

Randomness, exchangeability, and conformal prediction

Vladimir Vovk

January 22, 2025

Abstract

This note continues development of the functional theory of randomness, a modification of the algorithmic theory of randomness getting rid of unspecified additive constants. It introduces new kinds of confidence predictors, including randomness predictors (the most general confidence predictors based on the assumption of IID observations) and exchangeability predictors (the most general confidence predictors based on the assumption of exchangeable observations). The main result implies that both are close to conformal predictors and quantifies the difference between them.

The version of this note at <http://alrw.net> (Working Paper 42) is updated most often.

1 Introduction

The functional theory of randomness was proposed in [9] under the name of non-algorithmic theory of randomness. The algorithmic theory of randomness was started by Kolmogorov in the 1960s [3] and developed in numerous papers and books (see, e.g., [7]). It has been a powerful source of intuition, but its weakness is the dependence on the choice of a specific universal partial computable function, which leads to the presence of unspecified additive (sometimes multiplicative) constants in its mathematical results. Kolmogorov [2, Sect. 3] speculated that for natural universal partial computable functions the additive constants will be in hundreds rather than in tens of thousands of bits, but this accuracy is very far from being sufficient in statistical applications (an additive constant of 100 in the definition of Kolmogorov complexity leads to the astronomical multiplicative constant of 2^{100} in the corresponding p-value).

The way of dealing with unspecified constants proposed in [9] is to express statements of the algorithmic theory of randomness as relations between various function classes. It will be introduced in Sect. 2. In this note we will call this approach the functional theory of randomness. While it loses somewhat in intuitive simplicity, it moves closer to practical machine learning and statistics.

In this note we are interested in applying the functional theory of randomness to prediction. The most standard assumption in machine learning is that of *randomness*: we assume that the observations are generated in the IID fashion (are independent and identically distributed). An *a priori* weaker assumption is that of exchangeability, although for infinite data sequences randomness and exchangeability turn out to be essentially equivalent by the celebrated de Finetti representation theorem. For finite sequences, however, the difference is important, and it will be the subject of our Sect. 3.

We start discussing applications of the functional theory of randomness to prediction in Sect. 2. In it we introduce the notion of a confidence predictor (slightly modifying and generalizing the terminology of [11, Sect. 2.1]). Then we identify eight kinds of confidence predictors based on three dichotomies:

- the assumption about the data-generating mechanism can be randomness (R) or exchangeability (X);
- with each potential label of a test object we can associate its p-value (as in standard statistical hypothesis testing) or e-value (see, e.g., [12] or [1]);
- optionally, we can require the invariance (i) of the confidence predictor w.r. to the permutations of the training sequence.

The combination X/p/i corresponds to the conformal predictors, while the combinations R/p and R/e correspond to the most general confidence predictors under the assumption of randomness. Our main goal will be to establish the closeness of the X/p/i predictors (i.e., the conformal predictors) to the R/p predictors, since confidence predictors based on p-values enjoy a more intuitive property of validity. (The close relation between the conformal predictors and the R/e predictors will be established as a by-product.) Such closeness can be interpreted as the universality of conformal prediction, and it was explored in [4], which can be regarded as counterpart of this note in the algorithmic theory of randomness.

In the rest of this note we will explore

- the difference between randomness and exchangeability predictors in Sect. 3,
- the effect of imposing the requirement of invariance w.r. to the permutations of the training sequence in Sect. 4,
- and the difference between confidence predictors based on p-values and those based on e-values in Sect. 5.

My informal explanations will sometimes be couched in the language of the “naive theory of randomness” postulating the existence of the largest or smallest, as appropriate, element in each function class; this element will be called “universal”. Even though formally self-contradictory, this postulate makes some intuitive sense along the lines of the algorithmic theory of randomness.

In this note e may stand for an e-value; Euler’s number (the base of the natural logarithms) is $e \approx 2.72$.




Figure 1: A cube representing eight function classes.

2 Confidence predictors

In this note we are interested in the following prediction problem. After having observed a training sequence of *examples* $z_i = (x_i, y_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, each consisting of an *object* x_i and its *label* y_i , and given a new test object x_{n+1} , our task is to predict x_{n+1} 's label y_{n+1} . The length n of the training sequence is fixed throughout. We will say that y_{n+1} is the *true label* of x_{n+1} while labels $y \neq y_{n+1}$ are *false*.

