

# Resource-Bounded Strong Dimension versus Resource-Bounded Category

John M. Hitchcock  
Department of Computer Science  
University of Wyoming  
jhitchco@cs.uwyo.edu

A. Pavan\*  
Department of Computer Science  
Iowa State University  
pavan@cs.iastate.edu

## Abstract

Classically it is known that any set with packing dimension less than 1 is meager in the sense of Baire category. We establish a resource-bounded extension: if a class  $X$  has  $\Delta$ -strong dimension less than 1, then  $X$  is  $\Delta$ -meager. This has the applications of explaining some of Lutz's simultaneous  $\Delta$ -meager,  $\Delta$ -measure 0 results and providing a new proof of a Gu's strong dimension result on infinitely-often classes.

## 1 Introduction

The most common mathematical notions of size and dimension now have resource-bounded versions that are useful for complexity classes. We use  $\Delta$  to denote a resource bound such as  $p$  (polynomial time) or  $p$ space (polynomial space).

- *Resource-Bounded Category* [7]: Extension of *Baire category*. Complexity classes may be  $\Delta$ -meager or  $\Delta$ -comeager (or neither).
- *Resource-Bounded Measure* [8]: Extension of *Lebesgue measure*. The  $\Delta$ -measure of a complexity class  $X$  is denoted  $\mu_\Delta(X)$ . A class  $X$  may have  $\mu_\Delta(X) = 0$  or  $\mu_\Delta(X) = 1$  (or neither, in which case the class is called not  $\Delta$ -measurable).
- *Resource-Bounded Dimension* [9]: Extension of *Hausdorff dimension* [6]. Each complexity class  $X$  has a  $\Delta$ -dimension  $\dim_\Delta(X)$  that is always a real number in  $[0,1]$ .
- *Resource-Bounded Strong Dimension* [3]: Extension of *packing dimension* [12, 11]. Each complexity class  $X$  has a  $\Delta$ -strong dimension  $\text{Dim}_\Delta(X)$  that is always a real number in  $[0,1]$ .

In general, resource-bounded category and resource-bounded measure are incomparable:  $\Delta$ -meager does not imply  $\Delta$ -measure 0, and vice versa. Regarding measure versus the two notions of dimension, the following hold for every class  $X$ :

$$\dim_\Delta(X) \leq \text{Dim}_\Delta(X)$$

and

$$\dim_\Delta(X) < 1 \Rightarrow \mu_\Delta(X) = 0.$$

---

\*This research was supported in part by NSF grants CCF-0430807 and CCR-0344187.

In particular, it follows that if the  $\Delta$ -strong dimension of  $X$  is less than 1, then  $X$  has  $\Delta$ -measure 0. We show that  $\text{Dim}_\Delta(X) < 1$  also implies  $X$  is  $\Delta$ -meager. This is an extension of the analogous relationship between packing dimension and Baire category (see Edgar [4]).

We give two applications of this result:

- An explanation of why some complexity classes in the work of Lutz [7] have  $\Delta$ -measure 0 and are also  $\Delta$ -meager. It is because they have  $\Delta$ -strong dimension less than 1 (Gu [5]).
- A new category-based proof of Gu's result regarding the strong dimension of infinitely-often classes [5].

Section 2 contains preliminaries and background on category, measure, and dimension. Our main theorem is presented in section 3. The applications are given in section 4.

## 2 Category, Measure, and Dimension

The *Cantor space*  $\mathbf{C}$  is the set of all infinite binary sequences. A *language* (or *decision problem*) is a subset of  $\{0, 1\}^*$ . We identify each language with the element of Cantor space that is its characteristic sequence according to the standard enumeration of  $\{0, 1\}^*$ . In this way, complexity classes (sets of languages) are viewed as subsets of Cantor space.

A *constructor* is a function  $\delta : \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$ . The *result* of a constructor is the unique sequence  $R(\delta) \in \mathbf{C}$  that extends  $\delta^{(n)}(\lambda)$  for all  $n$ . (Here  $\lambda$  is the empty string.)

