

# *Effective Strong Measure Zero*

Kojiro Higuchi\*

Joint work with Takayuki Kihara<sup>+</sup>

\*Chiba University    +JAIST

May 15, 2013 at Hongo Campus, The University of Tokyo

# *Abstract*

- E. Borel introduced the concept, strong measure zero in 1919.
- We give some characterization of the concept through techniques and results obtained in Algorithmic Randomness Theory.

First, we introduce the following three concepts:

- Strong measure zero
- Effective strong measure zero
- Strong Martin-Löf measure zero

## *Strong Measure Zero*

- **Definition** (E. Borel, 1919)

$X \subset \mathbb{R}$  is a **strong measure zero** set  $\iff$

$\forall \{\varepsilon_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^+ \exists \{I_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} : \text{open intervals with } |I_n| < \varepsilon_n$

$X \subset \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} I_n.$

- Borel conjectured BC:  
 $\{\text{Strong measure zero sets}\} = \{\text{Countable sets}\}.$
- BC is independent from ZFC.
  - (Sierpiński, 1928) Continuum Hypothesis implies  $\neg$ BC.
  - (Laver, 1976) ZFC+BC  $\not\perp$  (if ZFC  $\not\perp$ ).

## *Strong Measure Zero*

- **Definition** (E. Borel, 1919)

$X \subset \mathbb{R}$  is a **strong measure zero** set  $\iff$

$\forall \{\varepsilon_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^+ \exists \{I_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} : \text{open intervals with } |I_n| < \varepsilon_n$

$X \subset \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} I_n.$

- Borel conjectured BC:  
 $\{\text{Strong measure zero sets}\} = \{\text{Countable sets}\}.$
- BC is independent from ZFC.
  - (Sierpiński, 1928) Continuum Hypothesis implies  $\neg$ BC.
  - (Laver, 1976) ZFC+BC  $\not\perp$  (if ZFC  $\not\perp$ ).

## *Strong Measure Zero*

- **Definition** (E. Borel, 1919)

$X \subset \mathbb{R}$  is a **strong measure zero** set  $\iff$

$\forall \{\varepsilon_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^+ \exists \{I_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} : \text{open intervals with } |I_n| < \varepsilon_n$   
 $X \subset \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} I_n.$

- Borel conjectured BC:  
 $\{\text{Strong measure zero sets}\} = \{\text{Countable sets}\}.$
- BC is independent from ZFC.
  - (Sierpiński, 1928) Continuum Hypothesis implies  $\neg$ BC.
  - (Laver, 1976) ZFC+BC  $\not\perp$  (if ZFC  $\not\perp$ ).

## Strong Measure Zero in $2^{\mathbb{N}}$

- **Definition** (E. Borel, 1919)

$X \subset \mathbb{R}$  is a **strong measure zero** set  $\iff$

$\forall \{\varepsilon_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^+ \exists \{I_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} : \text{open intervals with } |I_n| < \varepsilon_n$

$X \subset \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} I_n.$

- **Definition** (in  $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ )

$X \subset 2^{\mathbb{N}}$  is a **strong measure zero** set  $\iff$

$\forall \{k_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{N} \exists \{\sigma_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$  with  $|\sigma_n| \geq k_n$

$X \subset \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \llbracket \sigma_n \rrbracket,$

where  $\llbracket \sigma_n \rrbracket = \{f \in 2^{\mathbb{N}} \mid f \supset \sigma_n\}.$

## Strong Measure Zero in $2^{\mathbb{N}}$

- **Definition** (E. Borel, 1919)

$X \subset \mathbb{R}$  is a **strong measure zero** set  $\iff$

$\forall \{\varepsilon_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^+ \exists \{I_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} : \text{open intervals with } |I_n| < \varepsilon_n$

$X \subset \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} I_n.$

- **Definition** (in  $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ )

$X \subset 2^{\mathbb{N}}$  is a **strong measure zero** set  $\iff$

$\forall \{k_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{N} \exists \{\sigma_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$  with  $|\sigma_n| \geq k_n$

$X \subset \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \llbracket \sigma_n \rrbracket,$

where  $\llbracket \sigma_n \rrbracket = \{f \in 2^{\mathbb{N}} \mid f \supset \sigma_n\}.$



## Besicovitch's Theorem

**Definitions** For  $\mu : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ ,

- The induced outer measure  $\mu^*$  of  $\mu$  is defined by
 
$$\mu^*(X) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{\sigma \in A} \mu(\sigma) : A \subset 2^{<\mathbb{N}}, X \subset \bigcup_{\sigma \in A} \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \right\}$$
 for all  $X \subset 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ .
- $X$  is of  $\mu$ -zero  $\iff \mu^*(X) = 0$ .
- $\mu$  is atomless  $\iff \forall f \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}, \mu^*(f) = 0$ .
- $\mu$  is a premeasure  $\iff \forall \sigma \in 2^{<\mathbb{N}},$   
 $\mu(\sigma 0), \mu(\sigma 1) \leq \mu(\sigma) \leq \mu(\sigma 0) + \mu(\sigma 1)$ .
  - In this case, we have  $\mu^*(\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket) = \mu(\sigma)$ .

**Theorem** (due to A.S.Besicovitch, 1933)

$X \subset 2^{\mathbb{N}}$  is a strong measure zero set  $\iff$

$\forall$  atomless premeasure  $\mu : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, 1], \mu^*(X) = 0$ .

## Besicovitch's Theorem

**Definitions** For  $\mu : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ ,

- The induced outer measure  $\mu^*$  of  $\mu$  is defined by
 
$$\mu^*(X) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{\sigma \in A} \mu(\sigma) : A \subset 2^{<\mathbb{N}}, X \subset \bigcup_{\sigma \in A} \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \right\}$$
 for all  $X \subset 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ .
- $X$  is of  $\mu$ -zero  $\iff \mu^*(X) = 0$ .
- $\mu$  is atomless  $\iff \forall f \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}, \mu^*(f) = 0$ .
- $\mu$  is a premeasure  $\iff \forall \sigma \in 2^{<\mathbb{N}},$   
 $\mu(\sigma 0), \mu(\sigma 1) \leq \mu(\sigma) \leq \mu(\sigma 0) + \mu(\sigma 1)$ .
  - In this case, we have  $\mu^*(\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket) = \mu(\sigma)$ .

**Theorem** (due to A.S.Besicovitch, 1933)

$X \subset 2^{\mathbb{N}}$  is a strong measure zero set  $\iff$

$\forall$  atomless premeasure  $\mu : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, 1], \mu^*(X) = 0$ .

## Besicovitch's Theorem

**Definitions** For  $\mu : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ ,

- The induced outer measure  $\mu^*$  of  $\mu$  is defined by 
$$\mu^*(X) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{\sigma \in A} \mu(\sigma) : A \subset 2^{<\mathbb{N}}, X \subset \bigcup_{\sigma \in A} \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \right\}$$
 for all  $X \subset 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ .
- $X$  is of  $\mu$ -zero  $\iff \mu^*(X) = 0$ .
- $\mu$  is atomless  $\iff \forall f \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}, \mu^*(f) = 0$ .
- $\mu$  is a premeasure  $\iff \forall \sigma \in 2^{<\mathbb{N}},$   
 $\mu(\sigma 0), \mu(\sigma 1) \leq \mu(\sigma) \leq \mu(\sigma 0) + \mu(\sigma 1)$ .
  - In this case, we have  $\mu^*(\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket) = \mu(\sigma)$ .

**Theorem** (due to A.S.Besicovitch, 1933)

$X \subset 2^{\mathbb{N}}$  is a strong measure zero set  $\iff$

$\forall$  atomless premeasure  $\mu : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, 1], \mu^*(X) = 0$ .