Each object is drawn from a measurable space \mathbf{X} (the *object space*), and each label is drawn from a measurable space \mathbf{Y} (the *label space*). Therefore, the examples are drawn from the Cartesian product $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{Y}$ (the *example space*). We are mostly interested in the case of *classification*, where the label space \mathbf{Y} is finite. In informal explanations, I will assume that \mathbf{Y} is a small set, such as in the case of *binary classification* $|\mathbf{Y}| = 2$ (it might be a good idea for the reader to concentrate on this case, at least at first).

Remark 1. In our book [11] we referred to prediction algorithms in this setting as “one-off”, dropping “one-off” when n was allowed to vary. In this note, n is always fixed and “one-off” is never used.

We will be interested in two statistical assumptions about the data sequence z_1, \dots, z_{n+1} , where $z_{n+1} := (x_{n+1}, y_{n+1})$ is the test example. Under the *assumption of randomness*, the probability measure generating z_1, \dots, z_{n+1} is a *power probability measure* $R = Q^{n+1}$, Q being a probability measure on the example space \mathbf{Z} . Under the *assumption of exchangeability*, the probability measure R generating z_1, \dots, z_{n+1} is invariant under permutations of z_1, \dots, z_{n+1} .

Figure 1 shows eight function classes that we are interested in in this note. Let us concentrate on its left panel for now ignoring the right one. We start from the function class in the top left corner (of the exterior square), \mathcal{P}^R . It consists of all *randomness p-variables* on \mathbf{Z}^{n+1} , i.e., functions $P : \mathbf{Z}^{n+1} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that, for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and any power probability measure R on \mathbf{Z}^{n+1} ,

$$R(P \leq \epsilon) \leq \epsilon. \quad (1)$$

The importance of the class \mathcal{P}^R stems from randomness being the standard assumption of machine learning.

In the very informal setting of the naive theory of randomness, the universal randomness p-variable U is the smallest one, and we may call a data sequence $\zeta \in \mathbf{Z}^{n+1}$ random (to a varying degree) if $U(\zeta)$ is not small. We can consider two possible prediction situations:

- if the true data sequence z_1, \dots, z_{n+1} is random, we are in the situation of “prediction proper”; we can output y_{n+1} as a confident prediction for the label of the test object x_{n+1} if $U(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y)$ is small for all false labels y ;
- if the true data sequence z_1, \dots, z_{n+1} is not random, we are in the situation of “anomaly detection”; in this case all of $U(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y)$ can be expected to be small.

In this note we are interested in prediction proper.

The p-variable P can also be used as a “confidence transducer”, in the terminology of [11, Sect. 2.7.1]. Given a training sequence z_1, \dots, z_n and a test object x_{n+1} , we can compute the p-value $P(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y)$ for each possible label y for x_{n+1} (where a *p-value* is just a value taken by a p-variable). We can regard $P(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, \cdot)$ to be a fuzzy set predictor for y_{n+1} . To obtain a crisp set predictor, we can choose a *significance level* $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and define the prediction set

$$\Gamma^\epsilon(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}) := \{y \in \mathbf{Y} : P(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y) > \epsilon\}. \quad (2)$$

By the definition of p-variables, the probability of error (meaning $y_{n+1} \notin \Gamma^\epsilon(\dots)$) for this crisp set predictor will not exceed ϵ .

In [11, Sect. 2.1.6] we defined confidence predictors as nested families Γ^ϵ , $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, and called them *conservatively valid* if Γ^ϵ makes an error with probability at most ϵ . This includes the families defined by (2) as a subclass, and in general the inclusion is proper. However, the difference is not essential, as spelled out in Propositions 2.14 and 2.15 of [11]. We will refer to the randomness p-variables $P : \mathbf{Z}^{n+1} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ as *randomness predictors* (or, more fully, randomness confidence predictors).

The top right corner in Fig. 1, \mathcal{P}^X , is the class that consists of all *exchangeability p-variables* on \mathbf{Z}^{n+1} , i.e., functions $P : \mathbf{Z}^{n+1} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ satisfying (1) for all $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and all exchangeable probability measures R on \mathbf{Z}^{n+1} . Such p-variables serve as *exchangeability predictors*. Naively, a data sequence $\zeta \in \mathbf{Z}^{n+1}$ is exchangeable if $U(\zeta)$ is not small, U being the universal exchangeability p-variable.

