Resource-bounded dimension, nonuniform complexity, and approximation of

MAX3SAT

by

John Matthew Hitchcock

A thesis submitted to the graduate faculty

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Major: Computer Science

Program of Study Committee:
Jack H. Lutz, Major Professor
Clifford Bergman
Giora Slutzki

Iowa State University

Ames, Iowa

2001

Graduate College
Iowa State University

This is to certify that the Master's thesis of

John Matthew Hitchcock

has met the thesis requirements of Iowa State University

_____

Major Professor

_____

For the Major Program

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to Jack Lutz for providing me with excellent research advice and direction. I also thank Jack Lutz and Elvira Mayordomo for the opportunity to collaborate with them; our work together forms a large portion of this thesis.

1 INTRODUCTION

About a decade ago, Lutz [Lut92] presented resource-bounded measure as an analogue for classical Lebesgue measure in complexity theory. Resource-bounded measure has been commonly applied in complexity theory research in the following two forms.

1. Resource-bounded measure may be used to obtain quantitative characterization of the relative "sizes" of many complexity classes. Ideally this leads to separation results.

2. Hypotheses on the resource-bounded measure of complexity classes may be investigated. Some strong measure hypotheses are reasonable and seem to have more explanatory power than weaker, traditional complexity-theoretic hypotheses.

Resource-bounded dimension was recently introduced by Lutz [Lut00a] as an effectivization of classical Hausdorff dimension for complexity theory. Resource-bounded measure is refined by resource-bounded dimension in the same way that Hausdorff dimension refines Lebesgue measure. The two application methods listed above for resource-bounded measure can also be used with resource-bounded dimension. Dimension provides a finer quantitative measure of complexity classes, and this provides a finer variety of strong hypotheses for investigation. We study both applications in this thesis.

In the first part of the thesis, a theory of scaled resource-bounded dimensions is developed. These scaled dimensions are then used to give dimension measures for many nonuniform complexity classes that are too fine to be analyzed by unscaled dimension. The latter portion of this thesis uses a hypothesis on the polynomial-time dimension of NP to investigate the approximability of the MAX3SAT optimization problem. In the remainder of this introduction we motivate and further describe these results.

Scaled Dimension and Nonuniform Complexity

Many sets of interest in computational complexity have quantitative structures that are too fine to be elucidated by resource-bounded measure. For example, it has long been known that the Boolean circuit-size complexity class $\mathrm{SIZE}\left(\frac{2^n}{n}\right)$ has measure 0 in ESPACE [Lut92], so resource-bounded measure cannot make quantitative distinctions among subclasses of $\mathrm{SIZE}\left(\frac{2^n}{n}\right)$.

Resource-bounded dimension is sometimes able to remedy this situation. Just as classical Hausdorff dimension enables us to quantify the structures of many sets of Lebesgue measure 0, resource-bounded dimension enables us to quantify the structures of some sets that have measure 0 in complexity classes. For example, Lutz [Lut00a] showed that for every real number $\alpha \in [0,1]$, the class $\mathrm{SIZE}\left(\alpha \frac{2^n}{n}\right)$ has dimension α in ESPACE. He also showed that for every p-computable $\alpha \in [0,1]$, the class of languages with limiting frequency α has dimension $\mathcal{H}(\alpha)$ in E, where $\mathcal{H}$ is the binary entropy function of Shannon information theory. (This is a complexity-theoretic extension of a classical result of Eggleston [Egg49].) These preliminary results are hopeful because they suggest new relationships between information and complexity and open the way for investigating the fractal structure of complexity classes.

However, there is a conspicuous obstacle to further progress along these lines. Many classes that occur naturally in computational complexity are parametrized in such a way as to remain out of reach of the resource-bounded dimension of [Lut00a]. For example, when discussing cryptographic security or derandomization, one is typically interested in circuit-size bounds of the form $2^{\alpha n}$ or 2^{n^α}, rather than the $\alpha \frac{2^n}{n}$ bound of the above-cited result. It is easy to see that for all $\alpha < 1$, $\mathrm{SIZE}(2^{\alpha n})$ and $\mathrm{SIZE}(2^{n^\alpha})$ have dimension 0 in ESPACE, so the resource-bounded dimension of [Lut00a] cannot provide the sort of quantitative classification that is needed. Similarly, in their investigations of the information content of complete problems, Juedes and Lutz [JL96] established tight bounds on space-bounded Kolmogorov complexity of the forms 2^{n^ϵ} and $2^{n+1} - 2^{n^\epsilon}$; in the investigation of completeness in E one is typically interested in dense languages, which have census at least 2^{n^ϵ}; etc. The difficulty here is that

classes arising naturally in computational complexity are often scaled in a nonlinear way that is not compatible with the linear scaling implicit in classical Hausdorff dimension and the resource-bounded dimension of Lutz [Lut00a].

This sort of difficulty has already been encountered in the classical theory of Hausdorff dimension and dealt with by *rescaling* the dimension. For example, it is known that with probability 1, a Brownian sample path in the plane has Hausdorff dimension 2, but a more careful analysis with a rescaled version of Hausdorff dimension shows that the dimension is actually "logarithmically smaller" than 2 [Fal90].

In chapter 3 we extend the resource-bounded dimension of [Lut00a] by introducing the general notion of a *scale* according to which dimension may be measured. The choice of which scale to use for a particular application is very much like the choice of whether to plot data on a standard Cartesian graph or a log-log graph. We then define a particular, natural hierarchy of scales, one for each integer, and use these to define the ith-*order dimension* of arbitrary sets X in suitable complexity classes. The 0th-order dimension is precisely the dimension used by Hausdorff [Hau19] and Lutz [Lut00a]. We propose that higher- and lower-order dimensions will be useful for many investigations in computational complexity. In support of this proposal in chapter 4 we prove the following for $0 \le \alpha \le 1$ and any polynomial $q(n) \ge n^2$.

1. The class $\text{SIZE}(2^{\alpha n})$ and the time- and space-bounded Kolmogorov complexity classes $\text{KT}^q(2^{\alpha n})$ and $\text{KS}^q(2^{\alpha n})$ have 1st-order dimension α in ESPACE.

2. The classes $\text{SIZE}(2^{n^\alpha})$, $\text{KT}^q(2^{n^\alpha})$, and $\text{KS}^q(2^{n^\alpha})$ have 2nd-order dimension α in ESPACE.

3. The classes $\text{KT}^q(2^n(1 - 2^{-\alpha n}))$ and $\text{KS}^q(2^n(1 - 2^{-\alpha n}))$ have -1st-order dimension α in ESPACE.

We emphasize that, regardless of α, all these classes have measure 0 in ESPACE, the classes in 1 and 2 have 0th-order dimension 0 in ESPACE, and the class in 3 has 0th-order dimension 1 in ESPACE. Only when the dimension is appropriately rescaled does it respond informatively to variation of the parameter α. We also prove more general results along these lines.

The work on scaled dimension and nonuniform complexity in chapters 3 and 4 is joint with Jack Lutz and Elvira Mayordomo.

Approximation of MAX3SAT

MAX3SAT is a well-studied optimization problem. Tight bounds on its polynomial-time approximability are known:

1. There exists a polynomial-time $\frac{7}{8}$-approximation algorithm (Karloff and Zwick [KZ97, HZ99]). [1]

2. If P $\neq$ NP, then for all $\epsilon > 0$, there does not exist a polynomial-time $(\frac{7}{8}+\epsilon)$-approximation algorithm (Håstad [Hås97]).

Recently there has been some investigation of approximating MAX3SAT in exponential time. For example, for any $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{8}]$, Dantsin, Gavrilovich, Hirsch, and Konev [DGHK] give a $(\frac{7}{8} + \epsilon)$-approximation algorithm for MAX3SAT running in time $2^{8\epsilon k}$ where k is the number of clauses in a formula.

Given these results, it is natural to ask for stronger lower bounds on computation time for MAX3SAT approximation algorithms that have performance ratio greater than $\frac{7}{8}$. Such lower bounds are not known to follow from the hypothesis P $\neq$ NP. We address this question using a stronger hypothesis involving resource-bounded dimension.

Resource-bounded measure provides strong, reasonable hypotheses which seem to have more explanatory power than weaker, traditional complexity-theoretic hypotheses. The hypothesis that NP does not have p-measure 0, $\mu_{\mathrm{p}}(\mathrm{NP}) \neq 0$, implies P $\neq$ NP and is known to have many plausible consequences that are not known to follow from P $\neq$ NP.

Resource-bounded dimension refines resource-bounded measure by providing a spectrum of weaker, but still strong, hypotheses. We will use the hypothesis that NP has positive p-dimension, $\dim_{\mathrm{p}}(\mathrm{NP}) > 0$. This hypothesis is implied by $\mu_{\mathrm{p}}(\mathrm{NP}) \neq 0$ and implies P $\neq$ NP.

---

[1] An algorithm with conjectured performance ratio $\frac{7}{8}$ was given in [KZ97], and this conjecture has since been proved according to [HZ99].

In chapter 5 we use the hypothesis $\dim_p(\mathrm{NP}) > 0$ to give an exponential-time lower bound for approximating MAX3SAT beyond the known polynomial-time achievable ratio of $\frac{7}{8}$ on all but a subexponentially-dense set of satisfiable instances. Put another way, we prove:

If $\dim_p(\mathrm{NP}) > 0$, then any approximation algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ for MAX3SAT must satisfy at least one of the following:

1. For some $\delta > 0$, $\mathcal{A}$ uses at least 2^{n^δ} time.

2. For all $\epsilon > 0$, $\mathcal{A}$ has performance ratio less than $\frac{7}{8} + \epsilon$ on an exponentially dense set of satisfiable instances.

Lutz and Mayordomo asked whether the hypothesis $\mu_p(\mathrm{NP}) \neq 0$ implies an exponential-time lower bound on approximation schemes for MAXSAT [LM99]. Our result gives a strong affirmative answer to this question: we obtain a stronger conclusion from the weaker $\dim_p(\mathrm{NP}) > 0$ hypothesis. In fact, after we present the dimension result, we give an easy proposition that achieves an exponential-time lower bound from a hypothesis even weaker than $\dim_p(\mathrm{NP}) > 0$.

The work in chapter 5 has been accepted for publication as a research note in the journal *Theoretical Computer Science* [Hit02].

2   PRELIMINARIES

The set of all finite binary strings is $\{0,1\}^*$. We use the standard enumeration of binary strings $s_0 = \lambda, s_1 = 0, s_2 = 1, s_3 = 00, \ldots$. The length of a string $x \in \{0,1\}^*$ is denoted by $|x|$. We write $A[i..j]$ for the string consisting of the i-th through the j-th bits of the characteristic sequence of A according to the standard enumeration of strings.

All *languages* (decision problems) in this thesis are encoded as subsets of $\{0,1\}^*$. For a language $A \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$, we define $A_{\leq n} = \{x \in A \,|\, |x| \leq n\}$ and $A_{=n} = \{x \in A \,|\, |x| = n\}$.

We say that a language A is *(exponentially) dense* if there is an $\alpha > 0$ such that $|A_{\leq n}| > 2^{n^\alpha}$ holds for all but finitely many n. We write DENSE for the class of all dense languages.

A *prefix set* is a language A such that no element of A is a prefix of any other element of A.

The Cantor space $\mathbf{C}$ is the set of all decision problems. If $w \in \{0,1\}^*$ and $x \in \{0,1\}^* \cup \mathbf{C}$, then $w \sqsubseteq x$ means that w is a prefix of x. The *cylinder* generated by a string $w \in \{0,1\}^*$ is $\mathbf{C}_w = \{A \in \mathbf{C} \mid w \sqsubseteq A\}$.

A subset of $\mathbf{C}$ is called a *class* of languages. For any classes $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ of languages we define the classes

$$\mathcal{C} \uplus \mathcal{D} = \{A \cup B \,|\, A \in \mathcal{C}, B \in \mathcal{D}\}$$

and

$$\mathrm{P_m}(\mathcal{C}) = \{A \subseteq \{0,1\}^* \,|\, (\exists B \in \mathcal{C}) A \leq_{\mathrm{m}}^{\mathrm{P}} B\}.$$

All logarithms in this thesis are base 2.

