

**S.A. Terwijn\***

## **COMPLEXITY AND RANDOMNESS**

**Abstract.** These lectures notes review some of the fundamental concepts and results of the theory of randomness, and proceed to discuss some recent developments in this area relating to computability theory.

*AMS Subject Classification:* 68Q30, 03D15, 03D28, 03D80, 28E15.

### *Contents*

1	Introduction . . . . .	2
1.1	Reals and Lebesgue measure . . . . .	2
1.2	Martingales . . . . .	2
1.3	Three elementary theorems . . . . .	4
1.4	Measure and set theory . . . . .	6
2	Random finite strings . . . . .	7
2.1	Plain Kolmogorov complexity . . . . .	7
2.2	Prefix-free complexity . . . . .	8
2.3	Kraft inequality, Shannon-Fano code . . . . .	9
2.4	The universal semimeasure $\mathbf{m}$ . . . . .	10
2.5	A priori probability . . . . .	11
2.6	Coding, symmetry, and counting . . . . .	11
3	Random infinite strings . . . . .	12
3.1	Various approaches in historical order . . . . .	12
3.2	Several equivalences and separations . . . . .	13
3.3	Chaitins $\Omega$ . . . . .	17
3.4	Complexity of $\Sigma_1$ -random sets . . . . .	18
3.5	Martingales and orders . . . . .	19
4	Hausdorff dimension . . . . .	21
4.1	Classical Hausdorff dimension . . . . .	21
4.2	Effectivizations of Schnorr and Lutz . . . . .	22
4.3	Picture of implications . . . . .	23
4.4	$\Sigma_1$ -Dimension . . . . .	24
4.5	Relation with Kolmogorov complexity . . . . .	27
5	The complexity of randomness and dimension . . . . .	28
5.1	Category Methods . . . . .	28
5.2	Classification of the sets of dimension $\alpha$ . . . . .	29
5.3	The complexity of classes of random sets . . . . .	31
5.4	An extension of the effective Borel hierarchy . . . . .	32
6	Relativized randomness and lowness properties . . . . .	34

## 1. Introduction

These notes were compiled for a series of lectures on Complexity and Randomness at the University of Auckland and the University of Torino. Although they contain more material than could be treated in 6 one-hour lectures, they are far from a complete overview of the subject. Planned sections on the structure of  $\Delta_2^0$ , c.e. reals, computational depth, resource-bounded measure, and learning theory were cancelled due to lack of space and time. For a more comprehensive introduction to the subject the reader is referred to Calude [3], Downey [7] (a preliminary version of a forthcoming textbook by Downey and Hirschfeldt), the new survey paper Downey et al. [10], and Li and Vitányi [31].

### 1.1. Reals and Lebesgue measure

The topic of these notes is a mix of computability theory and measure theory. Our computability theory notation generally follows Odifreddi [43, 44] and Soare [50].

The Cantor space of all infinite binary sequences is denoted by  $2^\omega$ . An element  $X \in 2^\omega$  is called a *real*. The set of finite initial segments of reals is denoted by  $2^{<\omega}$ . The space  $2^\omega$  is endowed with the tree topology, which has as basic open sets

$$[\sigma] = \{X \in 2^\omega : \sigma \sqsubset X\},$$

where  $\sigma \in 2^{<\omega}$ . The *uniform* or *Lebesgue measure* on  $2^\omega$  is defined as follows. Every basic open set  $[\sigma]$  has the measure  $\mu([\sigma]) = 2^{-|\sigma|}$ , where  $|\sigma|$  denotes the length of  $\sigma$ . (This corresponds to the *length* of the binary interval defined by  $\sigma$ , or alternatively by the probability that an infinite sequence chosen by random coin flips (whatever that may mean) ends up in  $[\sigma]$ .) The *Borel subsets* of  $2^\omega$  are defined by closing the basic open sets under unions and complements. The definition of the measure of basic opens extends in a natural way to a measure for all Borel sets. This is the *Borel measure* on  $2^\omega$ . Now if  $\mathcal{B} \subset 2^\omega$  is a Borel set of measure 0, we think of  $\mathcal{B}$  as being small, and it is natural to consider all subsets of  $\mathcal{B}$  to be small also. So we extend the Borel measure by defining  $\mu(\mathcal{A}) = 0$  whenever  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$  for some Borel  $\mathcal{B}$  with  $\mu(\mathcal{B}) = 0$ . In this case we say that  $\mathcal{A}$  is a *null set*. Now we say that  $\mathcal{A}$  is *Lebesgue measurable* if  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B} \Delta \mathcal{C}$  is the symmetric difference of a Borel  $\mathcal{B}$  and a null set  $\mathcal{C}$ , and in this case we define  $\mu(\mathcal{A}) = \mu(\mathcal{B})$ .

Now one may wonder which subsets of  $2^\omega$  are Lebesgue measurable. This turns out to be a difficult question, known as the measure problem. We will say some words about it in section 1.4.

### 1.2. Martingales

A different treatment of measure is the one of Ville using martingales. A *martingale* is a function  $d : 2^{<\omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  that satisfies for every  $\sigma \in 2^{<\omega}$  the averaging condition

$$(1) \quad 2d(\sigma) = d(\sigma 0) + d(\sigma 1).$$

Similarly,  $d$  is a *supermartingale* if  $d$  satisfies

$$(2) \quad 2d(\sigma) \geq d(\sigma 0) + d(\sigma 1).$$

A (super)martingale  $d$  *succeeds* on a set  $A$  if  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(A \upharpoonright n) = \infty$ . We say that  $d$  succeeds on, or *covers*, a class  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^\omega$  if  $d$  succeeds on every  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ . The *success set*  $S[d]$  of  $d$  is the class of all sets on which  $d$  succeeds. Below we prove that the class of sets of the form  $S[d]$  coincides with the class of Lebesgue null sets.

LEMMA 1. *Let  $d$  be a (super)martingale. For any string  $v$  and any prefix-free set  $X \subseteq \{x : v \sqsubseteq x\}$  it holds that  $2^{-|v|}d(v) \geq \sum_{x \in X} 2^{-|x|}d(x)$ .*

*Proof.* It suffices to prove this for finite  $X$  (Bolzano-Weierstrass). Use induction on the cardinality of  $X$ . The base step  $\|X\| = 1$  is immediate from (2). Suppose the lemma holds for all  $X$  of cardinality  $n$ . Let  $X$  be prefix-free and of cardinality  $n + 1$ . Choose  $w$  of maximal length such that  $X \subseteq \{x : w \sqsubseteq x\}$ . Then both  $X_0 = \{x \in X : w0 \sqsubseteq x\}$  and  $X_1 = \{x \in X : w1 \sqsubseteq x\}$  have cardinality less than or equal to  $n$ . It follows by induction hypothesis that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in X} 2^{|w|-|x|}d(x) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in X_0} 2^{|w0|-|x|}d(x) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in X_1} 2^{|w1|-|x|}d(x) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}(d(w0) + d(w1)) \\ &\leq d(w). \end{aligned}$$

Since any  $v$  with  $X \subseteq \{x : v \sqsubseteq x\}$  satisfies  $v \sqsubseteq w$  and by (2) it holds that  $d(w) \leq 2^{|w|-|v|}d(v)$  the lemma follows by multiplying the above equations with  $2^{-|w|}$ .  $\square$

The following result is sometimes called ‘‘Kolmogorov’s inequality for martingales’’.

LEMMA 2. (Ville [59]) *Let  $d$  be a (super)martingale and define*

$$S^k[d] = \{X \in 2^\omega : (\exists \sigma \sqsubset X)[d(\sigma) \geq k]\}.$$

*Then  $\mu(S^k[d]) \leq d(\lambda)k^{-1}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $X \subseteq S^k[d]$  be prefix-free such that  $\mu(X) = \mu(S^k[d])$ . By Lemma 1 we have

$$k \cdot \mu(X) = k \sum_{x \in X} 2^{-|x|} \leq \sum_{x \in X} 2^{-|x|}d(x) \leq d(\lambda). \quad \square$$

THEOREM 1. (Ville [59]) *For any class  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^\omega$  the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $\mathcal{A}$  has Lebesgue measure zero,

(ii) *There exists a martingale that succeeds on  $\mathcal{A}$ .*

*Proof.* (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii). Suppose  $\mu(\mathcal{A}) = 0$ . Then there are open sets  $\mathcal{U}_k \subseteq 2^\omega$  such that  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \bigcap_k \mathcal{U}_k$  and  $\mu(\mathcal{U}_k) \leq 2^{-k}$ . Define the martingales  $d_k$  by

$$d_k(\sigma) = \mu(\mathcal{U}_k | \sigma) := \frac{\mu(\mathcal{U}_k \cap [\sigma])}{\mu([\sigma])},$$

and define

$$d(\sigma) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} d_k(\sigma).$$

Then  $d(\sigma) \leq \sum_k 2^{|\sigma|-k} < \infty$  and  $d$  is a martingale because every  $d_k$  is. If  $A \in \bigcap_{k \in \omega} \mathcal{U}_k$  then for all  $k$  there exists  $\sigma \sqsubset A$  such that  $\forall i = 1 \dots k. d_k(\sigma) \geq 1$ , hence  $d(\sigma) \geq k$ , and thus  $A \in S[d]$ .

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i). Suppose that martingale  $d$  succeeds on  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then by Lemma 2 the open sets  $S^k[d]$  defined there have measure smaller than  $d(\lambda)k^{-1}$ , so  $\mathcal{A}$  has measure zero.  $\square$

### 1.3. Three elementary theorems

A measurable set  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^\omega$  has *density  $d$  at  $X$*  if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\mathcal{A} | X \upharpoonright n) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\mathcal{A} \cap [X \upharpoonright n])2^n = d.$$

Define  $\phi(\mathcal{A}) = \{X \in 2^\omega : \mathcal{A} \text{ has density 1 at } X\}$ . Note that  $\mathcal{A}$  has density 0 at each point of  $\phi(\overline{\mathcal{A}})$ .

We now prove a classical theorem of Lebesgue. The proof is essentially the proof given in Oxtoby [45, p17]. The proof below is somewhat simpler because the basic open sets  $[x]$  have a more specific form than an arbitrary real interval.

**THEOREM 2.** (Lebesgue Density Theorem) *If  $\mathcal{A}$  is measurable then so is  $\phi(\mathcal{A})$ , and  $\mu(\mathcal{A} \Delta \phi(\mathcal{A})) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* It suffices to show that  $\mathcal{A} - \phi(\mathcal{A})$  is a null set since  $\phi(\mathcal{A}) - \mathcal{A} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{A}} - \phi(\overline{\mathcal{A}})$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$  is measurable. Define for every positive rational  $\varepsilon$

$$\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon = \{X \in \mathcal{A} : \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\mathcal{A} \cap [X \upharpoonright n])2^n < 1 - \varepsilon\}.$$

Then  $\mathcal{A} - \phi(\mathcal{A}) = \bigcup_\varepsilon \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon$ , hence it suffices to prove that every  $\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon$  is a null set. Suppose for a contradiction that for  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon$  we have that the outer measure  $\mu^*(\mathcal{B}) := \inf\{\mu(\mathcal{U}) : \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{U} \wedge \mathcal{U} \text{ open}\} > 0$ . Then there exists  $\mathcal{G} \supseteq \mathcal{B}$  open with  $\mu(\mathcal{G})(1 - \varepsilon) < \mu^*(\mathcal{B})$ . Define

$$I = \{x \in 2^{<\omega} : [x] \subseteq \mathcal{G} \wedge \mu(\mathcal{A} \cap [x]) < (1 - \varepsilon)2^{-|x|}\}.$$

Then

(i) for any  $X \in \mathcal{B}$ ,  $I$  contains  $X \upharpoonright n$  for some  $n$ , and

(ii) if  $\{x_i\}_{i \in \omega}$  is a prefix-free set of elements of  $I$  then  $\mu^*(\mathcal{B} - \bigcup_i [x_i]) > 0$ .

The first statement holds since  $\mathcal{G}$  is open and the second statement holds because  $\mu^*(\mathcal{B} \cap \bigcup_i [x_i]) \leq \sum_i \mu(\mathcal{A} \cap [x_i]) < \sum_i (1 - \varepsilon)2^{-|x_i|} \leq (1 - \varepsilon)\mu(\mathcal{G}) < \mu^*(\mathcal{B})$ .

Construct a sequence  $\{x_i\}_{i \in \omega}$  as follows. Let  $x_0$  in  $I$  be arbitrary, and if  $x_i, i \leq n$  are defined such that  $\{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$  is prefix-free, define  $x_{n+1} \in I$  of minimal length such that the set  $\{x_0, \dots, x_{n+1}\}$  is again prefix-free.

Now let  $X \in \mathcal{B} - \bigcup_i [x_i]$ .  $X$  exists by (ii). By (i), let  $x \in I$  be such that  $X \in [x]$ . Let  $k$  be the smallest number with  $[x] \cap [x_k] \neq \emptyset$ . Note that  $k$  exists because there are only finitely many  $y \in I$  of length shorter than  $x$ , so either  $x = x_k$  or  $x_k \sqsubset x$  for some  $k$ . In both cases  $X \in [x] \subseteq [x_k]$ , contradicting that  $X$  was not in  $\bigcup_i [x_i]$ .  $\square$

Next we prove a classical theorem from computability theory: Sacks' theorem on the measure of upper cones.

**THEOREM 3.** (Sacks [47]) *For every noncomputable set  $A \in 2^\omega$  the upper cone  $A^{\leq_T} = \{B : A \leq_T B\}$  has measure zero.*

*Proof.* Let  $A$  be an element of  $2^\omega$  such that  $\mu(\{B : A \leq_T B\}) \neq 0$ . Note that this set is measurable hence must have positive measure. We will show that  $A$  is computable. For two classes  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  define  $\mu(\mathcal{C}|\mathcal{D}) = \mu(\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D})/\mu(\mathcal{D})$  and for a formula  $P$  write  $\mu(P(\mathcal{B}))$  for  $\mu(\{B \in 2^\omega : P(B)\})$ . Since  $\{B : A \leq_T B\} = \bigcup_e \{B : A = \{e\}^B\}$  has positive measure there exists  $e \in \omega$  such that  $\mu(\{B : A = \{e\}^B\}) > 0$ . It follows from Theorem 2 that there is a point  $X \in 2^\omega$  such that  $\mathcal{A}$  has density 1 at  $X$ . From this follows the existence of a  $\sigma \in 2^{<\omega}$  such that  $\mu(A = \{e\}^B | [\sigma]) \geq 3/4$ . Using  $\sigma$  we can compute  $A$  as follows. For any  $x \in \omega$  the sets  $T_n = \{X \sqsupset \sigma : \{e\}^X(x) \downarrow = n\}$  are uniformly c.e., so we can enumerate the  $T_n$ 's,  $T_n = \bigcup_s T_{n,s}$ , until we find  $n$  with  $\mu(T_{n,s}) \geq 3/4$ . Then  $A(x) = n$ .  $\square$

Next we prove Kolmogorov's 0-1 law for measurable sets. As Sacks' theorem above, it can be proved directly, but it also follows very quickly from Lebesgue's density theorem. (This was pointed out to us by Jack Lutz.)

**DEFINITION 1.**  $\mathcal{E} \subseteq 2^\omega$  is a *tail set* if  $\mathcal{A}$  is closed under finite variances, i.e., if  $v \in 2^{<\omega}$  and  $X \in 2^\omega$  are such that  $vX \in \mathcal{E}$  then  $wX \in \mathcal{E}$  for every string  $w$  of length  $|v|$ .