The bottom left corner in Fig. 1, \mathcal{P}^{iR} , is the class of the randomness p-variables (elements of \mathcal{P}^R) that are invariant w.r. to the permutations of the training sequence. The bottom right corner \mathcal{P}^{iX} in Fig. 1 is the class of the exchangeability p-variables that are invariant w.r. to the permutations of the training sequence.

The top left corner \mathcal{E}^R of the interior square in Fig. 1 consists of all *randomness e-variables* on \mathbf{Z}^{n+1} , i.e., functions $E : \mathbf{Z}^{n+1} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ such that, for any power probability measure R on \mathbf{Z}^{n+1} ,

$$\int E dR \leq 1. \quad (3)$$

By Markov’s inequality, $1/\mathcal{E}^R \subseteq \mathcal{P}^R$. In general, the right panel of Fig. 1 shows all inclusions between our eight classes, with an arrow $A \rightarrow B$ from A to B meaning $A \subseteq B$. We will also refer to e-variables $E \in \mathcal{E}^R$ as *randomness e-predictors*. For a given training sequence z_1, \dots, z_n and test object x_{n+1} , the e-value $E(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y)$ for each $y \in \mathbf{Y}$ tells us how likely y is as label y for x_{n+1} . Therefore, $E(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, \cdot)$ is again a soft set predictor for y_{n+1} .

The other function classes in Fig. 1 are defined in a similar way: \mathcal{E}^X consists of all *exchangeability e-variables* on \mathbf{Z}^{n+1} , i.e., functions $E : \mathbf{Z}^{n+1} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ satisfying (3) for all exchangeable R . Finally, \mathcal{E}^{iR} and \mathcal{E}^{iX} consist of all invariant functions in \mathcal{E}^R and \mathcal{E}^X , respectively.

It is interesting that all four confidence (e-)predictors on the right of the cubes in Fig. 1 have names (either existing or trivial modifications of existing) containing the word “conformal”:

- \mathcal{P}^X (the exchangeability p-variables) are the weak conformal predictors [11, Sect. 2.2.8];
- \mathcal{E}^X (the exchangeability e-variables) are the weak conformal e-predictors;
- \mathcal{P}^{iX} (the invariant exchangeability p-variables) are the conformal predictors [4, Proposition 1];
- \mathcal{E}^{iX} (the invariant exchangeability e-variables) are the conformal e-predictors.

Returning to the very informal language of the naive theory of randomness, our discussion of calibration in Sect. 5 will show that random data sequences $\zeta \in \mathbf{Z}^{n+1}$ can be defined as those for which $U(\zeta)$ is not large, U being the universal (i.e., largest) randomness e-variable. Similarly, exchangeable data sequences ζ can be defined as those for which $U(\zeta)$ is not large, U being the universal exchangeability e-variable.

We are interested in connecting two opposite vertices of the cube in the left panel of Fig. 1, \mathcal{P}^R (confidence prediction under randomness) and \mathcal{P}^{iX} (conformal prediction). These are perhaps the most important vertices as \mathcal{P}^R corresponds to most general confidence prediction under the standard assumption of machine learning and \mathcal{P}^{iX} is understood very well and has been widely implemented; for the equivalence of \mathcal{P}^{iX} and conformal prediction, see [11, Proposition 2.9].

A possible path connecting \mathcal{P}^R and \mathcal{P}^{iX} is shown as the bold red polygonal chain in the left panel of Fig. 1. It will be used in proving our main result about the closeness of \mathcal{P}^R and \mathcal{P}^{iX} considered as predictors (Theorem 8 below);

namely we will prove the closeness for the start and end of each step in the path separately:

- The step from \mathcal{P}^R to \mathcal{E}^R (from p-values to e-values for randomness) is the calibration step, to be discussed in Sect. 5.
- The step from \mathcal{E}^R to \mathcal{E}^X (from randomness to exchangeability) is the key one; we will call it *Kolmogorov's step*. It is the topic of Sect. 3.
- The step from \mathcal{E}^X to \mathcal{E}^{iX} (adding invariance) is relatively straightforward. We will call it the *conformal step*. It is discussed in Sect. 4.
- The step from \mathcal{E}^{iX} (conformal e-prediction) to \mathcal{P}^{iX} (conformal prediction) is the e-to-p calibration step, and it is also the topic of Sect. 5.