Throughout this paper,  $\Delta$  denotes a *resource bound* [8]. Examples of  $\Delta$  include:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{all} &= \{f \mid f : \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*\} \\ \text{p} &= \{f \mid f \text{ is polynomial-time computable}\} \\ \text{p}_2 &= \{f \mid f \text{ is quasipolynomial-time computable}\} \\ \text{pspace} &= \{f \mid f \text{ is polynomial-space computable}\} \\ \text{comp} &= \{f \mid f \text{ is computable}\} \end{aligned}$$

For a resource bound  $\Delta$ , we define the class

$$R(\Delta) = \{R(\delta) \mid \delta \in \Delta \text{ is a constructor}\}.$$

Then  $R(\text{all}) = \mathbf{C}$ ,  $R(\text{p}) = \text{E}$ ,  $R(\text{p}_2) = \text{EXP}$ ,  $R(\text{pspace}) = \text{ESPACE}$ , and  $R(\text{comp}) = \text{DEC}$ . Each resource bound  $\Delta$  yields notions of resourced-bounded category, measure, and dimension that work within the class  $R(\Delta)$ . We now review these concepts.

### 2.1 Category

Baire category classifies sets into two types: *first category* and *second category*. First category sets are also commonly called *meager*. A set is meager if it is a countable union of nowhere dense sets. An equivalent definition comes from Banach-Mazur games.

Let  $X \subseteq \mathbf{C}$  and let  $\Gamma_I$  and  $\Gamma_{II}$  be two classes of functions. In the *Banach-Mazur game*  $G[X; \Gamma_I, \Gamma_{II}]$  there are two players I and II. A *strategy* in the game is a constructor. In a play of the game, player I chooses a strategy  $g \in \Gamma_I$  and player II chooses a strategy  $h \in \Gamma_{II}$ . The *result* of this play is the sequence  $R(g, h) = R(h \circ g)$ . Intuitively, the result is the sequence obtained when the two players start with the empty string and take turns extending it with their strategies. A *winning strategy* for player II is a strategy  $h \in \Gamma_{II}$  such that for every  $g \in \Gamma_I$ ,  $R(g, h) \notin X$ .

**Theorem 2.1.** (Banach and Mazur) *A class  $X \subseteq \mathbf{C}$  is meager if and only if player II has a winning strategy in the game  $G[X; \text{all}, \text{all}]$ .*

Resource-bounded category [7] is defined by requiring player II's winning strategy to be computable within a resource bound.

**Definition.** Let  $X \subseteq \mathbf{C}$ .

1.  $X$  is  $\Delta$ -meager if player II has a winning strategy in the game  $G[X; \text{all}, \Delta]$ .
2.  $X$  is  $\Delta$ -comeager if  $X^c$  is  $\Delta$ -meager.
3.  $X$  is meager in  $R(\Delta)$  if  $X \cap R(\Delta)$  is  $\Delta$ -meager.
4.  $X$  is comeager in  $R(\Delta)$  if  $X^c$  is meager in  $R(\Delta)$ .

The *resource-bounded Baire category theorem* [7] tells us that  $R(\Delta)$  is not  $\Delta$ -meager.

## 2.2 Measure

A *martingale* is a function  $d : \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  satisfying the averaging condition

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

for all  $w \in \{0, 1\}^*$ . We say  $d$  *succeeds on* a sequence  $S \in \mathbf{C}$  if

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(S \upharpoonright n) = \infty.$$

(Here  $S \upharpoonright n$  is the length  $n$  prefix of  $S$ .) The *success set* of  $d$  is

$$S^\infty[d] = \{S \in \mathbf{C} \mid d \text{ succeeds on } S\}.$$

Ville used martingales to give an equivalent definition of Lebesgue measure 0.

**Theorem 2.2.** (Ville [13]) *A class  $X \subseteq \mathbf{C}$  has Lebesgue measure 0 if and only if there is a martingale  $d$  with  $X \subseteq S^\infty[d]$ .*

Resource-bounded measure [8] arises from putting resource bounds on the martingales. We say that  $d : \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is  $\Delta$ -computable if there is an approximation  $\hat{d} : \mathbb{N} \times \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$  such that  $|\hat{d}(r, w) - d(w)| \leq 2^{-r}$  for all  $r \in \mathbb{N}, w \in \{0, 1\}^*$  and  $\hat{d} \in \Delta$  (with  $r$  encoded in unary and the outputs encoded in binary).

