

Numerical Evaluation of Algorithmic Complexity for Short Strings

A Glance into the Innermost Structure of Randomness

BY JEAN-PAUL DELAHAYE¹ AND HECTOR ZENIL²
 LABORATOIRE D'INFORMATIQUE FONDAMENTALE DE LILLE
 (CNRS)
 UNIVERSITÉ DE LILLE 1

July 16, 2018

Abstract

We describe a method that combines several theoretical and experimental results to numerically approximate the algorithmic (Kolmogorov-Chaitin) complexity of all $\sum_{n=1}^8 2^n$ bit strings up to 8 bits, and some bit strings between 9 and 16 bits. This is done by an exhaustive execution of all deterministic 2-symbol Turing machines with up to 4 states for which the halting times are known thanks to the busy beaver problem, that is 11 019 960 576 machines. An output frequency distribution is then computed, from which the algorithmic probability is calculated and the algorithmic complexity evaluated by way of the (Levin-Chaitin) coding theorem.

Keywords: algorithmic probability, program-size complexity, Chaitin's halting probability Omega, Levin's Universal Distribution, coding theorem, Busy Beaver problem, Kolmogorov-Chaitin complexity.

⟨parskip⟩0pt }
⟨parskip⟩0pt }

1 Overview

The algorithmic complexity of a bit string is defined as the length of the shortest binary computer program that prints out the string (hence also called *program-size* complexity). However, no general, finite and deterministic procedure exists to calculate algorithmic complexity. For a given string there are infinite many programs producing it. The most common approach to calculate the algorithmic complexity of a string is the use of compression algorithms exploiting the regularities of the string and producing shorter compressed versions. Compression algorithms have been used over the years, with the Lempel-Ziv algorithm[lempel] being one of the most prominent examples. The result of a compressed version of a string is an upper bound of the algorithmic complexity (denoted by $C(s)$) of the string s .

In practice, it is a known problem that one cannot compress short strings, shorter, for example, than the length in bits of the compression program which is added to the compressed version of s , making the result (the program producing s) sensitive to the compressor choice and the parameters involved. However, short strings are quite often the kind of data encountered in many practical settings. While compressors' asymptotic behavior guarantees the eventual convergence to $C(s)$ thanks to the invariance theorem (to be enunciated later), measurements differ considerably in the domain of short strings. A few attempts to deal with this problem have been reported before[[speidel](#)]. The conclusion is that estimators are always challenged by short strings.

Attempts to compute the uncomputable are always challenging, see for example [[rado](#), [brady](#), [marxen](#)] and more recently [[caludeomega](#)] and [[hertel](#)]. This often requires combining theoretical and experimental results. In this paper we describe a method to compute the algorithmic complexity (hereafter denoted by $C(s)$) of (short) bit strings by running a set of (relatively) large number of Turing machines for which the halting runtimes are known thanks to the busy beaver problem[[rado](#)]. The method describes a way to find the shortest program given a standard formalism of Turing machines, executing all machines from the shortest (in number of states) to a certain (small) size one by one recording how many of them produce a string and then using a theoretical result linking this string frequency with the algorithmic complexity of a string that we use to approximate $C(s)$.

The approach we adopt here is different and independent of the machine size (small machines are used only because they allow us to calculate all of them up to a small size) and relies only on the concept of algorithmic probability. The exhaustive approach is in the lines of Wolfram's paradigm[[wolfram](#)] consisting of exploring the space of simple programs by way of computer experiments. The result is a novel approach that we put forward for numerically calculate the complexity of short strings as an alternative to the indirect method using compression algorithms. The procedure makes use of a combination of results from related areas of computation, such as the concept of halting probability[[chaitin](#)], the busy beaver problem[[rado](#)], algorithmic probability[[solomonoff](#)], Levin's semi-measure and Levin-Chaitin's coding theorem[[levin](#)].