For each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we define a class G_i of functions from $\mathbb{N}$ into $\mathbb{N}$ as follows.

$$
\begin{aligned}
G_0 &= \{f \mid (\exists k)(\forall^\infty n) f(n) \leq kn\} \\
G_{i+1} &= 2^{G_i(\log n)} = \{f \mid (\exists g \in G_i)(\forall^\infty n) f(n) \leq 2^{g(\log n)}\}
\end{aligned}
$$

We also define the functions $\hat{g}_i \in G_i$ by $\hat{g}_0(n) = 2n$, $\hat{g}_{i+1}(n) = 2^{\hat{g}_i(\log n)}$. We regard the functions in these classes as growth rates. In particular, G_0 contains the linearly bounded growth rates and G_1 contains the polynomially bounded growth rates. It is easy to show that each G_i is closed under composition, that each $f \in G_i$ is $o(\hat{g}_{i+1})$, and that each $\hat{g}_i$ is $o(2^n)$. Thus G_i contains superpolynomial growth rates for all $i > 1$, but all growth rates in the G_i-hierarchy are subexponential.

We use the following classes of functions.

all $= \{f \mid f : \{0,1\}^* \to \{0,1\}^*\}$

rec $= \{f \in$ all $\mid f$ is computable $\}$

$\mathrm{p}_i = \{f \in$ all $\mid f$ is computable in G_i time $\}$ $(i \geq 1)$

$\mathrm{p}_i$space $= \{f \in$ all $\mid f$ is computable in G_i space $\}$ $(i \geq 1)$

(The length of the output *is* included as part of the space used in computing f.) We write p for p_1 and pspace for $\mathrm{p}_1$space. Throughout this thesis, Δ and Δ' denote one of the classes all, rec, $\mathrm{p}_i(i \geq 1)$, $\mathrm{p}_i$space$(i \geq 1)$.

A *constructor* is a function $\delta : \{0,1\}^* \to \{0,1\}^*$ that satisfies $x \overset{\sqsubset}{\neq} \delta(x)$ for all x. The *result* of a constructor δ (i.e., the language *constructed* by δ) is the unique language $R(\delta)$ such that $\delta^n(\lambda) \sqsubseteq R(\delta)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Intuitively, δ constructs $R(\delta)$ by starting with λ and then iteratively generating successively longer prefixes of $R(\delta)$. We write $R(\Delta)$ for the set of languages $R(\delta)$ such that δ is a constructor in Δ. The following facts are the reason for our interest in the above-defined classes of functions.

$R($all$) = \mathbf{C}$.

$R($rec$) = $REC.

For $i \geq 1$, $R(\mathrm{p}_i) = \mathrm{E}_i$.

For $i \geq 1$, $R(\text{p}_i\text{space}) = \text{E}_i\text{SPACE}$.

If D is a discrete domain, then a function $f : D \longrightarrow [0, \infty)$ is Δ-*computable* if there is a function $\hat{f} : \mathbb{N} \times D \longrightarrow \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, \infty)$ such that $|\hat{f}(r, x) - f(x)| \leq 2^{-r}$ for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in D$ and $\hat{f} \in \Delta$ (with r coded in unary and the output coded in binary). We say that f is *exactly* Δ-*computable* if $f : D \longrightarrow \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, \infty)$ and $f \in \Delta$.

3   SCALED DIMENSION

In this chapter we develop a theory of scaled dimensions in complexity classes. We then develop a particular, natural hierarchy of scaled dimensions that are suitable for complexity-theoretic applications such as those in chapter 4.

Definition. A *scale* is a continuous function $g : H \times \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with the following properties.

1. $H = (a, \infty)$ for some $a \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$.

2. $g(m, 1) = m$ for all $m \in H$.

3. $g(m, 0) = g(m', 0) \geq 0$ for all $m, m' \in H$.

4. For every sufficiently large $m \in H$, the function $s \mapsto g(m, s)$ is nonnegative and strictly increasing.

5. For all $s' > s \geq 0$, $\lim_{m \to \infty} [g(m, s') - g(m, s)] = \infty$.

Example 3.1. The function $g_0 : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by $g_0(m, s) = sm$ is the canonical example of a scale.

Example 3.2. The function $g_1 : (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by $g_1(m, s) = m^s$ is also a scale.

Definition. If $g : H \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a scale, then the *first rescaling* of g is the function $g^{\#} : H^{\#} \times \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$H^{\#} = \{2^m \mid m \in H\}$$

$$g^{\#}(m, s) = 2^{g(\log m, s)}.$$

Note that $g_0^\# = g_1$, where g_0 and g_1 are the scales of Examples 3.1 and 3.2.

If g is a scale, then for all $m \in H^\#$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\log g^\#(m, s) = g(\log m, s),$$

which means that a log-log graph of the function $m \mapsto g^\#(m, s)$ is precisely the ordinary graph of the function $m \mapsto g(m, s)$. This is the sense in which $g^\#$ is a rescaling of g.

Lemma 3.3. *If g is a scale, then $g^\#$ is a scale.*

Proof. Let $g : H \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a scale, where $H = (a, \infty)$.

1. It is clear that $H^\# = (2^a, \infty)$.

2. For $m \in H^\#$ we have $\log m \in H$, so $g^\#(m, 1) = 2^{g(\log m, 1)} = 2^{\log m} = m$.

3. If $m, m' \in H^\#$, then $\log m, \log m' \in H$, so $g^\#(m, 0) = 2^{g(\log m, 0)} = 2^{g(\log m', 0)} = g^\#(m', 0)$.

4. Since g is a scale, there exists $m_0 \in H$ such that for all $m \geq m_0$, the function $s \mapsto g(m, s)$ is nonnegative and strictly increasing. For all $m \geq 2^{m_0}$, then, we have $\log m \geq m_0$, so the function $s \mapsto g^\#(m, s) = 2^{g(\log m, s)}$ is nonnegative and strictly increasing.

5. Assume that $s' > s \geq 0$. Since g is a scale, there exists $m_0 \in H$ such that $g(m, s) \geq g(m, 0) \geq 0$ for all $m \geq m_0$. It follows that for all $m \geq 2^{m_0}$, $g(\log m, s) \geq 0$, whence

$$
\begin{aligned}
g^\#(m, s') - g^\#(m, s) &= 2^{g(\log m, s')} - 2^{g(\log m, s)} \\
&= 2^{g(\log m, s)}[2^{g(\log m, s') - g(\log m, s)} - 1] \\
&\geq 2^{g(\log m, s') - g(\log m, s)}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $\lim_{m \to \infty}[g(m, s') - g(m, s)] = \infty$, it follows immediately that $\lim_{m \to \infty}[g^\#(m, s') - g^\#(m, s)] = \infty$.

$\square$

Definition. If $g : H \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a scale, then the *reflection* of g is the function $g^R : H \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$g^R(m, s) = \begin{cases} m + g(m, 0) - g(m, 1 - s) & \text{if } 0 \leq s \leq 1 \\ g(m, s) & \text{if } s \leq 0 \text{ or } s \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Example 3.4. It is easy to verify that $g_0^R = g_0$ and that

$$g_1^R(m, s) = \begin{cases} m + 1 - m^{1-s} & \text{if } 0 \leq s \leq 1 \\ m^s & \text{if } s \leq 0 \text{ or } s \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

for all $m > 0$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

Lemma 3.5. *If g is a scale, then g^R is a scale.*

Proof. Let $g : H \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a scale. It is clear that g^R is continuous and has the same domain as g. Also, $g^R(m, 0) = g(m, 0)$ and $g^R(m, 1) = g(m, 1)$, so it suffices to prove that g^R satisfies conditions 4 and 5 in the definition of a scale.

Let m be large enough that $s \mapsto g(m, s)$ is nonnegative and strictly increasing, let $0 \leq s < s' \leq 1$. It suffices to show that $0 \leq g^R(m, s) < g^R(m, s')$. For the first inequality, note that $1 - s \leq 1$, so $g(m, 1 - s) \leq g(m, 1) = m$, so $g^R(m, s) = m + g(m, 0) - g(m, 1 - s) \geq g(m, 0) \geq 0$. For the second inequality, note that $1 - s > 1 - s'$, so $g(m, 1 - s) > g(m, 1 - s')$, so $g^R(m, s) < g^R(m, s')$. This confirms condition 4.

Let $s' > s \geq 0$. We have three cases.

(i) If $s \geq 1$, then

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} [g^R(m, s') - g^R(m, s)] = \lim_{m \to \infty} [g(m, s') - g(m, s)]$$

$$= \infty.$$

(ii) If $s' \leq 1$, then $1 - s > 1 - s' \geq 0$, so

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} [g^R(m, s') - g^R(m, s)] = \lim_{m\to\infty} [g(m, 1 - s) - g(m, 1 - s')]$$
$$= \infty.$$

(iii) If $s < 1$ and $s' > 1$, choose $m_0 \in H$ such that $s \mapsto g(m, s)$ is nonnegative and strictly increasing for all $m \geq m_0$. Then for all $m \geq m_0$,

$$g^R(m, s') - g^R(m, s) = g^R(m, s') - g^R(m, 1) + g^R(m, 1) - g^R(m, s)$$
$$= g(m, s') - g(m, 1) + g^R(m, 1) - g^R(m, s)$$
$$> g^R(m, 1) - g^R(m, s),$$

so (ii) above (with $s' = 1$) tells us that $\lim_{m\to\infty} [g^R(m, s') - g^R(m, s)] = \infty$.

$\square$

Notation. For each scale $g : H \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, we define the function $\Delta g : H \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\Delta g(m, s) = g(m + 1, s) - g(m, s).$$

Note that g is the usual finite difference operator, with the proviso that it is applied only to the first variable, m. For $l \in \mathbb{N}$, we also use the extended notation

$$\Delta^l g(m, s) = g(m + l, s) - g(m, s).$$

The following definition is central to scaled dimension.

Definition. Let $g : H \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a scale, and let $s \in [0, \infty)$.

1. A *g-scaled s-supergale* (briefly, an $s^{(g)}$*-supergale*) is a function $d : \{0, 1\}^* \longrightarrow [0, \infty)$ such

that for all $w \in \{0,1\}^*$ with $|w| \in H$,

$$d(w) \geq 2^{-\Delta g(|w|,s)}[d(w0) + d(w1)]. \qquad (3.1)$$

2. A *g-scaled s-gale* (briefly, an $s^{(g)}$-*gale*) is an $s^{(g)}$-supergale that satisfies (3.1) with equality for all $w \in \{0,1\}^*$ such that $|w| \in H$.

3. An *s-supergale* is an $s^{(g_0)}$-supergale.

4. An *s-gale* is an $s^{(g_0)}$-gale.

5. A *supermartingale* is a 1-supergale.

6. A *martingale* is a 1-gale.

Remarks.   1. Martingales were introduced by Lévy [Lév54] and named by Ville [Vil39], who used them in early investigations of random sequences. Martingales were later used extensively by Schnorr [Sch70, Sch71a, Sch71b, Sch73] in his investigations of random sequences and by Lutz [Lut92, Lut98] in the development of resource-bounded measure. Gales were introduced by Lutz [Lut00a, Lut00b] in the development of resource-bounded and constructive dimension. Scaled gales are introduced here in order to formulate scaled dimension.

2. Although the martingale condition is usually stated in the form

$$d(w) = \frac{d(w0) + d(w1)}{2},$$

this is a simplification of

$$d(w)\mu(w) = d(w0)\mu(w0) + d(w1)\mu(w1),$$

where $\mu(x) = 2^{-|x|}$ is the measure (probability) of the cylinder $\mathbf{C}_x = \{A \in \mathbf{C} \mid x \sqsubseteq A\}$.

Similarly, the s-gale condition

$$d(w) = 2^{-s}[d(w0) + d(w1)]$$

of [Lut00a, Lut00b] is a simplification of

$$d(w)\mu(w)^s = d(w0)\mu(w0)^s + d(w1)\mu(w1)^s,$$

which is equivalent to

$$d(w) = 2^{-\Delta g_0(|w|,s)}[d(w0) + d(w1)]. \tag{3.2}$$

In defining $s^{(g)}$-gales we have replaced the scale g_0 in (3.2) by an arbitrary scale g.

3. Condition (3.1) is only required to hold for strings w that are long enough for $g(|w|, s)$ to be defined. In fact, several of the scales $g(m, s)$ used in this paper are not defined for small m. For such a scale g, an $s^{(g)}$-supergale must satisfy condition (3.1) for all but finitely many strings w, and this is sufficient for our development.