# Effectivizations of Strong Measure Zero

**Definitions** For  $X \subset 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ ,

- $X$  is an **effective strong measure zero** set  $\iff$   
 $\forall$  comp. atomless premeasure  $\mu : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ ,  
 $\mu^*(X) = 0$ .
- (Kihara/Miyabe)  
 $X$  is a **strong Martin-Löf measure zero** set  $\iff$   
 $\forall$  comp. atomless premeasure  $\mu : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ ,  
 $X$  is of Martin-Löf  $\mu$ -zero,

Here,  $X$  is **Martin-Löf  $\mu$ -zero** for a premeasure

$$\mu : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$$

$\iff \exists$  comp. descending seq.  $\{\mathcal{U}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of c.e. open sets  
 $\forall n \in \mathbb{N} [\mu^*(\mathcal{U}_n) \leq 2^{-n} \text{ and } X \subset \mathcal{U}_n]$ .

# Effectivizations of Strong Measure Zero

**Definitions** For  $X \subset 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ ,

- $X$  is an **effective strong measure zero** set  $\iff$   
 $\forall$  comp. atomless premeasure  $\mu : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ ,  
 $\mu^*(X) = 0$ .
- (Kihara/Miyabe)  
 $X$  is a **strong Martin-Löf measure zero** set  $\iff$   
 $\forall$  comp. atomless premeasure  $\mu : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ ,  
 $X$  is of Martin-Löf  $\mu$ -zero,

Here,  $X$  is **Martin-Löf  $\mu$ -zero** for a premeasure

$$\mu : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$$

$\iff \exists$  comp. descending seq.  $\{\mathcal{U}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of c.e. open sets  
 $\forall n \in \mathbb{N} [\mu^*(\mathcal{U}_n) \leq 2^{-n} \text{ and } X \subset \mathcal{U}_n]$ .

Here, in terms of semimeasures and complexities, we give some characterizations of the concepts we have defined.

# *Semimeasures and The A Priori Complexity*

## Definitions

- $\nu : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is a **semimeasure**  $\iff$   
 $\forall \sigma \in 2^{<\mathbb{N}}, \nu(\sigma) \geq \nu(\sigma 0) + \nu(\sigma 1)$ .
- A left-computable semimeasure  $\nu_0$  is **optimal**  $\iff$   
 $\forall$  l.-c. semimeasure  $\nu_1 \exists c \in \mathbb{R} \forall \sigma \in 2^{<\mathbb{N}}, \nu_1(\sigma) \leq c\nu_0(\sigma)$ .
  - (Levin) There is such a l.-c. semimeasure.
- Fix an optimal l.-c. semimeasure  $\nu_{\text{opt}} : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ .  
**A priori complexity KA** of  $\sigma \in 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$  is defined by  
 $\text{KA}(\sigma) = -\log_2 \nu_{\text{opt}}(\sigma)$ .

# *Semimeasures and The A Priori Complexity*

## Definitions

- $\nu : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is a **semimeasure**  $\iff$   
 $\forall \sigma \in 2^{<\mathbb{N}}, \nu(\sigma) \geq \nu(\sigma 0) + \nu(\sigma 1)$ .
- A left-computable semimeasure  $\nu_0$  is **optimal**  $\iff$   
 $\forall$  l.-c. semimeasure  $\nu_1 \exists c \in \mathbb{R} \forall \sigma \in 2^{<\mathbb{N}}, \nu_1(\sigma) \leq c\nu_0(\sigma)$ .
  - (Levin) There is such a l.-c. semimeasure.
- Fix an optimal l.-c. semimeasure  $\nu_{\text{opt}} : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ .  
**A priori complexity KA** of  $\sigma \in 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$  is defined by  
 $\text{KA}(\sigma) = -\log_2 \nu_{\text{opt}}(\sigma)$ .