3 Kolmogorov's step

For infinite data sequences and assuming that the example space is standard Borel, each exchangeable probability measure is a convex mixture of power probability measures (see, e.g., [5, Theorem 1.49]), and so the difference between the assumptions of randomness and exchangeability simply disappears. For finite data sequences the difference exists, but still randomness was formalized as exchangeability by Kolmogorov in [3, Sect. 2]. The difference was first explored in [8, Theorem 1], and this result was translated into the language of the functional theory of randomness in [9, Corollary 3]. According to those results, the difference between the randomness and exchangeability for a data sequence ζ lies in the randomness of the *configuration* $\text{conf}(\zeta)$ of ζ , where $\text{conf}(\zeta)$ is the bag (i.e., multiset) obtained from ζ by “forgetting the order of its elements” (if $\zeta = (z_1, \dots, z_N)$, then $\text{conf}(\zeta) = \{z_1, \dots, z_N\}$, $\{\cdot\}$ being the notation for bags).

In principle, besides the eight function classes shown in Fig. 1, we are also interested in the following two:

- the class \mathcal{E}^{cR} consisting of *randomness e-variables for configurations* (or configuration randomness e-variables): $E \in \mathcal{E}^{cR}$ if $E : \mathbf{Z}^{(n+1)} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ (we are using the notation $\mathbf{Z}^{(N)}$ for the set of all bags of size N of examples) satisfies

$$\int E(\text{conf}(\zeta))R(d\zeta) \leq 1$$

for any power probability measure R on \mathbf{Z}^{n+1} ;

- the analogous class \mathcal{P}^{cR} consisting of *randomness p-variables for configurations*, which is the class of $P : \mathbf{Z}^{(n+1)} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ satisfying

$$R(\{\zeta \in \mathbf{Z}^{n+1} : P(\text{conf}(\zeta)) \leq \epsilon\}) \leq \epsilon$$

for all power probability measures R on \mathbf{Z}^{n+1} and all $\epsilon > 0$.

In this note, however, we will only use \mathcal{E}^{R} .

Proposition 2. *The class \mathcal{E}^{R} is the pointwise product of \mathcal{E}^{X} and another class, namely $\mathcal{E}^{\text{cR}} \circ \text{conf}$:*

$$\mathcal{E}^{\text{R}} = \mathcal{E}^{\text{X}}(\mathcal{E}^{\text{cR}} \circ \text{conf}). \quad (4)$$

The pointwise product of function classes \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 is defined as the class of all products $E_1 E_2$ for $E_1 \in \mathcal{E}_1$ and $E_2 \in \mathcal{E}_2$, where $E_1 E_2$ is the pointwise product of functions, $(E_1 E_2)(\zeta) := E_1(\zeta) E_2(\zeta)$. For a proof of Proposition 2, see [9, Corollary 3]; this result is derived in [9] as a corollary of a much more general statement [9, Theorem 1].

According to Proposition 2, the difference between randomness and exchangeability lies in the randomness of the configuration. Therefore, the following theorem establishes a connection between randomness e-predictors and exchangeability e-predictors.

Theorem 3. *For any randomness e-variable F for configurations there exists a randomness e-variable G such that, for all $z_1, \dots, z_n, z_{n+1} = (x_{n+1}, y_{n+1})$, and $y \neq y_{n+1}$,*

$$G(z_1, \dots, z_n, z_{n+1}) \geq \frac{1}{e(|\mathbf{Y}| - 1)} F(\wr z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y).$$

Let me give an informal argument (formalized in the following proof) why nonrandomness of $\wr z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y$ for $y \neq y_{n+1}$ implies nonrandomness of $(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y_{n+1})$. Consider, for simplicity, the case of binary labels. If after flipping the last label in the true data sequence $(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y_{n+1})$ the bag of its elements becomes nonrandom, then either the original bag was nonrandom or the last element was special, and in any case already the original data sequence was nonrandom.