This approach, never attempted before to the authors' knowledge, consists in the thorough execution of all 4-state, 2-symbol Turing machines (the exact model is described in [3](#)) which, upon halting, generate a set of output strings from which a frequency distribution is calculated to obtain the algorithmic probability of a string to be the result of a halting machine. The algorithmic complexity of a string is then evaluated from the algorithmic probability using the Levin-Chaitin's coding theorem.

The paper is structured as follows. In [section 2](#) it is introduced the various theoretical concepts and experimental results utilized in the experiment, providing essential definitions and referring the reader to the relevant papers and textbooks. [Section 3](#) introduces the definition of our empirical proba-

bility distribution D . In 4 we present the methodology for calculating D . In 5 we calculate D and provide numerical values of the algorithmic complexity for short strings (the probability distribution produced by all 4-state 2-symbol Turing machines) by way of the theory presented in 2, particularly the so-called coding theorem. Finally, in 7 we summarize, discuss possible applications, and suggest potential directions for further research.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 The Halting problem and Chaitin's Ω

The Halting problem for Turing machines is the problem of deciding whether an arbitrary Turing machine T eventually halts on an arbitrary input s . One can ask whether there is a Turing machine U which, given $code(T)$ and the input s , eventually stops and produces 1 if $T(s)$ halts, and 0 if $T(s)$ does not halt. Turing's result[turing] proves that there is no such U . A Cantor diagonalization argument[turing] shows that the set of all such functions is not enumerable, whereas the set of all Turing machines is enumerable. Therefore, there are functions that are noncomputable.

Halting computations can be recognized by simply running them for the time they take to halt. The problem is to detect non-halting programs, about which one cannot know if the program will run forever or will eventually halt.

An elegant and concise representation of the halting problem is Chaitin's irrational number Ω [chaitin], defined as the halting probability of a universal computer programmed by coin tossing. Formally,

DEFINITION 1. $0 < \Omega = \sum_{p \text{ halts}} 2^{-|p|} < 1$ with $|p|$ the size of p in bits.

Ω is the halting probability of a universal (prefix-free³) Turing machine running a random program⁴. From now on only plain complexity will be used in this paper, unless explicitly stated otherwise.

In contrast with the mathematical constant π , for which, given enough time, one can in principle compute any number of digits of its binary expansion, for an Ω number one cannot compute more than a finite number of digits. The numerical value of $\Omega = \Omega_U$ depends on the choice of universal Turing machine U . There are, for example, Ω numbers for which no digit can be computed[chaitin]. For a Ω number it matters only whether a program halts or not; the time at which a halting program stops and the output upon halting is irrelevant.

3. A set of programs A is prefix-free if there are no two programs p_1 and p_2 such that p_2 is a proper extension of p_1 . Kraft's inequality[calude] guarantees that for any prefix-free set A , $\sum_{x \in A} 2^{-|x|} \leq 1$.

4. The differences and compatibilities between plain and prefix-free complexity are studied in detail in basic texts such as [calude, li].

A program that halts will eventually halt and its contribution to Ω can be recorded. Knowing the first n bits of Ω allows to determine whether a program of length $\leq n$ bits halts by simply running all programs in parallel until the sum exceeds Ω_n . All programs with length $\leq n$ not halting yet will not halt. Using these results, Calude and Stay[calude2] have shown that most programs either stop “quickly” or never halt because the halting runtime (and therefore the length of the output upon halting) is ultimately bounded by its program-size complexity. The results herein connect theory with experiments by providing empirical values of halting times and string length frequencies.

2.2 Algorithmic (program-size) complexity

The algorithmic complexity $C_U(s)$ of a string s with respect to a universal Turing machine U , measured in bits, is defined as the length in bits of the shortest Turing machine U that produces the string s and halts[solomonoff, kolmogorov, levin, chaitin]. Formally,

DEFINITION 2. $C_U(s) = \min \{|p|, U(p) = s\}$ where $|p|$ is the length of p measured in bits.

This complexity measure clearly seems to depend on U , and one may ask whether there exists a Turing machine which yields different values of $C(s)$. The answer is that there is no such Turing machine which can be used to decide whether a short description of a string is the shortest (for formal proofs see [calude, li]).