**Definition.** Let  $X \subseteq \mathbf{C}$ .

1.  $X$  has  $\Delta$ -measure 0, written  $\mu_\Delta(X) = 0$ , if there is a  $\Delta$ -computable martingale  $d$  with  $X \subseteq S^\infty[d]$ .
2.  $X$  has  $\Delta$ -measure 1, written  $\mu_\Delta(X) = 1$ , if  $\mu_\Delta(X^c) = 0$ .
3.  $X$  has measure 0 in  $R(\Delta)$ , written  $\mu(X \mid R(\Delta)) = 0$ , if  $\mu_\Delta(X \cap R(\Delta)) = 0$ .
4.  $X$  has measure 1 in  $R(\Delta)$ , written  $\mu(X \mid R(\Delta)) = 1$ , if  $\mu_\Delta(X^c \mid R(\Delta)) = 0$ .

The *resource-bounded measure conservation theorem* [8] tells us that  $R(\Delta)$  does not have  $\Delta$ -measure 0.

### 2.3 Dimension and Strong Dimension

The most commonly used fractal dimension is the *Hausdorff dimension*  $\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(X)$ . Lutz used success sets of functions called gales to characterize Hausdorff dimension. Let  $s \geq 0$  be a real number. An *s-gale* is a function  $d : \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  satisfying the condition

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

for all  $w \in \{0, 1\}^*$ . Note that a martingale is a 1-gale. ‘‘Succeeds on’’ and ‘‘success set’’ are defined for *s-gales* in the same way as for martingales.

**Theorem 2.3.** (Lutz [9]) *For every  $X \subseteq \mathbf{C}$ ,*

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(X) = \inf \{s \mid \text{there is an } s\text{-gale } d \text{ with } X \subseteq S^{\infty}[d]\}.$$

Another common fractal dimension is the *packing dimension*  $\dim_{\mathbb{P}}(X)$ . This has an analogous gale characterization using the notion of strong success. An *s-gale*  $d$  *succeeds strongly* on a sequence  $S \in \mathbf{C}$  if

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(S \upharpoonright n) = \infty.$$

The *strong success set* of  $d$  is

$$S_{\text{str}}^{\infty}[d] = \{S \in \mathbf{C} \mid d \text{ succeeds strongly on } S\}.$$

**Theorem 2.4.** (Athreya, Hitchcock, Lutz, and Mayordomo [3]) *For every  $X \subseteq \mathbf{C}$ ,*

$$\dim_{\mathbb{P}}(X) = \inf \{s \mid \text{there is an } s\text{-gale } d \text{ with } X \subseteq S_{\text{str}}^{\infty}[d]\}.$$

Based on Theorems 2.3 and 2.4, resource-bounded dimension and resource-bounded strong dimension are defined as extensions of Hausdorff dimension and packing dimension, respectively, by requiring the gales to be computable within a resource bound.

**Definition.** Let  $X \subseteq \mathbf{C}$ .

1. The  $\Delta$ -dimension of  $X$  is

$$\dim_{\Delta}(X) = \inf \{s \mid \text{there is a } \Delta\text{-computable } s\text{-gale } d \text{ with } X \subseteq S^{\infty}[d]\}.$$

2. The  $\Delta$ -strong dimension of  $X$  is

$$\text{Dim}_{\Delta}(X) = \inf \{s \mid \text{there is a } \Delta\text{-computable } s\text{-gale } d \text{ with } X \subseteq S_{\text{str}}^{\infty}[d]\}.$$

3. The *dimension of  $X$  in  $R(\Delta)$*  is  $\dim(X \mid R(\Delta)) = \dim_{\Delta}(X \cap R(\Delta))$ .

4. The *strong dimension of  $X$  in  $R(\Delta)$*  is  $\text{Dim}(X \mid R(\Delta)) = \text{Dim}_{\Delta}(X \cap R(\Delta))$ .

We say that an *s-gale*  $d$  is *exactly  $\Delta$ -computable* if the range of  $d$  is rational and the values can be computed by a function in  $\Delta$ . The *exact computation lemma* [9] tells us that we may restrict to exactly computable *s-gales* in the above definitions.

**Proposition 2.5.** ([9, 3]) *Let  $X \subseteq \mathbf{C}$ .*

1.  $0 \leq \dim_{\Delta}(X) \leq \text{Dim}_{\Delta}(X) \leq 1$ .
2. If  $\dim_{\Delta}(X) < 1$ , then  $X$  has  $\Delta$ -measure 0.