## Characterizations via KA and Semimeasures

**Theorem** (due to Hudelson/H./Simpson/Yokoyama)

For a comp. premeasure  $\mu : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  and  $X \subset 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ , TFAE:

- $X$  is a Martin-Löf  $\mu$ -zero set.
- $X$  contains no  $\mu$ -complex element w.r.t. KA, i.e.,  
 $\neg \exists f \in X, c \in \mathbb{N} \forall \sigma \subset f, \text{KA}(\sigma) \geq -\log_2(\mu(\sigma)) - c.$
- $\exists$  l.-c. semimeasure  $\nu \forall f \in X, \sup_{\sigma \subset f} \nu(\sigma)/\mu(\sigma) = \infty.$

**Corollary**

For a comp. premeasure  $\mu : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  and  $X \subset 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ , TFAE:

- $X$  is a  $\mu$ -zero set.
- $X$  contains no  $\mu$ -complex element w.r.t. KA relative to some real, i.e.,  $\neg \exists f \in X, g \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}, c \in \mathbb{N} \forall \sigma \subset f,$   
 $\text{KA}^g(\sigma) \geq -\log_2(\mu(\sigma)) - c.$
- $\exists$  semimeasure  $\nu \forall f \in X, \sup_{\sigma \subset f} \nu(\sigma)/\mu(\sigma) = \infty.$

## Characterizations via KA and Semimeasures

**Theorem** (due to Hudelson/H./Simpson/Yokoyama)

For a comp. premeasure  $\mu : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  and  $X \subset 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ , TFAE:

- $X$  is a Martin-Löf  $\mu$ -zero set.
- $X$  contains no  $\mu$ -complex element w.r.t. KA, i.e.,  
 $\neg \exists f \in X, c \in \mathbb{N} \forall \sigma \subset f, \text{KA}(\sigma) \geq -\log_2(\mu(\sigma)) - c.$
- $\exists$  l.-c. semimeasure  $\nu \forall f \in X, \sup_{\sigma \subset f} \nu(\sigma)/\mu(\sigma) = \infty.$

**Corollary**

For a comp. premeasure  $\mu : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  and  $X \subset 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ , TFAE:

- $X$  is a  $\mu$ -zero set.
- $X$  contains no  $\mu$ -complex element w.r.t. KA relative to some real, i.e.,  $\neg \exists f \in X, g \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}, c \in \mathbb{N} \forall \sigma \subset f,$   
 $\text{KA}^g(\sigma) \geq -\log_2(\mu(\sigma)) - c.$
- $\exists$  semimeasure  $\nu \forall f \in X, \sup_{\sigma \subset f} \nu(\sigma)/\mu(\sigma) = \infty.$

## Characterizations via KA and Semimeasures

**Theorem** (Kihara/Miyabe) For  $X \subset 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ , TFAE:

- $X$  is a strong Martin-Löf measure zero set.
- $X$  contains no complex element, i.e.,  
 $\neg \exists$  comp. atomless premeasure  $\mu, f \in X, c \in \mathbb{N} \forall \sigma \subset f,$   
 $K(\sigma) \geq -\log_2(\mu(\sigma)) - c,$  where  $K$  is KA or KP, the  
 prefix-free Kolmogorov complexity.
- $\forall$  comp. atomless premeasure  $\mu \exists$  l.-c. semimeasure  $\nu$   
 $\forall f \in X, \sup_{\sigma \subset f} \nu(\sigma)/\mu(\sigma) = \infty.$

**Theorem** For  $X \subset 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ , TFAE:

- $X$  is an effective strong measure zero set.
- $\neg \exists$  comp. atomless premeasure  $\mu \forall g \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}$   
 $\exists f \in X, c \in \mathbb{N} \forall \sigma \subset f, K^g(\sigma) \geq -\log_2(\mu(\sigma)) - c.$
- $\forall$  comp. atomless premeasure  $\mu \exists$  semimeasure  $\nu \forall f \in X,$   
 $\sup_{\sigma \subset f} \nu(\sigma)/\mu(\sigma) = \infty.$

