

Meta-intransitive Systems of Independent Random Variables and Fractals

Alexey V. Lebedev¹

Abstract

We construct meta-intransitive systems of independent random variables of any finite order from basic tuple of random variables which generalize intransitive dice. Under this construction, the equality of some linear functional is preserved, provided this equality hold for the basic variables. This scheme is also extended to infinite-order systems, which are shown to be fractals, and for which the similarity dimension can be evaluated. The problem of the upper bound for this dimension is posed.

Key words

superiority relation, stochastic precedence, intransitivity, meta-intransitivity, fractals, similarity dimension.

Mathematics Subject Classification 60E15, 06A75, 91A05, 28A80

Alexey V. Lebedev

avlebed@yandex.ru

ORCID 0000-0002-9258-0588

arXiv:2405.02424v1 [math.PR] 3 May 2024

¹Faculty of Mechanics and Mathematics, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia

1 Introduction

In theoretical studies and in practical applications, various superiority relations between objects frequently feature the transitivity property: if A is superior to B and B is superior to C , then A is superior to C .

However, other cases are also possible. For example, in the classic finger-flashing game rock–scissors–paper: rock beats scissors, scissors beats paper, paper beats rock, and not vice versa. Thus, the relation between strategies in this game is intransitive.

Various aspects and numerous examples of intransitivity in superiority relations in nature, technology and society have been addressed by Poddiakov, see [21, 22], etc.

Among the recent works devoted to applications of intransitivity in biology, we note the interesting studies on the life of ants in Puerto Rico [31] and soil bacterial networks [32].

In what follows, we shall speak about intransitivity of the *stochastic precedence* relation between random variables, namely, when one variable is frequently smaller than another one. In [3, 5], this relation was applied in statistical analysis problems. In [25], the reverse relation was applied in ranking problems (where it was called the dominance with respect to probability).

Probabilistically, the intransitivity problem was first considered by Trybula (jointly with Steinhaus), who studied, as a practical application, the strength of materials [27, 28]. Assume that pairwise strength tests of iron bars of the same size and shape are conducted. The bars are produced in three different factories (with different strength distribution in bars) and that the bars are compared from the first and second, second and third, first and third factories. In theory, a paradoxical situation may arise: bars from the first factory are “worse” (break more often) than those from the second factory, bars from the second factory are “worse” than those from the third factory, and bars from the third factory are “worse” than those from the first factory.

Recently [9], a similar phenomenon was found to occur in medical statistics when comparing time to death and myocardial infarction in randomized controlled trial with three treatment arms.

The topic of intransitivity of stochastic precedence has gained popularity on the example of the so-called *intransitive (nontransitive) dice*. Here one means sets of dice whose faces contain numbers resulting in intransitive relations between the random variables. It is assumed that two players choose dice from some set and throw them. The one wins who has a larger number. Intransitive dice were popularized by Gardner [10, 11], and have been extensively studied. Under this approach, the concept of a die is generalized — namely, one considers dice with n faces, $n \geq 3$, labeled with arbitrary numbers c_1, \dots, c_n . It is assumed that each face is equiprobable. It can be also assumed without loss of generality that all the numbers are arranged in nondecreasing order:

$$c_1 \leq c_2 \leq \dots \leq c_n.$$

There is extensive literature on this topic. As recent works, see, for example, [1, 2, 6, 8, 14, 16].

The present paper continues author’s studies on intransitivity began in [18, 12, 13, 23] (partially jointly with A. V. Gorbunova and A. N. Poddiakov). In these papers, the reader may find more details on the problems considered, historical account, and applications.

2 Definitions and earlier results

We first consider arbitrary sets of objects and relations defined on these objects.

A relation \prec is an *intransitive relation* if, for some objects A, B, C , the relations $A \prec B, B \prec C$ do not imply that $A \prec C$ (on the contrary, $C \prec A$ is possible).

A tuple of objects A, B, C is called an *intransitive tuple* if on this tuple the relation \prec is intransitive, i.e., if $A \prec B \prec C \prec A$ (or in the reversed order).

A tuple of objects $A_1, \dots, A_m, m \geq 3$, will be said to be an intransitive tuple of length m if

$$A_1 \prec A_2 \prec \dots \prec A_m \prec A_1.$$

So, an intransitive relation establishes a cyclic order between objects of an intransitive tuple. More involved generalizations are also possible.

The above relations and tuples of objects induce relations and tuples of sets of objects.