The ability of universal machines to efficiently simulate each other implies a corresponding degree of robustness. The invariance theorem[solomonoff] states that if $C_U(s)$ and $C_{U'}(s)$ are the shortest programs generating s using the universal Turing machines U and U' respectively, their difference will be bounded by an additive constant independent of s . Formally:

THEOREM (INVARIANCE[SOLOMONOFF]) 1. $|C_U(s) - C_{U'}(s)| \leq c_{U,U'}$

It is easy to see that the underlying concept is that, since both U and U' are universal Turing machines, one can always write a general translator (a compiler) between U and U' such that one can run either Turing machine and get one or another complexity value, simply adding the constant length of the translator to the result.

Algorithmic complexity formalizes the concept of simplicity versus complexity. It opposes what is simple to what is complex or random. Chaitin proves, for example, that his Ω numbers are algorithmically random. Unlike a simple string, a random one is hard to describe and only long programs, of about the original string length, can produce it.

A major drawback of C as a function taking s to the length of the shortest program producing s , is its non-computability proven by reduction to the halting problem. In other words, there is no program which takes a string s as input and produces the integer $C(s)$ as output.

2.3 Algorithmic probability

Deeply connected to Chaitin's halting probability Ω , is Solomonoff's concept of algorithmic probability, independently proposed and further formalized by Levin's [levin] semi-measure usually denoted by $m(s)$.

Unlike Chaitin's Ω , it is not only whether a program halts or not that matters for the concept of algorithmic probability; the output and halting time of a halting Turing machine are also relevant in this case.

Levin's semi-measure $m(s)$ is the probability of producing a string s with a random program p when running on a universal prefix-free Turing machine U . Formally,

DEFINITION 3. $m(s) = \sum_{p: U(p)=s} 2^{-|p|} = \sum_{p: U(p)=s} \Pr(U(p)=s)$

i.e. the sum over all the programs for which the (prefix-free) universal Turing machine U outputs the string s and halts, or the probability that U with when provided with a sequence of fair coin flip inputs as a program p produces s . m is related to the algorithmic complexity in that $m(s)$ is at least the maximum term in the summation of programs, which is $2^{-C(s)}$. So by approximating or calculating $m(s)$, one can obtain $C(s)$.

DEFINITION 4. (CODING THEOREM [LEVIN3, CHAITIN]) $-\log m(s) = C(s) + O(1)$

The coding theorem states that the shortest description of a given binary string is the negative logarithm of its algorithmic probability up to an additive constant. Roughly speaking, if there are many long descriptions of a certain string, then there is also a short description. Here, 'description' is understood as defined for algorithmic complexity: a program for a universal Turing machine that outputs the string upon halting. $m(s)$ as a function of s is, like $C(s)$ and Chaitin's Ω , noncomputable due to the halting problem⁵.

Levin's semi-measure formalizes the concept of Occam's razor, that is, the principle that favors selecting the competing hypothesis that makes the fewest assumptions when the hypotheses are equal in all other respects (e.g. size). The program that has the greater chance of being the origin of the produced output is likely to be the one actually producing it. Since shorter programs are more probable, simpler strings are more likely to be printed out than complicated ones.

⁵. An important property of m as semi-measure is that it dominates any other effective semi-measure μ because there is a constant c_μ such that, for all s $m(s) \geq c_\mu \mu(s)$. For this reason $m(s)$ is often called a *universal distribution* [kirchherr].

2.4 The busy beaver problem

NOTATION: We denote by $(n,2)$ the class (or space) of all n -state 2-symbol Turing machines (with the halting state not included among the n states).

DEFINITION 6.[rado] If σ_T is the number of 1s on the tape of a Turing machine T upon halting, then: $\sum(n) = \max \{\sigma_T: T \in (n,2) T(n) \text{ halts}\}$.

DEFINITION 7.[rado] If t_T is the number of steps that a machine T takes upon halting, then $S(n) = \max \{t_T: T \in (n,2) T(n) \text{ halts}\}$.