Proof. We will construct the two components of $G \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{R}}$ (the exchangeability component and the configuration randomness component, as per Proposition 2) separately. To obtain an approximation G_1 to the configuration randomness component for (z_1, \dots, z_{n+1}) , choose randomly (with equal probabilities) $i \in \{1, \dots, n+1\}$ and change the label y_i to $y \in \mathbf{Y} \setminus \{y_i\}$ randomly (with equal probabilities; y_i is the label in z_i). Then $G_1(\wr z_1, \dots, z_{n+1})$ will be the expectation of the resulting value

$$F(\wr z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, x_i, y, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_{n+1})$$

over the random choice of i and y . The configuration randomness component G_2 is the IID analogue of G_1 : for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n+1\}$, with probability $1/(n+1)$ choose a random $y \neq y_i$ and change y_i to y ; define $G_2(\wr z_1, \dots, z_{n+1})$ to be the expectation of the value of F on the resulting bag. The exchangeability component is

$$G_3(z_1, \dots, z_{n+1}) := \frac{1}{|\mathbf{Y}| - 1} \sum_{y \in \mathbf{Y} \setminus \{y_{n+1}\}} \frac{F(\wr z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y)}{G_1(\wr z_1, \dots, z_{n+1})}.$$

Define $G := (G_2 \circ \text{conf})G_3$; then $G \in \mathcal{E}^R$ by Proposition 2.

Let us first check that G_2 and G_3 are really a configuration randomness e-variable and an exchangeability e-variable, respectively. To check that $G_2 \in \mathcal{E}^{\text{cR}}$, we need to prove, for a given power probability measure on z_1, \dots, z_{n+1} , that the expectation of $G_2 \circ \text{conf}$ does not exceed 1. It suffices to notice that if z_1, \dots, z_{n+1} are generated by a power probability measure, randomly changing the label of each z_i to a different label leads to a random sequence that is still IID. And to check that $G_3 \in \mathcal{E}^X$, notice that the average of G_3 over all permutations of its arguments is 1 by the definition of G_1 .

Let us now check that $G_2 \geq G_1/e$. The probability that randomly changing the label of each z_i to a different label leads to a change in just one label is

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{n+1}\right)^n \geq \frac{1}{e}$$

(by substitution $t := 1/n$ this inequality reduces to $(1+t)e^{-t} \leq 1$, which can be checked by differentiation).

Combining everything said so far in this proof, we obtain, for each $y \in \mathbf{Y} \setminus \{y_{n+1}\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} G(z_1, \dots, z_{n+1}) &= G_2(\wr z_1, \dots, z_{n+1}) G_3(z_1, \dots, z_{n+1}) \\ &\geq G_2(\wr z_1, \dots, z_{n+1}) \frac{1}{|\mathbf{Y}| - 1} \frac{F(\wr z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y)}{G_1(\wr z_1, \dots, z_{n+1})} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{e(|\mathbf{Y}| - 1)} F(\wr z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

The following example shows that the constant e in Theorem 3 cannot be improved.

Example 4. Suppose the training set is

$$(y_1, \dots, y_n) = (0, \dots, 0)$$

(there are no x s, or they are trivial: $|\mathbf{X}| = 1$) and we are asked to predict y_{n+1} . The natural (“universal”) exchangeability e-value for the potential label $y_{n+1} = 1$ will be $\frac{1}{n+1}$ under the exchangeability model, and the natural randomness e-value for the potential label $y_{n+1} = 1$ will be close to $\frac{1}{e(n+1)}$ (for large n): indeed, the maximal probability of the event

$$(y_1, \dots, y_n, y_{n+1}) = (0, \dots, 0, 1)$$

under a power probability measure is

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{n+1}\right)^n \frac{1}{n+1} \sim \frac{1}{e(n+1)}.$$

In conclusion of this section, let us now state explicitly the corollary of Proposition 2 and Theorem 3 that we will need later in the note.

Corollary 5. For any randomness e-variable E there exist an exchangeability e-variable E' and a randomness e-variable G such that, for all $z_1, \dots, z_n, z_{n+1} = (x_{n+1}, y_{n+1})$, and $y \neq y_{n+1}$,

$$E'(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y) \geq \frac{1}{e(|\mathbf{Y}| - 1)} \frac{E(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y)}{G(z_1, \dots, z_n, z_{n+1})}. \quad (5)$$

The informal interpretation of (5) is that, in classification, every false label y for the test object is excluded by an exchangeability e-variable once it is excluded by a randomness e-variable, unless the true data sequence (z_1, \dots, z_{n+1}) is not random.