**THEOREM 4.** (Kolmogorov's 0-1 law) *If  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^\omega$  is a measurable tail set then either  $\mu(\mathcal{A}) = 0$  or  $\mu(\mathcal{A}) = 1$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $\mu(\mathcal{A}) > 0$ . By Theorem 2, choose  $X \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $\mathcal{A}$  has density 1 at  $X$ . Let  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  be arbitrary. Choose  $n$  large enough such that  $\mu(\mathcal{A} \cap [X \upharpoonright n])2^n > 1 - \varepsilon$ . Because  $\mathcal{A}$  is a tail set we then have that  $\mu(\mathcal{A} \cap [w])2^n > 1 - \varepsilon$  for any  $w$  of length  $n$ . So  $\mu(\mathcal{A}) > 1 - \varepsilon$ . Since  $\varepsilon$  was arbitrary it follows that  $\mu(\mathcal{A}) = 1$ .  $\square$

#### 1.4. Measure and set theory

We do not give a full treatment of the measure problem here, but merely make some remarks about it. First, it is well-known that under AC there are nonmeasurable sets, using Vitali's construction. Solovay [52] proved that, assuming that there exists an inaccessible cardinal, there is a model of set theory in which all sets of reals are Lebesgue measurable. More precisely,  $\text{Con}(\text{ZFC} + \exists \text{inaccessible}) \rightarrow \text{Con}(\text{ZF} + \text{DC} + \text{all sets of reals measurable})$ .

We now prove that under AD, the axiom of determinacy, every set of reals is Lebesgue measurable. Since AD is game theoretic, it is natural to use Ville's game theoretic characterization of measure from Theorem 1. The proof below is due to Terwijn and Zambella. It is a variant of the proof using Harrington's covering game [15, p552], [38, p424], [19, p307].

Given a set  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^\omega$ , consider the following betting game  $G(\mathcal{A})$ :

$$\begin{array}{llll} \text{I:} & a_0 & a_1 & a_2 \dots \\ \text{II:} & (d(a_00), d(a_01)) & (d(a_0a_10), d(a_0a_11)) & \dots \end{array}$$

Here every  $a_i \in \{0, 1\}$ , so player I plays  $A = (a_i)_{i \in \omega} \in 2^\omega$ , and for every  $n$ ,  $d(A \upharpoonright n) \in \mathbb{Q}^{\geq 0}$ ,  $d(\emptyset) = 1$ , and

$$(3) \quad d(A \upharpoonright n) \geq \frac{d(A \upharpoonright n \hat{\ } 0) + d(A \upharpoonright n \hat{\ } 1)}{2}$$

Player I wins if  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $A \notin S[d] = \{X : \limsup_n d(X \upharpoonright n) = \infty\}$ .

A strategy for II is a martingale  $d : 2^{<\omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}^{\geq 0}$ .

**LEMMA 3.** (Compare [15, p552]) (AD) When  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^\omega$  is such that every measurable  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  is a null set, then  $\mathcal{A}$  is also a null set.

**THEOREM 5.** (AD) Every  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^\omega$  is measurable.

*Proof.* Since every  $\mathcal{A}$  always has an outer measure we always have a measurable  $\mathcal{X} \supseteq \mathcal{A}$  such that  $\mathcal{X} - \mathcal{A}$  does not contain any measurable subsets of measure 0. By Lemma 3 it follows that  $\mathcal{X} - \mathcal{A}$  is null, hence  $\mathcal{A}$  is measurable, with measure  $\mu(\mathcal{X})$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 3.* Let  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^\omega$  be as in the lemma.

Claim: I does not have a winning strategy for  $G(\mathcal{A})$ .

Proof of claim: Suppose I does have winning strategy  $\sigma$ . Consider  $\mathcal{B} = \{\sigma * \tau : \tau \text{ is strategy for II}\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{B}$  is measurable (being  $\Sigma_1^1$ , cf. [15, Thm 94], [38, p301]). Alternatively, directly construct a martingale that succeeds on  $\mathcal{B}$ , and because  $\sigma$  is winning we have  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ . Hence by hypothesis  $\mu(\mathcal{B}) = 0$ . By Theorem 1 there is a martingale  $d$  that wins on  $\mathcal{B}$ , but since such a  $d$  is a strategy that defeats  $\sigma$  this contradicts that  $\sigma$  is winning.

So by determinacy we have that II has a winning strategy. (AD says that every Gale-Stewart game is determined. It is easy to see that this implies also the determinacy of variants such as the betting game  $G(\mathcal{A})$  above.) But such a strategy is a martingale that wins on  $\mathcal{A}$ , so again by Theorem 1 we have that  $\mu(\mathcal{A}) = 0$ .  $\square$

## 2. Random finite strings

According to classical probability theory, based on measure theory, every real is just as probable as another one. Also, for a fixed length  $n$ , every string of length  $n$  is just as probable as another. Yet we feel that there are great qualitative differences between strings. E.g. the sequence 000...0 consisting of 100 zeros appears to us to be special among all strings of length 100. This is part of the motivation of introducing a complexity measure for individual strings and reals. General introductions to this area are Calude [3] and Li and Vitányi [31]. Our notation in this section mainly follows [31].\*

### 2.1. Plain Kolmogorov complexity

Fix a universal Turing machine  $U$ . Given a string  $\sigma \in 2^{<\omega}$ , define the *plain Kolmogorov complexity* of  $\sigma$  as

$$C(\sigma) = \min\{|\tau| : U(\tau) = \sigma\}.$$

Basic facts of  $C$ :

- The choice of  $U$  matters only an additive constant in the theory.
- For all  $\sigma$ ,  $C(\sigma) \leq |\sigma| + O(1)$ .
- We can define  $\sigma$  to be *k-random* if  $C(\sigma) \geq |\sigma| - k$ . An easy counting argument shows that random strings exist: Given length  $n$ , there are

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-k-1} 2^{-i} = 2^{n-k} - 1$$

programs of length  $< n - k$ , so there are  $2^n - 2^{n-k} + 1$   $k$ -random strings of length  $n$ .

- For every  $k$ , the set of  $k$ -random strings is an *immune*  $\Pi_1^0$  set, i.e. it does not contain any infinite c.e. subsets. Namely suppose it is not immune. Then for every  $m$  we can compute a string  $\psi(m)$  with  $C(\psi(m)) \geq m$ . But then  $m \leq C(\psi(m)) \leq \log m + O(1)$ , which can only be true for finitely many  $m$ , a contradiction.

---

\*There are two traditions of notation in the theory of Kolmogorov complexity. One is the  $C/K$  tradition which uses  $C$  to denote the plain Kolmogorov complexity and  $K$  for the prefix-free complexity. The other tradition uses  $K$  and  $H$ . In these notes we will follow the first tradition.

- As a corollary to the previous item we obtain
  - $C$  is not computable
  - If  $m(x) = \min\{C(y) : y \geq x\}$ , then  $m$  is unbounded (because we run out of short programs), but
  - $m$  grows slower than any partial recursive function (since otherwise we could enumerate infinitely many high-complexity strings, which is impossible by immunity, see above).

We would like to extend the definition of randomness for finite strings to a definition for infinite strings. Naively, we could define a real  $A$  to be random if and only if for some  $k$  every  $\sigma \sqsubset A$  would be  $k$ -random. However, Martin-Löf showed that such reals do not exist! We see this using the following argument by Katseff [17]. Suppose  $A \upharpoonright m$  is the  $n$ -th binary string. Then from the *length* of  $A \upharpoonright n$  we can recover  $A \upharpoonright m$ , which is of length  $\log n$ . This gives

$$C(A \upharpoonright n) \leq C(A \upharpoonright m + 1 \dots n) \leq n - \log n + O(1).$$

Namely first generate  $C(A \upharpoonright m + 1 \dots n)$ . Compute  $n$  from its length  $n - \log n$ . Then recover  $A \upharpoonright m$ .

So we see that for any real  $A$ , infinitely often the length of  $A \upharpoonright n$  codes extra information. Chaitin and Levin argued that only the *bits* of  $A$  should count in measuring its complexity. This prompted them to introduce (different versions of)  $K$ , the prefix-free complexity of the next section.

## 2.2. Prefix-free complexity

Call a Turing machine  $T$  a *prefix machine* if  $\text{dom}(T) \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$  is prefix-free. It is easy to construct a *universal* prefix machine  $U$ :

$$U(\langle m, \sigma \rangle) = T_m(\sigma),$$

for an effective enumeration  $T_0, T_1, \dots$  of all prefix machines. Here  $\langle m, \sigma \rangle$  denotes a prefix encoding of the pair  $(m, \sigma)$ .

Now we can define the *prefix-free complexity* of a string  $\sigma$  as

$$K(\sigma) = \min\{|\tau| : U(\tau) = \sigma\}.$$

Basic facts of  $C$ :

- Again, the choice of  $U$  matters only an additive constant in the theory.
- The prefix encoding  $\widehat{\sigma} = 1^\sigma 0 \sigma$  gives  $K(\sigma) \leq 2|\sigma| + O(1)$ .
- The prefix encoding  $\widehat{\widehat{\sigma}} \sigma$  gives  $K(\sigma) \leq |\sigma| + 2 \log |\sigma| + O(1)$ .

- Unlike  $C$ ,  $K$  is *subadditive*:

$$K(x, y) := K(\langle x, y \rangle) = K(x) + K(y) + O(1).$$

(Simply concatenate programs for  $x$  and  $y$ . Because the set of programs is prefix-free, we do not need a special encoding to separate programs.)

- All facts about the computability of  $C$  and the immunity of the high-complexity strings also hold for  $K$ .
- Almost all  $\sigma$  have high  $K$ -complexity. This counting argument (which was easy for  $C$ ) is now much harder! It will be proved in Theorem 10.

The naive approach to define a real to be random if and only if all its initial segments have high Kolmogorov complexity, which failed for  $C$ , does work for  $K$ , as we shall see in section 3.1.

### 2.3. Kraft inequality, Shannon-Fano code

In the following we will make extensive use of the next easy theorem. A *prefix code* is a prefix-free subset of  $2^{<math>\omega</math>}. The elements of a prefix code are its *code words*.$

**THEOREM 6.** (Kraft [23]) *Let  $l_1, l_2, l_3, \dots$  be a sequence of natural numbers, possibly with repetitions. Then there is a prefix code with the  $l_i$  as the lengths of its code words if and only if  $\sum_i 2^{-l_i} \leq 1$ .*

*Proof.* For the ‘only if’ direction, note that a prefix code corresponds with an open subset of  $2^\omega$ , and that  $\sum_i 2^{-l_i}$  is precisely the *measure* of this open set, and hence bounded by 1.

For the ‘if’ direction, enumerate a set of code words as follows. Set off intervals in  $2^\omega$  of length  $2^{-l_i}$ , going from left to right. If the sequence  $l_i$  is nondecreasing, which we may assume here, then all these intervals are in fact of the form  $[\sigma]$ . Choose the  $\sigma$  as code words.  $\square$

Chaitin [5] (see also [6, p113]) proved the following extension of Kraft’s theorem: Let a c.e. set of *requirements*  $(x_k, n_k)$ ,  $k \in \omega$ , be given. (Again there may be repetitions.) We think of  $(x_k, n_k)$  as saying that we want a code word of length  $n_k$  for  $x_k$ . Then, if  $\sum_k 2^{-n_k} \leq 1$  one can construct a prefix machine  $M$  whose domain is a prefix code that satisfies all the requirements, i.e. such that for all  $x$  and  $n$ ,  $|\{\sigma : |\sigma| = n \wedge M(\sigma) = x\}| = |\{k : (x_k, n_k) = (x, n)\}|$ . The enumeration of code words runs as follows. Initially all code words in  $2^{<math>\omega</math>}$  are available. If a code word is enumerated, it and all its prefixes and extensions become unavailable. Given code words of lengths  $l_1, \dots, l_n$ , enumerate the lexicographically first available code word of length  $l_{n+1}$ . A full proof that in assigning code words one never runs out of available strings (under the condition  $\sum_k 2^{-n_k} \leq 1$ ) is in Calude [3, p49 ff.].

The construction of  $M$  is sometimes referred to as “Chaitin-simulation”, and the existence of  $M$  as the Kraft-Chaitin theorem.

Next we explain a similar result, the Shannon-Fano code [49]. (See also [31, p63,p224].) The idea of the Shannon-Fano code is that symbols with high probabilities receive short code words  $\sigma$ . The code word  $\sigma$  will be defined by the largest binary interval included in the interval of length the probability.

A *discrete semimeasure* is a function  $P : \omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\sum_x P(x) \leq 1$ .

**THEOREM 7.** (Shannon-Fano code [49]) *Given a discrete semimeasure  $P$  on  $\omega$ , there is a prefix code  $E$  such that for the  $x$ -th code word  $E(x)$  it holds that  $|E(x)| \leq -\log P(x) + 2$ .*

*Proof.* As in the proof of Kraft's Theorem, set off intervals  $I_x$  of length  $P(x)$  from left to right. Since the numbers  $-\log P(x)$  need not be integers, we cannot assume the  $n$ -th interval to be a binary interval. Let  $i_x$  be the length of the longest binary interval included in  $I_x$ . If there are 3 consecutive binary intervals of size  $2^{-n}$  in  $I_x$  there is also a binary interval of size  $2 \cdot 2^{-n}$  in it. So  $i_x \geq \frac{P(x)}{3}$ , hence  $-\log i_x \leq -\log P(x) + \log 3 \leq -\log P(x) + 2$ . Now let  $E(x)$  be the binary code word corresponding to the leftmost binary interval of length  $i_x$ .  $\square$

#### 2.4. The universal semimeasure $\mathbf{m}$

- Recall from the previous section that a *discrete semimeasure* is a function  $P : \omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\sum_x P(x) \leq 1$ .
- $P_0$  is *universal* for a class of semimeasures  $\mathcal{M}$  if  $P_0$  multiplicatively dominates  $\mathcal{M}$ :  $(\forall P \in \mathcal{M})(\exists c > 0)(\forall x \in \omega)[P_0(x) \geq cP(x)]$ .
- A  $\Sigma_1$ -*function* is a function whose values are computably approximable from below. E.g.  $-C$  and  $-K$  are  $\Sigma_1$ -functions.
- There is a universal  $\Sigma_1$ -semimeasure  $\mathbf{m}$  (Zvonkin and Levin [63]): Let  $P_1, P_2, \dots$  be an effective enumeration of all  $\Sigma_1$ -semimeasures (such an enumeration is easily seen to exist: Effectively enumerate all  $\Sigma_1$ -functions  $P$ , and redefine  $P$  to be constant 0 from a point onwards if the sum  $\sum_x P(x)$  becomes too large), and define  $\mathbf{m}(x) = \sum_n 2^{-n} P_n(x)$ . (We will construct universal objects in a similar way in Theorem 11 and section 3.5.) An alternative definition for  $\mathbf{m}$  is  $\mathbf{m}(x) = \sum_n 2^{-K(n)} P_n(x)$ .
- Of course we are using  $\Sigma_1$ -semimeasures, since  $\Sigma_1$ -measures  $P$  with  $\sum_x P(x) = 1$  are computable and the computable semimeasures have no universal element. (This last fact can be proved by a direct diagonalization: Suppose  $P$  is universal. Build  $Q$  such that  $(\forall c > 0)(\exists x)[Q(x) > cP(x)]$ . This works because  $P(x) \rightarrow 0$ .)
- We see that  $\mathbf{m}$  is not computable and that  $\sum_x \mathbf{m}(x) < 1$ .

## 2.5. A priori probability

- Let  $T$  be a prefix machine (see section 2.2). Define

$$Q_T(x) = \sum_{T(\sigma)=x} 2^{-|\sigma|},$$

the probability that  $T$  computes  $x$ . (We will have to say more about such probabilities in section 3.3.)

