$ bits from z are chosen? Let x_i be the string obtained in this way. Note that x_{i+1} is obtained from x_i by removing the last bit and prepending the $i + 1$ -th last bit of $K(n)$. This implies that $K(x_i) = K(x_{i+1}) + O(1)$. For $i = 0$ we have $x_i = y$ and $K(x_i) = K(n) + n - \log^{(2)} n$, and for $i = \log^{(2)} n$ we have $x_i = z$ and thus $K(x_i) = K(n) + n$. This implies that the values of $K(x_i)$ are $O(1)$ -dense in an interval of size $\log^{(2)} n$. Using symmetry of information in a similar way as before, one can show that $C(x_i) = n + O(\log i)$ (we use that any i -bit segment of $K(n)$ is $O(\log i)$ incompressible given i). Recall that $i \leq \log^{(2)} n$, thus this implies that all values $C(x_i)$ are contained in an interval of size $O(\log^{(3)} n)$, and this finishes the proof of item 1.

We show item 3. Recall that $C(x_i) = n + O(\log^{(3)} n)$, so we need to show that $CCC(n) \leq O(\log^{(5)} n)$. We know that $C(\log^{(2)} n) \leq O(\log^{(5)} n)$ but unfortunately, $CC(n)$ can contain much more information than $\log^{(2)} n$. We take another approach by showing that $CC(K(n)) \leq O(\log^{(5)} n)$ and $CCC(n) \leq O(CC(K(n)))$. The last inequality follows from footnote 2. For the first, note from footnote 3 that $C(K(n)) = \log^{(2)} n$, and by (14) this implies $CC(K(n)) \leq O(\log^{(5)} n)$. \square