Proof of Corollary 5. Let E be a randomness e-variable. By Proposition 2, there exist an exchangeability e-variable E' and a randomness e-variable E'' for configurations such that

$$E(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y) = E'(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y)E''(\wr z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y\wr) \quad (6)$$

for all $z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y$. By Theorem 3 there exists a randomness e-variable G such that

$$G(z_1, \dots, z_n, z_{n+1}) \geq \frac{1}{e(|\mathbf{Y}| - 1)} E''(\wr z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y\wr) \quad (7)$$

for all $z_1, \dots, z_n, z_{n+1} = (x_{n+1}, y_{n+1})$, and $y \neq y_{n+1}$. It remains to combine (6) and (7). \square

4 Conformal step

Let us say that an exchangeability e-variable $E = E(z_1, \dots, z_n, z_{n+1})$ is *invariant* if

$$E(z_1, \dots, z_n, z_{n+1}) = E(z_{\pi(1)}, \dots, z_{\pi(n)}, z_{n+1})$$

for all permutations π of $\{1, \dots, n\}$. It is easy to check that an invariant exchangeability e-variable is the same thing as a conformal e-predictor as defined in [10]; indeed, the nonconformity e-measure [10, Sect. 2] corresponding to an invariant exchangeability e-variable E is

$$A(z_1, \dots, z_{n+1}) := (E(z_2, \dots, z_{n+1}, z_1), E(z_3, \dots, z_{n+1}, z_1, z_2), \dots, E(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n+1})).$$

Perhaps a more convenient definition of a nonconformity e-measure in this context would have been

$$A(\wr z_1, \dots, z_n\wr, z_{n+1}) := E(z_1, \dots, z_n, z_{n+1})$$

(in the spirit of [11, Sect. 2.9.3]).

We will also be interested in *conditional training exchangeability e-variables* $G = G(z_1, \dots, z_n \mid z_{n+1})$ (given the test observation). The defining property of such an e-variable is

$$\forall(z_1, \dots, z_{n+1}) : \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\pi} G(z_{\pi(1)}, \dots, z_{\pi(n)} \mid z_{n+1}) \leq 1,$$

π ranging over the permutations of $\{1, \dots, n\}$. If $G = G(z_1, \dots, z_n \mid z_{n+1})$ is large, the sequence z_1, \dots, z_n is not exchangeable given z_{n+1} . (This is a stronger property than z_1, \dots, z_{n+1} not being exchangeable.)

For any exchangeability e-predictor E , define the corresponding invariant exchangeability e-predictor \bar{E} by

$$\bar{E}(z_1, \dots, z_n, z_{n+1}) := \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\pi} E(z_{\pi(1)}, \dots, z_{\pi(n)}, z_{n+1}).$$

The following theorem says that \bar{E} is almost as good as E in our prediction problem unless z_1, \dots, z_{n+1} is not exchangeable.

Theorem 6. *For any exchangeability e-variable E there exists a conditional training exchangeability e-variable G such that, for all $z_1, \dots, z_n, z_{n+1} = (x_{n+1}, y_{n+1})$, and $y \neq y_{n+1}$,*

$$G(z_1, \dots, z_n \mid z_{n+1}) \geq \frac{1}{|\mathbf{Y}| - 1} \frac{E(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y)}{\bar{E}(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y)}. \quad (8)$$

Proof. Let E be an exchangeability e-variable. Define a conditional training exchangeability e-variable G by

$$G(z_1, \dots, z_n \mid z_{n+1}) := \frac{1}{|\mathbf{Y}| - 1} \sum_{y \in \mathbf{Y} \setminus \{y_{n+1}\}} \frac{E(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y)}{\bar{E}(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y)}, \quad (9)$$

where x_{n+1} and y_{n+1} are the components of $z_n = (x_{n+1}, y_{n+1})$. The last equality implies (8), so we only need to check that (9) is a conditional training exchangeability e-variable:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\pi} G(z_{\pi(1)}, \dots, z_{\pi(n)} \mid z_{n+1}) \\ &= \frac{1}{|\mathbf{Y}| - 1} \sum_{y \in \mathbf{Y} \setminus \{y_{n+1}\}} \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\pi} \frac{E(z_{\pi(1)}, \dots, z_{\pi(n)}, x_{n+1}, y)}{\bar{E}(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y)} \\ &= \frac{1}{|\mathbf{Y}| - 1} \sum_{y \in \mathbf{Y} \setminus \{y_{n+1}\}} 1 = 1. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Since each conditional training exchangeability e-variable is a randomness e-variable, we have the following corollary of Theorem 6.