## Characterizations via KA and Semimeasures

**Theorem** (Kihara/Miyabe) For  $X \subset 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ , TFAE:

- $X$  is a strong Martin-Löf measure zero set.
- $X$  contains no complex element, i.e.,  
 $\neg \exists$  comp. atomless premeasure  $\mu, f \in X, c \in \mathbb{N} \forall \sigma \subset f,$   
 $K(\sigma) \geq -\log_2(\mu(\sigma)) - c,$  where  $K$  is KA or KP, the  
 prefix-free Kolmogorov complexity.
- $\forall$  comp. atomless premeasure  $\mu \exists$  l.-c. semimeasure  $\nu$   
 $\forall f \in X, \sup_{\sigma \subset f} \nu(\sigma)/\mu(\sigma) = \infty.$

**Theorem** For  $X \subset 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ , TFAE:

- $X$  is an effective strong measure zero set.
- $\neg \exists$  comp. atomless premeasure  $\mu \forall g \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}$   
 $\exists f \in X, c \in \mathbb{N} \forall \sigma \subset f, K^g(\sigma) \geq -\log_2(\mu(\sigma)) - c.$
- $\forall$  comp. atomless premeasure  $\mu \exists$  semimeasure  $\nu \forall f \in X,$   
 $\sup_{\sigma \subset f} \nu(\sigma)/\mu(\sigma) = \infty.$

## Characterizations via KA and Semimeasures

By relativizing to all reals, we have:

**Theorem** TFAE:

- $X \subset 2^{\mathbb{N}}$  is a strong measure zero set.
- $\neg \exists$  atomless premeasure  $\mu \forall g \in 2^{\mathbb{N}} \exists f \in X, c \in \mathbb{N} \forall \sigma \subset f, K^g(\sigma) \geq -\log_2(\mu(\sigma)) - c$ .
- $\forall$  atomless premeasure  $\mu \exists$  semimeasure  $\nu \forall f \in X, \sup_{\sigma \subset f} \nu(\sigma)/\mu(\sigma) = \infty$ .

**Corollary** Assume Borel Conjecture is true. Then, every uncountable subset of  $2^{\mathbb{N}}$  has an element which is complex relative to some real.

- $\therefore$  Let  $X$  be uncountable and let  $\mu$  be an atomless premeasure in the above condition.
- Choose  $g$  s.t.  $\mu$  is  $g$ -comp.
- $f \in X$  in the above condition is complex relative to  $g$ .

## Characterizations via KA and Semimeasures

By relativizing to all reals, we have:

**Theorem** TFAE:

- $X \subset 2^{\mathbb{N}}$  is a strong measure zero set.
- $\neg \exists$  atomless premeasure  $\mu \forall g \in 2^{\mathbb{N}} \exists f \in X, c \in \mathbb{N} \forall \sigma \subset f, K^g(\sigma) \geq -\log_2(\mu(\sigma)) - c$ .
- $\forall$  atomless premeasure  $\mu \exists$  semimeasure  $\nu \forall f \in X, \sup_{\sigma \subset f} \nu(\sigma)/\mu(\sigma) = \infty$ .

**Corollary** Assume Borel Conjecture is true. Then, every uncountable subset of  $2^{\mathbb{N}}$  has an element which is complex relative to some real.

- $\therefore$  Let  $X$  be uncountable and let  $\mu$  be an atomless premeasure in the above condition.
- Choose  $g$  s.t.  $\mu$  is  $g$ -comp.
- $f \in X$  in the above condition is complex relative to  $g$ .

Here, in terms of martingales, we give characterizations of our main concepts. It is obtained easily using the characterizations by semimeasures.