Given sets M_1, M_2 , we say that $M_1 \prec M_2$ if $A_1 \prec A_2$ for all $A_1 \in M_1, A_2 \in M_2$.

Sets $M_1, \dots, M_m, m \geq 3$, form an intransitive tuple of length m if

$$M_1 \prec M_2 \prec \dots \prec M_m \prec M_1,$$

which is equivalent to saying that, for any choice of elements $A_1 \in M_1, \dots, A_m \in M_m$, these elements form an intransitive tuple (in the same order of traverse).

We will assume that X *stochastically precedes* Y ($X \prec Y$) if

$$\mathbf{E} \text{ sign}(Y - X) > 0$$

or, what is the same,

$$\mathbf{P}(X < Y) > \mathbf{P}(X > Y).$$

We can also introduce the relation via the *preference function*

$$\rho(Y, X) = \mathbf{E} \text{ sign}(Y - X);$$

in this case, $X \prec Y$ is equivalent to $\rho(Y, X) > 0$. Here, the function reflects not only the fact of superiority (or precedence), but also its measure.

If $\mathbf{P}(X = Y) = 0$ (for example, random variables are independent and continuous, or have disjoint ranges) then $X \prec Y$ is equivalent to saying that

$$\mathbf{P}(X < Y) > \frac{1}{2}.$$

In this case, an intransitivity situation occurs if the random variables X, Y and Z satisfy

$$P_{XYZ} = \min\{\mathbf{P}(X < Y), \mathbf{P}(Y < Z), \mathbf{P}(Z < X)\} > \frac{1}{2};$$

here, not only the mere fact is of interest, but also the measure of intransitivity.

According to [28], for independent random variables,

$$\max_{X,Y,Z} P_{XYZ} = \frac{\sqrt{5} - 1}{2} \approx 0.618,$$

and the maximum is attained, for example, on the triplet

$$\begin{aligned} X &= \begin{cases} 1, & \text{with probability } p, \\ 4, & \text{with probability } 1 - p, \end{cases} \\ Y &= 2, \\ Z &= \begin{cases} 0, & \text{with probability } 1 - p, \\ 3, & \text{with probability } p, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where

$$p = \frac{\sqrt{5} - 1}{2}.$$

Hence

$$\mathbf{P}(X < Y) = \mathbf{P}(Y < Z) = \mathbf{P}(Z < X) = \frac{\sqrt{5} - 1}{2}.$$

In [29, 30], combinations of $m \geq 3$ independent random variables were studied. Based on these studies, it was shown in [4] that the maximum of the probabilities

$$P_{X_1 \dots X_m} = \min\{\mathbf{P}(X_1 < X_2), \dots, \mathbf{P}(X_{m-1} < X_m), \mathbf{P}(X_m < X_1)\}$$

is as follows:

$$\max_{X_1, \dots, X_m} P_{X_1 \dots X_m} = 1 - \left(4 \cos^2 \frac{\pi}{m+2}\right)^{-1}, \quad m \geq 3. \tag{2}$$

(later, in [17] this result was reproved by a geometric method). This maximum is attained, for example, in the case of Efron dice (with $m = 4$).

Efron dice (ED), which were invented by B. Efron in the 1960s, is a tuple of four dice A, B, C, D with the numbers of the faces:

- A: 0, 0, 4, 4, 4, 4;
- B: 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3;
- C: 2, 2, 2, 2, 6, 6;
- D: 1, 1, 1, 5, 5, 5.

In this case, the result of throwing each die from this set is greater than that for the succeeding (in the circle) die with probability exceeding 1/2:

$$\mathbf{P}(A > B) = \mathbf{P}(B > C) = \mathbf{P}(C > D) = \mathbf{P}(D > A) = \frac{2}{3},$$

To get the reciprocal relations, one may consider dice in the reversed order (D, C, B, A).

For $m \neq 4$, the maximum in (2) is not attained on dice, since this maximum is an irrational number.

Let us give some other examples of intransitive dice.

Classical intransitive 3-sided dice (CID) are obtained from ancient Chinese Lo Shu magic square:

4	9	2
3	5	7
8	1	6

Namely, by ordering the numbers in the rows in an increasing order, we set

A: 2, 4, 9;
 B: 3, 5, 7;
 C: 1, 6, 8.