Corollary 7. For any exchangeability e -variable E there exists a randomness e -variable G such that, for all $z_1, \dots, z_n, z_{n+1} = (x_{n+1}, y_{n+1})$, and $y \neq y_{n+1}$,

$$\bar{E}(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y) \geq \frac{1}{|\mathbf{Y}| - 1} \frac{E(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y)}{G(z_1, \dots, z_n, z_{n+1})}. \quad (10)$$

Informally, (10) says that, in classification problems, if E excludes a false label y as the label of the test object, then \bar{E} will exclude it as well unless the true data sequence is not random.

5 Other steps

In previous sections we discussed the two internal red steps shown in the left panel of Fig. 1. Here we will discuss the two other red steps and summarize the overall picture.

Conversion from p -values to e -values (*calibration*) and vice versa (*e-to-p calibration*) is understood very well: see, e.g., [12, Sect. 2]. E -to- p calibration is particularly simple: there is one optimal e -to- p -calibrator, $e \mapsto \min(1/e, 1)$ [12, Proposition 2.2]. As for calibration, a decreasing function $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is a *calibrator* (transforms p -values into e -values) if and only if $\int_0^1 f \leq 1$ [12, Proposition 2.1]. We will use the calibrator

$$f(p) := \epsilon p^{\epsilon-1} \quad (11)$$

for a fixed value $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. If ϵ is small, $f(p)$ will be close to $1/p$ if we ignore the multiplicative constant (as customary in the algorithmic theory of randomness). Other popular calibrators are

$$f(p) := \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } p = 0 \\ \kappa(1 + \kappa)^\kappa p^{-1} (-\ln p)^{-1-\kappa} & \text{if } p \in (0, \exp(-1 - \kappa)] \\ 0 & \text{if } p \in (\exp(-1 - \kappa), 1] \end{cases}$$

for a constant $\kappa > 0$ (see [12, Appendix B]; this calibrator is even closer to $1/p$ than (11) with a small ϵ) and Shafer's [6] calibrator

$$f(p) := p^{-1/2} - 1.$$

The lines between the corresponding \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{E} vertices in the right panel of Fig. 1 stand for the possibility of calibration or e -to- p calibration.

The following result combines all the previous statements in this note and can be regarded as its main result.

Theorem 8. Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. For any $P \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{R}}$ there exist $P' \in \mathcal{P}^{\text{iX}}$ and $G \in \mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{R}}$ such that, for all $z_1, \dots, z_n, z_{n+1} = (x_{n+1}, y_{n+1})$, and $y \neq y_{n+1}$,

$$P'(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y) \leq (e/\epsilon)(|\mathbf{Y}| - 1)^2 G(z_1, \dots, z_{n+1})^2 P(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y)^{1-\epsilon}. \quad (12)$$

Theorem 8 reduces (as usual, imperfectly) randomness predictors to conformal predictors. It says that in classification problems every false label excluded by a randomness predictor is excluded by a conformal predictor (perhaps less strongly) unless the true data sequence is nonrandom.

Proof of Theorem 8. Let $P \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{R}}$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. We will construct $P' \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{iX}}$ and $G \in \mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{R}}$ satisfying (12) in several steps. Since (11) is a calibrator, there is $E \in \mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{R}}$ satisfying

$$E(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y) \geq \epsilon P(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y)^{\epsilon-1} \quad (13)$$

(in fact, with “=” in place of “ \geq ”); here and in the rest of the proof we will leave “for all $z_1, \dots, z_n, z_{n+1} = (x_{n+1}, y_{n+1})$, and $y \neq y_{n+1}$ ” implicit. By Corollary 5, there exist $E' \in \mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{X}}$ and $G_1 \in \mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{R}}$ such that

$$E'(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y) \geq \frac{1}{e(|\mathbf{Y}| - 1)} \frac{E(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y)}{G_1(z_1, \dots, z_n, z_{n+1})}. \quad (14)$$

By Corollary 7, there exist $E'' \in \mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{iX}}$ and $G_2 \in \mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{R}}$ such that

$$E''(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y) \geq \frac{1}{|\mathbf{Y}| - 1} \frac{E'(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y)}{G_2(z_1, \dots, z_n, z_{n+1})}. \quad (15)$$