# Martingales

## Definitions (related to Schnorr, Lutz)

- Any  $O : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$  is called **odds**.
- $M : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is  **$O$ -gale**  $\iff$   

$$M(\sigma) = M(\sigma 0)/O(\sigma 0) + M(\sigma 1)/O(\sigma 1).$$
  - Intuitively, an  $O$ -gale  $M$  is a betting strategy of a gambler:
    - at a stage  $\sigma$ , she/he has her/his capital  $M(\sigma)$ ,
    - she/he divides  $M(\sigma)$  into two  $M(\sigma 0)/O(\sigma 0)$  and  $M(\sigma 1)/O(\sigma 1)$  to bet 0 and 1 respectively as her/his conjecture of the next value, and
    - she/he gets  $M(\sigma 0)$  if the next value is 0,  $M(\sigma 1)$  if it is 1.
  - Note martingale = 2-martingale.
- $M : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is  **$O$ -supergale**  $\iff$   

$$M(\sigma) \geq M(\sigma 0)/O(\sigma 0) + M(\sigma 1)/O(\sigma 1).$$



# Martingales

## Definitions (related to Schnorr, Lutz)

- Any  $O : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$  is called **odds**.
- $M : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is  **$O$ -gale**  $\iff$   
 $M(\sigma) = M(\sigma 0)/O(\sigma 0) + M(\sigma 1)/O(\sigma 1)$ .
  - Intuitively, an  $O$ -gale  $M$  is a betting strategy of a gambler:
    - at a stage  $\sigma$ , she/he has her/his capital  $M(\sigma)$ ,
    - she/he divides  $M(\sigma)$  into two  $M(\sigma 0)/O(\sigma 0)$  and  $M(\sigma 1)/O(\sigma 1)$  to bet 0 and 1 respectively as her/his conjecture of the next value, and
    - she/he gets  $M(\sigma 0)$  if the next value is 0,  $M(\sigma 1)$  if it is 1.
  - Note martingale = 2-martingale.
- $M : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is  **$O$ -supergale**  $\iff$   
 $M(\sigma) \geq M(\sigma 0)/O(\sigma 0) + M(\sigma 1)/O(\sigma 1)$ .

# Martingales

## Definitions (related to Schnorr, Lutz)

- Any  $O : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$  is called **odds**.
- $M : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is  **$O$ -gale**  $\iff$   
 $M(\sigma) = M(\sigma 0)/O(\sigma 0) + M(\sigma 1)/O(\sigma 1)$ .
  - Intuitively, an  $O$ -gale  $M$  is a betting strategy of a gambler:
    - at a stage  $\sigma$ , she/he has her/his capital  $M(\sigma)$ ,
    - she/he divides  $M(\sigma)$  into two  $M(\sigma 0)/O(\sigma 0)$  and  $M(\sigma 1)/O(\sigma 1)$  to bet 0 and 1 respectively as her/his conjecture of the next value, and
    - she/he gets  $M(\sigma 0)$  if the next value is 0,  $M(\sigma 1)$  if it is 1.
  - Note martingale = 2-martingale.
- $M : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is  **$O$ -supergale**  $\iff$   
 $M(\sigma) \geq M(\sigma 0)/O(\sigma 0) + M(\sigma 1)/O(\sigma 1)$ .

## *Semimeasures vs Martingales*

### Definitions

- The induced odds  $O_\mu$  and the induced  $(O_\mu)$ -supergale  $M_\mu^\nu$  by a premeasure  $\mu : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow (0, 1]$  and a semimeasure  $\nu$  are defined as  $O_\mu(\emptyset) = 1/\mu(\emptyset)$  and  $O_\mu(\sigma i) = \mu(\sigma)/\mu(\sigma i)$ ; and  $M_\mu^\nu(\sigma) = \nu(\sigma)/\mu(\sigma)$ .
- The induced premeasure  $\mu_O$  and the induced semimeasure  $\nu_O^M$  by odds  $O : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$  with  $O(\sigma 0)^{-1} + O(\sigma 1)^{-1} \geq 1$  and an  $O$ -supergale  $M$  are defined as  $\mu_O(\sigma) = (\prod_{\tau \subset \sigma} O(\tau))^{-1}$  and  $\nu_O^M(\sigma) = \mu_O(\sigma)M(\sigma)$ .