The following lemma is a generalization of Kraft's inequality.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $g : H \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a scale, and let $s \in [0, \infty)$. If d is an $s^{(g)}$-supergale and $B \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ is a prefix set, then for all $w \in \{0,1\}^*$ with $|w| \in H$,*

$$\sum_{u \in B} 2^{-\Delta^{|u|}g(|w|,s)}\, d(wu) \leq d(w).$$

Proof. Assume the hypothesis. We first use induction on n to prove that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the lemma holds for all prefix sets $B \subseteq \{0,1\}^{\leq n}$. For $n = 0$, this is trivial. Assume that it holds for n, and let $A \subseteq \{0,1\}^{\leq n+1}$ be a prefix set. Let

$$A' = \{u \in \{0,1\}^n \mid u0 \in A \text{ or } u1 \in A\},$$

and let

$$B = A_{\leq n} \cup A'.$$

Note that B is a prefix set and $A_{\leq n} \cap A' = \emptyset$ (because A is a prefix set). Also, for all $w \in \{0,1\}^*$ with $|w| \in H$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{u \in A_{=n+1}} 2^{-\Delta^{|u|} g(|w|,s)} d(wu) &= 2^{-\Delta^{n+1} g(|w|,s)} \sum_{u \in A_{=n+1}} d(wu) \\
&\leq 2^{-\Delta^{n+1} g(|w|,s)} \sum_{u \in A'} [d(wu0) + d(wu1)] \\
&\leq 2^{-\Delta^{n+1} g(|w|,s)} \sum_{u \in A'} 2^{\Delta g(|wu|,s)} d(wu) \\
&= 2^{\Delta g(|w|+n,s) - \Delta^{n+1} g(|w|,s)} \sum_{u \in A'} d(wu) \\
&= 2^{-\Delta^n g(|w|,s)} \sum_{u \in A'} d(wu) \\
&= \sum_{u \in A'} 2^{-\Delta^{|u|} g(|w|,s)} d(wu).
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $B \subseteq \{0,1\}^{\leq n}$, it follows by the induction hypothesis that for all $w \in \{0,1\}^*$ with $|w| \in H$, if we write

$$\alpha(u) = 2^{-\Delta^{|u|} g(|w|,s)} d(wu),$$

then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{u \in A} \alpha(u) &= \sum_{u \in A_{\leq n}} \alpha(u) + \sum_{u \in A_{=n+1}} \alpha(u) \\
&\leq \sum_{u \in A_{\leq n}} \alpha(u) + \sum_{u \in A'} \alpha(u) \\
&= \sum_{u \in B} \alpha(u) \\
&\leq d(w).
\end{aligned}
$$

This completes the proof that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the lemma holds for all prefix sets $B \subseteq \{0,1\}^{\leq n}$.

To complete the proof of the lemma, let B be an arbitrary prefix set. Then for all $w \in$

$\{0,1\}^*$ with $|w| \in H$,

$$\sum_{u \in B} \alpha(u) = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{u \in B_{\leq n}} \alpha(u) \leq d(w).$$

$\square$

Corollary 3.7. *Let* $g : H \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ *be a scale,* $s \in [0, \infty)$, $0 < \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, *and* $w \in \{0,1\}^*$ *with* $|w| \in H$. *If* d *is an* $s^{(g)}$-*supergale such that* $d(w) > 0$ *and* $B \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ *is a prefix set such that* $d(wu) \geq \alpha 2^{\Delta^{|u|} g(|w|,s) - |u|} d(w)$ *for all* $u \in B$, *then*

$$\sum_{u \in B} 2^{-|u|} \leq \frac{1}{\alpha}.$$

Proof. Assume the hypothesis. Then by Lemma 3.6,

$$d(w) \geq \sum_{u \in B} 2^{-\Delta^{|u|} g(|w|,s)} d(wu) \geq \alpha d(w) \sum_{u \in B} 2^{-|u|},$$

whence the corollary follows. $\square$

Corollary 3.8. *Let* $g : H \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ *be a scale, let* $s \in [0, \infty)$, *and let* d *be an* $s^{(g)}$-*supergale.* *Then for all* $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, *and* $w \in \{0,1\}^*$ *with* $|w| \in H$, *there are fewer than* $\frac{2^l}{\alpha}$ *strings* $u \in \{0,1\}^l$ *for which*

$$\max_{v \sqsubseteq u} 2^{|v| - \Delta^{|v|} g(|w|,s)} d(wv) > \alpha d(w).$$

In particular, there is at least one string $u \in \{0,1\}^l$ *such that* $d(wv) \leq 2^{\Delta^{|v|} g(|w|,s) - |v|} d(w)$ *for all* $v \sqsubseteq u$.

Proof. Let g, s, d, l, α, and w be as given, and let

$$A = \{u \in \{0,1\}^l \mid \max_{v \sqsubseteq u} 2^{|v| - \Delta^{|v|} g(|w|,s)} d(wv) > \alpha d(w)\}.$$

Let B be the set of all $v \in \{0,1\}^{\leq l}$ such that $2^{|v| - \Delta^{|v|} g(|w|,s)} d(wv) > \alpha d(w)$ but

$2^{|v'|-\Delta^{|v'|}g(|w|,s)}d(wv') \le \alpha d(w)$ for all $v' \sqsubseteq_{\neq} v$. Then B is a prefix set, and

$$A = \{u \in \{0,1\}^l | (\exists v \sqsubseteq u)v \in B\},$$

so $|A| = \sum_{v \in B} 2^{l-|v|} = 2^l \sum_{v \in B} 2^{-|v|}$. Let $\alpha' = \min_{v \in B} 2^{|v|-\Delta^{|v|}g(|w|,s)} \frac{d(wv)}{d(w)}$, and note that $\alpha < \alpha' < \infty$. Then B is a prefix set such that $d(wv) \ge \alpha' 2^{\Delta^{|v|}g(|w|,s)-|v|}d(w)$ for all $v \in B$, so Corollary 3.7 tells us that

$$|A| = 2^l \sum_{v \in B} 2^{-|v|} \le \frac{2^l}{\alpha'} < \frac{2^l}{\alpha}.$$

This proves the main assertion of the corollary. The last sentence of the corollary follows by taking $\alpha = 1$. $\square$

Corollary 3.9. *Let* $g : H \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ *be a scale, let* $s \in [0, \infty)$, *and let* d *be an* $s^{(g)}$*-supergale. Then for all* $w, u \in \{0,1\}^*$ *with* $|w| \in H$,

$$d(wu) \le 2^{\Delta^{|u|}g(|w|,s)} d(w).$$

Proof. Let g, s, d, w, and u be as given, and let $l = |u|$. Then Corollary 3.8 with $\alpha = 2^l$ tells us that there are fewer than 1, hence no strings $v \in \{0,1\}^l$ for which $d(wv) > 2^{\Delta^l g(|w|,s)}d(w)$. Thus $d(wu) \le 2^{\Delta^{|u|}g(|w|,s)}d(w)$. $\square$

The following useful observations are now clear, as are the analogous observations for $s^{(g)}$-supergales.

Observation 3.10. *Let* $g : H \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ *be a scale, let* $m = \min(H \cap \mathbb{N})$, *and let* $s \in [0, \infty)$. *For each* $k \in \mathbb{N}$, *let* d_k *be an* $s^{(g)}$*-gale, and let* $\alpha_k \in [0, \infty)$.

    1. For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \alpha_k d_k$ *is an* $s^{(g)}$*-gale.*

    2. If $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k d_k(w) < \infty$ *for each* $w \in \{0,1\}^m$, *then* $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k d_k$ *is an* $s^{(g)}$*-gale.*

Observation 3.11. *Let* $g : H \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ *be a scale, let* $s, s' \in [0, \infty)$, *and let* $d, d' : \{0,1\}^* \to [0, \infty)$. *If*

$$d(w)\, 2^{-g(|w|,s)} = d'(w)\, 2^{-g(|w|,s')}$$

for all $w \in \{0,1\}^*$ such that $|w| \in H$, then d is an $s^{(g)}$-gale if and only if d' is an $s'^{(g)}$-gale.

Definition. Let g be a scale, let $s \in [0, \infty)$, and let d be an $s^{(g)}$-supergale.

1. We say that d *succeeds* on a language $A \in \mathbf{C}$ if $\limsup\limits_{n \to \infty} d(A[0 \ldots n-1]) = \infty$.

2. The *success set* of d is $S^\infty[d] = \{A \in \mathbf{C} \mid d \text{ succeeds on } A\}$.

We now use scaled gales to define scaled dimension.

Notation. Let g be a scale, and let $X \subseteq \mathbf{C}$.

1. $\mathcal{G}^{(g)}(X)$ is the set of all $s \in [0, \infty)$ such that there is an $s^{(g)}$-gale d for which $X \subseteq S^\infty[d]$.

2. $\hat{\mathcal{G}}^{(g)}(X)$ is the set of all $s \in [0, \infty)$ such that there is an $s^{(g)}$-supergale d for which $X \subseteq S^\infty[d]$.

Lemma 3.12. *If g is a scale, then for all $X \subseteq \mathbf{C}$, $\mathcal{G}^{(g)}(X) = \hat{\mathcal{G}}^{(g)}(X)$.*

Proof. Let $s \in [0, \infty)$. Let d be an $s^{(g)}$-supergale. We show that there is an $s^{(g)}$-gale $\tilde{d}$ such that $S^\infty[d] \subseteq S^\infty[\tilde{d}]$.

Define

$$\tilde{d} : \{0,1\}^* \longrightarrow [0, \infty)$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tilde{d}(w) &= d(w) & \text{for } |w| \notin H \\
\tilde{d}(w0) &= \tfrac{1}{2}[2^{g(|w|,s)}\tilde{d}(w) + d(w0) - d(w1)] & \text{for } |w| \in H \\
\tilde{d}(w1) &= \tfrac{1}{2}[2^{g(|w|,s)}\tilde{d}(w) - d(w0) + d(w1)] & \text{for } |w| \in H
\end{aligned}
$$

Then $\tilde{d}$ is clearly an $s^{(g)}$-gale, and an easy induction shows that $\tilde{d}(w) \geq d(w)$ for all $w \in \{0,1\}^*$, whence $S^\infty[d] \subseteq S^\infty[\tilde{d}]$. $\qquad\square$

Recall the scale g_0 of Example 3.1. It was proven by Lutz [Lut00a] that the following definition is equivalent to the classical definition of Hausdorff dimension in $\mathbf{C}$.

Definition. The *Hausdorff dimension* of a set $X \subseteq \mathbf{C}$ is $\dim_H(X) = \inf \mathcal{G}^{(g_0)}(X)$.

This suggests the following rescaling of Hausdorff dimension in Cantor space.

Definition. If g is a scale, then the *g-scaled dimension* of a set $X \subseteq \mathbf{C}$ is $\dim^{(g)}(X) = \inf \mathcal{G}^{(g)}(X)$.

By Lemma 3.12, this definition would not be altered if we used $\hat{\mathcal{G}}^{(g)}(X)$ in place of $\mathcal{G}^{(g)}(X)$.

We now use resource-bounded scaled gales to develop scaled dimension in complexity classes. In the following, the resource bound Δ may be any one of the classes all, rec, p, p_2, pspace, $p_2$space, etc., defined in chapter 2.

Notation. If g is a scale and $X \subseteq \mathbf{C}$, let $\mathcal{G}_\Delta^{(g)}(X)$ be the set of all $s \in [0, \infty)$ such that there is a Δ-computable $s^{(g)}$-gale d for which $X \subseteq S^\infty[d]$.

Definition. Let g be a scale and $X \subseteq \mathbf{C}$.

1. The *g-scaled Δ-dimension* of X is $\dim_\Delta^{(g)}(X) = \inf \mathcal{G}_\Delta^{(g)}(X)$.

2. The *g-scaled dimension of X in $R(\Delta)$* is $\dim^{(g)}(X \mid R(\Delta)) = \dim_\Delta^{(g)}(X \cap R(\Delta))$.

Note that $\dim_\Delta^{(g)}(X)$ and $\dim^{(g)}(X \mid R(\Delta))$ are defined for every scale g and *every* set $X \subseteq \mathbf{C}$. Recalling the scale $g_0(m, s) = sm$, we write

$$\dim_\Delta(X) = \dim_\Delta^{(g_0)}(X),$$

$$\dim(X \mid R(\Delta)) = \dim^{(g_0)}(X \mid R(\Delta))$$

and note that these are exactly the resource-bounded dimensions defined by Lutz [Lut00a].

Observation 3.13. *Let g be a scale.*

1. For all $X \subseteq Y \subseteq \mathbf{C}$,

$$\dim_\Delta^{(g)}(X) \leq \dim_\Delta^{(g)}(Y)$$

and

$$\dim^{(g)}(X \mid R(\Delta)) \leq \dim^{(g)}(Y \mid R(\Delta)).$$

2. *If Δ and Δ' are resource bounds such that $\Delta \subseteq \Delta'$, then for all $X \subseteq \mathbf{C}$,*

$$\mathrm{dim}_{\Delta'}^{(g)}(X) \leq \mathrm{dim}_{\Delta}^{(g)}(X).$$

3. *For all $X \subseteq \mathbf{C}$, $0 \leq \mathrm{dim}^{(g)}(X \mid R(\Delta)) \leq \mathrm{dim}_{\Delta}^{(g)}(X)$.*

4. *For all $X \subseteq \mathbf{C}$, $\mathrm{dim}^{(g)}(X \mid \mathbf{C}) = \mathrm{dim}_{\mathrm{all}}^{(g)}(X) = \mathrm{dim}^{(g)}(X)$.*

The following lemma relates resource-bounded scaled dimension to resource-bounded measure.