Hence

$$\mathbf{P}(A < B) = \mathbf{P}(B < C) = \mathbf{P}(C < A) = 5/9.$$

Moon and Moser [20] seem to be the first to observe that the magic square gives an intransitive tuple for triples of numbers (columns were picked from the square in [20], and rows, in [11]). We will follow the second variant. Note that [20, 11] were not concerned with a game of dice, but rather with competitions of sports teams, but this is not important. Here, each sum of numbers on faces is 15, and the mean is 5.

There also exists a modification of Efron dice with equal means. For more involved examples, see, for example, [1, 2, 6, 8], etc. Examples of dice for which not only the means are equal, but the variances are also equal, were recently presented in [34] for $n \geq 8$.

Simplest intransitive 3-sided dice (SID) are obtained from triplet (1) with $p = 2/3$:

A: 1, 1, 4;
 B: 2, 2, 2;
 C: 0, 3, 3.

We have

$$\mathbf{P}(A < B) = 2/3, \quad \mathbf{P}(B < C) = 2/3, \quad \mathbf{P}(C < A) = 5/9.$$

In this case, the first player selects die C, the second player selects die A, and the guaranteed probability of winning for the second player is $P_{ABC} = 5/9$. The sum of the numbers on the faces is 6, the mean is 2.

The meta-intransitivity (of type I) was introduced in [23]. Let us clarify this concept.

A *meta-intransitive system* is a set equipped with an intransitive relation of elements with the following properties.

1. The set is partitioned into groups (subsets), which may have different nesting level.
2. The set is partitioned into first-level groups, which form an intransitive tuple, which, in turn, may either contain intransitive sets of elements or be partitioned into second-level groups which form intransitive tuples, and so on.

The *order* of a meta-intransitive is defined as the maximal nesting level of groups (possibly infinite).

As an illustrative example, we mention the nested Borromean rings [26]. For some examples, see also [23, 24]. Meta-intransitive system of second order presented in Fig. 1 (schematically).

Our next purpose is to construct and study meta-intransitive systems of random variables and fractals based on a generalization of intransitive dice.

3 Main notation and assumptions

We note, first of all, that with any random variable X one can associate the inverse distribution function, also known as the *quantile function*:

$$x(u) = \inf\{x : \mathbf{P}(X \leq x) \geq u\}, \quad u \in (0, 1),$$




Figure 1: Meta-intransitive system of second order [24].

and vice versa, from this function one can construct a random variable with the same distribution, by taking $x(U)$, where the random variable U is uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]$.

The class of quantile functions \mathcal{Q} is the class of all càd functions which nondecrease on $(0, 1)$. It is clear that this class is closed with respect to addition of functions and multiplication by positive numbers. Let $M \subset \mathcal{Q}$. For each $a \in \mathcal{Q}$ and any number $b > 0$, consider the set

$$a + bM = \{a + bx : x \in M\} \subset \mathcal{Q}. \quad (3)$$

Note that in the case of an n -sided die with numbers $c_1 \leq c_2 \leq \dots \leq c_n$ on faces, we get

$$x(u) = c_{[nu]+1}, \quad (4)$$

i.e., we get the value c_1 on $[0, 1/n)$, the value c_2 on $[1/n, 2/n)$, and so on.

Let us define the preference function on $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{Q}$ by

$$\rho_q(x_1, x_2) = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \text{sign}(x_1(u_1) - x_2(u_2)) du_1 du_2. \quad (5)$$

Hence, for the independent random variables X_1 and X_2 with such quantile functions, we have

$$\rho(X_1, X_2) = \rho_q(x_1, x_2). \quad (6)$$

For the piecewise continuous function $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, consider the linear functional

$$J_f(X) = \int_0^1 f(u)x(u) du$$

(assuming that the integral converges). In the simplest case $f \equiv 1$, we have $J_1(X) = \mathbf{E}X$. Such functionals appear in the actuarial theory (Wang's premium principle) [33], financial mathematics (weighted VaR) [7], modern extreme value theory [15], etc.

In the case of n -sided dice with numbers on faces $c_1 \leq c_2 \leq \dots \leq c_n$, we get

$$J_f(X) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\int_{\frac{i-1}{n}}^{\frac{i}{n}} f(u) du \right) x \left(\frac{i-1}{n} \right) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\int_{\frac{i-1}{n}}^{\frac{i}{n}} f(u) du \right) c_i. \quad (7)$$

Consider a basic tuple of independent random variables X_1^0, \dots, X_m^0 , $m \geq 3$, such that

$$X_1^0 \prec X_2^0 \prec \dots \prec X_m^0 \prec X_1^0 \quad (8)$$

and

$$\inf_{u_1, u_2 \in (0,1)} \min_{i_1 \neq i_2} |x_{i_1}^0(u_1) - x_{i_2}^0(u_2)| = r > 0, \quad \sup_{u_1, u_2 \in (0,1)} \max_{i_1 \neq i_2} |x_{i_1}^0(u_1) - x_{i_2}^0(u_2)| = R < \infty. \quad (9)$$

From condition (9) it follows that the random variables are bounded and have disjoint ranges (as in the above examples of dice). Their characteristics are given in the table.