**Proposition** These maps are a bijection and its inverse b/w;

- the set of all pairs of premeasures  $\mu : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow (0, 1]$  and semimeasures; and
- the set of all pairs of odds  $O$  with  $O(\sigma 0)^{-1} + O(\sigma 1)^{-1} \geq 1$  and  $O$ -supergales.

# Semimeasures vs Martingales

## Definitions

- The induced odds  $O_\mu$  and the induced  $(O_\mu)$ -supergale  $M_\mu^\nu$  by a premeasure  $\mu : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow (0, 1]$  and a semimeasure  $\nu$  are defined as  $O_\mu(\emptyset) = 1/\mu(\emptyset)$  and  $O_\mu(\sigma i) = \mu(\sigma)/\mu(\sigma i)$ ; and  $M_\mu^\nu(\sigma) = \nu(\sigma)/\mu(\sigma)$ .
- The induced premeasure  $\mu_O$  and the induced semimeasure  $\nu_O^M$  by odds  $O : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$  with  $O(\sigma 0)^{-1} + O(\sigma 1)^{-1} \geq 1$  and an  $O$ -supergale  $M$  are defined as  $\mu_O(\sigma) = (\prod_{\tau \subset \sigma} O(\tau))^{-1}$  and  $\nu_O^M(\sigma) = \mu_O(\sigma)M(\sigma)$ .

**Proposition** These maps are a bijection and its inverse b/w;

- the set of all pairs of premeasures  $\mu : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow (0, 1]$  and semimeasures; and
- the set of all pairs of odds  $O$  with  $O(\sigma 0)^{-1} + O(\sigma 1)^{-1} \geq 1$  and  $O$ -supergales.

## *Semimeasures vs Martingales*

### Definitions

- The induced odds  $O_\mu$  and the induced  $(O_\mu)$ -supergale  $M_\mu^\nu$  by a premeasure  $\mu : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow (0, 1]$  and a semimeasure  $\nu$  are defined as  $O_\mu(\emptyset) = 1/\mu(\emptyset)$  and  $O_\mu(\sigma i) = \mu(\sigma)/\mu(\sigma i)$ ; and  $M_\mu^\nu(\sigma) = \nu(\sigma)/\mu(\sigma)$ .
- The induced premeasure  $\mu_O$  and the induced semimeasure  $\nu_O^M$  by odds  $O : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$  with  $O(\sigma 0)^{-1} + O(\sigma 1)^{-1} \geq 1$  and an  $O$ -supergale  $M$  are defined as  $\mu_O(\sigma) = (\prod_{\tau \subset \sigma} O(\tau))^{-1}$  and  $\nu_O^M(\sigma) = \mu_O(\sigma)M(\sigma)$ .

**Proposition** These maps are a bijection and its inverse b/w;

- the set of all pairs of premeasures  $\mu : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow (0, 1]$  and semimeasures; and
- the set of all pairs of odds  $O$  with  $O(\sigma 0)^{-1} + O(\sigma 1)^{-1} \geq 1$  and  $O$ -supergales.

# Characterizations via Martingales

**Proposition**  $\forall f \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}, \sup_{\sigma \subset f} M_{\mu}^{\nu}(\sigma) = \sup_{\sigma \subset f} \nu(\sigma)/\mu(\sigma)$ .

- Since  $M_{\mu}^{\nu}(\sigma) = \nu(\sigma)/\mu(\sigma)$ .