Lemma 3.14. *If g is a Δ-computable scale, then for all $X \subseteq \mathbf{C}$,*

$$\mathrm{dim}_{\Delta}^{(g)}(X) < 1 \Rightarrow \mu_{\Delta}(X) = 0$$

and

$$\mathrm{dim}^{(g)}(X \mid R(\Delta)) < 1 \Rightarrow \mu(X \mid R(\Delta)) = 0.$$

Proof. It suffices to prove the first implication, since the second implication then follows immediately.

Assume that $\mathrm{dim}_{\Delta}^{(g)}(X) < 1$, where g is a Δ-computable scale. Then there exists $s \in (0,1) \cap \mathbb{Q}$ and a Δ-computable $s^{(g)}$-gale d such that $X \subseteq S^{\infty}[d]$. Then the function $d' : \{0,1\}^* \rightarrow [0,\infty)$ defined by

$$d'(w) = 2^{|w|-g(|w|,s)}d(w)$$

is Δ-computable, and Observation 3.11 tells us that d' is a $1^{(g)}$-gale, i.e., a martingale. Since g is a scale and $s < 1$, we have $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty}[m - g(m,s)] = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty}[g(m,1) - g(m,s)] = \infty$, so $X \subseteq S^{\infty}[d] \subseteq S^{\infty}[d']$. Thus $\mu_{\Delta}(X) = 0$. $\square$

An important property of Hausdorff dimension is its *stability* [Fal90], which is the fact that $\mathrm{dim}_H(X \cup Y)$ is always the maximum of $\mathrm{dim}_H(X)$ and $\mathrm{dim}_H(Y)$. We now show that resource-bounded scaled dimensions also have this property.

Lemma 3.15. *For every scale g and all sets $X, Y \subseteq \mathbf{C}$,*

$$\dim_\Delta^{(g)}(X \cup Y) = \max\{\dim_\Delta^{(g)}(X),\ \dim_\Delta^{(g)}(Y)\}$$

and

$$\dim^{(g)}(X \cup Y \mid R(\Delta)) = \max\{\dim^{(g)}(X \mid R(\Delta)),\ \dim^{(g)}(Y \mid R(\Delta))\}.$$

Proof. The second identity follows from the first, so by Observation 3.13 it suffices to show that

$$\dim_\Delta^{(g)}(X \cup Y) \leq \max\{\dim_\Delta^{(g)}(X), \dim_\Delta^{(g)}(Y)\}.$$

Choose an arbitrary $s > \max\{\dim_\Delta^{(g)}(X), \dim_\Delta^{(g)}(Y)\}$ such that s is Δ-computable. There exist $s_1 \leq s$ and Δ-computable $s_1^{(g)}$-gale d_1 such that $X \subseteq S^\infty[d_1]$, and $s_2 \leq s$ and Δ-computable $s_2^{(g)}$-gale d_2 such that $Y \subseteq S^\infty[d_2]$. Since s is Δ-computable, d_X and d_Y are Δ-computable $s^{(g)}$-supergales, and by the proof of Lemma 3.12 $s \in \mathcal{G}_\Delta^{(g)}(X) \cap \mathcal{G}_\Delta^{(g)}(Y)$. So there exist Δ-computable $s^{(g)}$-gales d_X and d_Y such that $X \subseteq S^\infty[d_X]$ and $Y \subseteq S^\infty[d_Y]$. Let $d = d_X + d_Y$. Then d is clearly Δ-computable , and d is an $s^{(g)}$-gale by Observation 3.10. It is clear that $X \cup Y \subseteq S^\infty[d]$, whence $s \in \mathcal{G}_\Delta^{(g)}(X \cup Y)$. It follows that $\dim_\Delta^{(g)}(X \cup Y) \leq s$. Since s is arbitrary here, we have shown that $\dim_\Delta^{(g)}(X \cup Y) \leq \max\{\dim_\Delta^{(g)}(X), \dim_\Delta^{(g)}(Y)\}$. $\qquad\square$

Hausdorff dimension is also *countably stable* [Fal90], which means that the dimension of a countable union of sets is the supremum of the dimensions of the sets. The following definition and lemma show that resource-bounded scaled dimensions are "Δ-stable" in the sense that they are stable relative to countable unions that are "Δ-effective."

Definition. Let g be a scale and let $X, X_0, X_1, X_2, \ldots \subseteq \mathbf{C}$.

1. X is a Δ-*union of the* $\Delta^{(g)}$-*dimensioned sets* $X_0, X_1, X_2, \ldots$ if $X = \bigcup_{k=0}^\infty X_k$ and for each rational $s > \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \dim_\Delta^{(g)}(X_k)$ there is a function $d : \mathbb{N} \times \{0,1\}^* \to [0, \infty)$ with the following properties.

    (i) d is Δ-computable.

(ii) For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, if we write $d_k(w) = d(k, w)$, then the function d_k is an $s^{(g)}$-gale.

(iii) For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $X_k \subseteq S^\infty[d_k]$.

2. X is a Δ-*union of the sets* $X_0, X_1, X_2, \ldots$ $^{(g)}$-*dimensioned in* $R(\Delta)$ if $X = \bigcup_{k=0}^\infty X_k$ and $X \cap R(\Delta)$ is an Δ-union of the $\Delta^{(g)}$-dimensioned sets $X_0 \cap R(\Delta), X_1 \cap R(\Delta), X_2 \cap R(\Delta), \ldots$.

Lemma 3.16. *Let g be a Δ-computable scale, and let $X, X_0, X_1, X_2, \ldots \subseteq \mathbf{C}$.*

1. *If X is a Δ-union of the $\Delta^{(g)}$-dimensioned sets $X_0, X_1, X_2, \ldots$, then*

$$\dim_\Delta^{(g)}(X) = \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \dim_\Delta^{(g)}(X_k).$$

2. *If X is a Δ-union of the sets $X_0, X_1, X_2, \ldots$ $^{(g)}$-dimensioned in $R(\Delta)$, then*

$$\dim^{(g)}(X \mid R(\Delta)) = \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \dim^{(g)}(X_k \mid R(\Delta)).$$

Proof. We assume that g is exactly Δ-computable; the general proof is similar. It suffices to prove 1, since 2 follows immediately from 1. Assume the hypothesis of 1, and let $s > \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \dim_\Delta^{(g)}(X_K)$ be arbitrary with s rational and $s < 2$. By Observation 3.13, it suffices to show that $\dim_\Delta^{(g)}(X) \leq s$.

Since X is a union of the $\Delta^{(g)}$-dimensioned sets $X_0, X_1, X_2, \ldots$, there is a Δ-computable function $d : \mathbb{N} \times \{0, 1\}^* \longrightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that each d_k is an $s^{(g)}$-gale with $X_k \subseteq S^\infty[d_k]$. Without loss of generality (modifying d if necessary), we can assume that each $d_k(w) \leq 1$ for each w with $|w| = a + 1$, $H = (a, \infty)$.

Let $\tilde{d} = \sum_{k=0}^\infty 2^{-k} d_k$. By Observation 3.10, $\tilde{d}$ is an $s^{(g)}$-gale. Since d is Δ-computable, there is a function $\hat{d} : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \times \{0, 1\}^* \longrightarrow \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, \infty)$ such that $\hat{d} \in \Delta$ and for all $r, k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $w \in \{0, 1\}^*$, $|\hat{d}(r, k, w) - d(k, w)| \leq 2^{-r}$. Define

$$\hat{\tilde{d}} : \mathbb{N} \times \{0, 1\}^* \longrightarrow \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, \infty)$$

$$\hat{\tilde{d}}(r, w) = \sum_{k=0}^{r+g(|w|,2)-g(a+1,s)+1} 2^{-k} \hat{d}(r+2, k, w).$$

Then $\hat{\tilde{d}} \in \Delta$ and for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $w \in \{0,1\}^*$,

$$|\hat{\tilde{d}}(r, w) - \tilde{d}(w)| \leq |\tilde{d}(w) - b| + |b - \hat{\tilde{d}}(w)|,$$

where $b = \sum_{k=0}^{r+g(|w|,2)-g(a+1,s)+1} 2^{-k} d_k(w)$. By Corollary 3.9,

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\tilde{d}(w) - b| &= \sum_{k=r+g(|w|,2)-g(a+1,s)+2}^{\infty} 2^{-k} d_k(w) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=r+g(|w|,2)-g(a+1,s)+2}^{\infty} 2^{-k} 2^{\Delta^{|w|-a-1} g(a+1,s)} \\
&\leq \sum_{k=r+g(|w|,2)-g(a+1,s)+2}^{\infty} 2^{g(|w|,s)-k-g(a+1,s)} \\
&= 2^{-(r+1)}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Also,

$$
\begin{aligned}
|b - \hat{\tilde{d}}(w)| &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{r+g(|w|,2)-g(a+1,s)+1} 2^{-k} |\tilde{d}(r+2, k, w) - d(k, w)| \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-(k+r+2)} \\
&= 2^{-(r+1)}.
\end{aligned}
$$

It follows that for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $w \in \{0,1\}^*$,

$$|\hat{\tilde{d}}(r, w) - \tilde{d}(w)| \leq 2^{-r},$$

whence $\hat{\tilde{d}}$ testifies that $\tilde{d}$ is Δ-computable. It is clear that $X = \bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} X_k \subseteq \bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} S^{\infty}[d_k] \subseteq S^{\infty}[\tilde{d}]$, so it follows that $\dim_{\Delta}^{(g)}(X) \leq s$. $\qquad \square$

Definition. Let d be an $s^{(g)}$-gale. The *unitary success set of d* is

$$S^1[d] = \{S \in \mathbf{C} \,|\, (\exists n)d(S[0..n-1]) \geq 1\}.$$

A series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n$ of nonnegative real numbers a_n is Δ-*convergent* if there is a function $m : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that $m \in \Delta$ and

$$\sum_{n=m(i)}^{\infty} a_n \leq 2^{-i}$$

for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Such a function m is called a *modulus* of the convergence. Adding a layer of uniformity, a sequence

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_{j,k} \quad (j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots)$$

of series of nonnegative real numbers is *uniformly Δ-convergent* if there is a function $m : \mathbb{N}^2 \to \mathbb{N}$ such that $m \in \Delta$ and, for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, m_j is a modulus of the convergence of the series $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_{j,k}$.

We now further generalize the Borel-Cantelli lemma as was done for resource-bounded measure [Lut92].

Lemma 3.17. *Let $g : H \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a Δ-computable scale, let $b = \min(H \cap \mathbb{N})$, and let $s \in [0, \infty)$. If $d : \mathbb{N}^2 \times \{0,1\}^* \to [0, \infty)$ is a Δ-computable function such that for each $j, k \in \mathbb{N}$ $d_{j,k}$ is an $s^{(g)}$-gale, and such that for each w with $|w| = b$ the series*

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} d_{j,k}(w) \quad (j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots) \tag{3.3}$$

are uniformly Δ-convergent, then

$$\dim_{\Delta}^{(g)} \left(\bigcup_{j=0}^{\infty} \bigcap_{t=0}^{\infty} \bigcup_{k=t}^{\infty} S^1[d_{j,k}] \right) \leq s.$$

Proof. Assume the hypothesis. Fix a function $m : \mathbb{N}^2 \to \mathbb{N}$ testifying that the series (3.3) are uniformly Δ-convergent for all w with $|w| = b$. (The same m can be valid for all w because

there are only finitely many w with $|w| = b$.) Let $\hat{d}$ be a Δ-computation of d.

Without loss of generality, assume that m_j is nondecreasing and $m_j(n) \geq 2$ for all $j, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Define

$$S_{j,t} = \bigcup_{k=t}^{\infty} S^1[d_{j,k}],$$

$$S_j = \bigcap_{t=0}^{\infty} S_{j,t}, \text{ and}$$

$$S = \bigcup_{j=0}^{\infty} S_j.$$

Our task is to prove that $\dim_{\Delta}^{(g)}(S) \leq s$.

Let $\epsilon > 0$. Define $d' : \mathbb{N} \times \{0,1\}^* \to [0, \infty)$ by

$$d'_j(w) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} d_{j,k}(w) \cdot 2^{g(|w|,s+\epsilon)-g(|w|,s)}$$

for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $w \in \{0,1\}^*$ with $|w| \in H$. For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, d'_j is an $(s+\epsilon)^{(g)}$-gale by Observations 3.10 and 3.11. We will use the Δ-union Lemma (3.16) to show that d' testifies that $\dim_{\Delta}^{(g)}(S) \leq s + \epsilon$.