Dice	m	n	r	R
ED	4	6	1	6
CID	3	3	1	8
SID	3	3	1	4

However, in the general case, X_1^0, \dots, X_m^0 may fail to be discrete and assume only finite number of values. For example, integer-valued dice can be augmented with continuous random variables on $[0, \Delta]$, where $0 < \Delta < 1$.

We set

$$\lambda \geq 1 + \frac{R}{r}, \quad \varepsilon = \frac{1}{\lambda}. \quad (10)$$

We let $A^{(k)}$, $k \geq 0$, denote the sets of quantile functions, which are called *generations* (of functions). These functions have k -dimensional indexes.

Consider the following algorithm for construction of the generations.

1. $A^{(0)}$ contains one function $x \equiv 0$ with empty index.
2. Each quantile function $x \in A^{(k-1)}$ generates the quantile functions

$$x(u) + \varepsilon^k x_1^0(u), \dots, x(u) + \varepsilon^k x_m^0(u),$$

which are given indexes by affixing the numbers $1, \dots, m$, respectively, to the right of the mother number index. This gives us the set $A^{(k)}$.

Now $A^{(k)}$ contains m^k functions with indexes $i_1 i_2 \dots i_k \in \{1, \dots, m\}^k$.

We let $A_{i_1 \dots i_p}^{(k)}$, $1 \leq p \leq k-1$, $k \geq 2$, denote the subsets $A^{(k)}$ of functions such that their indexes start with $i_1 \dots i_p$ (common ancestors). Hence $A^{(k)}$, $k \geq 2$, is partitioned into $A_{i_1}^{(k)}$; the subsets $A_{i_1}^{(k)}$, $k \geq 3$, are partitioned into $A_{i_1 i_2}^{(k)}$, and so on. So, we have nesting up to the level $k-1$.

Consider the tuple of random variables $U_{i_1 \dots i_k}$, $i_1 i_2 \dots i_k \in \{1, \dots, m\}^k$, which are independent and uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]$. We also set

$$X_{i_1 \dots i_k} = x_{i_1 \dots i_k}(U_{i_1 \dots i_k}).$$

From these random variables, we compose the set $B^{(k)}$ and the subsets $B_{i_1 \dots i_p}^{(k)}$, $1 \leq p \leq k-1$, $k \geq 2$, of random variables, whose indexes start with $i_1 \dots i_p$. For these random variables, we have the same partitioning and nesting as for the functions in $A^{(k)}$. In view of (6), they satisfy the same relations \prec .

It remains to verify the intransitivity of tuples and subsets of functions in $A^{(k)}$. This will imply that the tuples and subsets of random variables in $B^{(k)}$ are intransitive.

4 Main results for generations

By construction, each quantile function from $A^{(k)}$, $k \geq 1$, with index $i_1 i_2 \dots i_k \in \{1, \dots, m\}^k$ is described by the formulas

$$x_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_k}(u) = \sum_{l=1}^k \varepsilon^l x_{i_l}^0(u) = \sum_{j=1}^m \left(\sum_{l=1}^k \varepsilon^l \delta_{ij} \right) x_j^0(u), \quad (11)$$

where δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta.

Note that in view of (4) from the basic tuple n -sided dice one gets only n -sided dice (in the sense of constancy of quantile functions on the intervals $[(i-1)/n, i/n)$, $1 \leq i \leq n$).

