# A Chain Rule for the Randomness Deficiency Function

Samuel Epstein\*

October 24, 2023

#### Abstract

This paper is an exposition of the addition equality theorem for algorithmic entropy in [G21], applied to the Cantor space. This application implies that randomness deficiency of infinite sequences obeys the chain rule, analogous to the finite Kolmogorov complexity case. This is a generalization of van Lambalgen's Theorem. It is unclear whether this result is folklore, but in any case, this paper presents a dedicated proof of the equality. In addition, a dual integration trick shortens the proof.

## 1 Introduction

Prefix free Kolmogorov complexity, **K**, obeys the chain rule, with for  $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^*$ ,

$$\mathbf{K}(x,y) =^+ \mathbf{K}(x) + \mathbf{K}(y|x,\mathbf{K}(x)).$$

In this paper, we apply the addition equality theorem for algorithmic entropy in [G21] to the specific case of infinite sequences. We also shorten the proof using an integration trick. The consequence to this is a result about randomness deficiency  $\mathbf{D}$ , where for computable probability  $\mu$ , for infinite sequences,  $\mathbf{D}(\alpha|\mu,x) = \sup_n -\log \mu(\alpha[0..n] - \mathbf{K}(\alpha[0..n]|x)$ . The randomness deficiency over the space  $\{0,1\}^{\infty} \times \{0,1\}^{\infty}$ , is  $\mathbf{D}(\alpha,\beta|\mu,\nu) = \sup_n -\log \mu(\alpha[0..n]) -\log \nu(\beta[0..n]) -\mathbf{K}(\alpha[0..n]\beta[0..n])$ . The discrete case for  $\mathbf{d}(x|p) = -\log p(x) - \mathbf{K}(x)$  is trivial. The result detailed in this paper is as follows.

**Theorem.** ([G21]) Relativized to probabilities  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  over  $\{0,1\}^{\infty}$ ,

$$\mathbf{D}(\alpha, \beta | \mu, \nu) =^{+} \mathbf{D}(\alpha | \mu) + \mathbf{D}(\beta | \nu, (\alpha, \lceil \mathbf{D}(\alpha | \mu) \rceil)).$$

This is a generalization of van Lambalgen's Theorem, which states  $(\alpha, \beta)$  is ML random iff  $\alpha$  is ML random and  $\beta$  is ML random with respect to  $\alpha$ . An open question is whether **D** follows the linear inequalities that parallel Shannon entropy  $\mathcal{H}$ , as Kolmogorov complexity was shown to do [HRSV00]:

**Conjecture.** Given  $\{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n\} \in \{0,1\}^{\infty n}$ , and random variables  $\{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n\}$  is it the case that over all  $W \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ , and  $\lambda_W \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\sum_{W} \lambda_{W} \mathbf{D}(\alpha^{W}) \le 0 \Leftrightarrow \sum_{W} \lambda_{W} \mathcal{H}(\beta^{W}) \ge 0?$$

<sup>\*</sup>JP Theory Group. samepst@jptheorygroup.org

## 2 Results

For the nonnegative real function f, we use  $<^+f$ ,  $>^+f$ , and  $=^+f$  to denote < f+O(1), > f-O(1), and  $= f \pm O(1)$ . The Kolmogorov complexity of a lower computable function f is  $\mathbf{K}(f)$ , the size of the shortest program that enumerates it. As shown in [G21],  $2^{\mathbf{D}(\alpha|\mu)} \stackrel{*}{=} \mathbf{t}_{\mu}(\alpha)$  where  $\mathbf{t}_{\mu}$  is a universal lower computable  $\mu$ -test. Furthermore, a modification of the proof Theorem 2.3.4 in [G21] to the  $\{0,1\}^{\infty} \times \{0,1\}^{\infty}$  space can be used to show that  $2^{\mathbf{D}(\alpha,\beta|\mu\nu)} \stackrel{*}{=} \mathbf{t}_{\mu\nu}(\alpha,\beta)$ , where  $\mathbf{t}_{\mu\nu}$  is a universal lower computable test over  $\{0,1\}^{\infty} \times \{0,1\}^{\infty}$ . For measure  $\mu$  and lower continuous function f over  $\{0,1\}^{\infty}$ , we use the notation  $\mu^x f(x) = \int_{x \in \{0,1\}^{\infty}} f(x) d\mu(x)$ . Throughout this section, the universal Turing machine is assumed to be relativized to probabilities  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  over  $\{0,1\}^{\infty}$ . This means that there is an O(1) sized program that can compute  $\mu(x\{0,1\}^{\infty})$  uniformly in  $x \in \{0,1\}^*$ , and similarly for  $\nu$ .

**Proposition 1**  $\log \nu^y 2^{\mathbf{D}(x,y|\mu\nu)} <^+ \mathbf{D}(x|\mu)$ .

**Proof.** Let  $f(x) = \log \nu^y 2^{\mathbf{D}(x,y|\mu\nu)}$ . The function f is lower computable and has  $\mu^x 2^{f(x)} \leq 1$ . The proposition follows from the universal properties of  $\mathbf{t}_{\mu}$ , where  $2^f \stackrel{*}{<} \mathbf{t}_{\mu}$ .