To see that each $S_j \subseteq S^{\infty}[d'_j]$, let $A \in S_j$. For each $t \in \mathbb{N}$, $A \in \cap_{t=0}^{\infty} S_{j,t}$, so there exists a $k_t \geq m_j(t)$ and $l_t \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d_{j,k_t}(x[0..l_t - 1]) \geq 1$. Then

$$d'_j(A[0..l_t - 1]) \geq 2^{g(l_t,s+\epsilon)-g(l_t,s)} d_{j,k_t}(A[0..l_t - 1])$$

$$\geq 2^{g(l_t,s+\epsilon)-g(l_t,s)}.$$

By Corollary 3.9, $d_{j,k_t}(A[0..l_t - 1]) \leq 2^{-t} 2^{g(l_t,s)-g(b,s)}$, so $g(l_t, s) \geq t + g(b, s)$ and l_t is unbounded. By the definition of scale, $2^{g(l_t,s+\epsilon)-g(l_t,s)}$ is unbounded as t goes to infinity, so $A \in S^{\infty}[d'_j]$. "

To complete the proof, we need to show that d' is Δ-computable. For each $j, r \in \mathbb{N}$ we

define

$$\hat{d}'_{j,r}(w) = \sum_{k=0}^{m_j(r+1-g(|w|,s+\epsilon)-g(b,s))} \hat{d}_{j,k,r+k+2+g(|w|,s+\epsilon)-g(b,s)}(w) \cdot 2^{g(|w|,s+\epsilon)-g(|w|,s)}.$$

Then $\hat{d}' \in \Delta$ and for each $j, r \in \mathbb{N}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
|d'_j(w) - \hat{d}'_{j,r}(w)| &= 2^{g(|w|,s+\epsilon)-g(|w|,s)} \left(\sum_{k=m_j(r+1-g(|w|,s+\epsilon)-g(b,s))+1}^{\infty} d_{j,k}(w) \right. \\
&\quad + \left| \sum_{k=0}^{m_j(r+1-g(|w|,s+\epsilon)-g(b,s))} d_{j,k}(w) - \hat{d}_{j,k,r+k+2+g(|w|,s+\epsilon)-g(|w|,s)} \right| \Bigg) \\
&\le 2^{-(r+1)} + \sum_{k=0}^{m_j(r+1-g(|w|,s+\epsilon)-g(b,s))} 2^{-(r+k+2)} \\
&\le 2^{-(r+1)} + 2^{-(r+1)} = 2^{-r}.
\end{aligned}
$$

$\square$

We now show that singleton subsets of $R(\Delta)$ have scaled dimension 0 in $R(\Delta)$.

Lemma 3.18. *If g is a Δ-computable scale, then for all $A \in R(\Delta)$,*

$$\dim^{(g)}(\{A\} \mid R(\Delta)) = \dim^{(g)}_{\Delta}(\{A\}) = 0.$$

Proof. Assume the hypothesis, with $g : H \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, and let $s > 0$ be rational. Let $m = \min(H \cap \mathbb{N})$, and define

$$d : \{0,1\}^* \longrightarrow [0, \infty)$$

$$d(w) = \begin{cases} 2^{g(m,s)} & \text{if } w \sqsubseteq A \text{ and } |w| < m \\ 2^{g(|w|,s)} & \text{if } w \sqsubseteq A \text{ and } |w| \ge m \\ 0 & \text{if } w \not\sqsubseteq A . \end{cases}$$

The hypothesis implies that d is Δ-computable, and it is easily checked that d is an $s^{(g)}$-gale. It is clear that $A \in S^{\infty}[d]$, whence d testifies that $\dim^{(g)}_{\Delta}(\{A\}) \le s$. Since s is arbitrary here,

it follows that $\dim_\Delta^{(g)}(\{A\}) = 0$. $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad$ $\square$

Lemmas 3.15 and 3.18 immediately give the following.

Corollary 3.19. *If g is a Δ-computable scale, then for all finite sets $X \subseteq R(\Delta)$,*

$$\dim^{(g)}(X \mid R(\Delta)) = \dim_\Delta^{(g)}(X) = 0.$$

In fact, Lemma 3.18 can be combined with Δ-stability (Lemma 3.16) to show that all "Δ-countable" subsets of $R(\Delta)$ have scaled dimension 0 in $R(\Delta)$. This implies, for example, that for all pspace-computable scales g and all constants $c \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\dim^{(g)}(\mathrm{DSPACE}(2^{cn}) \mid \mathrm{ESPACE}) = 0.$$

In contrast, even if $R(\Delta)$ is countable, $R(\Delta)$ does not have scaled dimension 0 in $R(\Delta)$. In fact we have the following.

Theorem 3.20. *If g is a Δ-computable scale, then*

$$\dim^{(g)}(R(\Delta) \mid R(\Delta)) = \dim_\Delta^{(g)}(R(\Delta)) = \dim_\Delta^{(g)}(\mathbf{C}) = 1$$

Proof. Let $g : H \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be Δ-computable. It is clear that

$$\dim^{(g)}(R(\Delta) \mid R(\Delta)) = \dim_\Delta^{(g)}(R(\Delta)) \le \dim_\Delta^{(g)}(\mathbf{C}),$$

so it suffices to prove that $\dim^{(g)}(R(\Delta) \mid R(\Delta)) \ge 1$ and $\dim_\Delta^{(g)}(\mathbf{C}) \le 1$.

By the Measure Conservation Theorem [Lut92], $\mu(R(\Delta) \mid R(\Delta)) = 1$, so by Lemma 3.14, $\dim^{(g)}(R(\Delta) \mid R(\Delta)) \ge 1$.

Let $s > 1$ be rational, and define

$$d : \{0,1\}^* \longrightarrow [0, \infty)$$

$$d(w) = \begin{cases} 2^{g(m_0,s)-m_0} & \text{if } |w| < m_0 \\ 2^{g(|w|,s)-|w|} & \text{if } |w| \geq m_0, \end{cases}$$

where $m_0 = \min(H \cap \mathbb{N})$. Then d is a Δ-computable $s^{(g)}$-gale and $\lim_{m \to \infty} [g(m,s) - m] = \lim_{m \to \infty} [g(m,s) - g(m,1)] = \infty$ (because g is a scale), so $\mathbf{C} \subseteq S^\infty[d]$. Thus $\dim_\Delta^{(g)}(\mathbf{C}) \leq s$. Since $s > 1$ is arbitrary, this implies that $\dim_\Delta^{(g)}(\mathbf{C}) \leq 1$. $\qquad\square$

We now define a particular family of scales that will be useful for studying the fractal structures of classes that arise naturally in computational complexity.

Definition.   1. For each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, define a_i by the recurrence $a_0 = -\infty, a_{i+1} = 2^{a_i}$.

2. For each $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, define the ith-*order scale* $g_i : (a_{|i|}, \infty) \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ by the following recursion.

   (a) $g_0(m, s) = sm$.

   (b) For $i \geq 0$, $g_{i+1} = g_i^{\#}$.

   (c) For $i < 0$, $g_i = g_{-i}^R$.

Note that each g_i is a scale by Lemmas 3.3 and 3.5. It is easy to see that each g_i is Δ-computable.

Definition. Let $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $X \subseteq \mathbf{C}$.

1. The ith-*order dimension of* X is $\dim^{(i)}(X) = \dim^{(g_i)}(X)$.

2. The ith-*order* Δ-*dimension of* X is $\dim_\Delta^{(i)}(X) = \dim_\Delta^{(g_i)}(X)$.

3. The ith-*order dimension of* X *in* $R(\Delta)$ is $\dim^{(i)}(X \mid R(\Delta)) = \dim^{(g_i)}(X \mid R(\Delta))$.

In the spirit of the above definition, $s^{(g_i)}$-gales are now called $s^{(i)}$-gales, etc.

Intuitively, if $i < j$, then it is harder to succeed with an $s^{(j)}$-gale than with an $s^{(i)}$-gale, so $\dim^{(i)}(X) \leq \dim^{(j)}(X)$. We conclude this chapter by showing that even more is true.

Theorem 3.21. *Let* $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ *and* $X \subseteq \mathbf{C}$. *If* $\dim_\Delta^{(i+1)}(X) < 1$, *then* $\dim_\Delta^{(i)}(X) = 0$.

Proof. It can be proven by induction that for every $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, for arbitrary $s, \tilde{s} < 1$, $\Delta g_{i+1}(m, s) = o(\Delta g_i(m, \tilde{s}))$.

Assume the hypothesis. There exist an $s < 1$ and a Δ-computable $s^{(i+1)}$-gale d such that $X \subseteq S^\infty[d]$. Take an arbitrary $\tilde{s} > 0$, since $\Delta g_{i+1}(m, s) = o(\Delta g_i(m, \tilde{s}))$, by changing only finitely many values we can transform d into an $\tilde{s}^{(i)}$-supergale $\tilde{d}$ with $S^\infty[d] = S^\infty[\tilde{d}]$. It follows that $\dim_\Delta^{(i)}(X) \leq \tilde{s}$. Since $\tilde{s}$ was arbitrary, $\dim_\Delta^{(i)}(X) = 0$. $\qquad\square$

This theorem tells us that for every set $X \subseteq \mathbf{C}$, the sequence of dimensions $\dim_\Delta^{(i)}(X)$ for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfies exactly one of the following three conditions.

(i) $\dim_\Delta^{(i)}(X) = 0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$.

(ii) $\dim_\Delta^{(i)}(X) = 1$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$.

(iii) There exist $i^* \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\dim_\Delta^{(i)}(X) = 0$ for all $i < i^*$ and $\dim_\Delta^{(i)}(X) = 1$ for all $i > i^*$.

Intuitively, if condition (iii) holds and $0 < \dim_\Delta^{(i^*)}(X) < 1$, then i^* is the "best" order at which to measure the Δ-dimension of X because $\dim_\Delta^{(i^*)}(X)$ provides more quantitative information about X than is provided by $\dim_\Delta^{(i)}(X)$ for $i \neq i^*$. Chapter 4 provides some concrete examples of this phenomenon.

4 NONUNIFORM COMPLEXITY

In this chapter we examine the scaled dimension of several nonuniform complexity classes in the complexity class ESPACE.

The *circuit-size complexity* of a language $A \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ is the function $\mathrm{CS}_A : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, where $\mathrm{CS}_A(n)$ is the number of gates in the smallest n-input Boolean circuit that decides $A \cap \{0,1\}^n$. For each function $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, we define the circuit-size complexity classes

$$\mathrm{SIZE}(f) = \{A \in \mathbf{C} \mid (\forall^\infty n)\mathrm{CS}_A(n) \le f(n)\}$$

and

$$\mathrm{SIZE}_{\mathrm{i.o.}}(f) = \{A \in \mathbf{C} \mid (\exists^\infty n)\mathrm{CS}_A(n) \le f(n)\}.$$

Given a machine M, a resource-bound $t : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, a language $L \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$, and a natural number n, the *t-space-bounded Kolmogorov complexity* of $L_{=n}$ relative to M is

$$\mathrm{KS}_M^t(L_{=n}) = \min\left\{|\pi| \,\Big|\, M(\pi, n) = \chi_{L_{=n}} \text{ in } \le t(2^n) \text{ space}\right\},$$

i.e., the length of the shortest program π such that M, on input (π, n), outputs the characteristic string of $L_{=n}$ and halts without using more than $t(2^n)$ workspace. Similarly the *t-time-bounded Kolmogorov complexity* of $L_{=n}$ relative to M is

$$\mathrm{KT}_M^t(L_{=n}) = \min\left\{|\pi| \,\Big|\, M(\pi, n) = \chi_{L_{=n}} \text{ in } \le t(2^n) \text{ time}\right\},$$

Well-known simulation techniques show that there exists a machine U which is *optimal* in

the sense that for each machine M there is a constant c such that for all t, L and n we have

$$\mathrm{KS}_U^{ct+c}(L_{=n}) \leq \mathrm{KS}_M^t(L_{=n}) + c$$

and

$$\mathrm{KT}_U^{ct\log t+c}(L_{=n}) \leq \mathrm{KT}_M^t(L_{=n}) + c.$$

For each resource bound $t : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ and function $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ we define the following complexity classes.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{KS}^t(f) &= \{L \in \mathbf{C} | (\forall^\infty n) \mathrm{KS}^t(L_{=n}) < f(n)\} \\
\mathrm{KT}^t(f) &= \{L \in \mathbf{C} | (\forall^\infty n) \mathrm{KT}^t(L_{=n}) < f(n)\} \\
\mathrm{KS}_{\text{i.o.}}^t(f) &= \{L \in \mathbf{C} | (\exists^\infty n) \mathrm{KS}^t(L_{=n}) < f(n)\} \\
\mathrm{KT}_{\text{i.o.}}^t(f) &= \{L \in \mathbf{C} | (\exists^\infty n) \mathrm{KT}^t(L_{=n}) < f(n)\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Our first lemma provides inclusion relationships between some SIZE and KS classes defined using the scales.