Theorem 1. *For all functions $x', x'' \in A^{(k)}$, $k \geq 1$, with different indexes $i'_1 i'_2 \dots i'_k$ and $i''_1 i''_2 \dots i''_k$, we have $\rho_q(x', x'') = \rho_q(x'_{i'_\nu}, x''_{i''_\nu})$, where $\nu = \min\{l : i'_l \neq i''_l\}$.*

Proof. For all $u', u'' \in (0, 1)$, consider the difference

$$\begin{aligned} x'(u') - x''(u'') &= \sum_{l=1}^k \varepsilon^l \left(x_{i'_l}^0(u') - x_{i''_l}^0(u'') \right) = \\ &= \varepsilon^\nu \left(\left(x_{i'_\nu}^0(u') - x_{i''_\nu}^0(u'') \right) + \sum_{l=1}^{k-\nu} \varepsilon^l \left(x_{i'_{\nu+l}}^0(u') - x_{i''_{\nu+l}}^0(u'') \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

By (9), we have

$$|x_{i'_\nu}^0(u') - x_{i''_\nu}^0(u'')| \geq r$$

and

$$\sum_{l=1}^{k-\nu} \varepsilon^l \left(x_{i'_{\nu+l}}^0(u') - x_{i''_{\nu+l}}^0(u'') \right) \leq R \varepsilon \frac{1 - \varepsilon^{k-\nu}}{1 - \varepsilon} < R \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - \varepsilon} = \frac{R}{\lambda - 1} \leq r,$$

by (10). Hence

$$\text{sign}(x'(u') - x''(u'')) = \text{sign}(x_{i'_\nu}^0(u') - x_{i''_\nu}^0(u'')),$$

which proves the theorem. \square

The meaning of the theorem is as follows. In each generation, the functions preserve the relations between their nearest noncommon ancestors. If functions are in some relation, then all their descendants are in the same relation. And these descendants form kindred groups (in subsequent generations).

Corollary 1. *There is a one-one correspondence between the indexes and the quantile functions of the same generation.*

Proof. It is clear that to each index there corresponds a quantile function by (11). Assume that there exist two different indexes $i'_1 i'_2 \dots i'_k$ and $i''_1 i''_2 \dots i''_k$ that generate the functions x' and x'' via (11), and which are equal: $x' = x''$. Hence $\rho_q(x', x'') = 0$. But by Theorem 1 we have $\rho_q(x', x'') = \rho_q(x'_{i'_\nu}, x''_{i''_\nu}) \neq 0$, which is a contradiction. Hence to each quantile function of generation there corresponds precisely one index. \square

Corollary 2. *The generation of quantile functions $A^{(k)}$, $k \geq 2$, is a meta-intransitive system of order $k - 1$, where as groups of the p th nesting level one may take $A_{i_1 \dots i_p}^{(k)}$, $1 \leq p \leq k - 1$, $k \geq 2$.*

Proof. The sets have a nesting structure by construction and Corollary 1. Let us verify the intransitivity.

The set $A_{i_1 \dots i_p}^{(k)}$ is partitioned into the sets $A_{i_1 \dots i_{p-1}j}^{(k)}$, $1 \leq j \leq m$. We choose functions $x^{(j)} \in A_{i_1 \dots i_{p-1}j}^{(k)}$. Hence by Theorem 1 we have

$$\rho_q(x^{(j_1)}, x^{(j_2)}) = \rho_q(x_{j_1}^0, x_{j_2}^0), \quad j_1 \neq j_2.$$

Hence $x^{(j)}$ are in the same relations as the functions from the basic tuple x_j^0 , i.e., they form an intransitive tuple of length m . Therefore, by definition, the sets $A_{i_1 \dots i_{p-1}j}^{(k)}$, $1 \leq p \leq k-1$, form an intransitive tuple of length m for sets.

The set $A_{i_1 \dots i_{k-1}}^{(k)}$ consists of the functions $x_{i_1 \dots i_{k-1}j}$, $1 \leq j \leq m$, for which, by Theorem 1, we have

$$\rho_q(x_{i_1 \dots i_{k-1}j_1}, x_{i_1 \dots i_{k-1}j_2}) = \rho_q(x_{j_1}^0, x_{j_2}^0), \quad j_1 \neq j_2.$$

Hence these functions are in the same relations as those from the basic tuple x_j^0 , i.e., they form an intransitive tuple of length m . \square

Corollary 3. *The generation of the random variables $B^{(k)}$, $k \geq 2$, is a meta-intransitive system of order $k-1$, where as groups of the p th nesting level one may take $B_{i_1 \dots i_p}^{(k)}$, $1 \leq p \leq k-1$, $k \geq 2$.*

This result follows from Corollary 2 by (6).