$\sum(n)$ and $S(n)$ as defined in 7 and 8 are noncomputable by reduction to the halting problem. Yet values are known for $(n,2)$ with $n \leq 4$. The solution for $(n,2)$ with $n < 3$ is trivial, the process leading to the solution in $(3,2)$ is discussed by Lin and Rado[lin], and the process leading to the solution in $(4,2)$ is discussed in [brady].

A program showing the evolution of all known busy beaver machines developed by one of this paper's authors is available online[busyhz]. The formalism followed in this paper is exactly the same as the one originally described and followed for the busy beaver problem as introduced by Rado[rado].

2.4.1 Solving the halting problem for small machines

The halting problem and the halting probability problem are closely related to the busy beaver problem in that a solution to any one of them would yield a solution to each of the others.

It is easy to see that $\sum(1) = 1$ and $\sum(2) = 4$. Lin and Rado[lin] proved $\sum(3) = 6$. The exact known values so far are $\sum(n) = \{1, 4, 6, 13\}$ and $\sum(n) = \{1, 6, 21, 107\}$ for $n = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$.

3 The empirical distribution D

DEFINITION 8. Consider a Turing machine with the binary alphabet $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$ and n states $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and an additional Halt state denoted by 0 (just as defined in Rado's original busy beaver paper[rado]).

The machine runs on a 2-way unbounded tape. At each step:

- * the machine's current "state" (instruction); and
- * the tape symbol the machine's head is scanning.<setlength>
define each of the following:
- * a unique symbol to write (the machine can overwrite a 1 on a 0, a 0 on a 1, a 1 on a 1, and a 0 on a 0);
- * a direction to move in: -1 (left), 1 (right) or 0 (none, when halting); and
- * a state to transition into (may be the same as the one it was in).<setlength>

The machine halts if and when it reaches the special halt state 0.

Since the domain of the program has size $2n$ and the target space has size $4(n+1)$, we can easily count the number of Turing machines. There are $4(n+1)^{2n}$ Turing machines with n states and 2 symbols according to the formalism described above.

No transition starting from the halting state exists, and the blank symbol is one of the 2 symbols (0 or 1) in the first run, while the other is used in the second run (in order to avoid any asymmetries due to the choice of a single blank symbol). In other words, we run each machine twice, one with 0 as the blank symbol (the symbol with which the tape starts out and is filled with), and an additional run with 1 as the blank symbol⁶.

DEFINITION 9. $D(n)$ = the function that assigns to every finite bit string s the quotient (number of times that a machine $(n,2)$ produces s) / (number of machines in $(n,2)$).

The output string is taken from the number of contiguous cells on the tape the head of the halting n -state machine has gone through upon halting.

Examples of $D(n)$ for $n=1, n=2$:

$$\begin{aligned} D(1) &= 0 \rightarrow 0.5; 1 \rightarrow 0.5 \\ D(2) &= 0 \rightarrow 0.328; 1 \rightarrow 0.328; 00 \rightarrow .0834 \dots \end{aligned}$$

$D(n)$ is the probability distribution of the strings produced by all 2-symbol halting Turing machines with n states. Tables 1, 2 and 3 in 5 show the full results for $D(1)$, $D(2)$ and $D(3)$, and Table 4 the top ranking of $D(4)$.

THEOREM 2. $D(n)$ is not computable.

PROOF (BY CONTRADICTION) Suppose that $n \rightarrow D(n)$ is computable. Let n be a given integer. Let $D(n)$ be computed. Once this finished the busy beaver functions $S(n)$ and $\Sigma(n)$ can be known for any n . This means this is a method to calculate Rado's busy beaver functions. Which is a contradiction with the non-computability of Rado's busy beaver functions.

Exact values can be calculated for small $(n,2)$ Turing machines up to $n=4$ states because the maximum halting runtime is known thanks to the busy beaver values $S(n)$ for $n < 5$. Turing machines that run more than $S(n)$ steps will therefore never halt. For example, for $n=4$, $S(4)=107$, so 107 is the maximum runtime we have to run each machine in $(4,2)$ in order to get the all the outputs.