Lemma 4.1. *There exists a constant $c_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $i > 0$, $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, and $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$\mathrm{SIZE}(g_i(2^n, \alpha)) \subseteq \mathrm{KS}^{c_0 n + c_0}(g_i(2^n, \alpha + \epsilon)).$$

Proof. It was shown in [Lut92] that there exists a polynomial q_0 and a constant d such that for all $A \subseteq \{0, 1\}^*$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathrm{KS}^{q_0}(A_{=n}) < f_A(n)(d + \log f_A(n)),$$

where $f_A(n) = \max\{\mathrm{CS}_A(n), n\}$. From that proof it is easy to see that q_0 may be taken as $c_0 n + c_0$ for some $c_0 \in \mathbb{N}$. Also, for $i > 0$,

$$g_i(2^n, \alpha)(d + \log g_i(2^n, \alpha)) = o(g_i(2^n, \alpha + \epsilon)).$$

The lemma follows using these facts. □

The next two lemmas present positive-order dimension lower bounds for some SIZE classes.

Lemma 4.2. *For all $i \geq 1$ and $\alpha \in (0,1]$, for all sufficiently large n there are at least $2^{g_i(2^n,\alpha)}$ different sets $B \subseteq \{0,1\}^n$ that are decided by Boolean circuits of fewer than $g_i(2^n,\alpha)$ gates.*

Proof. Let $m(n) = \lceil \log g_i(2^n,\alpha) \rceil$. For n large enough, $m(n) < n$. Then there are $2^{2^{m(n)}} \geq 2^{g_i(2^n,\alpha)}$ different sets $C \subseteq \{0,1\}^{m(n)}$. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. For all sufficiently large n, Lupanov [Lup58] has shown that each of these sets is decided by a circuit of at most $\frac{2^{m(n)}}{m(n)}(1+\varepsilon)$ gates. Now for sufficiently large n,

$$\frac{2^{m(n)}}{m(n)}(1+\varepsilon) \leq \frac{2g_i(2^n,\alpha)}{\log(g_i(2^n,\alpha))}(1+\varepsilon) < g_i(2^n,\alpha).$$

Thus, for each $C \subseteq \{0,1\}^{m(n)}$, if we let $B_C = \{w0^{n-m(n)} \mid w \in C\}$, then B_C is decided by a Boolean circuit of fewer than $g_i(2^n,\alpha)$ gates. □

Lemma 4.3. *For every $i \geq 1$, for every real $\alpha \in [0,1]$,*

$$\dim^{(i)}(\mathrm{SIZE}(g_i(2^n,\alpha))|\mathrm{ESPACE}) \geq \alpha.$$

Proof. This is clear if $\alpha = 0$, so assume that $\alpha \in (0,1]$. Let $s, \alpha' \in Q$ such that $0 < s < \alpha' < \alpha$, and let d be a pspace-computable $s^{(i)}$-gale. It suffices to show that $\mathrm{SIZE}(g_i(2^n,\alpha)) \cap \mathrm{ESPACE} \nsubseteq S^\infty[d]$.

By Lemma 4.2, there is an N_1 such that for all $n \geq N_1$, there are at least $2^{g_i(2^n,\alpha')}$ different sets $B \subseteq \{0,1\}^n$ that are decided by Boolean circuits of fewer than $g_i(2^n,\alpha')$ gates. By Corollary 3.8, for all w such that $|w| = 2^n - 1$, there are fewer than $2^{g_i(2^n,\alpha')}$ sets $B \subseteq \{0,1\}^n$ such that $d(wu) > 2^{-g_i(2^n,\alpha')}2^{\Delta^{2^n}g_i(|w|,s)}d(w)$, where u is the characteristic string of B. Let N_2 be such that $\Delta^{2^n}g_i(2^n-1,s) - g_i(2^n,\alpha') < 0$ for all $n \geq N_2$.

We now define a language A inductively by lengths. Let $N = \max(N_1, N_2)$. We start with $A_{<N} = \emptyset$. Let $n \geq N$ and assume that $A_{<n}$ has been defined by characteristic string w. Let

u be the lexicographically first string of length 2^n such that $d(wu) < d(w)$ and the set with characteristic string u can be decided by a circuit of less than $g_i(2^n, \alpha')$ gates. By the previous paragraph, A is well-defined and $A \notin S^\infty[d]$. Since d is pspace-computable, $A \in$ ESPACE, and by definition, $A \in \mathrm{SIZE}(g_i(2^n, \alpha')) \subseteq \mathrm{SIZE}(g_i(2^n, \alpha))$. $\qquad\square$

We now give positive-order scaled dimension upper bounds for some KS classes defined using the scales.

Lemma 4.4. *For all $i \geq 0$, for any polynomial q, and any $\alpha \in [0,1]$,*

$$\dim_{\mathrm{pspace}}^{(i)}(\mathrm{KS}^q(g_i(2^n, \alpha))) \leq \alpha.$$

Proof. Let q be a polynomial, let $\alpha \in (0,1]$, and let $s > \alpha$ be rational. Define $d : \mathbb{N} \times \{0,1\}^* \longrightarrow [0, \infty)$ inductively as follows. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $2^k \geq a_i + 2$,

(i) For $w \in \{0,1\}^*$ with $|w| \leq a_i + 1$, let $d_k(w) = 1$.

(ii) For $w \in \{0,1\}^*$ with $a_i + 1 \leq |w| < 2^k - 1$, $b \in \{0,1\}$, let $d_k(wb) = 2^{\Delta g_i(|w|,s)-1}d_k(w)$.

(iii) Assume that $d_k(w)$ has been defined, where $|w| = 2^n - 1$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq k$. For each u with $0 < |u| \leq 2^n$, define $d_k(wu) = 2^{\Delta^{|u|}g_i(|w|,s)}\rho(u)d_k(w)$, where

$$\rho(u) = \frac{\left|\left\{\pi \,\middle|\, |\pi| < g_i(2^n, \alpha) \wedge u \sqsubseteq U(\pi, n) \text{ in } \leq q(2^n) \text{ space}\right\}\right|}{2^{g_i(2^n, \alpha)} - 1}.$$

It is easy to check that d is exactly pspace-computable and that for each k, d_k is an $s^{(i)}$-gale. The definition of d_k implies that if $|w| = 2^n - 1$ and u is the characteristic string of a set $B \subseteq \{0,1\}^n$ with $\mathrm{KS}^q(B_{=n}) < g_i(2^n, \alpha)$, then for sufficiently large n,

$$
\begin{aligned}
d_k(wu) &\geq 2^{\Delta^{2^n}g_i(|w|,s)}\frac{1}{2^{g_i(2^n,\alpha)} - 1}d_k(w) \\
&\geq 2^{\Delta^{2^n}g_i(|w|,s)-g_i(2^n,\alpha)}d_k(w) \\
&= 2^{g_i(2^{n+1}-1,s)-g_i(2^n-1,s)-g_i(2^n,\alpha)}d_k(w)
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $s > \alpha$,

$$g_i(m, \alpha) = o(g_i(2m - 1, s) - g_i(m - 1, s))$$

then for n large enough, $d_k(wu) \geq 2d_k(w)$. This implies that if

$$Y_k = \{L \in \mathbf{C} \mid (\forall n \geq k)\mathrm{KS}^q(L_{=n}) < g_i(2^n, \alpha)\},$$

$Y_k \subseteq S^\infty[d_k]$. Therefore d witnesses that $\mathrm{KS}^q(g_i(2^n, \alpha))$ is a pspace-union of the pspace$^{(i)}$-dimensioned sets $Y_0, Y_1, \ldots$. Lemma 3.16 then yields

$$\dim^{(i)}_{\mathrm{pspace}}(\mathrm{KS}^q(g_i(2^n, \alpha))) \leq \alpha.$$

$\square$

Now we are able to present exact scaled-dimension results for circuit-size complexity classes defined in terms of the positive scales. Note that in each case, we have obtained the "best" order at which to measure the dimension of the class.

Theorem 4.5. *Let $i \geq 1$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Then*

$$\dim^{(i)}(\mathrm{SIZE}(g_i(2^n, \alpha))|\mathrm{ESPACE}) = \alpha.$$

In particular,

$$\dim^{(1)}(\mathrm{SIZE}(2^{\alpha n})|\mathrm{ESPACE}) = \alpha$$

and

$$\dim^{(2)}(\mathrm{SIZE}(2^{n^\alpha})|\mathrm{ESPACE}) = \alpha.$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.1 we have $\mathrm{SIZE}(g_i(2^n, \alpha)) \subseteq \mathrm{KS}^{c_0 n + c_0}(2^n, \alpha + \epsilon)$ for all $\epsilon > 0$. The theorem then follows from Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4. $\square$

At this point, we could use Lemmas 4.1 and 4.3 to give scaled dimension lower bounds for some KS classes defined using the positive scales. Also, proving an analogue of Lemma 4.1

for KT complexity will yield scaled dimension lower bounds for similar KT classes. However, taking a direct approach to these lower bounds yields slightly stronger results for KT complexity. In the next lemma we do this, and we also obtain scaled dimension lower bounds for all orders (not just the positive ones) at the same time.

Lemma 4.6. *There exist constants $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\alpha \in [0,1]$,*

$$\dim^{(i)}(\mathrm{KT}^{c_1 n \log n + c_1}(g_i(2^n, \alpha))|\mathrm{ESPACE}) \geq \alpha$$

and

$$\dim^{(i)}(\mathrm{KS}^{c_2 n + c_2}(g_i(2^n, \alpha))|\mathrm{ESPACE}) \geq \alpha.$$

Proof. Let $s < \alpha$ be rational. Define $m(n) = \lceil g_i(2^n, s) \rceil$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For each $x \in \{0,1\}^{m(n)}$, let $B_x \subseteq \{0,1\}^n$ be the set with characteristic string $x0^{2^n - m(n)}$. Let M be a machine that on input (x,n) outputs $x0^{2^n - |x|}$. Then there are constants c and d such that for all $x \in \{0,1\}^{m(n)}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{KT}_U^{c(dn)\log(dn)+c}(B_x) &\leq \mathrm{KT}_M^{dn}(B_x) + c \\
&\leq m(n) + c \\
&= \lceil g_i(2^n, s) \rceil + c.
\end{aligned}
$$

We let c_1 be such that $cdn\log(dn) + c \leq c_1 n \log n + c_1$ for all n. For all sufficiently large n, $g_i(2^n, s) + c_1$ is bounded by $g_i(2^n, \alpha)$ since $s < \alpha$. Similarly, we obtain

$$\mathrm{KS}_U^{c_2 n + c_2}(B_x) \leq g_i(2^n, \alpha)$$

for all $x \in \{0,1\}^{m(n)}$.

Let d be a pspace-computable $s^{(i)}$-gale. By Corollary 3.8, for all w with $|w| = 2^n - 1$, there are fewer than $2^{g_i(2^n,s)}$ strings $u \in \{0,1\}^{2^n}$ such that $d(wu) > 2^{-g_i(2^n,s)}2^{\Delta^{2^n} g_i(|w|,s)}d(w)$. For all sufficiently large n, we have constructed at least $2^{g_i(2^n,s)}$ sets $B \subseteq \{0,1\}^n$ with

$\mathrm{KT}^{c_1 n \log n + c_1}(B) \le g_i(2^n, \alpha)$. As in the proof of Lemma 4.3, we can define a language

$$A \in [\mathrm{KT}^{c_1 n \log n + c_1}(g_i(2^n, \alpha)) \cap \mathrm{ESPACE}] - S^\infty[d].$$

Analagously, we also obtain

$$\mathrm{KS}^{c_2 n + c_2}(g_i(2^n, \alpha)) \cap \mathrm{ESPACE} \not\subseteq S^\infty[d].$$

$\square$

Now we can state exact scaled dimensions results for some KS and KT classes in the 0th- and positive-order scales.