**Proposition 2** If i < j, then

$$i + \mathbf{D}(x|\mu, j) <^+ j + \mathbf{D}(x|\mu, i).$$

**Proof.** By the properties of  $\mathbf{D}$ , we have

$$\mathbf{D}(x|\mu, j) <^{+} \mathbf{D}(x|\mu, i) + \mathbf{K}(j - i) <^{+} \mathbf{D}(x|\mu, i) + j - i.$$

**Definition 1** Let  $F: \{0,1\}^{\infty} \to \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$  be a lower semicomputable function. An  $(\nu, F)$ -test is a function  $t: \{0,1\}^{\infty} \times \{0,1\}^{\infty} \to \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$  that is lower semicomputable and  $\nu^y t(x,y) \leq 2^{F(x)}$ . There exists a maximal  $(\nu, F)$  test,  $\mathbf{t}_{(\nu, F)}$ , such that  $t \stackrel{*}{<} \mathbf{t}_{(\nu, F)}$ .

**Proposition 3** Let  $F: \{0,1\}^{\infty} \to \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$  be a lower semicomputable function of Kolmogorov complexity O(1). For all y,

$$\mathbf{t}_{(\nu,F)}(x,y) \stackrel{*}{=} 2^{F(x)} \mathbf{t}_{\nu}(y|x, -F(x)).$$

**Proof.** To prove the inequality  $\stackrel{*}{>}$ , let  $g(x,y,m) = \max_{i \geq m} 2^{-i} \mathbf{t}_{\nu}(y|x,i)$ . This function is lower computable, and decreasing in m. The function g(x,y) = g(x,y,-F(x)) is lower semicomputable since -F is upper semi-computable. The multiplicative form of Proposition 2 implies

$$g(x, y, m) \stackrel{*}{=} 2^{-m} \mathbf{t}_{\nu}(y|x, m)$$
$$g(x, y) \stackrel{*}{=} 2^{F(x)} \mathbf{t}_{\nu}(y|x, -F(x)).$$

Since  $\mathbf{t}_{\nu}$  is a test:

$$\nu^{y} 2^{-m} \mathbf{t}_{\nu}(y|x,m) \le 2^{-m}$$
  
 $\nu^{y} g(x,y) \stackrel{*}{<} 2^{F(x)},$ 

which implies

$$g(x,y) \stackrel{*}{<} \mathbf{t}_{(\nu,F)}(x,y)/\mathbf{m}(g|x) \stackrel{*}{<} \mathbf{t}_{(\nu,F)}(x,y)2^{\mathbf{K}(F)} \stackrel{*}{<} \mathbf{t}_{(\nu,F)}(x,y)$$

by the optimality of  $\mathbf{t}_{(\nu,F)}$ . If  $F(x) = \infty$  then  $g(x,y) = \infty$  for all y so  $\mathbf{t}_{(\nu,F)}(x,y) = 2^{F(x)}\mathbf{t}_{\nu}(y|x,-F(x)) = \infty$  for all y. We now consider the upper bound. Since, given fixed x,  $2^{-F(x)}\mathbf{t}_{(\nu,F)}(x,y)$  is an y-test conditional on x and -F(x), we have

$$2^{-F(x)}\mathbf{t}_{(\nu,F)}(x,y) \stackrel{*}{<} \mathbf{t}_{\nu}(y|x,-F(x))/\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{t}_{(\nu,F)}|x,-F(x)) \stackrel{*}{<} \mathbf{t}_{\nu}(y|x,-F(x))2^{\mathbf{K}(F)} \stackrel{*}{<} \mathbf{t}_{\nu}(y|x,-F(x)).$$

**Theorem 1** Relativized to probabilities  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  over  $\{0,1\}^{\infty}$ ,

$$\mathbf{D}(x, y|\mu\nu) =^+ \mathbf{D}(x|\mu) + \mathbf{D}(y|\nu, (x, \lceil \mathbf{D}(x|\mu) \rceil)).$$

**Proof.** Let  $f(x,y) = 2^{\mathbf{D}(x,y|\mu\nu)}$ . Proposition 1 implies  $\nu^y f(x,y) \stackrel{*}{<} 2^{\mathbf{D}(x|\mu)+c}$ . Let  $F(x) = [\mathbf{D}(x|\mu)] + c$  for some suitable constant  $c \in \mathbb{N}$ . Note that if h is a lower computable function such that  $\nu^y h(x,y) \stackrel{*}{<} 2^{\mathbf{D}(x|\mu)}$ , then  $\mu^x \nu^y h(x,y) \stackrel{*}{<} \mu^x \mathbf{t}_{\mu}(x) \stackrel{*}{<} 1$ , so  $h \stackrel{*}{<} f$ , so f is a universal F-test. Proposition 3 (noting that  $\mathbf{K}([\mathbf{D}(\cdot|\mu)]) = O(1)$ ) gives

$$\mathbf{D}(x, y | \mu \nu) = \log f(x, y) =^+ F(x) + \mathbf{D}(y | \nu, (x, -F(x)))$$
  
$$\mathbf{D}(x, y | \mu \nu) =^+ \mathbf{D}(x | \mu) + \mathbf{D}(y | \nu, (x, \lceil \mathbf{D}(x | \mu) \rceil)).$$

## References

[G21] Peter Gács. Lecture notes on descriptional complexity and randomness. CoRR, abs/2105.04704, 2021.

[HR09] M. Hoyrup and C. Rojas. Computability of probability measures and martin-löf randomness over metric spaces. *Information and Computation*, 207(7):830–847, 2009.

[HRSV00] D. Hammer, A. Romashchenko, A. Shen, and N. Vereshchagin. Inequalities for shannon entropy and kolmogorov complexity. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 60(2):442–464, 2000.