⁶. Due to the symmetry of the computation, there is no real need to run each machine twice; one can *complete* the string frequencies assuming that each string produced its reversed and complemented version with the same frequency, and then group and divide by symmetric groups. A more detailed explanation of how this is done is in [delahayezeni].

For each busy beaver candidate with $n > 4$ states, a sample of Turing machines running up to the candidate $S(n)$ is possible. As for Rado's busy beaver functions $\Sigma(n)$ and $S(n)$, D is also approachable *from above*. For larger n sampling methods asymptotically converging to $D(n)$ can be used to approximate $D(n)$. In 5 we provide exact values of $D(n)$ for $n < 5$ for which the busy beaver functions are known.

Another common property between $D(n)$ and Rado's busy beaver functions is that $D(4)$ is well-defined in the sense that the calculation of the digits of $D(n)$ are fully determined as is in the decimal expansion of the mathematical constant π , but the calculation of $D(n)$ rapidly becomes impractical to determine for even a slightly larger number of states.

4 Methodology

The approach for evaluating the complexity $C(s)$ of a string s presented herein is limited by (1) the halting problem and (2) computing time constraints. Restriction (1) was overcome because the values of the busy beaver problem provided the halting times for all (4,2) Turing machines that started with a blank tape. Restriction (2) represented a challenge in terms of computing time and programming skills. It is also the same restriction that has kept others from attempting to solve the busy beaver problem for a greater number of states. Constraint (2) and the knowledge of the values of the busy beaver function permitted us to systematically study machines up to 4 states. We were able to compute up to about 1.3775×10^9 machines per day or 15 943 per second, taking us about 9 days⁷ to run all (4,2) Turing machines each up to the number of steps bounded by the busy beaver values.

Our quest is similar in several respects to the busy beaver problem or the calculation of the digits of Chaitin's Ω number. The main underlying difficulty in analyzing thoroughly a given class of machines is their uncomputability. Just as it is done for solving small values of the busy beaver problem, we rely on the experimental approach to analyze and describe a computable fraction of the uncomputable. A similar quest for the calculation of the digits of a Chaitin's Ω number was undertaken by Calude et al.[[caludeomega](#)], but unlike Chaitin's Ω , the calculation of $D(n)$ does not depend on the enumeration of Turing machines. In $D(n)$, however, one obtains different probabilities for the same string for each n , but the relative order seems to be preserved. In fact, every $(2, n)$ machine contributing to $D(n)$ is included in $D(n + 1)$ simply because every machine rule in $(2, n)$ is in $(2, n + 1)$.

7. Running on a single computer on a MacBook Intel Core Duo at 1.83Ghz, 2Gb. of memory and a solid state hard drive, using the `TuringMachine[]` function available in *Mathematica* 8 for $n < 4$ and a C++ program for $n = 4$. Since for $n = 4$ there were 2.56×10^8 machines involved, running on both 0 and 1 as blank, further optimizations were required. The use of a bignum library and an actual enumeration of the machines rather than producing the rules beforehand (which would have meant overloading the memory even before the actual calculation) was necessary.

4.1 Numerical evaluation of D

We consider the space $(n,2)$ of Turing machines with $0 < n < 5$. The halting “history” and output probability followed by their respective runtimes, presented in Tables 1, 2 and 3, show the times at which the programs in the domain of M halt, the frequency of the strings produced, and the time at which they halted after writing down the output string on their tape.

We provide exact values for $n = \{2, 3, 4\}$ in the Results 5. We derive $D(n)$ for $n < 5$ from counting the number of n -strings produced by all $(n,2)$ Turing machines upon halting. We define D to be an *empirical universal distribution* in Levin’s sense, and calculate the algorithmic complexity C of a string s in terms of D using the coding theorem.