Theorem 4.7. *Let $i \ge 0$, $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, and $t : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ be a polynomially-bounded function. Let c_1 and c_2 be as in Lemma 4.6. If $t(n) \ge c_1 n \log n + c_1$ almost everywhere, then*

$$\dim^{(i)}(\mathrm{KT}^t(g_i(2^n, \alpha))|\mathrm{ESPACE}) = \alpha,$$

and if $t(n) \ge c_2 n + c_2$ almost everywhere, then

$$\dim^{(i)}(\mathrm{KS}^t(g_i(2^n, \alpha))|\mathrm{ESPACE}) = \alpha.$$

In particular, for any polynomial $q(n) \ge n^2$,

$$\dim^{(1)}(\mathrm{KT}^q(2^{\alpha n})|\mathrm{ESPACE}) = \dim^{(1)}(\mathrm{KS}^q(2^{\alpha n})|\mathrm{ESPACE}) = \alpha,$$

and

$$\dim^{(2)}(\mathrm{KT}^q(2^{n^\alpha})|\mathrm{ESPACE}) = \dim^{(2)}(\mathrm{KS}^q(2^{n^\alpha})|\mathrm{ESPACE}) = \alpha.$$

Proof. This follows immediately from Lemmas 4.4 and 4.6. $\square$

Now we give an upper bound on the scaled dimension of some KS classes for the negative

scales. In the negative orders, we are able to work with classes of the infinitely-often type.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $i \leq -1$, q be a polynomial, and $\alpha \in [0,1]$. Then*

$$\dim_{\text{pspace}}^{(i)}(\text{KS}_{\text{i.o.}}^q(g_i(2^n, \alpha))) \leq \alpha.$$

Proof. Let q be a polynomial, let $\alpha \in (0,1)$, and let $1 > s > \alpha$ be rational. Define for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ a function $d_n : \{0,1\}^* \longrightarrow [0,\infty)$ inductively as follows. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $2^n \geq a_{|i|} + 2$,

(i) For $w \in \{0,1\}^*$ with $|w| \leq a_{|i|} + 1$, let $d_n(w) = 2^{-g_{|i|}(2^n, 1-s)}$.

(ii) For $w \in \{0,1\}^*$ with $a_{|i|} + 1 \leq |w| < 2^n - 1$, $b \in \{0,1\}$, let $d_n(wb) = 2^{\Delta g_i(|w|,s)-1}d_n(w)$.

(iii) Assume that $d_n(w)$ has been defined, where $|w| = 2^n - 1$. For each u with $0 < |u| \leq 2^n$, define $d_n(wu) = 2^{\Delta^{|u|}g_i(|w|,s)}\rho(u)d_n(w)$, where

$$\rho(u) = \frac{\left|\left\{\pi \,\middle|\, |\pi| < g_i(2^n, \alpha) \wedge u \sqsubseteq U(\pi, n) \text{ in} \leq q(2^n) \text{ space}\right\}\right|}{2^{g_i(2^n,\alpha)} - 1}.$$

(iv) For $w \in \{0,1\}^*$ with $|w| \geq 2^{n+1} - 1$, $b \in \{0,1\}$, let $d_n(wb) = 2^{\Delta g_i(|w|,s)-1}d_n(w)$

It is easy to check that for each n, d_n is an exactly pspace-computable $s^{(i)}$-gale. The definition of d_n implies that if $|w| = 2^n - 1$ and u is the characteristic string of a set $B \subseteq \{0,1\}^n$ with $\text{KS}^q(B_{=n}) < g_i(2^n, \alpha)$, then for sufficiently large n,

$$
\begin{aligned}
d_n(wu) &\geq 2^{\Delta^{2^n}g_i(|w|,s)}\frac{1}{2^{g_i(2^n,\alpha)} - 1}d_n(w) \\
&\geq 2^{\Delta^{2^n}g_i(|w|,s)-g_i(2^n,\alpha)}d_n(w) \\
&= 2^{\Delta^{2^n}g_i(|w|,s)-g_i(2^n,\alpha)}2^{\Delta^{|w|-a_{|i|}-1}g_i(a_{|i|}+1,s)-|w|+a_{|i|}+1-g_{|i|}(2^n,1-s)} \\
&= 2^{g_i(2^{n+1}-1,s)-g_i(a_{|i|}+1,s)-g_i(2^n,\alpha)-|w|+a_{|i|}+1-g_{|i|}(2^n,1-s)} \\
&= 2^{g_{|i|}(2^n,1-\alpha)-g_{|i|}(2^{n+1}-1,1-s)-g_{|i|}(2^n,1-s)+g_{|i|}(a_{|i|}+1,1-s)}
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $s > \alpha$,

$$g_{|i|}(2m-1, 1-s) + g_{|i|}(m, 1-s) = o(g_{|i|}(m, 1-\alpha)).$$

Then for n large enough, $d_n(wu) \geq 1$. This implies that if

$$Y_n = \{L \in \mathbf{C} | \mathrm{KS}^q(L_{=n}) < g_i(2^n, \alpha)\},$$

then $Y_n \subseteq S^1[d_n]$. Since for each w with $|w| = a_{|i|} + 1, \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} d_n(w)$ is pspace-convergent, by Lemma 3.17 it holds that $\dim_{\mathrm{pspace}}^{(i)}(\mathrm{KS}_{\mathrm{i.o}}^q(2^{g_i(2^n, \alpha)})) \leq \alpha$. $\qquad \square$

Our final theorem is an exact scaled dimension result analagous to Theorem 4.7 for the negative scales. Here the dimension is invariant if we change the type of the class from almost-everywhere to infinitely-often.

Theorem 4.9. *Let $i \leq -1$, $\alpha \in [0,1]$, and $t : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ be a polynomially-bounded function. Let c_1 and c_2 be as in Lemma 4.6. If $t(n) \geq c_1 n \log n + c_1$ almost everywhere, then*

$$\dim^{(i)}(\mathrm{KT}^t(g_i(2^n, \alpha)) | \mathrm{ESPACE}) = \dim^{(i)}(\mathrm{KT}_{\mathrm{i.o.}}^t(g_i(2^n, \alpha)) | \mathrm{ESPACE}) = \alpha,$$

and if $t(n) \geq c_2 n + c_2$ almost everywhere,

$$\dim^{(i)}(\mathrm{KS}^t(g_i(2^n, \alpha)) | \mathrm{ESPACE}) = \dim^{(i)}(\mathrm{KS}_{\mathrm{i.o.}}^t(g_i(2^n, \alpha)) | \mathrm{ESPACE}) = \alpha.$$

In particular, for any polynomial $q(n) \geq n^2$,

$$\dim^{(-1)}(\mathrm{KT}^q(2^n(1 - 2^{-\alpha n})) | \mathrm{ESPACE}) = \dim^{(-1)}(\mathrm{KS}^q(2^n(1 - 2^{-\alpha n})) | \mathrm{ESPACE}) = \alpha.$$

Proof. This follows from Lemmas 4.6 and 4.8. $\qquad \square$

5   APPROXIMATION OF MAX3SAT

In this chapter prove an inapproximability result for the MAX3SAT problem under a hypothesis on the p-dimension of NP. We will restrict our attention polynomial-time measure and polynomial-time 0th-order dimension. For clarity we now recall the definitions of p-measure and p-dimension.

Definition. Let $s \in [0, \infty)$.

1. A function $d : \{0,1\}^* \to [0, \infty)$ is an *s-gale* if for all $w \in \{0,1\}^*$,

$$d(w) = \frac{d(w0) + d(w1)}{2^s}.$$

2. A *martingale* is a 1-gale.

Definition. Let $s \in [0, \infty)$ and let d be an s-gale.

1. We say *d succeeds on* a language A if

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} d(A[0..n-1]) = \infty.$$

2. The *success set* of d is

$$S^\infty[d] = \{A \subseteq \{0,1\}^* | d \text{ succeeds on } A\}.$$

Definition. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a class of languages.

1. $\mathcal{C}$ has p-measure 0, written $\mu_{\text{p}}(\mathcal{C}) = 0$, if there exists a polynomial-time martingale d with $\mathcal{C} \subseteq S^\infty[d]$.

2. The p-dimension of $\mathcal{C}$ is

$$\dim_{\mathrm{p}}(\mathcal{C}) = \inf \left\{ s \,\middle|\, \begin{array}{l} \text{there exists a polynomial-time} \\ s\text{-gale } d \text{ for which } \mathcal{C} \subseteq S^{\infty}[d] \end{array} \right\}.$$

For any class $\mathcal{C}$, $\dim_{\mathrm{p}}(\mathcal{C}) \in [0,1]$. In this chapter we will use hypotheses on the p-dimension and p-measure of NP. The following implications are easy to verify.

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\mathrm{p}}(\mathrm{NP}) \neq 0 \;\Rightarrow\;& \dim_{\mathrm{p}}(\mathrm{NP}) = 1 \\ \Rightarrow\;& \dim_{\mathrm{p}}(\mathrm{NP}) > 0 \\ \Rightarrow\;& \mathrm{P} \neq \mathrm{NP}. \end{aligned}$$

We begin with the following simple but useful measure and dimension invariance result.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a class of languages and $c \in \mathbb{N}$.*

(1) *If $\mu_{\mathrm{p}}(\mathcal{C}) = 0$, then $\mu_{\mathrm{p}}(\mathcal{C} \uplus \mathrm{DTIME}(2^{cn})) = 0$.*

(2) $\dim_{\mathrm{p}}(\mathcal{C} \uplus \mathrm{DTIME}(2^{cn})) = \dim_{\mathrm{p}}(\mathcal{C})$.

Proof. Let $s \in [0,1]$ be rational and assume that there is a polynomial-time s-gale d succeeding on $\mathcal{C}$. It suffices to give a polynomial-time s-gale succeeding on $\mathcal{C} \uplus \mathrm{DTIME}(2^{cn})$. Let $M_0, M_1, \ldots$ be a standard enumeration of all Turing machines running in time 2^{cn}. Define for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $w \in \{0,1\}^*$,

$$d_i(w1) = \begin{cases} 2^s d_i(w) & \text{if } M_i \text{ accepts } s_{|w|} \\ \frac{d(w1)}{d(w)} d_i(w) & \text{if } d(w) \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$d_i(w0) = 2^s d_i(w) - d_i(w1).$$

Let $d' = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} 2^{-i} d_i$. Then d' is a polynomial-time computable s-gale. Let $A \in \mathcal{C}$ and $B = L(M_i) \in \mathrm{DTIME}(2^{cn})$. Then for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $d_i((A \cup B)[0..n-1]) \geq 2^{-i} d(A[0..n-1])$. Because $A \in S^{\infty}[d]$, $A \cup B \in S^{\infty}[d_i] \subseteq S^{\infty}[d']$. $\square$

Dimension of $P_m(DENSE^c)$

Lutz and Mayordomo [LM94] proved that a superclass of $P_m(DENSE^c)$ has p-measure 0, so $\mu_p(P_m(DENSE^c)) = 0$. We now develop a proof of the stronger result that $\dim_p(P_m(DENSE^c)) = 0$. This result will be used in proving the main theorem of this chapter.

We use the binary entropy function $\mathcal{H} : [0, 1] \to [0, 1]$ defined by

$$\mathcal{H}(x) = \begin{cases} -x \log x - (1 - x) \log(1 - x) & \text{if } x \in (0, 1) \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in \{0, 1\}. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 5.2. *For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 \leq k \leq n$,*

$$\binom{n}{k} \leq \frac{n^n}{k^k(n - k)^{(n-k)}} = 2^{\mathcal{H}(\frac{k}{n})n}.$$

Lemma 5.2 appears as an exercise in [CLR90]. The following lemma is also easy to verify.

Lemma 5.3. *For all $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\mathcal{H}(2^{(n^\epsilon - n)})2^n = o(2^{\epsilon n}).$$

We now show that only a p-dimension 0 set of languages are $\leq_m^P$-reducible to non-dense languages.

Theorem 5.4.
$$\dim_p(P_m(DENSE^c)) = 0.$$

Proof. Let $s > 0$ be rational. It suffices to show that $\dim_p(P_m(DENSE^c)) \leq s$.

Let $\{(f_m, \epsilon_m)\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a standard enumeration of all pairs of polynomial-time computable functions $f_m : \{0, 1\}^* \to \{0, 1\}^*$ and rationals $\epsilon_m \in (0, 1)$. Define

$$A_{m,n} = \left\{ u \in \{0, 1\}^{2^{n+1}-1} \; \middle| \; \begin{array}{c} (\forall i, j)(f_m(s_i) = f_m(s_j) \Rightarrow u[i] = u[j]) \\ \text{and } |\{f_m(s_i)|u[i] = 1\}| \leq 2^{n^{\epsilon_m}} \end{array} \right\}.$$

For each $u \in \{0,1\}^{\leq 2^{n+1}-1}$, define the integers

$$\text{collision}_{m,n}(u) = |\{(i,j)|0 \leq i < j < |u|, f_m(s_i) = f_m(s_j), \text{ and } u[i] \neq u[j]\}|,$$

$$\text{committed}_{m,n}(u) = |\{f_m(s_i)|0 \leq i < |u| \text{ and } u[i] = 1\}|, \text{ and}$$

$$\text{free}_{m,n}(u) = \left|\{f_m(s_i)||u| \leq i < 2^{n+1}-1\} - \{f_m(s_i)|0 \leq i < |u|\}\right|.$$

Then there are

$$\text{count}_{m,n}(u) = \begin{cases} \displaystyle\sum_{i=0}^{2^{n^{\epsilon m}} - \text{committed}_{m,n}(u)} \binom{\text{free}_{m,n}(u)}{i} & \text{if } \text{collision}_{m,n}(u) = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

strings v for which $uv \in A_{m,n}$.