### 3 Main Theorem

It is known classically that if the packing dimension  $\dim_{\text{p}}(X) < 1$ , then  $X$  is meager (see Edgar [4, page 65]). We now establish the resource-bounded extension of this fact.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $X \subseteq \mathbf{C}$ .*

1. *If  $\text{Dim}_{\Delta}(X) < 1$ , then  $X$  is  $\Delta$ -meager.*
2. *If  $\text{Dim}(X \mid R(\Delta)) < 1$ , then  $X$  is meager in  $R(\Delta)$ .*

*Proof.* Part 2 is immediate from part 1. Assume the hypothesis of part 1. Then for some  $s < 1$ , there is an exactly- $\Delta$ -computable  $s$ -gale  $d$  with  $X \subseteq S_{\text{str}}^{\infty}[d]$ .

Let  $t = \left\lceil \frac{s}{1-s} \right\rceil$ . For each  $w \in \{0, 1\}^*$ , we inductively construct an extension  $w'$  of  $w$  by the following algorithm.

```

 $w' := w.$ 
for  $i = 1$  to  $t|w|$ 
  if  $d(w'0) \leq d(w'1)$ 
     $w' := w'0.$ 
  else
     $w' := w'1.$ 

```

Because  $d$  is an  $s$ -gale, the average of  $d(w'0)$  and  $d(w'1)$  is  $2^{s-1}d(w')$ . One of  $d(w'0)$  and  $d(w'1)$  must be no more than this average, so  $d(w')$  decreases by multiplicative factor of  $2^{s-1}$  (or a smaller factor) each iteration of the for-loop. Therefore,  $d(w') \leq 2^{(s-1)t|w|}d(w)$  at the end.

We define a constructor  $h : \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$  by

$$h(w) = w'.$$

Then  $h \in \Delta$  by the above algorithm. For each  $w \in \{0, 1\}^*$ ,

$$d(h(w)) \leq 2^{(s-1)t|w|}d(w) \leq 2^{-s|w|}d(w).$$

Also,  $d(w) \leq 2^{s|w|}d(\lambda)$  because  $d$  is an  $s$ -gale, so we have

$$d(h(w)) \leq d(\lambda) \tag{3.1}$$

for every  $w \in \{0, 1\}^*$ .

Since  $h \in \Delta$ , it suffices to show that  $h$  always wins the Banach-Mazur game  $G[X; \text{all}, \Delta]$  for player II. Let  $g$  be any constructor. Let  $R(g, h)$  be the sequence built when  $g$  and  $h$  are played against each other. We need to show that  $R(g, h) \notin X$ . For this we can show  $R(g, h) \notin S_{\text{str}}^{\infty}[d]$  since  $X \subseteq S_{\text{str}}^{\infty}[d]$ .

Define  $w_0 = \lambda$  and  $w_n = h(g(w_{n-1}))$  for all  $n \geq 1$ . Then each  $w_n$  is a prefix of  $R(g, h)$  and for every  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$d(w_n) = d(h(g(w_{n-1}))) \leq d(\lambda)$$

by (3.1). Therefore

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(R(g, h) \upharpoonright n) \leq d(\lambda),$$

i.e.,  $d$  does not succeed strongly on  $R(g, h)$ . □

We remark that Theorem 3.1 does not extend to *resource-bounded genericity*, a different notion of resource-bounded category. For example, we might ask if strong  $\text{Dim}_{\text{p}}(X) < 1$  implies that  $X$  has no  $\text{p}$ -generics. This is false because there are sparse  $n^2$ -generics [2] but the class of sparse languages has strong  $\text{p}$ -dimension 0.

## 4 Corollaries

In general,  $\Delta$ -measure 0 and  $\Delta$ -meager are incomparable properties. For example, Mayordomo [10] showed that the class of non-P-bi-immune languages has p-measure 0 but is not p-meager. There are also examples of classes that are  $\Delta$ -meager which do not have  $\Delta$ -measure 0 [1]. However, Lutz [7, 8] showed that several classes both have  $\Delta$ -measure 0 and are  $\Delta$ -meager. Proposition 2.5 and Theorem 3.1 give us the following corollary which along with recent work of Gu [5] provides further explanation of Lutz's results.