We calculated the 72, 20 000, 15 059 072 and 22 039 921 152 two-way tape Turing machines started with a tape filled with 0s and 1s for $D(2)$, $D(3)$ and $D(4)$ ⁸. The number of Turing machines to calculate grows exponentially with the number of states. For $D(5)$ there are 53 119 845 582 848 machines to calculate, which makes the task as difficult as finding the busy beaver values for $\sum(5)$ and $S(5)$, busy beaver values which are currently unknown but for which the best candidate may be $S(5) = 47\,176\,870$ which makes the exploration of $(5,2)$ quite a challenge.

Although several ideas exploiting symmetries to reduce the total number of Turing machines have been proposed and used for finding busy beaver candidates[brady, machlin, holkner] in large spaces such as $n \geq 5$, to preserve the structure of the data we couldn’t apply all of them. This is because, unlike the busy beaver challenge, in which only the maximum values are important, the construction of a probability distribution requires every output to be equally considered. Some reduction techniques were, however, utilized, such as running only one-direction rules with a tape only filled with 0s and then completing the strings by reversion and complementation to avoid running every machine a second time with a tape filled with 1s. For an explanation of how we counted the number of symmetries to recuperate the outputs of the machines that were skipped see [delahayezeni].

5 Results

5.1 Algorithmic complexity tables

$D(1)$ is trivial. $(1,2)$ Turing machines produce only two strings, with the same number of machines producing each. The busy beaver values for $n = 1$ are $\sum(1) = 1$ and $S(1) = 1$. That is, all machines that halt do so after 1 step, and print at most one symbol.

⁸. We ran the experiment on several computers and cores in parallel, which allowed us to shorten the time by about a fourth of that calculated in a single processor. The space occupied by the machine outputs was 77.06 GB (of which only 38.53 GB was actually necessary by taking advantage of machine rule symmetries that could be later compensated without having to run them).

0	→ 0.5
1	→ 0.5

Table 1. Complete $D(1)$ from 24 (1,2)-Turing machines that halt out of a total of 64.

The busy beaver values for $n=2$ are $\sum(1)=4$ and $S(1)=6$. $D(2)$ is quite simple but starts to display some basic structure, such as a clear correlation between string length and occurrence, following what may be an exponential decrease:

$$\begin{aligned} P(|s|=1) &= 0.657 \\ P(|s|=2) &= 0.333 \\ P(|s|=3) &= 0.0065 \\ P(|s|=4) &= 0.0026 \end{aligned}$$

0 → .328	010 → .00065
1 → .328	101 → .00065
00 → .0834	111 → .00065
01 → .0834	0000 → .00032
10 → .0834	0010 → .00032
11 → .0834	0100 → .00032
001 → .00098	0110 → .00032
011 → .00098	1001 → .00032
100 → .00098	1011 → .00032
110 → .00098	1101 → .00032
000 → .00065	1111 → .00032

Table 2. Complete $D(2)$ (22 bit-strings) from 6088 (2,2)-Turing machines that halt out of 20000. Each string is followed by its probability (from the number of times produced), sorted from highest to lowest.

Among the various facts one can draw from $D(2)$, there are:

- * The relative string order in $D(1)$ is preserved in $D(2)$.
- * A fraction of $1/3$ of the total machines halt while the remaining $2/3$ do not. That is, 24 among 72 (running each machine twice with tape filled with 1 and 0 as explained before).
- * The longest string produced by $D(2)$ is of length 4.
- * $D(2)$ does not produce all $\sum_1^4 2^n = 30$ strings shorter than 5, only 22. The missing strings are 0001, 0101 and 0011 never produced, hence neither were their complements and reversions: 0111, 1000, 1110, 1010 and 1100. (setlength)