Define for each $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ a function $d_{m,n} : \{0,1\}^* \to [0,\infty)$ by

$$d_{m,n}(u) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{\text{count}_{m,n}(u)2^{s|u|}}{|A_{m,n}|} & \text{if } |u| \leq 2^{n+1}-1 \\ 2^{(s-1)(|u|-2^{n+1}+1)}d(u[0..2^{n+1}-2]) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then each $d_{m,n}$ is a well-defined s-gale because $\text{count}_{m,n}(u) = \text{count}_{m,n}(u0) + \text{count}_{m,n}(u1)$ for all u. Define a polynomial-time computable s-gale

$$d = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} 2^{-m} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{-n} d_{m,n}.$$

Let $A \leq_m^P D \in \text{DENSE}^c$ by a reduction f running in time n^l. Let ϵ be a positive rational such that for infinitely many n, $|D_{\leq n^l}| < 2^{n^\epsilon}$. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $f_m = f$ and $\epsilon_m = \epsilon$.

Using Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
|A_{m,n}| &= \text{count}_{m,n}(\lambda) \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{2^{n^\epsilon}} \binom{|f(\{0,1\}^{\leq n})|}{i} \\
&\leq (2^{n^\epsilon}+1)\binom{2^{n+1}-1}{2^{n^\epsilon}} \\
&\leq (2^{n^\epsilon}+1)2^{\mathcal{H}(2^{n^\epsilon-n})2^n} \\
&\leq 2^{2^{\epsilon n}} \\
&\leq 2^{s2^n-2n}
\end{aligned}
$$

for all sufficiently large n. Whenever $|D_{\leq n^l}| < 2^{n^\epsilon}$, we have $A[0..2^{n+1}-2] \in A_{m,n}$. Therefore for infinitely many n,

$$
\begin{aligned}
d(A[0..2^{n+1}-2]) &\geq 2^{-(m+n)}d_{m,n}(A[0..2^{n+1}-2]) \\
&= 2^{-(m+n)}\frac{\text{count}_{m,n}(A[0..2^{n+1}-2])2^{s(2^{n+1}-1)}}{|A_{m,n}|} \\
&\geq 2^{-(m+n)}\frac{2^{s(2^{n+1}-1)}}{2^{s2^n-2n}} \\
&\geq 2^{n-m}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore $A \in S^\infty[d]$. This shows that $\text{P}_{\text{m}}(\text{DENSE}^c) \subseteq S^\infty[d]$, from which it follows that $\dim_{\text{p}}(\text{P}_{\text{m}}(\text{DENSE}^c)) = 0$. $\qquad \Box$

An Inapproximability Result

We now present an inapproximability result for the MAX3SAT problem under the hypothesis that NP has positive p-dimension.

Notation. For an instance x of 3SAT we write $\text{MAX3SAT}(x)$ for the maximum fraction of clauses of x that can be satisfied by a single assignment. An *approximation algorithm* $\mathcal{A}$ for MAX3SAT outputs an assignment of the variables for each instance of 3SAT. For each instance x we write $\mathcal{A}(x)$ for the fraction of clauses satisfied by the assignment produced by $\mathcal{A}$ for x. An approximation algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ has *performance ratio* α on x if $\mathcal{A}(x) \geq \alpha \cdot \text{MAX3SAT}(x)$. If $\mathcal{A}$ has performance ratio α on all instances, then $\mathcal{A}$ is an α-*approximation algorithm*.

Håstad proved the following in order to show that satisfiable instances of 3SAT cannot be distinguished from instances x with $\text{MAX3SAT}(x) < \frac{7}{8} + \epsilon$ in polynomial-time unless P=NP.

Theorem 5.5. (Håstad [Hås97]) *For each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a polynomial-time computable function f_ϵ such that for all $x \in \{0,1\}^*$,*

$$x \in \text{SAT} \Rightarrow \text{MAX3SAT}(f_\epsilon(x)) = 1$$
$$x \notin \text{SAT} \Rightarrow \text{MAX3SAT}(f_\epsilon(x)) < \tfrac{7}{8} + \epsilon.$$

We are now ready to prove the main theorem of this chapter.

Theorem 5.6. *If $\dim_{\mathrm{p}}(\text{NP}) > 0$, then for all $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that any 2^{n^δ}-time approximation algorithm for MAX3SAT has performance ratio less than $\frac{7}{8} + \epsilon$ on a dense set of satisfiable instances.*

Proof. We prove the contrapositive. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be rational. For any MAX3SAT approximation algorithm $\mathcal{A}$, define the set

$$F_{\mathcal{A}} = \left\{ x \in 3\text{SAT} \,\middle|\, \mathcal{A}(x) < \frac{7}{8} + \epsilon \right\}.$$

Assume that for each $\delta > 0$, there exists a 2^{n^δ}-time approximation algorithm $\mathcal{A}_\delta$ for MAX3SAT with $F_{\mathcal{A}_\delta} \in \text{DENSE}^c$. By Theorem 5.4 and Lemma 5.1, it is sufficient to show that $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{P}_{\mathrm{m}}(\text{DENSE}^c) \uplus \text{DTIME}(2^n)$.

Let $B \in \text{NP}$ and let r be a $\leq_{\mathrm{m}}^{\mathrm{P}}$-reduction of B to SAT. Let n^k be an almost-everywhere time bound for computing $f_\epsilon \circ r$ where f_ϵ is as in Theorem 5.5. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
x \in B \quad &\Longleftrightarrow \quad r(x) \in \text{SAT} \\
&\Longleftrightarrow \quad \text{MAX3SAT}((f_\epsilon \circ r)(x)) = 1 \\
&\Longleftrightarrow \quad \mathcal{A}_{\frac{1}{k}}((f_\epsilon \circ r)(x)) \geq \tfrac{7}{8} + \epsilon \text{ or } (f_\epsilon \circ r)(x) \in F_{\mathcal{A}_{\frac{1}{k}}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Define the languages

$$C = \left\{ x \left| (f_\epsilon \circ r)(x) \in F_{\mathcal{A}_{\frac{1}{k}}} \right. \right\} \text{ and } D = \left\{ x \left| \mathcal{A}_{\frac{1}{k}}((f_\epsilon \circ r)(x)) \geq \frac{7}{8} + \epsilon \right. \right\}.$$

Then $B = C \cup D$, $C \leq_{\mathrm{m}}^{\mathrm{P}} F_{\mathcal{A}_{\frac{1}{k}}} \in \mathrm{DENSE}^c$, and D can be decided in time $2^{(n^k)^{\frac{1}{k}}} = 2^n$ for all sufficiently large n, so $B \in \mathrm{P_m}(\mathrm{DENSE}^c) \uplus \mathrm{DTIME}(2^n)$. $\qquad \square$

Theorem 5.6 provides a strong positive answer to Problem 8 of Lutz and Mayordomo [LM99]:

> Does $\mu_{\mathrm{p}}(\mathrm{NP}) \neq 0$ imply an exponential lower bound on approximation schemes
>
> for MaxSat?

We observe that a weaker positive answer can be more easily obtained by using a simplified version of our argument to prove the following result.

Proposition 5.7. *If*

$$\mathrm{NP} \not\subseteq \bigcap_{\alpha > 0} \mathrm{DTIME}\left(2^{n^\alpha}\right),$$

then for all $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that there does not exist a 2^{n^δ}-time $(\frac{7}{8} + \epsilon)$-approximation algorithm for Max3Sat.

The inapproximability results for MAX3SAT derivable from various strong hypotheses are summarized in figure 5.1.

$\boxed{\mu_{\mathrm{p}}(\mathrm{NP}) \neq 0}$

$\Downarrow$

$\boxed{\dim_{\mathrm{p}}(\mathrm{NP}) > 0}$ $\Rightarrow$ There exists a $\delta > 0$ such that any $2^{n^{\delta}}$-time approximation algorithm for MAX3SAT has performance ratio less than $\frac{7}{8} + \epsilon$ on a dense set of satisfiable instances.

$\Downarrow$ $\Downarrow$

$\boxed{\mathrm{NP} \nsubseteq \bigcap_{\alpha>0} \mathrm{DTIME}\left(2^{n^{\alpha}}\right)}$ $\Rightarrow$ There exists a $\delta > 0$ such that no $2^{n^{\delta}}$-time $\left(\frac{7}{8} + \epsilon\right)$-approximation algorithm for MAX3SAT exists.

$\Downarrow$ $\Downarrow$

$\boxed{\mathrm{P} \neq \mathrm{NP}}$ $\Rightarrow$ No polynomial-time $\left(\frac{7}{8} + \epsilon\right)$-approximation algorithm for MAX3SAT exists.

Figure 5.1   Inapproximability Results for MAX3SAT

BIBLIOGRAPHY

[CLR90] T.H. Cormen, C.E. Leiserson, and R. L. Rivest. *Introduction to Algorithms*. MIT Press/McGraw-Hill, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1990.

[DGHK] E. Dantsin, M. Gavrilovich, E.A. Hirsch, and B. Konev. MAX SAT approximation beyond the limits of polynomial-time approximation. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*. To appear.

[Egg49] H.G. Eggleston. The fractional dimension of a set defined by decimal properties. *Quarterly Journal of Mathematics*, Oxford Series 20:31–36, 1949.

[Fal90] K. Falconer. *Fractal Geometry: Mathematical Foundations and Applications*. John Wiley & Sons, 1990.

[Hås97] J. Håstad. Some optimal inapproximability results. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 1–10, 1997.

[Hau19] F. Hausdorff. Dimension und äusseres Mass. *Mathematische Annalen*, 79:157–179, 1919.

[Hit02] J. M. Hitchcock. MAX3SAT is exponentially hard to approximate if NP has positive dimension. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 2002. To appear.

[HZ99] E. Halperin and U. Zwick. Approximation algorithms for MAX 4-SAT and rounding procedures for semidefinite programs. In *IPCO: 7th Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization Conference*, 1999.

[JL96]   D. W. Juedes and J. H. Lutz.   Completeness and weak completeness under polynomial-size circuits. *Information and Computation*, 125:13–31, 1996.

[KZ97]   H. Karloff and U. Zwick. A 7/8-approximation algorithm for MAX 3SAT? In *38th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 406–415, 1997.

[Lév54]   P. Lévy.   *Théorie de l'Addition des Variables Aleatoires.*   Gauthier-Villars, 1937 (second edition 1954).

[LM94]   J. H. Lutz and E. Mayordomo.   Measure, stochasticity, and the density of hard languages. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 23:762–779, 1994.

[LM99]   J. H. Lutz and E. Mayordomo.   Twelve problems in resource-bounded measure. *Bulletin of the European Association for Theoretical Computer Science*, 68:64–80, 1999.

[Lup58]   O. B. Lupanov.   On the synthesis of contact networks.   *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 119:pp. 23–26, 1958.

[Lut92]   J. H. Lutz. Almost everywhere high nonuniform complexity. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 44:220–258, 1992.

[Lut98]   J. H. Lutz. Resource-bounded measure. In *Proceedings of the 13th IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity*, pages 236–248, New York, 1998. IEEE Computer Society Press.

[Lut00a] J. H. Lutz. Dimension in complexity classes. In *Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity*, pages 158–169. IEEE Computer Society Press, 2000.

[Lut00b] J. H. Lutz. Gales and the constructive dimension of individual sequences. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 902–913. Springer-Verlag, 2000.

[Sch70] C. P. Schnorr. Klassifikation der Zufallsgesetze nach Komplexität und Ordnung. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie verw. Geb.*, 16:1–21, 1970.

[Sch71a] C. P. Schnorr. A unified approach to the definition of random sequences. *Mathematical Systems Theory*, 5:246–258, 1971.

[Sch71b] C. P. Schnorr. Zufälligkeit und Wahrscheinlichkeit. *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, 218, 1971.

[Sch73] C. P. Schnorr. Process complexity and effective random tests. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 7:376–388, 1973.

[Vil39] J. Ville. *Étude Critique de la Notion de Collectif.* Gauthier–Villars, Paris, 1939.