- By taking for  $T$  a universal prefix machine  $U$  we obtain the *universal a priori probability*  $Q_U$  (Solomonoff [51]).
- $Q_U$  is very important for learning theory. Solomonoff proposed to use  $Q_U$  as a universal prior in Bayes' rule:

$$\Pr(x|y) = \frac{\Pr(y|x)\Pr(x)}{\Pr(y)}.$$

This may be seen as a solution to the old philosophical problem of what to choose as a prior.

## 2.6. Coding, symmetry, and counting

The next theorem relates the subjects of the previous three sections:

**THEOREM 8.** (Coding Theorem, Levin [30, 63], Chaitin [5]) *Up to an additive constant, for all  $x$*

$$-\log \mathbf{m}(x) = -\log Q_U(x) = K(x).$$

Recall that  $K(x, y)$  is defined as  $K(\langle x, y \rangle)$ .

**THEOREM 9.** (Symmetry of Information, Levin)

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

*Hence*

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

**THEOREM 10.** (Counting Theorem, Chaitin [5])

- (i)  $\max \{K(x) : |x| = n\} = n + K(n) + O(1)$ .
- (ii)  $|\{x : |x| = n \wedge K(x) \leq n + K(n) - r\}| \leq 2^{n-r+O(1)}$ , where the constant  $O(1)$  does not depend on  $n$  and  $r$ .

### 3. Random infinite strings

#### 3.1. Various approaches in historical order

Among the oldest definitions of randomness are the definitions saying that a random sequence should have certain stochastic properties, such as being normal in the sense of Bernoulli. These approaches have been quite important for the subject, and many interesting and deep theorems have been proven about them, but we will not treat them here. For a discussion of stochasticity properties see we refer the reader to Ambos-Spies and Kučera [1].

Below, we restrict ourselves to those definitions of randomness that use a constructive version of Lebesgue measure or that use a constructive version of Ville's game-theoretic martingale framework.

$\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^\omega$  is a  $\Sigma_1^0$ -class if there is a c.e.  $A \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$  such that  $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{\sigma \in A} [\sigma]$ .

**DEFINITION 2.** (Martin-Löf [36]) *A set of reals  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^\omega$  is Martin-Löf null (or  $\Sigma_1$ -null) if there is a uniformly c.e. sequence  $\{\mathcal{U}_i\}_{i \in \omega}$  of  $\Sigma_1^0$ -classes (called a Martin-Löf test) such that  $\mu(\mathcal{U}_i) \leq 2^{-i}$  and  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \bigcap_i \mathcal{U}_i$ .  $A \in 2^\omega$  is Martin-Löf random, or  $\Sigma_1$ -random, if  $\{A\}$  is not  $\Sigma_1$ -null.*

**DEFINITION 3.** (Schnorr [48]) *A Schnorr test is a Martin-Löf test  $\{\mathcal{U}_i\}_{i \in \omega}$  with the additional property  $\mu(\mathcal{U}_i) = 2^{-i}$ . Equivalently, the sequence of reals  $\mu(\mathcal{U}_i)$  is a uniformly computable sequence of computable reals.  $\mathcal{A}$  is Schnorr null if  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \bigcap_i \mathcal{U}_i$  for some Schnorr test  $\{\mathcal{U}_i\}_{i \in \omega}$ , and  $A$  is Schnorr random if  $\{A\}$  is not Schnorr null.*

**DEFINITION 4.** (Solovay [53]) *A real  $A$  is Solovay random if for all uniformly c.e. sequences  $\{\mathcal{U}_i\}_{i \in \omega}$  with  $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \mu(\mathcal{U}_i) < \infty$ ,  $A \in \mathcal{U}_i$  for only finitely many  $i$ . Note that the definition does not change if we replace the  $\Sigma_1^0$ -classes  $\mathcal{U}_i$  by intervals  $[\sigma_i]$  here.*

**DEFINITION 5.** (Chaitin [5]) *A real  $A$  is Chaitin random (or Kolmogorov-Chaitin random) if there is a constant  $c$  such that  $K(A \upharpoonright n) \geq n - c$  for every  $n$ .*

**DEFINITION 6.** (Schnorr [48], Lutz [32, 33]) *A real  $A$  is computably random if there is no computable martingale succeeding on  $A$ .*

There are more definitions of random reals in the literature (see e.g. [18, 27, 31, 60]), but we will not discuss these here. In the following, we will make use of some of the above definitions in relativized form, though. Relativizing computable randomness to  $K$ , the halting set, yields  $\Delta_2$ -randomness, and relativizing Schnorr randomness to  $K$  yields Schnorr  $\Delta_2$ -randomness. Relativizing Martin-Löf's  $\Sigma_1$ -randomness to  $K$  yields  $\Sigma_2$ -randomness.

In section 3.2 we will prove that a real  $A$  is Martin-Löf random if and only if it is Solovay random if and only if it is Chaitin random. Also, we will prove that the

following sequence of measure zero notions is strictly increasing in strength.

- (i) Schnorr null
- (ii) computably null
- (iii)  $\Sigma_1$ -null
- (iv) Schnorr  $\Delta_2$ -null
- (v)  $\Delta_2$ -null
- (vi)  $\Sigma_2$ -null

From the definitions it is immediate that (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii). (ii) $\not\Rightarrow$ (i) was proved by Wang, (Theorem 16, see also Theorem 17), and (iii) $\not\Rightarrow$ (ii) follows since the computable sets have  $\Sigma_1$ -measure zero. (This does not immediately imply that  $\Sigma_1$ -randomness is different from computable randomness. This will be proved in Theorem 15.) The strict implications (iv) $\Rightarrow$ (v) $\Rightarrow$ (vi) follow from relativizing this. (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (iv) follows because given a Martin-Löf test  $\{\mathcal{U}_i\}_{i \in \omega}$ , with  $K$  we can exactly compute  $\mu(\mathcal{U}_i)$  for every  $i$ , so  $\{\mathcal{U}_i\}_{i \in \omega}$  is automatically a  $K$ -computable Schnorr test. Finally, (iv) $\not\Rightarrow$ (iii) because, as noted above, there are  $A \in \Delta_2$  such that  $\{A\}$  is not  $\Sigma_1$ -null, whereas for every  $A \in \Delta_2$  we have that  $\{A\}$  is mod- $\Delta_2$ -null. So (i)–(vi) is indeed a sequence of notions of measure 0 increasing in strength.

A martingale characterization of Definition 3 will be given in section 3.5.

### 3.2. Several equivalences and separations

We start off by giving some basic facts about Martin-Löf randomness. The next theorem shows that there is a universal Martin-Löf null set:

**THEOREM 11.** (Martin-Löf [36]) *There exists a universal Martin-Löf test. That is, there is a computable sequence of  $\Sigma_1^0$  classes  $\mathcal{U}_0, \mathcal{U}_1, \dots$  such that*

- $\mathcal{U}_0 \supseteq \mathcal{U}_1 \supseteq \dots$
- $\forall n (\mu(\mathcal{U}_n) < 2^{-n})$
- for any  $\Sigma_1^0$ -approximable class  $\mathcal{A}$  we have  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \bigcap_n \mathcal{U}_n$ .

*Proof.* Our presentation follows Kučera [24]. For every  $n$  construct a c.e. set  $U_n \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$  as follows. For every  $e > n$ ,  $U_n$  enumerates all the elements of  $W_{\{e\}(e)}$  (where we take this set to be empty if  $\{e\}(e)$  is undefined) as long as  $\mu(W_{\{e\}(e)}) < 2^{-e}$ . Define  $\mathcal{U}_n = \text{Ext}(U_n)$ . Then  $\mu(\mathcal{U}_n) < \sum_{e>n} 2^{-e} = 2^{-n}$ , and if  $\{e\}$  defines a Martin-Löf test then for every  $n$  there exists by padding  $i \in \omega$  (in fact, infinitely many  $i$ ) such that  $W_{\{e\}(i)} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_n$  (if  $i > n$  is an alternative code for  $e$  then  $W_{\{e\}(i)} = W_{\{i\}(i)} \subseteq U_n$ ), so  $\bigcap_i W_{\{e\}(i)} \subseteq \bigcap_n \mathcal{U}_n$ .  $\square$

DEFINITION 7. For every  $n$ , denote by  $\mathcal{U}_n$  the  $\Sigma_1^0$  class from the above proof. Define  $\mathcal{P}_n$  to be the complement of  $\mathcal{U}_n$ .

Define the left shift  $T : 2^\omega \rightarrow 2^\omega$  by  $T(C)(n) = C(n+1)$ . Let  $T^k$  denote the  $k$ -iteration of  $T$ .

THEOREM 12. (Kučera) *For every  $\Sigma_1$ -random  $C$  there exists  $k \in \omega$  such that  $T^k(C) \in \mathcal{P}_0$ .*

*Proof.* For a set of initial segments  $\Sigma$  and a class  $\mathcal{A}$  define  $\Sigma \hat{\ } \mathcal{A} = \{\sigma \hat{\ } A : \sigma \in \Sigma \wedge A \in \mathcal{A}\}$ , where  $\sigma \hat{\ } A$  denotes the concatenation of  $\sigma$  with the characteristic sequence of  $A$ . Fix a c.e. set  $U_0$  that defines the  $\Sigma_1^0$  class  $\mathcal{U}_0$ . By induction define  $\mathcal{U}_0^1 = \mathcal{U}_0$  and  $\mathcal{U}_0^{k+1} = U_0 \hat{\ } \mathcal{U}_0^k$ .

Now by  $q = \mu(U_0) < 1$  there is an  $l \in \omega$  such that  $q^l < 1/2$ , so  $\mu(\mathcal{U}_0^{kl}) = q^{kl} < 2^{-k}$ . It follows that the sequence

$$\mathcal{U}_0, \mathcal{U}_0^l, \mathcal{U}_0^{2l}, \dots$$

constitutes a Martin-Löf test. Therefore, if  $C$  is  $\Sigma_1$ -random then either  $C \notin \mathcal{U}_0$ , i.e.  $C \in \mathcal{P}_0$  and we are done, or for some  $k > 0$  we have  $C \in \mathcal{U}_0^{kl}$  and  $C \notin \mathcal{U}_0^{(k+1)l}$ . But the latter means that  $T^{k'}(C) \notin \mathcal{U}_0$  for some  $k'$ , so  $T^{k'}(C) \in \mathcal{P}_0$ .  $\square$

THEOREM 13. (Solovay [53])  *$A \in 2^\omega$  is Solovay random if and only if it is Martin-Löf random,*

*Proof.* It is immediate from the definitions that every Solovay random real is Martin-Löf random. For the other direction, suppose that  $X$  is Martin-Löf random and that  $\{I_n\}_{n \in \omega}$  is a computable sequence of intervals such that  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |I_n| < \infty$ . Without loss of

generality,  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |I_n| < 1$ . Define

$$\mathcal{V}_k = \{Y : Y \in I_n \text{ for } \geq 2^k \text{ many } I_n\}.$$

Then  $2^k \mu(\mathcal{V}_k) \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |I_n| < 1$ . (It suffices to prove this for any finite collection of  $I_n$ 's, with induction on the number of  $I_n$ 's.) It follows that  $\{\mathcal{V}_k\}_{k \in \omega}$  is a Martin-Löf test, and thus  $X \notin \bigcap_k \mathcal{V}_k$ .  $\square$

THEOREM 14. (Schnorr, see Chaitin [5])  *$A \in 2^\omega$  is Martin-Löf random if and only if it is Chaitin random, i.e. there is a constant  $c$  such that  $K(A \upharpoonright n) \geq n - c$  for every  $n$ .*

*Proof.* (Only if) Define  $\mathcal{U}_k = \{X : \exists n \ K(X \upharpoonright n) \leq n - k\}$ . That this is a test follows from the Counting Theorem 10. Namely, by Theorem 10 we have for all  $n$  and  $k$  that

$$\mu(\{X : K(X \upharpoonright n) \leq K(n) + n - k\}) \leq 2^{-k+O(1)},$$

where the  $O(1)$  does not depend on  $n$  and  $k$ . Subtracting  $K(n)$  from  $k$  we obtain,

$$\mu(\{X : K(X \upharpoonright n) \leq n - k\}) \leq 2^{-K(n)-k+O(1)},$$

Hence  $\mu(\mathcal{U}_k) \leq 2^{-k+O(1)} \sum_n 2^{-K(n)} \leq 2^{-k+O(1)}$ , so  $\{\mathcal{U}_k\}_{k \in \omega}$  is a test. So if  $A$  is Martin-Löf random then there is  $k$  such that  $A \notin \mathcal{U}_k$ .

(If) Suppose that  $\{\mathcal{U}_k\}$  is a Martin-Löf test. Define

$$L = \{|\sigma| - k : \sigma \in \mathcal{U}_{2k}, k > 1\}.$$

$L$  is c.e., and  $L$  satisfies Kraft:

$$\sum_{k>1} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{U}_{2k}} 2^{-|\sigma|+k} = \sum_{k>1} 2^k \mu(\mathcal{U}_{2k}) \leq \sum_{k>1} 2^k 2^{-2k} = \sum_{k>1} 2^{-k} \leq 1.$$

So by Kraft-Chaitin (page 9) there is a prefix code assigning strings of length  $|\sigma| - k$  to  $\sigma$ , i.e. there is prefix-free machine  $T$  such that

$$K_T(\sigma) \leq |\sigma| - k$$

for all  $\sigma \in \mathcal{U}_{2k}, k > 1$ . Since  $K$  is additively optimal, if  $A \in \bigcap_k \mathcal{U}_k$  then for all  $k$  there is  $n$  such that  $A \upharpoonright n \in \mathcal{U}_{2k}$ , so

$$K(A \upharpoonright n) \leq K_T(A \upharpoonright n) + O(1) \leq n - k + O(1). \quad \square$$

Recall that a real  $A$  is computably random if and only if there is no computable martingale  $d$  such that  $\limsup_n d(A \upharpoonright n) = \infty$ . The next lemma says that the definition does not change if we replace ‘limsup’ by ‘lim.’

LEMMA 4. (Savings Lemma, Lutz) *For every computable martingale  $d$  there is a computable martingale  $d'$  such that  $S[d] \subseteq \{A : \lim_n d'(A \upharpoonright n) = \infty\}$ .*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality suppose  $d(\lambda) = 1$ . Define  $d'$  by using the same betting percentages  $\frac{d(\sigma i)}{d(\sigma)}$ ,  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ , at every point in the tree, but by letting  $d'$  save one dollar every time its value becomes bigger than 2, and use the other dollar for betting. If  $d$  becomes infinitely large,  $d'$  will become bigger than 2 infinitely often, since it is using the same betting strategy, and hence  $d'$  will be saving infinitely many dollars.  $\square$

THEOREM 15. (Schnorr [48, Satz 7.2]) *There is a computably random real that is not Martin-Löf random.*

*Proof.* We follow some notes of Lutz and Gasarch from around 1991. This proof is essentially the same as Schnorr’s proof. We use Lemma 4 saying that that randomness using “lim sup” in the definition of success of a martingale is equivalent to randomness defined using just “lim”. Let  $\mathcal{U}_h$  be a sequence of c.e. open sets such that  $\mathcal{U}_n \supseteq \mathcal{U}_{n+1}$

and  $\text{ML-RAND}^c = \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{U}_n$  (see Theorem 11). Let  $d_0, d_1, d_2, \dots$  be a (necessarily noneffective) enumeration of all computable martingales  $d$  such that  $d(\lambda) = 1$ . We construct  $A \in \text{compRAND} \setminus \text{ML-RAND}$  as a union of initial segments  $A = \bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} w_k$ . We define  $w_k$  and numbers  $l_k$  with the properties

- (i)  $w_k \sqsubset w_{k+1}$ ,
- (ii)  $[w_k] \subseteq \mathcal{U}_k$ ,
- (iii)  $\sum_{j=0}^k 2^{-l_j} d_j(w_k) \leq 1 - 2^{-k}$ .

