

---

# AN ERGODIC APPROACH TO OCCAM’S RAZOR

---

Aidan Rocke  
aidanrocke@gmail.com

March 4, 2021

## ABSTRACT

An algorithmic Occam’s razor may be derived using the Expected Kolmogorov Complexity of a discrete random variable. This derivation is based upon a combination of Bayesian and ergodic perspectives that are both necessary and sufficient in the context of the scientific method as it is applied in the natural sciences.

## 1 A Bayesian perspective on computation

As computations are observer-dependent, computation is fundamentally Bayesian. In particular, the uncertainty associated with a discrete random variable is defined with respect to a predictive model. It follows that Occam’s razor for a discrete random variable  $X$  is a measure of epistemic uncertainty or the memory requirements of the ideal model for predicting the behaviour of  $X$ .

In this setting, the minimum description length of  $X$  is given by the most parsimonious model  $\Omega$  for predicting the behaviour of  $X$ :

$$\mathbb{E}[K(X)] = \mathbb{E}[-\ln P(X|\Omega)P(\Omega)] = H(X|\Omega) + H(\Omega) \quad (1)$$

where  $H(\Omega)$  is the complexity of the model  $\Omega$  and  $H(X|\Omega)$  is the expected information gained by  $\Omega$  from observing  $X$ .

The reason why the expression in (1) has a probabilistic representation is that the behaviour of a discrete random variable is described by its probability distribution. From an ergodic perspective, these probabilities also have a natural frequentist interpretation.

## 2 An ergodic analysis

Given that an event that occurs with frequency  $p$  generally requires modelling a sequence of length  $\sim \frac{1}{p}$ , in order to encode the structure of such an event, a machine would generally need a number of bits proportional to:

$$\ln\left(\frac{1}{p}\right) = -\ln(p) \quad (2)$$

But, how should we define the constant of proportionality? If we assume that the memory of the machine is finite and that the data-generating process is ergodic, an optimal encoding would use the expected number of bits:

$$-p \cdot \ln(p) \quad (3)$$

in order to encode an event that occurs with frequency  $p$ .

Regarding the assumptions, I may make a couple remarks. First, the ergodic assumption is equivalent to the premise that scientific experiments are repeatable in the natural sciences. Second, all Turing machines have finite memory.

### 3 Application: Ockcam's razor and asymptotic incompressibility

Given a binary sequence  $X_N = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^N$ , we say that  $X_N$  is *asymptotically incompressible* if given the subsequence  $X_k$  and  $N \gg k$  on average we would not profit by gambling on the  $N - k$  terms in  $X_N$  based on the partial knowledge provided by  $X_k$ . If  $X_N$  satisfies these assumptions then Occam's razor applied to  $X_N$  scales as follows:

$$\mathbb{E}[K(X_N)] \sim N \quad (4)$$

which means that the average size(in bits) of the smallest approximately correct predictive model, found using machine learning methods, scales with  $N$ . It follows that an effective betting strategy has infinite sample complexity and therefore such a strategy is not learnable.

### 4 Discussion

I would like to point out that mainstream Algorithmic Information Theory insists that the Expected Kolmogorov Complexity of a discrete random variable equals its Shannon entropy:

$$\mathbb{E}[K(X)] = H(X) \quad (5)$$

by appealing to contrived mathematical notions such 'Universal distributions' which may 'solve' the No Free Lunch problem [1,2]. What we may infer from this is that the mainstream theory is both incorrect and incomplete.

The implicit error in (4) is to assume that computations are observer-independent. Since we can't remove the observer in (1), we have:

$$X = \Omega \implies \mathbb{E}[K(\Omega)] = H(\Omega) \quad (6)$$

So information that is truly incompressible is self-referential.

### References

- [1] Peter Grünwald and Paul Vitányi. Shannon Information and Kolmogorov Complexity. 2010.
- [2] Tom Everitt, Tor Lattimore, Marcus Hutter. Free Lunch for Optimisation under the Universal Distribution. 2016.
- [3] Schnorr, C. P. (1971). "A unified approach to the definition of a random sequence". Mathematical Systems Theory.
- [4] Shai Shalev-Shwartz and Shai Ben-David. Understanding Machine Learning: From Theory to Algorithms. Cambridge University Press. 2014.