By \sqcup we denote the disjoint union of sets. Form (3) and (11) we have the recurrence formula:

$$A^{(k)} = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^m A_i^{(k)}, \quad A_i^{(k)} = \varepsilon x_i^0 + \varepsilon A^{(k-1)}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m, \quad k \geq 1. \quad (12)$$

Below, this formula will be generalized to the case $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Proposition 1. *If $J_f(X_i^0) = K$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, then, for all $X \in B^{(k)}$, $k \geq 1$,*

$$J_f(X) = K\varepsilon \frac{1 - \varepsilon^k}{1 - \varepsilon}. \quad (13)$$

Proof. Let X have an arbitrary index $i_1 i_2 \dots i_k$. Since the functional is linear with respect to the function x , it follows from representation (11) that

$$J_f(X) = \sum_{l=1}^k \varepsilon^l J_f(X_{i_l}^0) = K \sum_{l=1}^k \varepsilon^l = K\varepsilon \frac{1 - \varepsilon^k}{1 - \varepsilon}.$$

\square

For example, if the means of all dice in the basic tuple are equal (as in the case of CID and SID), their the means of all dice of the same generation will also be equal.

As noted above, from n -sided dice one can obtain only n -sided dice. With 3-sided dice we associate the points $(x(0), x(1/3), x(2/3))$ of the Euclidean space. Then the equation $J_f(X) = K$ by (7) defines a plane. If all dice of the basic tuple (as space points) lie in some plane, then all dice of the same generation also lie in some plane (which a translation of the original one). In the case of a basic tuple of three 3-sided dice, all the dice of any generation always lie in some plane, because there is always a plane passing through any three points.




Figure 2: The set $\tilde{A}^{(3)}$ for SID (27 points), $\lambda = 5$.

Example. Consider an SID as a basic tuple. By (10), $\lambda \geq 5$. Setting $\lambda = 5$, we have $\varepsilon = 0.2$. We construct $A^{(3)}$, and associate with each function the point $(x(0), x(1/3), x(2/3))$. The resulting set $\tilde{A}^{(3)}$ consists of 27 points (see Fig. 2).

The figure is rotated for better clarity. It is seen that all points lie on the same plane. In the projection to the figure plane, the dice “beat” (dominate) each other in the clockwise direction relative to the center. In the figure, the fractal nature of the set is clearly visible, which suggests the idea of making $k \rightarrow \infty$ in our construction.

5 Fractals

Consider the following conditions, which is stronger than (10):

$$\lambda > 1 + \frac{R}{r}, \quad \varepsilon = \frac{1}{\lambda}. \quad (14)$$

We define the *infinite generation* $A^{(\infty)}$ as the set of functions with infinite indexes $i_1 \dots i_l \dots$ defined by the series

$$x_{i_1 \dots i_l \dots}(u) = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon^l x_{i_l}^0(u) = \sum_{j=1}^m \left(\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon^l \delta_{i_l j} \right) x_j^0(u), \quad (15)$$

where δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta.

This is a denumerable set.

We let $A_{i_1 \dots i_p}^{(\infty)}$, $p \geq 1$, denote the subsets $A^{(\infty)}$ of dice such that their indexes start from $i_1 \dots i_p$. For these subsets, we have the same splitting and nesting as in the finite case, but without constraints on p .

We also introduce the tuple of random variables $U_{i_1 \dots i_p}$, $1 \leq i_l \leq m$, jointly independent and uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]$. We also set

$$X_{i_1 \dots i_p} = x_{i_1 \dots i_p}(U_{i_1 \dots i_p}).$$

From the random variables set $B^{(\infty)}$ and subsets $B_{i_1 \dots i_p}^{(\infty)}$ we compose the random variables show indexes start with $i_1 \dots i_p$. For these random variables, we have the same partitioning and nesting as for the functions in $A^{(\infty)}$. In view of (6), they satisfy the same relations \prec .

Theorem 2. *For all two functions from $x', x'' \in A^{(\infty)}$ with different indexes $i'_1 \dots i'_l \dots$ and $i''_1 \dots i''_l \dots$, we have $\rho(x', x'') = \rho(c_{i'_\nu}, c_{i''_\nu})$, where $\nu = \min\{l : i'_l \neq i''_l\}$.*

Proof. For all $u', u'' \in (0, 1)$, consider the difference

$$\begin{aligned} x'(u') - x''(u'') &= \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon^l \left(x_{i'_l}^0(u') - x_{i''_l}^0(u'') \right) = \\ &= \varepsilon^\nu \left(\left(x_{i'_\nu}^0(u') - x_{i''_\nu}^0(u'') \right) + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon^l \left(x_{i'_{\nu+l}}^0(u') - x_{i''_{\nu+l}}^0(u'') \right) \right); \end{aligned}$$

