
1. Kraft's Inequality (20)

Background

Kraft's inequality is a combinatorial lemma that is often used in the theory of prefix codes; it is also crucial for the construction of Chaitin's Ω .

Kraft's Lemma:

Let $S \subseteq 2^*$ be a prefix set of binary words. Then

$$\sum_{x \in S} 2^{-|x|} \leq 1$$

On the other hand, call a non-decreasing sequence of natural numbers $\ell = (\ell_k)_{k < N}$, where $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\omega\}$, **admissible** if

$$\sum_{k < N} 2^{-\ell_k} \leq 1$$

Then for every admissible sequence ℓ there exists a prefix set $S = \{s_k \mid k < N\}$ of cardinality N such that $\ell_k = |s_k|$, in which case S is said to **realize** ℓ . For example, $\ell_k = k + 1$ is admissible and can be realized by $s_k = 0^k 1$.

Task

- Prove the lemma for any finite prefix set S .
- Find an algorithm that constructs a realizing set S from a finite admissible list ℓ . Prove your algorithm correct and analyze its running time.
- Conclude that the lemma holds for arbitrary prefix sets.
- Characterize the finite prefix sets for which $\sum_{x \in S} 2^{-|x|} = 1$.

Extra Credit: Extend the characterization to infinite sets.

2. Prefix Encoding (30)

Background

Recall our project of finding a good prefix encoding that works for any binary string. In the following, by an **encoding** or **code** we mean any injective function $\mathbf{2}^* \rightarrow \mathbf{2}^*$. An encoding f is **prefix** if $f(\mathbf{2}^*)$ is prefix. To avoid pesky edge cases, we will simply ignore words of length 0 or 1 (extra credit: figure out how to fix this).

$$\begin{aligned} E(x_1 \dots x_n) &= x_1 0 x_2 0 \dots x_{n-1} 0 x_n 1 \\ E_0(x) &= E(x) \\ E_{i+1}(x) &= E_i(\text{blen } x) x \\ \widehat{E}(x) &= E_k(x) \quad k = \text{blen}^* x \\ E_\infty(x) &= E(k) \widehat{E}(x) \quad k = \text{blen}^* x \end{aligned}$$

Using a slightly different approach, here is another attempt at a prefix code

$$G(x) = \text{blen}^k(x) 0 \text{blen}^{k-1}(x) 0 \dots |x| 0 x 1$$

For example, G turns any string x of length 20000 into

$$G(x) = 11 \underline{0} 100 \underline{0} 1111 \underline{0} 100111000100000 \underline{0} x \underline{1}$$

where the extra spaces and underlining are added for visually clarity, they are missing in the actual code.

Task

- Show that E_k is a prefix encoding for all fixed $k \geq 0$.
- Show that \widehat{E} is an encoding but not prefix.
- Show that E_∞ is a prefix encoding.
- Show that G is a prefix encoding.

3. Kolmogorov versus Primes (30)

Background

One can abuse Kolmogorov-Chaitin complexity to show that there are infinitely many primes, though many would argue that the original argument is far superior. But, with a little bit of extra effort, one can push this argument to get a fairly good estimate for the density of primes (which results are important for algorithms trying to produce large primes). Write $\pi(n)$ for the number of primes up to n . The celebrated and difficult prime number theorem (PNT) says that $\pi(n) \approx n/\log n$. We will settle for a weaker claim: $\pi(n) \geq cn/\log^2 n$

Write p_1, p_2, \dots for the sequence of primes, so that for any number n we have a unique decomposition $n = \prod_{i \leq m} p_i^{e_i}$ where $0 \leq e_i$ and $e_m \neq 0$.

Task

- A. Use Kolmogorov-Chaitin complexity to show that there are infinitely many primes.
- B. Use Kolmogorov-Chaitin complexity to prove $\pi(n) \geq cn/\log^2 n$, for some constant c and infinitely many n .

Comment Use the fact that a number n can be decomposed into its largest prime factor p and n/p ; our prefix coding functions also come in handy. For the second part, it is easier to use prefix complexity, but the argument does not depend on it.