Item (ii) guarantees that for every  $k$  it holds that  $A \in \mathcal{U}_k$ , hence  $A \notin \text{ML-RAND}$ , and item (iii) guarantees that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_j(A \upharpoonright n) < \infty$  for every  $j$ , so  $A \in \text{compRAND}$ .

Define  $l_k$  and  $w_k$  with induction as follows. Let  $l_{-1} = 0$  and  $w_{-1} = \lambda$ . Suppose that  $l_k$  and  $w_k$  satisfying (i), (ii), and (iii) are defined. Let  $l_{k+1} = |w_k| + k + 2$  and define  $\tilde{d} = \sum_{j=0}^{k+1} 2^{-l_j} d_j$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{d}(w_k) &\leq 1 - 2^{-k} + 2^{-l_{k+1}} d_{k+1}(w_k) \\ &\leq 1 - 2^{-k} + 2^{-l_{k+1}} 2^{|w_k|} \\ &= 1 - 2^{-k} + 2^{-(k+2)} \\ &< 1 - 2^{-(k+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

By direct diagonalization there exists  $Y \in [w_k] \cap \text{COMP}$  such that  $\tilde{d}(w) \leq 1 - 2^{-(k+1)}$  for every  $w$  with  $w_k \sqsubseteq w \sqsubset Y$ . Because  $Y \in \text{COMP} \subseteq \text{ML-RAND}^c \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{k+1}$  and this last set is open there exists  $w_k \sqsubset w_{k+1} \sqsubset Y$  such that  $[w_{k+1}] \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{k+1}$ . This  $w_{k+1}$  clearly satisfies (i), (ii), and (iii).  $\square$

**THEOREM 16.** (Wang [61]) *There exists a Schnorr random real that is not computably random.*

**THEOREM 17.** (Terwijn [55]) *There exists a subset  $\mathcal{A}$  of COMP such that  $\mathcal{A}$  has computable measure 0 but not Schnorr measure 0.*

*Proof.* For every number  $n = \langle e, f \rangle$  recursively define a set of numbers  $\{\langle y_m^n, z_m^n \rangle : m \in \omega\}$  as follows. Let  $y_0^n = z_0^n = n$ . If  $\langle y_{m-1}^n, z_{m-1}^n \rangle$  is defined let  $\langle y_m^n, z_m^n \rangle$  be the smallest number such that  $y_m^n \geq z_m^n$ , and

$$(4) \quad 2^{y_{m-1}^n+1} < \varphi_{f, y_m^n}(z_m^n) \downarrow$$

if this exists and let  $\langle y_m^n, z_m^n \rangle$  be undefined otherwise.

Call a number  $\langle e, f \rangle$  a Schnorr-test if  $\varphi_e$  is a martingale with  $\varphi_e(\lambda) = 1$  and  $\varphi_f$  is a monotonic unbounded function. For every Schnorr-test  $n = \langle e, f \rangle$  define a computable set  $A_n$  that escapes  $n$ : Let  $A_n \upharpoonright n = \emptyset \upharpoonright n$  and define  $A_n(n) = 1$ , so that  $0^n 1 \sqsubset A_n$  and the number  $n$  is coded in this way into the initial segment of  $A_n$ . Since  $\varphi_e$  is a martingale and  $\varphi_f$  is unbounded we can recursively define the rest of  $A_n$  as follows. Given  $A_n \upharpoonright y_{m-1}^n$ , define  $A_n \upharpoonright y_m^n$  to be the (lexicographically) first string  $\sigma$  of length  $y_m^n$  such that  $(A_n \upharpoonright y_{m-1}^n) 1 \sqsubseteq \sigma$  and

$$(5) \quad (\forall j)[y_{m-1}^n < j < |\sigma| - 1 \rightarrow \varphi_e(\sigma \upharpoonright j) \geq \varphi_e(\sigma \upharpoonright j + 1)]$$

i.e. the martingale  $\varphi_e$  does not grow along  $\sigma$ . For every  $A_n$  defined in this way we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_e(A_n \upharpoonright y_m^n) &\leq \varphi_e((A_n \upharpoonright y_{m-1}^n)1) && (\varphi_e \text{ does not grow}) \\ &\leq 2^{y_{m-1}^n+1} && (\forall w (\varphi_e(w) \leq 2^{|w|})) \\ &< \varphi_{f, y_m^n}(z_m^n) \downarrow && (\text{by (4)}) \\ &\leq \varphi_f(y_m^n) && (y_m^n \geq z_m^n \text{ and } \varphi_f \text{ is monotone}) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by (5) we have

$$(\forall i > n) [ \varphi_e(A_n \upharpoonright i) < \varphi_f(i) ],$$

and hence  $A_{\langle e, f \rangle} \notin S_{\varphi_f}[\varphi_e]$ . Now define  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_n : n \text{ is a Schnorr-test}\}$ . Then there is no Schnorr-test  $\langle e, f \rangle$  such that  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq S_{\varphi_f}[\varphi_e]$ , and hence  $\mathcal{A}$  is not Schnorr null. On the other hand,  $\mathcal{A}$  does have computable measure zero. Namely, define a computable martingale  $d$  that succeeds on  $\mathcal{A}$  as follows. Let  $d(\lambda) = 1$ , and for  $w = 0^n 1v$  define  $d(w1) = 2d(w)$  if and only if  $|w| \in \{y_m^n : m \in \omega\}$ , and  $d(w1) = d(w)$  otherwise. In any case define  $d(w0) = 2d(w) - d(w1)$ , so that  $d$  is a martingale. Note that the sets  $\{y_m^n : m \in \omega\}$  are computable uniformly in  $n$ : to test whether a number  $k$  is one of the numbers  $y_m^n$  we only have to perform the finite number of computations  $\varphi_{f,k}(l)$ , where  $n = \langle e, f \rangle$  and  $l \leq k$ . So  $d$  is indeed computable. Also,  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq S[d]$  because if  $A_n \in \mathcal{A}$  then the set  $\{y_m^n : m \in \omega\}$  is infinite.  $\square$

### 3.3. Chaitin's $\Omega$

Let  $U$  be a universal prefix machine (see section 2.2). Chaitin defined the real

$$\Omega := \sum_{U(\sigma) \downarrow} 2^{-|\sigma|}.$$

Note that the definition of  $\Omega$  depends on the choice of  $U$ . We state some interesting facts about  $\Omega$ .

- Note that  $\Omega = \sum_{x \in \omega} Q_U(x)$ , see section 2.5.
- From its definition it is immediate that  $\Omega$  is a c.e. real. Furthermore,  $0 < \Omega < 1$ , because  $U$  halts on some, but not on every program.
- $\Omega$  is sometimes called “the number of wisdom”, because it has the property that  $\Omega \upharpoonright n$  can compute whether  $U(\sigma) \downarrow$  for all  $\sigma$  with  $|\sigma| \leq n$ . To see this, first note that

$$(6) \quad \Omega \upharpoonright n \leq \Omega \leq \Omega \upharpoonright n + 2^{-n}.$$

Given  $\sigma$  of length  $\leq n$ , compute  $s$  such that  $\Omega_s > \Omega \upharpoonright n$ . Then, if  $U_s(\sigma) \uparrow$ ,  $U$  will not halt on  $\sigma$  at a stage later than  $s$ , because  $\sigma$  would contribute an extra amount of  $2^{-|\sigma|} \geq 2^{-n}$  to  $\Omega$ , which would contradict the upper bound (6).

- $\Omega$  is incompressible in the sense of Chaitin (Chaitin random, see Definition 5), hence  $\Sigma_1$ -random. To see this, let  $\phi$  be a computable function such that for all

$n$ ,  $\phi(\Omega \upharpoonright n) = x$ , with  $K(x) \geq n$ . Such  $\phi$  exists by the previous item: any  $x$  not among all the  $U(\sigma) \downarrow$  with  $|\sigma| < n$  will do. Then

$$K(\Omega \upharpoonright n) \geq K(\phi(\Omega \upharpoonright n)) - c \geq n - c$$

for some constant  $c$  depending only on  $\phi$ .

- By the previous items,  $\Omega$  can be seen as a very compact version of the halting problem  $K$ . Its first 10,000 bits contain a solution to all interesting open problems in mathematics that can be formulated as an effective search problem, such as Goldbach's conjecture (every even  $n > 2$  is the sum of two primes).
- However, to compute these solutions would take an unreasonable amount of time: To compute as above from  $\Omega \upharpoonright n$  which  $\sigma$ ,  $|\sigma| < n$ , have  $U(\sigma) \downarrow$ , would take time  $t(n)$ , where  $t$  is a function growing faster than any computable function.

More on  $\Omega$ -numbers in section 3.4.

### 3.4. Complexity of $\Sigma_1$ -random sets

In this section we will say a few words on the complexity of Martin-Löf random sets. Recall that a set  $A$  is *low* if  $A' \leq_T K \oplus A$ , i.e. the jump of  $A$  is as low as possible. The Low Basis Theorem of Jockusch and Soare [43, Theorem V.5.32] says that every nonempty  $\Pi_1^0$ -class (i.e. a class that consists of the infinite branches of a computable tree) contains a low set. Now consider the first level  $\mathcal{U}_0$  of the universal Martin-Löf test, see Theorem 11. The complement  $\mathcal{P}_0$  of  $\mathcal{U}_0$  is a nonempty  $\Pi_1^0$ -class consisting purely of  $\Sigma_1$ -random sets. Therefore, by the Low Basis Theorem we have that there is a low  $\Sigma_1$ -random set.<sup>†</sup> However, there are no  $\Sigma_1$ -random sets of low *c.e.* degree, by the following theorem.

**THEOREM 18.** (Kučera [24, p249]) *Let  $A$  be c.e.,  $A <_T K$ . Then  $\leq^T A$  has  $\Sigma_1$ -measure 0. Equivalently,  $A$  does not bound a  $\Sigma_1$ -random set.*

Recently Kučera and Slaman [25] characterized the  $\Sigma_1$ -random sets of c.e. degree exactly in terms of Solovay reducibility, see also Downey's survey paper [7]: A real is an  $\Omega$ -number if it is equal to Chaitin's  $\Omega$  from section 3.3 for some choice of a universal prefix machine (see also section 2.2). Chaitin and Solovay both showed that  $\Omega$ -numbers are random. By Theorem 18 these are all  $T$ -complete c.e. reals. A real  $A$  is  $\Omega$ -like if it has a universal approximation, which is the same as saying that  $A$  is Solovay-complete for all c.e. reals. Any  $\Omega$ -number is  $\Omega$ -like (Solovay), and Calude, Hertling, Khossainov, and Wang [4] proved that any  $\Omega$ -like real is an  $\Omega$ -number. Finally, Kučera and Slaman [25] showed that every  $\Sigma_1$ -random c.e. real is  $\Omega$ -like, thus proving that the random c.e. reals are precisely the Solovay-complete ones.

<sup>†</sup>Nies [39] observed that the Low Basis Theorem actually gives a *superlow*  $\Sigma_1$ -random set. A set  $A$  is superlow if  $A' \leq_{tt} K$ . That there are  $\Sigma_1$ -randoms *tt*-below  $K$ , but none that are *btt*-below  $K$  was observed in Terwijn [55].

We will come back to Theorem 18 in section 4.4.

### 3.5. Martingales and orders

Martingales are a convenient way of introducing various effective measures by varying the complexity of the martingales. This approach was first taken by Schnorr, and later applied with much success in complexity theory by Lutz.

Next we discuss  $\Sigma_1$ -martingales. Recall that a  $\Sigma_1$ -function is a function whose values are computably approximable from below.

It is often convenient to have all martingales be  $\mathbb{Q}$ -valued. Namely, by identifying  $\mathbb{Q}$  with  $\omega$  in an appropriate way, one can then directly speak about computability, without having to use approximations. However, for  $\Sigma_1$ -martingales  $d$ , if  $d(\lambda) \in \mathbb{Q}$  then in particular  $d(\lambda)$  is computable, but this implies that all of  $d$  is computable. So either one uses  $\Sigma_1$ -martingales with values in  $\mathbb{R}$ , or one relaxes the martingale property (1) to the *supermartingale* property (2).

Schnorr proved the following effective version of Ville's Theorem 1:

**THEOREM 19.** (Schnorr [48, Satz 5.3])  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^\omega$  is Martin-Löf null if and only if there is a  $\Sigma_1$ -supermartingale  $d$  such that  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq S[d]$ .

*Proof.* This is a direct effectivization of the proof of Theorem 1. Note that  $d$  in the proof of Theorem 1 is a  $\Sigma_1$ -martingale if the  $U_k$  are uniformly c.e. Since in general  $d$  cannot be computable, by the discussion above this implies that  $d(\lambda)$  cannot be a computable real.  $\square$

Now  $\Sigma_1$ -supermartingales are  $\Sigma_1$  objects, so it comes as no surprise that we can effectively list all of them in an enumeration  $d_0, d_1, \dots$ . The sum  $d = \sum_i 2^{-i} d_i$  is then again a  $\Sigma_1$ -supermartingale, and the success set  $S[d]$  is the maximal Martin-Löf null set, so  $d$  is a *universal*  $\Sigma_1$ -supermartingale. (Alternatively, we could have used the existence of a universal Martin-Löf test, Theorem 11.)

We now give a characterization of the Schnorr null sets in terms of martingales.

**DEFINITION 8.** (Schnorr [48]) An *order* is a nondecreasing unbounded function  $h : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ . (N.B. An "Ordnungsfunktion" in Schnorr's terminology is always computable, whereas we prefer to leave the complexity of orders unspecified in general.) For a martingale  $d$  and an order  $h$  we define

$$S_h[d] := \{X : \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(X \upharpoonright n)}{h(n)} \geq 1\}.$$

Schnorr pointed out that the rate of success of a  $\Sigma_1$ -martingale  $d$  can be so slow that it cannot be computably detected. Thus rather than working with  $\Sigma_1$  null sets of the form  $S[d]$  with  $d \in \Sigma_1$ , he worked with null sets of the form  $S_h[d]$ , where both  $d$  and  $h$  are computable. He showed that these null sets are the same as the Schnorr null

sets from Definition 3. For the proof of this, we isolate the following lemma, which will also be useful later on when we discuss Hausdorff dimension.