**Theorem** For  $X \subset 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ , TFAE

- $X$  is an effective strong measure zero set.
- $\forall$  comp. atomless premeasure  $\mu : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$   
 $\exists$  semimeasure  $\nu \forall f \in X, \sup_{\sigma \subset f} \nu(\sigma)/\mu(\sigma) = \infty$ .
- $\forall$  comp. acceptable odds  $O : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$   
 $\exists O$ -supergale  $M \forall f \in X, \sup_{\sigma \subset f} M(\sigma) = \infty$ ,
  - where  $O$  is **acceptable**  $\iff$   
 $\forall g \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}, \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} O(g \upharpoonright n) = \infty$ .

## Characterizations via Martingales

**Proposition**  $\forall f \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}, \sup_{\sigma \subset f} M_{\mu}^{\nu}(\sigma) = \sup_{\sigma \subset f} \nu(\sigma)/\mu(\sigma)$ .

- Since  $M_{\mu}^{\nu}(\sigma) = \nu(\sigma)/\mu(\sigma)$ .

**Theorem** For  $X \subset 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ , TFAE

- $X$  is an effective strong measure zero set.
- $\forall$  comp. atomless premeasure  $\mu : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$   
 $\exists$  semimeasure  $\nu \forall f \in X, \sup_{\sigma \subset f} \nu(\sigma)/\mu(\sigma) = \infty$ .
- $\forall$  comp. acceptable odds  $O : 2^{<\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$   
 $\exists O$ -supergale  $M \forall f \in X, \sup_{\sigma \subset f} M(\sigma) = \infty$ ,
  - where  $O$  is **acceptable**  $\iff$   
 $\forall g \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}, \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} O(g \upharpoonright n) = \infty$ .

# Characterizations via Martingales

Again, by relativization, we have

**Theorem** For  $X \subset 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ , TFAE:

- $X$  is a strong measure zero set.
- $\forall$  atomless premeasure  $\mu \exists$  semimeasure  $\nu \forall f \in X$ ,  
 $\sup_{\sigma \subset f} \nu(\sigma) / \mu(\sigma) = \infty$ .
- $\forall$  acceptable odds  $O \exists O$ -supergale  $M \forall f \in X$ ,  
 $\sup_{\sigma \subset f} M(\sigma) = \infty$ .



## Summary

TFAE:

- $X$  is a strong measure zero set.
- $\neg\exists$  atomless premeasure  $\mu \forall g \in 2^{\mathbb{N}} \exists f \in X$   
 $f$  is  $\mu$ -complex relative to  $g$ .
- $\forall$  atomless premeasure  $\mu \exists$  semimeasure  $\nu \forall f \in X$ ,  
 $\sup_{\sigma \subset f} \nu(\sigma)/\mu(\sigma) = \infty$ .
- $\forall$  acceptable odds  $O \exists O$ -supergale  $M \forall f \in X$ ,  
 $\sup_{\sigma \subset f} M(\sigma) = \infty$ .

This talk is based on:

K.Higuchi and T.Kihara, On effectively closed sets of effective strong measure zero, preprint.

Thank you for your attention!

## Summary

TFAE:

- $X$  is a strong measure zero set.
- $\neg\exists$  atomless premeasure  $\mu \forall g \in 2^{\mathbb{N}} \exists f \in X$   
 $f$  is  $\mu$ -complex relative to  $g$ .
- $\forall$  atomless premeasure  $\mu \exists$  semimeasure  $\nu \forall f \in X$ ,  
 $\sup_{\sigma \subset f} \nu(\sigma)/\mu(\sigma) = \infty$ .
- $\forall$  acceptable odds  $O \exists O$ -supergale  $M \forall f \in X$ ,  
 $\sup_{\sigma \subset f} M(\sigma) = \infty$ .

This talk is based on:

K.Higuchi and T.Kihara, On effectively closed sets of effective strong measure zero, preprint.

Thank you for your attention!