**Corollary 4.1.** *Let  $X \subseteq \mathbf{C}$ .*

1. *If  $\text{Dim}_\Delta(X) < 1$ , then  $X$  has  $\Delta$ -measure 0 and is  $\Delta$ -meager.*
2. *If  $\text{Dim}(X \mid R(\Delta)) < 1$ , then  $X$  has measure 0 in  $R(\Delta)$  and is meager in  $R(\Delta)$ .*

For example, Lutz showed that for each constant  $c$ , the circuit-size complexity class  $\text{SIZE}(n^c)$  has  $p_2$ -measure 0 and is  $p_2$ -meager. Gu showed  $\text{Dim}_{p_2}(\text{SIZE}(n^c)) = 0$ . By Corollary 4.1, this yields a new proof of Lutz's simultaneous measure 0 and meager result. Similarly, Lutz showed that P/poly has  $p_3$ -measure 0 and is  $p_3$ -meager; Gu showed that  $\text{Dim}_{p_3}(\text{P/poly}) = 0$ .

However, we remark that the converse of Corollary 4.1 does not hold in general. For example, the class  $\text{SIZE}(\frac{2^n}{n})$  has pspace-measure 0 and is pspace-meager [7], but it has pspace-dimension 1 [9].

For a class  $X$  of languages, define

$$\text{io-}X = \{A \subseteq \{0, 1\}^* \mid (\exists B \in X)(\exists^\infty n)A_{=n} = B_{=n}\}.$$

(Here  $A_{=n} = A \cap \{0, 1\}^n$ .) Gu [5] showed that if  $X$  contains the empty language, then  $\text{dim}(\text{io-}X \mid R(\Delta)) \geq 1/2$  and  $\text{Dim}(\text{io-}X \mid R(\Delta)) = 1$  for every  $\Delta$ . Theorem 3.1 along with the resource-bounded Baire category theorem provides a simpler proof of (a minor extension of) the latter fact.

**Corollary 4.2.** (Gu [5]) *If  $X \cap R(\Delta) \neq \emptyset$ , then  $\text{Dim}(\text{io-}X \mid R(\Delta)) = 1$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $B \in X \cap R(\Delta)$ . Then

$$E = \{A \subseteq \{0, 1\}^* \mid (\exists^\infty n)A_{=n} = B_{=n}\}$$

is a subclass of  $\text{io-}X$ . Because  $B \in R(\Delta)$ , it can be shown that  $E$  is  $\Delta$ -comeager. In particular,  $E^c$  is meager in  $R(\Delta)$ .

Suppose that  $\text{Dim}(\text{io-}X \mid R(\Delta)) < 1$ . Then  $\text{io-}X$  is meager in  $R(\Delta)$  by Theorem 3.1, so  $E$  is also meager in  $R(\Delta)$ . But since the meager sets are closed under union, the resource-bounded Baire category theorem tells us we cannot have both  $E$  and  $E^c$  meager in  $R(\Delta)$ .  $\square$

**Acknowledgment.** We thank Jack Lutz for an encouraging discussion.

## References

- [1] K. Ambos-Spies. Resource-bounded genericity. In S. B. Cooper, et al., editor, *Computability, Enumerability, Unsolvability*, volume 224 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Notes*, pages 1–59. Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- [2] K. Ambos-Spies, H.-C. Neis, and S. A. Terwijn. Genericity and measure for exponential time. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 168(1):3–19, 1996.

- [3] K. B. Athreya, J. M. Hitchcock, J. H. Lutz, and E. Mayordomo. Effective strong dimension in algorithmic information and computational complexity. *SIAM Journal on Computing*. To appear.
- [4] G. A. Edgar. *Integral, probability, and fractal measures*. Springer-Verlag, 1998.
- [5] X. Gu. A note on dimensions of polynomial size circuits. Technical Report TR04-047, Electronic Colloquium on Computational Complexity, 2004.
- [6] F. Hausdorff. Dimension und äußeres Maß. *Mathematische Annalen*, 79:157–179, 1919.
- [7] J. H. Lutz. Category and measure in complexity classes. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 19(6):1100–1131, 1990.
- [8] J. H. Lutz. Almost everywhere high nonuniform complexity. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 44(2):220–258, 1992.
- [9] J. H. Lutz. Dimension in complexity classes. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 32(5):1236–1259, 2003.
- [10] E. Mayordomo. Almost every set in exponential time is P-bi-immune. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 136(2):487–506, 1994.
- [11] D. Sullivan. Entropy, Hausdorff measures old and new, and limit sets of geometrically finite Kleinian groups. *Acta Mathematica*, 153:259–277, 1984.
- [12] C. Tricot. Two definitions of fractional dimension. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 91:57–74, 1982.
- [13] J. Ville. *Étude Critique de la Notion de Collectif*. Gauthier–Villars, Paris, 1939.