LEMMA 5. *Suppose that  $f$  is a computable order and that  $\{\mathcal{U}_n\}_{n \in \omega}$  is a Martin-Löf test, where the  $\mathcal{U}_n$  are defined by prefix-free sets  $U_n \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$ , such that*

$$\sum_{\sigma \in U_n} 2^{-|\sigma|} 2^{f(|\sigma|)} \leq 2^{-n}.$$

*Then there is a  $\Sigma_1$ -martingale  $d$  such that  $\bigcap_n \mathcal{U}_n \subseteq S_{2^{f(\omega)}}[d]$ . Furthermore, if  $\{\mathcal{U}_n\}_{n \in \omega}$  is a Schnorr test then  $d$  is a computable martingale.*

*Proof.* Define

$$d_k(\sigma) = \begin{cases} 2^{f(|\tau|)} & \text{if } \tau \sqsubset \sigma \text{ and } \tau \in U_k, \\ \sum_{\sigma\tau \in U_n} 2^{-|\tau|} 2^{f(|\sigma\tau|)} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

One can easily verify that  $d_k$  is a martingale. Note that the expression  $\sum_{\sigma\tau \in U_n} 2^{-|\tau|} 2^{f(|\sigma\tau|)}$  is like the  $\mu(\mathcal{U}_k|\sigma)$  used in the proof of Theorem 1, except that now every  $\sigma\tau \in U_k$  counts for  $2^{-|\tau|+f(|\sigma\tau|)}$  rather than just  $2^{-|\tau|}$ . Again we define the sum martingale

$$d(\sigma) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} d_k(\sigma).$$

Note that  $d_k(\lambda) = \sum_{\tau \in U_k} 2^{-|\tau|} 2^{f(|\tau|)} \leq 2^{-k}$  by assumption, so  $d(\lambda) \leq \sum_k 2^{-k}$  is finite, and hence by the martingale property all  $d(\sigma)$  are finite. The computability claims on  $d$  are easily verified. (Note that, given  $\sigma$ , there can be only finitely many  $\mathcal{U}_k$   $\sigma$  can be in.) Finally, note that if  $\sigma \in U_k$  then  $d_k(\sigma) \geq 2^{f(|\sigma|)}$ . So if  $A \in \bigcap_{k \in \omega} \mathcal{U}_k$  then  $A \in S_{2^{f(\omega)}}[d]$ .  $\square$

THEOREM 20. (Schnorr [48, Satz 9.4, 9.5])  *$\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^\omega$  is Schnorr null if and only if there are computable  $d$  and  $h$  such that  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq S_h[d]$ .*

*Proof.* (Only if) Let  $\{\mathcal{V}_n\}_{n \in \omega}$  be a Schnorr test. By Lemma 5 it suffices to show that there are a computable order  $f$  and a Schnorr test  $\{\mathcal{U}_n\}_{n \in \omega}$  such that

$$(7) \quad \bigcap_n \mathcal{V}_n \subseteq \bigcap_n \mathcal{U}_n \text{ and } \sum_{\sigma \in U_n} 2^{-|\sigma|} 2^{f(|\sigma|)} \leq 2^{-n}.$$

Let  $V \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$  be prefix-free and computable such that  $[V] = \bigcup_n \mathcal{V}_n$ . ( $V$  exists because  $\{\mathcal{V}_n\}_{n \in \omega}$  is a Schnorr test.) Construct a computable order  $f$  such that

$$\sum_{\sigma \in V, |\sigma| \geq n} 2^{-|\sigma|} \leq 2^{-2f(n)}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\sigma \in V, f(|\sigma|)=m} 2^{-|\sigma|} 2^{f(|\sigma|)} &\leq 2^m \sum_{\sigma \in V, f(|\sigma|)=m} 2^{-|\sigma|} \\ &\leq 2^m 2^{-2m} \\ &= 2^{-m}, \end{aligned}$$

so  $\sum_{\sigma \in V} 2^{-|\sigma|} 2^{f(|\sigma|)} \leq \sum_m 2^{-m}$  is finite. Let  $g$  be computable such that

$$\sum_{\sigma \in V, |\sigma| \geq g(n)} 2^{-|\sigma|} 2^{f(|\sigma|)} \leq 2^{-n},$$

and define  $U_n = \{\sigma \in V : |\sigma| \geq g(n)\}$ . Then the  $U_n$  define a Schnorr test  $\mathcal{U}_n$  with the properties (7).

(If) Let the  $\Sigma_1^0$ -classes  $\mathcal{U}_k$  be defined by the sets of strings

$$U_k = \{\sigma : |\sigma| \text{ minimal such that } d(\sigma) \geq h(|\sigma|) \wedge d(\sigma) \geq 2^{-k}\}.$$

Then  $\mu(\mathcal{U}_k) \leq 2^{-k}$  and  $\mu(\mathcal{U}_k)$  is computable: To compute it to within precision  $2^{-r}$ , compute  $n$  such that  $h(n) \geq 2^r d(\lambda)$ . Let  $A_n = U_k - \{\sigma : |\sigma| > n\}$ . Then  $\sigma \in U_k - A_n \implies d(\sigma) \geq h(|\sigma|) \geq h(n) \geq 2^r d(\lambda)$ , so  $\mu(U_k - A_n) \leq 2^{-r}$  by Ville's Lemma 2.  $\square$

## 4. Hausdorff dimension

### 4.1. Classical Hausdorff dimension

First we repeat the definition of classical Hausdorff dimension [13]. For comments and discussion the reader can consult e.g. Falconer [12].

DEFINITION 9. •  $C \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$  is an  $n$ -cover if  $\sigma \in C \rightarrow |\sigma| \geq n$ .

•  $C$  covers  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^\omega$  if  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \bigcup_{\sigma \in C} [\sigma]$ .

• Define  $H_n^\varepsilon(\mathcal{A}) := \inf \left\{ \sum_{\sigma \in C} 2^{-\varepsilon|\sigma|} : C \text{ is } n\text{-cover of } \mathcal{A} \right\}$ .

• Define  $H^\varepsilon(\mathcal{A}) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_n^\varepsilon(\mathcal{A})$ . This is the  $\varepsilon$ -dimensional outer Hausdorff measure of  $\mathcal{A}$ .

LEMMA 6. There exists  $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$  such that

•  $\forall \varepsilon' > \varepsilon. H^{\varepsilon'}(\mathcal{A}) = 0$ ,

•  $\forall 0 \leq \varepsilon' < \varepsilon. H^{\varepsilon'}(\mathcal{A}) = \infty$ .

*Proof.* First note that for all  $n$  and  $\delta > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} H_n^{\varepsilon+\delta}(\mathcal{A}) &= \inf \left\{ \sum_{\sigma \in C} 2^{-\varepsilon|\sigma|} 2^{-\delta|\sigma|} : C \text{ } n\text{-cover of } \mathcal{A} \right\} \\ &\leq \inf \left\{ 2^{-\delta n} \sum_{\sigma \in C} 2^{-\varepsilon|\sigma|} : C \text{ } n\text{-cover of } \mathcal{A} \right\} \\ &= 2^{-\delta n} H_n^\varepsilon(\mathcal{A}). \end{aligned}$$

Now suppose that  $H^\varepsilon(\mathcal{A}) < \infty$ . Then  $H_n^{\varepsilon+\delta}(\mathcal{A}) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} 2^{-\delta n} H_n^\varepsilon(\mathcal{A}) = 0$ .  $\square$

The  $\varepsilon$  from Lemma 6 is called the *Hausdorff dimension* of  $\mathcal{A}$ :

DEFINITION 10.

$$\dim(\mathcal{A}) := \inf\{\varepsilon : H^\varepsilon(\mathcal{A}) = 0\}$$

#### 4.2. Effectivizations of Schnorr and Lutz

We now discuss effectivizations of Hausdorff dimension. Recall from section 3.5 the null sets of the form  $S_h[d]$ . Schnorr also addressed null sets of the form  $S_h[d]$  with  $h(n) = 2^{\varepsilon n}$ ,  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ , of *exponential* order. Although he did not make explicit reference to Hausdorff dimension, it turns out that the theory of Hausdorff dimension can be cast precisely in terms of such null sets of exponential order.

Lutz constructivized Hausdorff dimension in [34, 35], using what he called *s-gales* (a generalization of martingales). Let  $s \in [0, \infty)$ . An *s-gale* is a function  $d : 2^{<\omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  that satisfies the averaging condition

$$(8) \quad 2^s d(w) = d(w0) + d(w1)$$

for every  $w \in 2^{<\omega}$ . Similarly,  $d$  is an *s-supergale* if (8) holds with  $\geq$  instead of equality. The success set  $S[d]$  is defined exactly as was done for martingales in section 1.2.

Although Theorem 21 shows that we do not really need *s-gales* for the treatment of Hausdorff dimension, it will be convenient to use them at some points.

THEOREM 21. *For any class  $\mathcal{A}$  the following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $\mathcal{A}$  has dimension  $\alpha$  (as defined in Definition 10),
- (ii)  $\alpha = \inf \{s \in \mathbb{Q} : \exists d \text{ } s\text{-}(super)\text{gale } (\mathcal{A} \subseteq S[d])\}$ .
- (iii)  $\alpha = \inf \{s \in \mathbb{Q} : \exists d \text{ } (super)\text{martingale } (\mathcal{A} \subseteq S_{2^{(1-s)n}}[d])\}$ .

*Proof.* For the equivalence of (ii) and (iii), note that  $d'$  is an *s-gale* if and only if  $d(w) = 2^{(1-s)|w|} d'(w)$  is a martingale. For  $s' < s$  we have  $2^{(1-s')n} > 2^{(1-s)n}$  so

$$(9) \quad S_{2^{(1-s')n}}[d] \subseteq S\left[\frac{d}{2^{(1-s)n}}\right] \subseteq S_{2^{(1-s)n}}[d].$$

Now the equivalence of (ii) and (iii) is immediate.

The equivalence of (i) and (ii) is due to Lutz [34, Theorem 3.6]. This proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 20.

Note that the implication (i) $\implies$ (iii) follows from Lemma 5, with  $f(n) = (1-s)n$ . So we see that the theory of (effective) Hausdorff dimension falls out as a special case of Schnorr's treatment of effective measure theory.  $\square$


Theorem 21 motivates the following definition:

DEFINITION 11. For a complexity class  $\mathcal{C}$ ,  $\mathcal{A}$  has  $\mathcal{C}$ -dimension  $\alpha$  if

$$\alpha = \inf\{s \in \mathbb{Q} : \exists d \in \mathcal{C} \text{ ( } d \text{ supermartingale and } \mathcal{A} \subseteq S_{2^{(1-s)n}}[d])\}.$$

### 4.3. Picture of implications

The relations between these notions are as follows:



No other implications hold than the ones indicated. The strictness of the implications was discussed in section 3.1. That there are no more implications between the first and the second column follows from the next proposition. The strictness of the two implications in the second column follows by similar means. (It is easy to see (cf. [35]) that COMP has  $\Sigma_1$ -dimension 0, but is not computably null, so in particular COMP has computable dimension 1. Also, Lutz [35] has shown that there are sets in  $\Delta_2^0$  of any  $\Sigma_1$ -dimension  $\alpha$ , but it is elementary that every set in  $\Delta_2^0$  has  $\Delta_2^0$ -dimension 0.)

PROPOSITION 1. *There are sets  $A$  such that  $A$  is not Schnorr random and  $A$  has  $\Delta_2$ -dimension 1.*

*Proof.* Let  $R$  be  $\Delta_2$ -random, and let  $D = \{2^x : x \in \omega\}$  be an exponentially sparse computable domain. Then  $A = R \cup D$  is not Schnorr random, since no Schnorr random contains an infinite computable subset, and no  $\Delta_2$ -martingale can succeed on  $A$  exponentially fast.  $\square$

Clearly, the “ $\Delta_2$ -dimension 1” in Proposition 1 can be improved to “ $\Delta_n$ -dimension 1” by the same proof, if one is considering higher orders of randomness.

#### 4.4. $\Sigma_1$ -Dimension

Write  $\mu^\varepsilon(C) := \sum_{\sigma \in C} 2^{-\varepsilon|\sigma|}$ . Note that since  $H_n^\varepsilon$  is monotone in  $n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} H^\varepsilon(\mathcal{A}) = 0 &\iff (\forall \delta > 0)(\forall n)(\exists C \text{ } n\text{-cover})[\mu^\varepsilon(C) < \delta] \\ &\iff (\forall n)(\exists C \text{ } n\text{-cover})[\mu^\varepsilon(C) < 2^{-n}] \\ &\iff (\forall n)(\exists C \text{ cover})[\mu^\varepsilon(C) < 2^{-n}]. \end{aligned}$$

DEFINITION 12. Let  $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ . An  $\varepsilon$ -test is a uniform sequence of  $\Sigma_1^0$ -classes  $\{\mathcal{U}_n\}_{n \in \omega}$  such that for all  $n$  and every prefix  $x$ -free  $C \subseteq \mathcal{U}_n$  it holds that  $\mu^\varepsilon(C) < 2^{-n}$ .

An  $\varepsilon$ -test  $\{\mathcal{U}_n\}$  with  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \bigcap_n \mathcal{U}_n$  shows that  $H^\varepsilon(\mathcal{A}) = 0$  in an effective way.

THEOREM 22. (Calude, Staiger, Terwijn) *For any class  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^\omega$  the following three statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $\alpha$  is minimal such that for all  $\varepsilon > \alpha$  there is an  $\varepsilon$ -test  $\{\mathcal{U}_n\}_{n \in \omega}$  such that  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \bigcap_n \mathcal{U}_n$ .
- (ii) Lutz's definition of constructive dimension [35]:  $\alpha = \inf\{s \in \mathbb{Q} : \exists d \in \Sigma_1 (d \text{ } s\text{-supergale and } \mathcal{A} \subseteq S[d])\}$ ,
- (iii)  $\mathcal{A}$  has  $\Sigma_1$ -dimension  $\alpha$  (as defined in Definition 11), i.e.  $\alpha = \inf\{s \in \mathbb{Q} : \exists d \in \Sigma_1 (d \text{ supermartingale and } \mathcal{A} \subseteq S_{2^{(1-s)n}}[d])\}$ ,

*Proof.* (i) $\implies$ (ii). Suppose  $\{\mathcal{U}_n\}_{n \in \omega}$  is an  $\varepsilon$ -test. Let  $\mathcal{U}_{n,t}$  be the computable approximation of  $\mathcal{U}_n$  at stage  $t$ , and define

$$d_{n,t}(\sigma) := \max \{2^{(1-\varepsilon)|\sigma|} \mu^\varepsilon(C|\sigma) : C \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{n,t} \text{ prefix } x\text{-free}\}.$$

Then one can easily check that for each  $n$  and  $t$ ,  $d_{n,t}$  is a martingale. Define

$$d_n(\sigma) := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d_{n,t}(\sigma),$$

$$d(\sigma) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} d_n(\sigma).$$

Then  $d(\sigma) < \infty$  for every  $\sigma$  since  $d(\lambda) \leq \sum_n d_n(\lambda) \leq \sum_n 2^{-n}$  and  $d$  is a martingale. Note that  $d$  is  $\Sigma_1$ . Now if  $\sigma \in \mathcal{U}_n$  then  $d_n(\sigma) \geq 2^{(1-\varepsilon)|\sigma|}$ , so if  $\mathcal{A} \in \bigcap_n \mathcal{U}_n$  then  $\mathcal{A} \in S_{2^{(1-\varepsilon)n}}[d]$ .

(ii) $\implies$ (i). Suppose  $d$  is a  $\Sigma_1$ -(super)martingale. Fix  $\varepsilon_0$ . For every  $\varepsilon > \varepsilon_0$  we define an  $\varepsilon$ -test  $\{\mathcal{U}_n\}$  such that  $\bigcap_n \mathcal{U}_n \supseteq S_{2^{(1-\varepsilon)n}}[d]$

Fix  $k \geq d(\lambda)$ . Define

$$\mathcal{U}_n := \{\sigma : d(\sigma) \geq 2^{(1-\varepsilon)|\sigma|} 2^n k\}.$$

Note that if  $A \in S_{2^{(1-\varepsilon_0)n}}[d]$  then for all  $\varepsilon > \varepsilon_0$  we have  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(A \upharpoonright n)}{2^{(1-\varepsilon)n}} = \infty$ , so  $A \in \bigcap_n \mathcal{U}_n$ . We claim that the  $\mathcal{U}_n$  form an  $\varepsilon$ -test. Namely, let  $C \subseteq \mathcal{U}_n$  be prefix-free. Then by Lemma 2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2^n k \cdot \mu^\varepsilon(C) &= 2^n k \sum_{\sigma \in C} 2^{-\varepsilon|\sigma|} \leq \sum_{\sigma \in C} 2^{-\varepsilon|\sigma|} \frac{d(\sigma)}{2^{(1-\varepsilon)|\sigma|}} \\ &\leq \sum_{\sigma \in C} 2^{-|\sigma|} d(\sigma) \leq d(\lambda) \leq k, \end{aligned}$$

so  $\mu^\varepsilon(C) \leq 2^{-n}$ .