Finally, since $e \mapsto 1/e$ is an e-to-p calibrator, there is $P' \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{iX}}$ satisfying

$$P'(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y) \leq 1/E''(z_1, \dots, z_n, x_{n+1}, y). \quad (16)$$

It remains to combine (13)–(16) and set $G := \sqrt{G_1 G_2}$. (By the inequality between the geometric and arithmetic means, $G \in \mathcal{E}^{\mathbf{R}}$.) \square

6 Conclusion

This notes continues study of the functional theory of randomness started in [9]. While its statements are somewhat less intuitive than those of the algorithmic theory of randomness, they are more precise (do not involve unspecified constants) and simpler in an important respect: e.g., the analogue of (4) in the algorithmic theory of randomness is

$$d^{\mathbf{R}}(\zeta) = d^{\mathbf{X}}(\zeta \mid d^{\mathbf{cR}}(\text{conf}(\zeta))) + d^{\mathbf{cR}}(\text{conf}(\zeta)) + O(1)$$

(see [8, Theorem 1]), where $d^{\mathbf{R}}$ is deficiency of randomness of data sequences, $d^{\mathbf{X}}$ is deficiency of exchangeability of data sequences, and $d^{\mathbf{cR}}$ is deficiency of randomness of configurations of data sequences. The condition “ $\mid d^{\mathbf{cR}}(\text{conf}(\zeta))$ ” disappears in (4).

These are the most obvious directions of further research:

- Example 4 shows that the constant e in Theorem 3 is optimal, but, e.g., it does not say anything about the optimality of the factor $|\mathbf{Y}| - 1$. It would be interesting to explore the optimality of our results more systematically.

- Besides, the optimality of individual steps shown in red in Fig. 1 does not mean that the whole red path is optimal. Deriving optimal versions of the inequality (12) in Theorem 8 is another interesting direction of further research.

Acknowledgments

In October 2024 Vladimir V'yugin, one of my first teachers in the algorithmic theory of randomness, died at the age of 75. I am deeply grateful to him for his support and encouragement from the time when I first met him, in 1980, until the end of his life. The research reported in this note is dedicated to his memory.

References

- [1] Peter Grünwald, Rianne de Heide, and Wouter M. Koolen. Safe testing (with discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B*, 2024. To appear.
- [2] Andrei N. Kolmogorov. Three approaches to the quantitative definition of information. *Problems of Information Transmission*, 1:1–7, 1965.
- [3] Andrei N. Kolmogorov. Logical basis for information theory and probability theory. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, IT-14:662–664, 1968.
- [4] Ilya Nourtdinov, Vladimir V'yugin, and Alex Gammerman. Transductive Confidence Machine is universal. In Ricard Gavaldà, Klaus P. Jantke, and Eiji Takimoto, editors, *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, volume 2842 of *Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 283–297, Berlin, 2003. Springer.
- [5] Mark J. Schervish. *Theory of Statistics*. Springer, New York, 1995.
- [6] Glenn Shafer. The language of betting as a strategy for statistical and scientific communication (with discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society A*, 184:407–478, 2021.
- [7] Alexander Shen, Vladimir A. Uspensky, and Nikolai Vereshchagin. *Kolmogorov Complexity and Algorithmic Randomness*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2017.
- [8] Vladimir Vovk. On the concept of the Bernoulli property. *Russian Mathematical Surveys*, 41:247–248, 1986. Another English translation with proofs: arXiv:1612.08859 (math.ST).
- [9] Vladimir Vovk. Non-algorithmic theory of randomness. In Andreas Blass, Patrick Cégielski, Nachum Dershowitz, Manfred Droste, and Berndt Finkbeiner, editors, *Fields of Logic and Computation III: Essays Dedicated*

to Yuri Gurevich on the Occasion of His 80th Birthday, volume 12180 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 323–340, Cham, 2020. Springer.

- [10] Vladimir Vovk. Conformal e-prediction. Technical Report arXiv:2001.05989 [stat.ME], arXiv.org e-Print archive, November 2024.
- [11] Vladimir Vovk, Alex Gammerman, and Glenn Shafer. *Algorithmic Learning in a Random World*. Springer, Cham, second edition, 2022.
- [12] Vladimir Vovk and Ruodu Wang. E-values: Calibration, combination, and applications. *Annals of Statistics*, 49:1736–1754, 2021.