Here, using (9), we have

$$|x_{i'_\nu}^0(u') - x_{i''_\nu}^0(u'')| \geq r$$

and

$$\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon^l \left(x_{i'_{\nu+l}}^0(u') - x_{i''_{\nu+l}}^0(u'') \right) \leq R \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - \varepsilon} = \frac{R}{\lambda - 1} < r,$$

by(14). So,

$$\text{sign}(x'(u') - x''(u'')) = \text{sign}(x_{i'_\nu}^0(u') - x_{i''_\nu}^0(u'')),$$

which proves the theorem. \square

Corollary 4. *There is a one-one correspondence between the indexes and the quantile functions $A^{(\infty)}$.*

Corollary 5. *The infinite generation of quantile functions $A^{(\infty)}$ is a system of infinite order, where as groups of p th nesting level one may take $A_{i_1 \dots i_p}^{(k)}$, $p \geq 1$.*

Corollary 6. *The infinite generation of random variables $B^{(\infty)}$ is a meta-intransitive system of infinite order, where as groups of the p th nesting level one may take $B_{i_1 \dots i_p}^{(k)}$, $p \geq 1$.*

Corollaries 4–6 are proved similarly to Corollaries 1–3.

Proposition 2. *If $J_f(X_i^0) = K$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, then for all $X \in B^{(\infty)}$,*

$$J_f(X) = K \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - \varepsilon}. \tag{16}$$

The proof of Proposition 2 is similar to that of Proposition 1.

We also have the recurrence formula

$$A^{(\infty)} = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^m A_i^{(\infty)}, \quad A_i^{(\infty)} = \varepsilon x_i^0 + \varepsilon A^\infty, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m, \quad (17)$$

which is similar to (12). So, the set $A^{(\infty)}$ consists of m parts similar to the entire set with similarity coefficient $\varepsilon = 1/\lambda$. Hence by [19], this is a *fractal* with *similarity dimension*

$$d = \frac{\ln m}{\ln \lambda}.$$

By condition (14), we get the boundary for dimension with known m , r , and R :

$$d < d_{\text{sup}} = \frac{\ln m}{\ln(1 + R/r)}.$$

This calls for the problem of the behavior of d_{sup} .

Considering the characteristics of the above problems, we have the table.

Dice	d_{sup}
ED	$(\ln 4)/(\ln 7) \approx 0.7124$
SID	$(\ln 3)/(\ln 5) \approx 0.6826$
CID	$(\ln 3)/(\ln 9) = 0.5$

The maximal value is attained for the Efron dice. In all cases $d < 1$, and hence by [19] the fractals are subsumed into the *fractal dust* category.

This suggests the interesting question about the boundary for the dimension in the general case. This question is still open.

References

- [1] Akin, E.: Generalized Intransitive Dice: Mimicking an Arbitrary Tournament. *J. Dynamic. Games* 8(1), 1–20 (2019)
- [2] Akin, E., Saccamano, J.: Generalized intransitive dice II: Partition constructions. *J. of Dynamic. Games* 8(3), 187–202 (2021)
- [3] Arcones, M.A., Kvam, P.H., Samaniego, F.J.: Nonparametric Estimation of a Distribution Subject to a Stochastic Precedence Constraint. *J. Amer. Stat. Assoc.* 97(457), 170–182. (2002)
- [4] Bogdanov, I.I.: Nontransitive roulette. *Math. Education. Ser. 3. N 14.* 240–255 (2010) (in Russian)
- [5] Boland, P.J., Singh, H., Cukic, B.: The Stochastic Precedence Ordering with Applications in Sampling and Testing. *J. Appl. Probab.* 41(1), 73–82 (2004)
- [6] Bozoki, S.: Nontransitive dice sets releasing the Paley tournament for solving Shütte’s tournament problem. *Miskolc Math. Notes.* 15(1), 39–50 (2014)