For the equivalence of item (ii) and (iii) see Theorem 21.  $\square$

We now give an explicit construction of a universal  $\varepsilon$ -test  $\{\mathcal{U}_n^\varepsilon\}_{n \in \omega}$  for the sets of  $\Sigma_1$ -dimension less or equal to  $\varepsilon$ . The definition is a straightforward modification of Martin-Löf's universal  $\Sigma_1$  null set, Theorem 11. That a universal  $\varepsilon$ -test exists follows implicitly also from the analyses of Schnorr [48] and Lutz [35], but below it will be convenient to have the explicit formulation presented here.

**THEOREM 23.** *For every  $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Q}$  there exists a universal  $\varepsilon$ -test. That is, there is a computable sequence of  $\Sigma_1^0$  classes  $\mathcal{U}_0^\varepsilon, \mathcal{U}_1^\varepsilon, \dots$  such that*

- $\mathcal{U}_0^\varepsilon \supseteq \mathcal{U}_1^\varepsilon \supseteq \dots$
- for every  $n$  and every prefix-free  $C \subseteq \mathcal{U}_n^\varepsilon$  it holds that  $\mu^\varepsilon(C) < 2^{-n}$
- for any class  $\mathcal{A}$  of  $\Sigma_1$ -dimension  $\leq \varepsilon$  we have  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \bigcap_n \mathcal{U}_n^\varepsilon$ .

*Proof.* This is very similar to the proof of Theorem 11. For every  $n$  construct a  $\Sigma_1^0$ -class  $\mathcal{U}_n^\varepsilon$  as follows. For every  $e > n$ ,  $\mathcal{U}_n^\varepsilon$  enumerates all the elements of  $W_{\{e\}(e)}$  (where we take this set to be empty if  $\{e\}(e)$  is undefined) as long as for every prefix-free  $C \subseteq W_{\{e\}(e)}$  it holds that  $\mu^\varepsilon(C) < 2^{-e}$ . Then if  $C \subseteq \mathcal{U}_n^\varepsilon$  is prefix-free we have  $\mu^\varepsilon(C) < \sum_{e > n} 2^{-e} = 2^{-n}$ , and if  $\{e\}$  defines an  $\varepsilon$ -test then for every  $n$  there exists by padding  $i \in \omega$  (in fact, infinitely many  $i$ ) such that  $W_{\{e\}(i)} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_n^\varepsilon$  (if  $i > n$  is an alternative code for  $e$  then  $W_{\{e\}(i)} = W_{\{i\}(i)} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_n^\varepsilon$ ), so  $\bigcap_i W_{\{e\}(i)} \subseteq \bigcap_n \mathcal{U}_n^\varepsilon$ .  $\square$

The following analogue of Theorem 12 can also be proven, with a similar proof:

**THEOREM 24.** *For every  $A$  of  $\Sigma_1$ -dimension  $> \varepsilon$  there exists  $k \in \omega$  such that  $T^k(A) \in \mathcal{P}_0^\varepsilon$ .*

Now we come back to Theorem 18 that stated that for an c.e. Turing-incomplete set  $A$ ,  $\leq_T A$  has  $\Sigma_1$ -measure 0.

The idea of the proof of Theorem 18 is the following. First, any  $\Sigma_1$ -random set is effectively bi-immune. Second, with any effectively immune set one can compute

a fixed point free function (FPF for short,  $f$  is FPF if for all  $x$ ,  $W_x \neq W_{f(x)}$ ). The Arslanov completeness criterion (see e.g. [43]) says that a c.e. set is Turing complete if and only if it can compute a FPF function. So if the c.e. set  $A$  bounds a  $\Sigma_1$ -random set it follows that  $A$  is Turing complete.

We now want to strengthen Theorem 18 from  $\Sigma_1$ -measure 0 to  $\Sigma_1$ -dimension 0. Note that this is stronger since there are sets  $A$  such that  $\{A\}$  has  $\Sigma_1$ -dimension 1 but  $\Sigma_1$ -measure 0.<sup>‡</sup>

LEMMA 7. *Suppose  $A$  has  $\Sigma_1$ -dimension  $> 0$ . Then  $A$  can compute a fixed point free function.*

*Proof.* For any  $e$  let  $e_0$  and  $e_1$  denote codes (defined in some canonical way from  $e$ ) such that  $W_e = W_{e_0} \oplus W_{e_1}$ .

Fix  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ . Let  $f(n) = n/\varepsilon$ . Define

$$\mathcal{B}_{e,n} = \{ \sigma : |\sigma| = f(n) \wedge (\exists s)[W_{e_0,s} \upharpoonright f(n) = \sigma \wedge W_{e_1,s} \upharpoonright f(n) = \bar{\sigma}] \}$$

Here  $\bar{\sigma}$  denotes the complement of  $\sigma$ . That is,  $\mathcal{B}_{e,n}$  contains all long strings  $\sigma$  (of length  $f(n)$ ) for which the c.e. set  $W_e$  provides its  $f(n)$  bits. That is, there can be at most one  $\sigma$  in  $\mathcal{B}_{e,n}$ .  $\mathcal{B}_{e,n}$  is an  $n$  cover since  $|\sigma| = f(n) \geq n$ , and

$$(10) \quad \mu^\varepsilon(\mathcal{B}_{e,n}) = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{B}_{e,n}} 2^{-\varepsilon|\sigma|} \leq 2^{-\varepsilon f(n)} = 2^{-n},$$

so  $\mathcal{B}_{e,n}$  is an  $\varepsilon$ -test. Suppose now that  $A$  has  $\Sigma_1$ -dimension  $> \varepsilon$ . Then by Theorem 23 there is a  $k$  such that  $A \notin \mathcal{U}_k^\varepsilon$ . For every  $e$  we can effectively find  $g(e) > k$  such that  $\varphi_{g(e)}(j)$  is a code of  $\mathcal{B}_{e,j}$  for every  $j$ . By (10) the sets  $\mathcal{B}_{e,j}$  form an  $\varepsilon$ -test and by the definition of  $\mathcal{U}_h^\varepsilon$  in the proof of Theorem 23 we have  $\mathcal{B}_{e,g(e)} \subseteq W_{\{\varphi_{g(e)}\}(g(e))} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{g(e)}^\varepsilon \subseteq \mathcal{U}_k^\varepsilon$ , so  $A \notin \mathcal{B}_{e,g(e)}$ .

Now we use this to construct a fixed point free function  $h \leq_T A$ : Given  $e$ , let  $h(e)$  be a code such that  $W_{h(e)_0} = A \upharpoonright f(g(e))$  and  $W_{h(e)_1} = \bar{A} \upharpoonright f(g(e))$ . Then  $W_{h(e)} \neq W_e$  for every  $e$ , for if  $W_{h(e)} = W_e$  then  $A \upharpoonright f(g(e)) \in \mathcal{B}_{e,g(e)}$ .  $\square$

THEOREM 25. *Let  $A$  be c.e.,  $A <_T K$ . Then  $\leq^T A$  has  $\Sigma_1$ -dimension 0.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $\leq^T A$  does not have  $\Sigma_1$ -dimension 0. Then by Theorem 23 there exists  $B \leq_T A$  such that  $\{B\}$  does not have  $\Sigma_1$ -dimension 0. By Lemma 7  $B$  can compute a fixed point free function, so by Arslanov's completeness criterion  $A$  is Turing complete.  $\square$

Since by the low basis theorem there are low  $\Sigma_1$ -random sets, and since there exist high incomplete c.e. sets, we now have both examples of low sets for which  $\leq^T A$  has

<sup>‡</sup>This can be proved by a direct construction, but it also follows from the fact that the class of reals of dimension 1 is properly  $\Pi_3^0$  in the arithmetical hierarchy of reals (Theorem 29), whereas the class of  $\Sigma_1$ -random reals is  $\Sigma_2^0$  (Theorem 28). Since the latter is included in the former, they cannot be equal.

$\Sigma_1$ -dimension 1, and of high sets for which  $\leq^t A$  has  $\Sigma_1$ -dimension 0. The same examples show that there are low sets for which  $\dim_{\Sigma_1}(\leq^m A)$  is maximal and high sets for which  $\dim_{\Sigma_1}(\leq^m A)$  is minimal.

#### 4.5. Relation with Kolmogorov complexity

In this section we prove a relation between  $\Sigma_1$ -dimension and the prefix-free Kolmogorov complexity. Similar results relating Kolmogorov complexity and *classical* Hausdorff dimension were proven by Cai and Hartmanis, Levin, Ryabko, and Staiger. See Lutz [35] for a discussion of these results.

We use the following lemma for  $s$ -gales, the proof of which is completely analogous to the one of Lemma 1.

LEMMA 8. (Lutz [35]) *Let  $d$  be an  $s$ -(super)gale. For any string  $\sigma$  and any prefix-free set  $X \subseteq \{\tau : \sigma \sqsubseteq \tau\}$  it holds that*

$$2^{-s|\sigma|}d(\sigma) \geq \sum_{\tau \in X} 2^{-s|\tau|}d(\tau).$$

THEOREM 26. (Levin [63], Lutz [35], Mayordomo [37], Staiger [54]) *For any  $A \in 2^\omega$ ,*

$$\dim_{\Sigma_1}(A) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{K(A \upharpoonright n)}{n}.$$

*Proof.* ( $\geq$ ) This direction was first proved by Lutz. Let  $\alpha = \dim_{\Sigma_1}(A)$ . Clearly if  $\alpha = 1$  then the statement is true, so assume that  $\alpha < 1$ . Fix  $\alpha < s < t < 1$ ,  $s, t \in \mathbb{Q}$ . By Theorem 22 there is an  $s$ -gale  $d$  such that  $A \in S[d]$ . Fix a rational  $r \geq d(\lambda)$ . Let

$$B = \{\sigma : d(\sigma) > r\},$$

and denote by  $B_n$  be the strings of length  $n$  in  $B$ .  $B_n$  is prefix-free, so by Lemma 8

$$d(\lambda) \geq \sum_{\sigma \in B_n} d(\sigma) 2^{-sn} \geq d(\lambda) |B_n| 2^{-sn},$$

hence  $|B_n| \leq 2^{-sn}$ . Since  $B_n$  is c.e. we have for every  $\sigma \in B_n$ ,

$$(11) \quad K(\sigma) \leq sn + K(n) + O(1).$$

Since  $t > s$  there is  $n_0$  such that for all  $n \geq n_0$ ,

$$(12) \quad K(n) \leq (t - s)n + O(1)$$

(Recall the bound  $K(n) \leq 2 \log n$  from section 2.2.) Because  $A \in S[d]$  we have  $A \upharpoonright n \in B_n$  for infinitely many  $n$ . For these  $n$ , (11) and (12) together give

$$K(A \upharpoonright n) \leq tn,$$

and hence  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{K(A \upharpoonright n)}{n} \leq t \leq \alpha$ .

( $\leq$ ) This direction was proved in Mayordomo [37]. As Staiger pointed out in [54], the result already quickly follows from results in [63] and [35].

Let  $t > s > \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{K(A \upharpoonright n)}{n}$  be rationals. Define

$$B = \{\sigma : K(\sigma) \leq s|\sigma|\},$$

and let  $B_n$  be the strings of length  $n$  in  $B$ . Then  $|B_n| \leq 2^{sn - K(n) + c}$  for some constant  $c$  by a version of the Counting Theorem 10.

Define  $d : 2^{\omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  by

$$d(\sigma) = 2^{(t-s)|\sigma|} \left( \sum_{\sigma\tau \in B} 2^{-s|\tau|} + \sum_{\rho \in B, \rho \subsetneq \sigma} 2^{(s-1)(|\sigma| - |\rho|)} \right).$$

(Compare this definition of  $d$  to the proof of Lemma 5.) Then  $d$  is a  $\Sigma_1$ - $t$ -gale: First,  $d$  is  $\Sigma_1$  function because  $B$  is c.e. Second,  $d(\lambda)$  is finite:  $d(\lambda) = \sum_{\sigma\tau \in B} 2^{-s|\tau|} \leq \sum_n |B_n| 2^{-sn} \leq \sum_n 2^{-K(n) + c} \leq 2^c$ . Finally, one can check (by a tedious checking of cases) that  $d$  has the  $t$ -gale property.

Now if  $\sigma \in B$  then  $d(\sigma) \geq 2^{(t-s)|\sigma|}$ . Because  $s > \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{K(A \upharpoonright n)}{n}$  there are infinitely many  $n$  with  $A \upharpoonright n \in B$ , hence  $A \in S[d]$  and  $\dim_{\Sigma_1}(A) \leq t$ . The result follows since  $t$  was arbitrary.  $\square$

## 5. The complexity of randomness and dimension

The material in this section is based on Hitchcock, Lutz, and Terwijn [14].

### 5.1. Category Methods

Recall that a class  $\mathcal{C}$  is *meager* if it is included in a countable union of nowhere dense subsets of  $2^{\omega}$ , and *comeager* if its complement  $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$  is meager. The following lemma (implicit in Rogers [46, p 341]) will be useful:

LEMMA 9. *If  $\mathcal{C} \in \Sigma_2^0$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$  is dense then  $\mathcal{C}$  is meager.*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\mathcal{C} = \bigcup_n \mathcal{X}_n$ ,  $\mathcal{X}_n$  closed. Since  $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$  is dense,  $\mathcal{X}_n$  contains no basic open set, hence  $\mathcal{X}_n$  is nondense (i.e. its closure contains no basic open set), and  $\mathcal{C}$  is a countable union of nondense sets.  $\square$

As a warm-up we give a short proof of Shoenfelds result that COMP is not a  $\Pi_3^0$ -class.

THEOREM 27. (Shoenfeld [46, p344]) *COMP is a  $\Sigma_3^0$ -class, but not a  $\Pi_3^0$ -class.*

*Proof.* Clearly  $\text{COMP} \in \Sigma_3^0$ . Suppose for a contradiction that  $\overline{\text{COMP}}$  is  $\Sigma_3^0$ . Then there is a uniform sequence of  $\Sigma_1^0$ -classes  $\mathcal{O}_{n,m}$  such that  $\overline{\text{COMP}} = \bigcup_n \bigcap_m \mathcal{O}_{n,m}$ .

Without loss of generality  $\mathcal{O}_{n,m} \supseteq \mathcal{O}_{n,m+1}$  for all  $n,m$ . Now COMP is meager because it is countable, so  $\overline{\text{COMP}}$  is comeager, so there is an  $n$  such that  $\bigcap_m \mathcal{O}_{n,m}$  is not nowhere dense, hence dense in some interval  $[\sigma]$ . Then every  $\mathcal{O}_{n,m}$ ,  $m \in \omega$ , is dense in  $[\sigma]$ . Now it is easy to construct a computable set (starting with  $\sigma$ ) in  $\bigcap_m \mathcal{O}_{n,m}$ , contradicting that  $\bigcap_m \mathcal{O}_{n,m} \subseteq \overline{\text{COMP}}$ .  $\square$

The class  $\mathcal{R}$  of  $\Sigma_1$ -random sets can also easily be classified with category methods:

**THEOREM 28.** (folk) *The class of  $\Sigma_1$ -random sets  $\mathcal{R}$  is a  $\Sigma_2^0$ -class, but not a  $\Pi_2^0$ -class.*

*Proof.* Analogous to the proof in Rogers [46, p 341] that  $\{X : X \text{ finite}\}$  is a  $\Sigma_2^0$ -class but not a  $\Pi_2^0$ -class: Both  $\mathcal{R}$  and its complement are dense, so by Lemma 9,  $\mathcal{R}$  is meager. If  $\mathcal{R}$  were a  $\Pi_2^0$ -class, its complement would also be meager, contradicting that  $2^\omega$  is not meager.  $\square$

## 5.2. Classification of the sets of dimension $\alpha$

$\Sigma_1^0$  and  $\Pi_1^0$  denote the levels of the classical Borel hierarchy. Recall that a class  $\mathcal{A}$  Wadge reduces to a class  $\mathcal{B}$  if there is a continuous function  $f : 2^\omega \rightarrow 2^\omega$  such that  $X \in \mathcal{A} \Leftrightarrow f(X) \in \mathcal{B}$ .

For every  $k > 0$  define the computable order  $h_k(n) = 2^{\frac{1}{k}n}$ . Let  $d$  be a universal  $\Sigma_1$ -supermartingale (see section 3.5). By Lutz [35]  $d^{(s)}(w) = 2^{(s-1)|w|}d(w)$  is a universal  $\Sigma_1$ - $s$ -supergale. Hence

$$(13) \quad \bigcup_{s \in \mathbb{Q}^{<1}} S[d^{(s)}] = \bigcup_{s \in \mathbb{Q}^{<1}} S_{2^{(1-s)n}}[d] = \bigcup_{k>0} S_{h_k}[d].$$

The first equality uses that  $S_{h_k}[d] \subseteq S[d/h_{k+1}]$ .

**LEMMA 10.** *Every  $S_{h_k}[d]$  is a comeager  $\Pi_2^0$ -class.*

*Proof.*  $\overline{S_{h_k}[d]} \in \Sigma_2^0$  and  $S_{h_k}[d]$  is dense. Now apply Lemma 9.  $\square$

Lutz [34, 35] defines the sets of constructive dimension 1 as

$$\text{DIM}^1 = \{X \in 2^\omega : \text{no } \Sigma_1\text{-}s\text{-supergale, } s \in \mathbb{R}^{<1}, \text{ succeeds on } X\}.$$

Note that for  $s' > s$  every  $s$ -gale is an  $s'$ -gale, so if  $X \in \text{co-DIM}^1$  there is always some  $s'$ -gale that succeeds on  $X$  with  $s' \in \mathbb{Q}^{<1}$ . Hence in classifying  $\text{DIM}^1$  we can confine our attention to  $s$ -gales with  $s \in \mathbb{Q}$ . By (13) we have  $\text{co-DIM}^1 = \{X : \exists s \in \mathbb{Q}^{<1} (X \in S[d^{(s)}])\} = \bigcup_{k>0} S_{h_k}[d]$ . So by Lemma 10,  $\text{DIM}^1$  is meager (it is contained in the meager set  $\overline{S_{h_k}[d]}$ ) and  $\text{co-DIM}^1$  is comeager. Since every  $S_{h_k}[d]$  is a  $\Pi_2^0$ -class we have that  $\text{co-DIM}^1$  is a  $\Sigma_3^0$ -class, and hence:

PROPOSITION 2.  $\text{DIM}^1$  is a meager  $\Pi_3^0$ -class.

A simple category argument shows that  $\text{DIM}^1$  is not a  $\Pi_2^0$ -class: Otherwise  $\text{co-DIM}^1$  would be  $\Sigma_2^0$ , and by Lemma 9 we would have that  $\text{co-DIM}^1$  were meager, contradicting Lemma 10. We now prove that  $\text{DIM}^1$  is  $\Pi_3^0$ -complete under Wadge reducibility. In particular,  $\text{DIM}^1$  is not a  $\Sigma_3^0$ -class.

THEOREM 29.  $\text{DIM}^1$  is not a  $\Sigma_3^0$ -class. Hence it is properly  $\Pi_3^0$ .

*Proof.* One could prove this by reducing a known  $\Pi_3^0$ -complete class to  $\text{DIM}^1$ , e.g. the class of sets that have a limiting frequency of 1's that is 0 (this class was proved to be  $\Pi_3^0$ -complete by Ki and Linton [21]), but is just as easy to build a direct reduction from an arbitrary  $\Pi_3^0$ -class.

Let  $d$  be the universal constructive supermartingale. Note that we have

$$S_{2^n}[d] \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq S_{2^{\frac{1}{k}n}}[d] \subsetneq S_{2^{\frac{1}{k+1}n}}[d] \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \text{DIM}^1.$$

Let  $\bigcup_k \bigcap_s \mathcal{O}_{k,s}$  be a  $\Sigma_3^0$ -class. Without loss of generality  $\mathcal{O}_{k,s} \supseteq \mathcal{O}_{k,s+1}$  for all  $k,s$ . We define a continuous function  $f : \mathcal{Z}^\omega \rightarrow 2^\omega$  such that

$$(14) \quad \forall k \left( X \in \bigcap_s \mathcal{O}_{k,s} \iff f(X) \in S_{2^{\frac{1}{k}n}}[d] \right)$$

so that we have

$$\begin{aligned} X \notin \bigcup_k \bigcap_s \mathcal{O}_{k,s} &\iff \forall k \left( f(X) \notin S_{2^{\frac{1}{k}n}}[d] \right) \\ &\iff f(X) \in \text{DIM}^1. \end{aligned}$$

The image  $Y = f(X)$  is defined in stages,  $Y = \bigcup_s Y_s$ , such that every initial segment of  $X$  defines an initial segment of  $Y$ .

At stage 0 we define  $Y_0$  to be the empty sequence.

At stage  $s > 0$  we consider  $X \upharpoonright_s$ , and for each  $k$  we define  $t_{k,s}$  to be the largest stage  $t \leq s$  such that  $X \upharpoonright_t \in \mathcal{O}_{k,t}$ . (Let  $t_{k,s} = 0$  if such a  $t$  does not exist.) Define  $k$  to be *expansionary* at stage  $s$  if  $t_{k,s-1} < t_{k,s}$ . Now we let  $k(s) = \min\{k : k \text{ is expansionary at } s\}$ . There are two substages.

*Substage (a).* First consider all strings  $\sigma$  extending  $Y_{s-1}$  of minimal length with  $d(\sigma) \geq 2^{\frac{1}{k(s)}|\sigma|}$ , and take the leftmost one of these  $\sigma$ 's. Such  $\sigma$ 's exist because  $S_{2^{\frac{1}{k(s)}n}}[d]$  is dense. If  $k(s)$  does not exist let  $\sigma = Y_{s-1}$ .

*Substage (b).* Next consider all extensions  $\tau \supseteq \sigma$  of minimal length such that  $d(\tau \upharpoonright_i) \leq d(\tau \upharpoonright_{i-1})$  for every  $|\sigma| < i < |\tau|$ , and  $d(\tau) \leq |\tau|$ . Clearly such  $\tau$  exist, by direct diagonalization against  $d$ . Define  $Y_s$  to be the leftmost of these  $\tau$ . This concludes the construction.

So  $Y_s$  is defined by first building a piece of evidence  $\sigma$  that  $d$  achieves growth rate  $2^{\frac{1}{k(s)}n}$  on  $Y$  and then slowing down the growth rate of  $d$  to the order  $n$ . Note that  $f$  is continuous. If  $X \in \bigcup_k \bigcap_s \mathcal{O}_{k,s}$ , then for the minimal  $k$  such that  $X \in \bigcap_s \mathcal{O}_{k,s}$ , infinitely many pieces of evidence  $\sigma$  witness that  $d$  achieves growth rate  $2^{\frac{1}{k}n}$  on  $Y$ , so  $Y \notin \text{DIM}^1$ . On the other hand, if  $X \notin \bigcup_k \bigcap_s \mathcal{O}_{k,s}$  then for every  $k$  only finitely often  $d(Y_s) \geq 2^{\frac{1}{k}|Y_s|}$  because in substage (a) the extension  $\sigma$  is chosen to be of minimal length, so  $Y \notin S_{h_k}[d]$ . Hence  $Y \in \text{DIM}^1$ .  $\square$

From Theorem 28 and Theorem 29 the following result follows, which can also be proved by a direct construction:

**COROLLARY 1.** (Lutz [35])  $\mathcal{R}$  is a proper subset of  $\text{DIM}^1$ .

One can check that for computable real  $\alpha$  with  $0 < \alpha < 1$ , the above results also hold for  $\text{DIM}^\alpha$  (the sets of  $\Sigma_1$ -dimension  $\alpha$ ):  $\text{DIM}^\alpha$  is a proper  $\Pi_3^0$ -class. This requires only slight changes to the proof of Theorem 29. Since  $\text{DIM}^{\geq \alpha}$  (the sets of  $\Sigma_1$ -dimension  $\geq \alpha$ ) is in  $\Pi_3^0$ , follows that it is also properly  $\Pi_3^0$ , and hence that  $\text{DIM}^{< \alpha} = 2^\omega - \text{DIM}^{\geq \alpha}$  is properly  $\Sigma_3^0$ . Other classifications of dimension classes can be found in [14].

### 5.3. The complexity of classes of random sets

Recall definitions of Schnorr randomness and computable randomness from section 3.1. We denote the class of Schnorr random sets by  $\mathcal{S}$ .

**THEOREM 30.** *The class of Schnorr random sets  $\mathcal{S}$  is properly  $\Pi_3^0$ .*

*Proof.* First note that  $\mathcal{S} \in \Pi_3^0$ :  $A \in \mathcal{S}$  if and only if for every pair of codes  $e$  and  $f$ , either the  $e$ -th partial computable function  $\varphi_e$  is not a computable order (i.e. is not total or decreases at some point), or  $\varphi_f$  is not a computable martingale (i.e. is not total or violates the martingale property at some point), or  $A \notin S_{\varphi_e}[\varphi_f]$ , and that every one of these options is  $\Sigma_2^0$ .

The rest of the proof resembles that of Theorem 29. Fix a (noncomputable) sequence of computable martingales  $\{d_k\}_{k \in \omega}$  and a sequence of computable orders  $\{h_k\}_{k \in \omega}$  such that

- (i)  $A \in \mathcal{S} \iff \forall k (A \notin S_{h_k}[d_k])$ .
- (ii)  $S_{h_k}[d_k] - S_{\min\{h_j : j < k\}}[\sum_{j < k} d_j]$  is dense for every  $k$ .

The  $d_k$  can be defined by taking appropriate sums of computable martingales, such that every  $S[d]$ ,  $d$  computable, is included in some  $S[d_k]$ , and for the  $h_k$  one can take any family of computable orders such that every computable order  $h$  dominates some  $h_k$ .

(Of course the  $d_k$  and  $h_k$  cannot be uniformly computable families, but that is of no concern to us.)

Let  $\bigcup_k \bigcap_s \mathcal{O}_{k,s}$  be a  $\Sigma_3^0$ -class. We define a continuous function  $f : 2^\omega \rightarrow 2^\omega$  such that

$$(15) \quad \forall k \left( X \in \bigcap_s \mathcal{O}_{k,s} \iff f(X) \in S_{h_k}[d_k] \right)$$

so that by (i) we have  $X \notin \bigcup_k \bigcap_s \mathcal{O}_{k,s} \iff f(X) \in \mathcal{S}$ , and  $\mathcal{S}$  is  $\Pi_3^0$ -complete.

As in the proof of Theorem 29 we define the image  $Y = f(X)$  in stages. Every time we find a new piece of evidence that  $X \in \bigcap_s \mathcal{O}_{k,s}$ , at stage  $s$  say, we build a piece of evidence that  $Y \in S_{h_k}[d_k]$  by choosing an appropriate finite extension at stage  $s$ . Such an extension can be found by (ii). The rest of the proof is identical to that of Theorem 29.  $\square$

With only some obvious changes one can prove

**THEOREM 31.** *The class of computably random sets is properly  $\Pi_3^0$ .*

*Proof.* Note that  $X$  is computably random if and only if for every  $e$ ,  $\varphi_e$  is not a computable martingale or  $X \notin S[\varphi_e]$ , so the class is  $\Pi_3^0$ . That it is properly  $\Pi_3^0$  is actually easier than the proof of Theorem 30 since we only need the sequence  $\{d_k\}$  and not the  $\{h_k\}$ .  $\square$

#### 5.4. An extension of the effective Borel hierarchy

The complexity of  $\text{DIM}^\alpha$ , the Schnorr random sets  $\mathcal{S}$ , and the computably random sets in the effective hierarchy corresponds exactly with their complexity in the Borel hierarchy, which is why we were able to use (noncomputable) continuous reductions to classify them. For COMP, the class of computable sets, this is not the case, since  $\text{COMP} \in \Sigma_3^0 \cap \Sigma_2^0$ , but COMP could be classified using category methods. (The  $\Sigma_1$ -random sets can be classified with both methods.) For some classes, however, we need other methods to classify them. An example of this, namely the class of 1-generic sets, is given below. Other examples can be found in [14]. As it turns out, we need a slight extension of the effective hierarchy to classify a number of natural randomness and dimension classes. We first give this extended definition.

Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a class of predicates. The ordinary definitions of  $\Sigma_n^0$  and  $\Pi_n^0$  use computable predicates. If instead predicates from  $\mathcal{C}$  are used, we denote them by  $\Sigma_n^0[\mathcal{C}]$  and  $\Pi_n^0[\mathcal{C}]$ .

**DEFINITION 13.** •  $\mathcal{A} \in \Sigma_1^0[\mathcal{C}]$  if there is  $P \in \mathcal{C}$  such that

$$A \in \mathcal{A} \iff (\exists \sigma \sqsubset A)[\sigma \in P].$$

•  $\mathcal{A} \in \Pi_1^0[\mathcal{C}]$  if  $\bar{\mathcal{A}} \in \Sigma_1^0[-\mathcal{C}]$ , where  $P \in -\mathcal{C}$  if and only if  $\bar{P} \in \mathcal{C}$ .

- In general, for  $n > 1$ ,  $\mathcal{A} \in \Sigma_n^0[\mathcal{C}]$  if  $\mathcal{A}$  is a  $\mathcal{C}$ -effective union of  $\Pi_{n-1}^0[\mathcal{C}]$  classes, i.e. if there is a  $\Pi_{n-1}^0[\mathcal{C}]$ -class  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq 2^\omega \times \omega$  such that  $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \{X : (X, n) \in \mathcal{B}\}$ .
- $\mathcal{A} \in \Pi_n^0[\mathcal{C}]$  if  $\overline{\mathcal{A}} \in \Sigma_n^0[-\mathcal{C}]$ .

Below we will be interested in the case where  $\mathcal{C}$  is either  $\Sigma_1^0$  or  $\Pi_1^0$ . We make the following basic observations:

- For every  $n$  we have

$$(16) \quad \Sigma_n^0 \subseteq \Sigma_n^0[\Sigma_1^0] \subseteq \Sigma_{n+1}^0,$$

$$(17) \quad \Pi_n^0 \subseteq \Pi_n^0[\Pi_1^0] \subseteq \Pi_{n+1}^0.$$

- If  $n$  is odd we have  $\Sigma_n^0[\Sigma_1^0] = \Sigma_n^0$  and  $\Pi_n^0[\Pi_1^0] = \Pi_n^0$ .
- If  $n$  is even, the inclusions from (16) and (17) are strict, as we will prove in Proposition 3 below.