- [7] Cherny, A.S.: Weighted V@R and its Properties. *Finance Stoch.* 10(3), 367–393 (2006)
- [8] Conrey, B., Gabbard, J., Grant, K., Liu, A., Morrison, K.E.: Intransitive dice. *Math. Mag.* 89, 133–143 (2016).
- [9] Demler, O.V., Demler, I.A.: Non-transitivity of the Win Ratio and Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristics Curve (AUC): a case for evaluating the strength of stochastic comparisons. (2023) <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.01791>
- [10] Gardner, M.: The Paradox of the Nontransitive Dice and the Elusive Principle of Indifference. *Sci. Amer.* 223(6), 110–114 (1970)
- [11] Gardner, M.: On the Paradoxical Situations that Arise from Nontransitive Relations. *Sci. Amer.* 231(6), 120–125 (1974)
- [12] Gorbunova, A. V., Lebedev A. V.: Stochastic nontransitivity effects in queueing systems. *Large-Scale Systems Control.* 85, 23–50 (2020) (in Russian)
- [13] Gorbunova, A.V., Lebedev, A.V.: Nontransitivity of tuples of random variables with polynomial density and its effects in Bayesian models. *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation.* 202, 181–192 (2022)
- [14] Hazla, J., Mossel, E., Ross, N.: The probability of intransitivity in dice and close elections. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields.* 178, 951–1009 (2020).
- [15] Ivanov, D.V.: On the bounds for the expected maxima of random samples with known expected maxima of two samples of smaller size. *Theory Probab. Appl.* 68(1), 2–15 (2023)
- [16] Kirkegaard, J.B., Sneppen, K.: Emerging diversity in a population of evolving intransitive dice. *Phys. Rev. E* 106, 054409. (2022)
- [17] Komisarski, A.: Nontransitive Random Variables and Nontransitive Dice. *American Mathematical Monthly.* 128(5), 423–434 (2021)
- [18] Lebedev, A.V.: The nontransitivity problem for three continuous random variables. *Autom. Remote Control.* 80(6), 1058–1068 (2019)
- [19] Mandelbrot, B.: *The Fractal Geometry of Nature.* NY: W.H. Freeman Co. (1982)
- [20] Moon, J.W., Moser, M.L. Generating oriented graphs by means of team comparisons. *Pac. J. Math.* 21(3), 531–535 (1967)
- [21] Poddiakov, A., Valsiner, J.: Intransitivity cycles and their transformations: How dynamically adapting systems function? In L. Rudolph (Ed.), *Qualitative Mathematics for the Social Sciences: Mathematical Models for Research on Cultural Dynamics.* Abingdon, NY: Routledge, 2013. pp. 343–391 (2013)
- [22] Poddiakov, A.: Learning intransitivity: from intransitive geometrical objects to “rhizomatic” intransitivity. In: *Proceedings of the PME and Yandex Russian conference: Technology and Psychology for Mathematics Education* (ed. by A. Shvarts). pp. 178–185 (2019)

- [23] Poddiakov, A., Lebedev, A.V.: Intransitivity and meta-intransitivity: meta-dice, levers and other opportunities. *European Journal of Mathematics*. 9, Art. 27 (2023)
- [24] Poddiakov, A.N.: Self-Similar Structures of Nontransitive Dice Sets: Numerical Examples of Nested “Rock–Paper–Scissors” Relations. Preprint. August 2023. (2023) <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/373141480>
- [25] Shakhnov, I.F.: A problem of ranking interval objects in a multicriteria analysis of complex systems. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci. Int.* 47(1), 33–39 (2011)
- [26] Southwell, R.: Borromean rings of Borromean rings — new fractal. (2014) <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dh9s1vyzy7s>
- [27] Steinhaus, H., Trybula S.: On a paradox in applied probabilities. *Bull. de l’Acad. Polon. des Sci.* 7, 67–69 (1959)
- [28] Trybula, S.: On the paradox of three random variables. *Zastos. Matem.* 5(4), 321–332 (1961)
- [29] Trybula, S.: On the paradox of n random variables. *Zastos. Matem. (Appl. Math.)* 8(2), 143–156 (1965)
- [30] Usiskin, Z.: Max–min probabilities in the voting paradox. *Ann. Math. Stat.* 35(2), 857–862 (1964)
- [31] Vandermeer, J., Perfecto, I.: Intransitivity as a dynamic assembly engine of competitive communities. *PNAS*. 120(15), Art. e2217372120 (2023)
- [32] Verdu, M., Alcantara, J.M., Navarro-Cano, J.A. et al.: Transitivity and intransitivity in soil bacterial networks. *ISME J.* 17, 2135–2139 (2023)
- [33] Wang, S.S.: Premium calculation by transforming the layer premium density. *Astin Bulletin*. 26, 71–92 (1996)
- [34] Yakusheva, A.N.: Nontransitive dice with equal means and variances. *Math. Game Theory Appl.* 14(3), 101–120 (2022) (in Russian)