PROPOSITION 3. *The inclusions from (16) and (17) are strict.*

Here's an example: The class of 1-generic sets. Recall that  $X$  is 1-generic if

$$(\forall e)(\exists \sigma \sqsubset X)[\{e\}^\sigma(e) \downarrow \vee (\forall \tau \sqsupset \sigma)[\{e\}^\tau(e) \uparrow]]$$

From this definition it is immediate that 1-generic is in  $\Pi_2^0[\Pi_1^0]$ , and that it is in  $\Pi_2^0$ . Below we show that it is not  $\Pi_2^0$ . So this is an example where our one-extra-quantifier hierarchy makes sense.

Note that using computable continuous reductions does not help in classifying 1-generic: Suppose that  $X \in 2^\omega$  iff  $f(X)$  is 1-generic, for some computable  $f$ . Note that if  $X$  is computable then also  $f(X)$  is. But this is impossible, because there are no computable 1-generics. So we see that an "easy" class like  $2^\omega$  does not Wadge reduce via a computable reduction to a "difficult" class like the 1-generic sets.

Also note that we may use category theory to conclude that the class of 1-generic sets is not  $\Sigma_2^0$ , by Lemma 9.

Now we show, using an ad-hoc argument, since there seems not to be any systematic way of doing it, that 1-generic is not  $\Pi_2^0$ . Suppose it is,  $X$  1-generic iff  $(\forall n)(\exists m)[R^X(n, m)]$ ,  $R$  computable predicate that uses  $X$  as an oracle. Since the 1-generic sets are dense, also  $\{X : (\forall n)(\exists m)[R^X(n, m)]\}$  is dense. But then we can easily construct a computable element of it, using a computable finite extension argument. (Given  $\sigma$  and  $n$ , search for extension such that  $R^\sigma(n, m)$  for some  $m$ . Such extension will be found by density. If extension is found, take it. Proceed to  $n + 1$ .)

In conclusion, we see that the class of 1-generic sets is in  $\Pi_2^0[\Pi_1^0] \cap \Pi_2^0 \setminus (\Sigma_2^0 \cup \Pi_2^0)$ .

## 6. Relativized randomness and lowness properties

In this section we briefly discuss relativized randomness and lowness properties for classes of random sets.<sup>§</sup>

In computability theory a set  $A$  is called *low* if for  $A'$ , the halting problem relativized to  $A$ , it holds that  $A' \leq_T \emptyset'$ , that is, if the complexity of the halting problem does not increase when relativized to  $A$ . In complexity theory, if a class  $\mathcal{C}$  has a definition that relativizes, a set  $A$  is called *low for  $\mathcal{C}$*  if  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}^A$ . So the low sets from computability theory are those that are low for the class of sets that are Turing complete for  $\Delta_2^0$ .

Relativized randomness was studied by several authors, including van Lambalgen [28] and Kautz [18]. The definition of e.g.  $\Sigma_1$ -random relative to  $A$  is obtained by reading everywhere in Definition 2 “ $A$ -computable” instead of “computable.” That is, a sequence is Martin-Löf random relative to  $A$  if there is no uniformly  $A$ -computably enumerable sequence of open  $\mathcal{U}_n$ 's with  $\mu(\mathcal{U}_n) \leq 2^{-n}$  that cover the sequence.

M. van Lambalgen and D. Zambella asked whether there exist noncomputable sets  $A$  such that every  $\Sigma_1$ -random set is already  $\Sigma_1$ -random relative to  $A$ . (The question is first explicitly stated in Zambella [62].) Note that every computable set is low for the  $\Sigma_1$ -random sets. This question was raised in the context of a comparison between randomness properties in classical dynamic systems (specifically, Bernoulli sequences) and recursion theoretic randomness. A result of Kamae [16] showed that the infinite binary sequences that have no information about Bernoulli sequences (normal sequences) are precisely the sequences with zero entropy. The question was whether a similar characterization exists for sets that have no information about Martin-Löf random sequences. This motivated the question whether every set that is low for the  $\Sigma_1$ -random sets has to be computable. The next theorem gives a negative answer:

**THEOREM 32.** (Kučera and Terwijn [26]) *There exists a noncomputable c.e. set that is low for the  $\Sigma_1$ -random sets.*

Kučera and Terwijn left open the question about the exact complexity that such low sets may have. In particular they asked if there are examples outside of  $\Delta_2^0$ . It was also noted by Downey et al. [9] that the construction of Theorem 32 bears much resemblance to that of a  $K$ -trivial set, i.e. a set  $A$  such that  $K(A \upharpoonright n) \leq K(n) + O(1)$  for every  $n$ .  $K$ -trivial sets are sets that are as nonrandom as possible in the sense of prefix complexity. Nies [40] clarified the situation by proving that these notions coincide, which by a result of Chaitin implies in particular that every low for  $\Sigma_1$ -random set is in  $\Delta_2^0$ .

Terwijn and Zambella gave an exact characterization of the sets that are low for the notion of Schnorr-null in terms of the notion of traceability. A set  $A$  is computably traceable if the values of the functions that  $A$  computes can be well-approximated by finite sets of a computably bounded size. The computably traceable sets are a strict subset of the sets of hyper-immune free degree, and there exist noncomputable examples

---

<sup>§</sup>A much more complete account on this topic can be found in the upcoming survey paper [10].

of them.

**THEOREM 33.** (Terwijn and Zambella [58]) *A set  $A$  is low for the notion of Schnorr-null if and only if it is computably traceable.*

Theorem 33 implies that there are uncountably many low for Schnorr-random sets, and that they are all outside of  $\Delta_2^0$  (except the computable ones, of course). Note that this radically differs from the situation for the Martin-Löf random sets, where the low sets all had to be *inside* of  $\Delta_2^0$ .

Finally, for the notion of computable randomness (see Definition 6) lying in between Martin-Löf and Schnorr randomness, Nies [41]) proved that there are no non-trivial low sets at all:

**THEOREM 34.** (Nies [41]) *Every set that is low for the computably random sets is computable.*

So we see that for these three notions of randomness the situation of the existence of low sets is completely different.

**Acknowledgments** This paper is a slightly updated version of [57], a collection of notes that were used in a series of lectures given at the University of Auckland in (March 2003) and the University of Torino (November 2003). Section 3.6 was deleted since it is now superseded by [42]. The author wishes to thank Bakhadyr Khoussainov, Andr e Nies, and Domenico Zambella for inviting him. We wish to thank Cris Calude, Bakh Khoussainov, Andre Nies, Ludwig Staiger, and Domenico Zambella for hospitality and stimulating discussions. Financial support by the Marsden fund of New Zealand, the University of Torino, and the Austrian Research Fund (Lise Meitner fellowship nr. M699-N05) is gratefully acknowledged.

## References

- [1] AMBOS-SPIES K. AND KUČERA A., *Randomness in computability theory*, in: ‘Computability theory: current trends and open problems’ (Eds. Cholak P. et al.), Contemporary Mathematics 257 (2000), 1–14.
- [2] AMBOS-SPIES K., MERKLE W., REIMANN J. AND STEPHAN F., *Hausdorff dimension in exponential time*, Computational Complexity, IEEE Computer Society (2001), 210–217.
- [3] CALUDE C.S., *Information and randomness, an algorithmic perspective*, Springer, 1994 (second edition 2002).
- [4] CALUDE C.S., HERTLING P.H., KHOUSSAINOV B. AND WANG Y., *Recursively enumerable reals and Chaitin  $\Omega$  numbers*, Proc. STACS, Springer, 1998, 596–606.
- [5] CHAITIN G.J., *A theory of program size formally identical to information theory*, Journal of the ACM **22** (1975) 329–340.
- [6] CHAITIN G.J., *Algorithmic information theory*, Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- [7] DOWNEY R.G., *Some computability-theoretical aspects of reals and randomness*, manuscript, 2001.
- [8] DOWNEY R.G., HIRSCHFELDT D.R., LEMPP S. AND SOLOMON R., *A  $\Delta_2^0$  set with no infinite low subset in either it or its complement*, Journal of Symbolic Logic **66** (2001), 1371–1381.
- [9] DOWNEY R.G., HIRSCHFELDT D.R., NIES A. AND STEPHAN F., *Trivial reals*, in: ‘Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science’, 2002.
- [10] DOWNEY R.G., HIRSCHFELDT D.R., NIES A. AND TERWIJN S.A., *Calibrating randomness*, to appear.

- [11] DOWNEY R.G. AND TERWIJN S.A., *Computably enumerable reals and uniformly presentable ideals*, Mathematical Logic Quarterly **48** 1 (2002), 29–40.
- [12] FALCONER K., *Fractal geometry, mathematical foundations & applications*, Wiley & Sons, 1992.
- [13] HAUSDORFF F., *Dimension und äußeres Maß*, Mathematische Annalen **79** (1919), 157–179.
- [14] HITCHCOCK J.M., LUTZ J.H. AND TERWIJN S.A., *The arithmetical complexity of dimension and randomness*, manuscript, 2003.
- [15] JECH T., *Set theory*, Academic Press, 1978.
- [16] KAMAE T., *Subsequences of normal sequences*, Israel J. Math. **16** (1973), 121–149.
- [17] KATSEFF H.P., *Complexity dips in random infinite binary sequences*, Information and Control **38** (1978), 258–263.
- [18] KAUTZ S.M., *Degrees of random sets*, PhD Thesis, Cornell University, 1991.
- [19] KECHRIS A.S., *Classical descriptive set theory*, Springer-Verlag, 1994.
- [20] KHOUSSAINOV B., *Randomness, computability and algebraic specifications*, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic **91** (1998), 1–15.
- [21] KI H. AND LINTON T., *Normal numbers and subsets of  $\omega$  with given densities*, Fundamenta Mathematicae **144** (1994), 163–179.
- [22] KO K.-I., *On the notion of infinite pseudorandom sequences*, Theoretical Computer Science **48** (1986), 9–33.
- [23] KRAFT L.G., *A device for quantizing, grouping and coding amplitude modulated pulses*, M. Sc. Thesis, MIT, 1949.
- [24] KUČERA A., *Measure,  $\Pi_1^0$ -classes and complete extensions of PA*, Lect. Notes in Math. **1141**, Springer-Verlag, 1985, 245–259.
- [25] KUČERA A. AND SLAMAN T.A., *Randomness and recursive enumerability*, SIAM J. Comput. **31** (2001), 199–211.
- [26] KUČERA A. AND TERWIJN S.A., *Lowness for the class of random sets*, Journal of Symbolic Logic **64** 4 (1999), 1396–1402.
- [27] KURTZ S.A., *Randomness and genericity in the degrees of unsolvability*, PhD Thesis, University of Illinois, 1981.
- [28] VAN LAMBALGEN M., *Random sequences*, PhD Thesis, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam 1987.
- [29] LATHROP J.I. AND LUTZ J.H., *Recursive computational depth*, Information and Computation **153** (1999), 139–172.
- [30] LEVIN L.A., *On the notion of a random sequence*, Soviet Math. Dokl. **14** (1973), 1413–1416.
- [31] LI M. AND VITÁNYI P., *An introduction to Kolmogorov complexity and its applications*, Springer-Verlag, 1993.
- [32] LUTZ J.H., *Category and measure in complexity classes*, SIAM J. Comput. **19** (1990), 1100–1131.
- [33] LUTZ J.H., *Almost everywhere high nonuniform complexity*, J. Comput. System Sci. **44** (1992), 220–258.
- [34] LUTZ J.H., *Dimension in complexity classes*, in: ‘Proceedings of the 15th Conference on Computational Complexity’, IEEE Computer Society, 2000, 158–169.
- [35] LUTZ J.H., *The dimensions of individual strings and sequences*, Information and Computation, to appear. Preliminary version: *Gales and the constructive dimension of individual sequences*, in: ‘Proceedings of the 27th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming’, Springer, 2000, 902–913.
- [36] MARTIN-LÖF P., *The definition of random sequences*, Information and Control **9** (1966), 602–619.
- [37] MAYORDOMO E., *A Kolmogorov complexity characterization of constructive Hausdorff dimension*, Information Processing Letters **84** (2002), 1–3.

- [38] MOSCHOVAKIS Y.N., *Descriptive set theory*, North-Holland, 1980.
- [39] NIES A., *Reals which compute little*, typeset manuscript, 2002.
- [40] NIES A., *Lowness properties of reals and randomness*, typeset manuscript, 2002.
- [41] NIES A., *Each Low(CR) set is computable*, typeset manuscript, 2003.
- [42] NIES A., STEPHAN F. AND TERWIJN S.A., *Randomness, relativization, and Turing degrees*, in preparation.
- [43] ODIFREDDI P.G., *Classical recursion theory*, Vol. 1, Studies in logic and the foundations of mathematics **125**, North-Holland, 1989.
- [44] ODIFREDDI P.G., *Classical recursion theory*, Vol. 2, Studies in logic and the foundations of mathematics **143**, North-Holland, 1989.
- [45] OXTOBY J.C., *Measure and Category*, Springer, 1980.
- [46] ROGERS H. JR., *Theory of recursive functions and effective computability*, McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- [47] SACKS G.E., *Degrees of unsolvability*, Annals of Mathematics Studies **55**, Princeton University Press, 1963.
- [48] SCHNORR C.-P., *Zufälligkeit und Wahrscheinlichkeit*, Lect. Notes in Math. **218**, Springer-Verlag, 1971.
- [49] SHANNON C.E., *The mathematical theory of communication*, Bell System Tech. J. **27** (1948), 379–423, 623–656.
- [50] SOARE R., *Recursively enumerable sets and degrees*, Springer, 1987.
- [51] SOLOMONOFF R.J., *A preliminary report on a general theory of inductive inference*, Tech. Report ZTB-138, Zator Company, Cambridge, 1960.
- [52] SOLOVAY R., *A model of set theory in which every set of reals is Lebesgue measurable*, Annals of Mathematics **92** (1970), 1–56.
- [53] SOLOVAY R., *Draft of a paper (or series of papers) on Chaitin's work*, unpublished manuscript, IBM Thomas J. Watson Research Center, New York 1975.
- [54] STAIGER L., *Constructive dimension equals Kolmogorov complexity*, Research Report CDMTCS-210, University of Auckland, 2003.
- [55] TERWIJN S.A., *Computability and measure*, PhD thesis, University of Amsterdam/ILLC, Amsterdam 1998.
- [56] TERWIJN S.A., *On the quantitative structure of  $\Delta_2^0$* , in: "Reuniting the Antipodes — Constructive and Nonstandard Views of the Continuum" (Eds. Berger U., Osswald H. and Schuster P.), Synthèse Library, Kluwer, 2000, 271–284.
- [57] TERWIJN S.A., *Complexity and randomness*, research report CDMTCS-212, University of Auckland.
- [58] TERWIJN S.A. AND ZAMBELLA D., *Computational randomness and lowness*, Journal of Symbolic Logic **66** 3 (2001), 1199–1205.
- [59] VILLE J., *Étude critique de la notion de collectif*, Gauthier-Villars, 1939.
- [60] WANG Y., *Randomness and complexity*, PhD Thesis, University of Heidelberg, Heidelberg 1996.
- [61] WANG Y., *A separation of two randomness concepts*, Information Processing Letters **69** 3 (1999), 115–118.
- [62] ZAMBELLA D., *On sequences with simple initial segments*, ILLC technical report ML-1990-05, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam 1990.
- [63] ZVONKIN A.K. AND LEVIN L.A., *The complexity of finite objects and the development of the concepts of information and randomness by means of the theory of algorithms*, Russian Math. Surveys **25** 6 (1970), 83–124.

Sebastiaan A. TERWIJN, Institute for Discrete Mathematics and Geometry, Technical University of Vienna, Wiedner Hauptstrasse 8–10/E104, A-1040 Vienna, AUSTRIA  
 e-mail: terwijn@few.vu.nl

Lavoro pervenuto in redazione il 03.12.2003.