0 → 0.250	11110 → 0.0000470	100101 → 1.43×10^{-6}
1 → 0.250	00100 → 0.0000456	101001 → 1.43×10^{-6}
00 → 0.101	11011 → 0.0000456	000011 → 9.313×10^{-7}
01 → 0.101	01010 → 0.0000419	000110 → 9.313×10^{-7}
10 → 0.101	10101 → 0.0000419	001100 → 9.313×10^{-7}
11 → 0.101	01001 → 0.0000391	001101 → 9.313×10^{-7}
000 → 0.0112	01101 → 0.0000391	001111 → 9.313×10^{-7}
111 → 0.0112	10010 → 0.0000391	010001 → 9.313×10^{-7}
001 → 0.0108	10110 → 0.0000391	010010 → 9.313×10^{-7}
011 → 0.0108	01110 → 0.0000289	010011 → 9.313×10^{-7}
100 → 0.0108	10001 → 0.0000289	011000 → 9.313×10^{-7}
110 → 0.0108	00101 → 0.0000233	011101 → 9.313×10^{-7}
010 → 0.00997	01011 → 0.0000233	011110 → 9.313×10^{-7}
101 → 0.00997	10100 → 0.0000233	100001 → 9.313×10^{-7}
0000 → 0.000968	11010 → 0.0000233	100010 → 9.313×10^{-7}
1111 → 0.000968	00011 → 0.0000219	100111 → 9.313×10^{-7}
0010 → 0.000699	00111 → 0.0000219	101100 → 9.313×10^{-7}
0100 → 0.000699	11000 → 0.0000219	101101 → 9.313×10^{-7}
1011 → 0.000699	11100 → 0.0000219	101110 → 9.313×10^{-7}
1101 → 0.000699	000000 → 3.733×10^{-6}	110000 → 9.313×10^{-7}
0101 → 0.000651	111111 → 3.733×10^{-6}	110010 → 9.313×10^{-7}
1010 → 0.000651	000001 → 2.793×10^{-6}	110011 → 9.313×10^{-7}
0001 → 0.000527	011111 → 2.793×10^{-6}	111001 → 9.313×10^{-7}
0111 → 0.000527	100000 → 2.793×10^{-6}	111100 → 9.313×10^{-7}
1000 → 0.000527	111110 → 2.793×10^{-6}	0101010 → 9.313×10^{-7}
1110 → 0.000527	000100 → 2.333×10^{-6}	1010101 → 9.313×10^{-7}
0110 → 0.000510	001000 → 2.333×10^{-6}	001110 → 4.663×10^{-7}
1001 → 0.000510	110111 → 2.333×10^{-6}	011100 → 4.663×10^{-7}
0011 → 0.000321	111011 → 2.333×10^{-6}	100011 → 4.663×10^{-7}
1100 → 0.000321	000010 → 1.863×10^{-6}	110001 → 4.663×10^{-7}
00000 → 0.0000969	001001 → 1.863×10^{-6}	0000010 → 4.663×10^{-7}
11111 → 0.0000969	001010 → 1.863×10^{-6}	0000110 → 4.663×10^{-7}
00110 → 0.0000512	010000 → 1.863×10^{-6}	0100000 → 4.663×10^{-7}
01100 → 0.0000512	010100 → 1.863×10^{-6}	0101110 → 4.663×10^{-7}
10011 → 0.0000512	011011 → 1.863×10^{-6}	0110000 → 4.663×10^{-7}
11001 → 0.0000512	100100 → 1.863×10^{-6}	0111010 → 4.663×10^{-7}
00010 → 0.0000489	101011 → 1.863×10^{-6}	1000101 → 4.663×10^{-7}
01000 → 0.0000489	101111 → 1.863×10^{-6}	1001111 → 4.663×10^{-7}
10111 → 0.0000489	110101 → 1.863×10^{-6}	1010001 → 4.663×10^{-7}
11101 → 0.0000489	110110 → 1.863×10^{-6}	1011111 → 4.663×10^{-7}
00001 → 0.0000470	111101 → 1.863×10^{-6}	1111001 → 4.663×10^{-7}
01111 → 0.0000470	010110 → 1.43×10^{-6}	1111101 → 4.663×10^{-7}
10000 → 0.0000470	011010 → 1.43×10^{-6}	

Table 3. Complete $D(3)$ (128 bit-strings) produced by all the 15 059 072 (3,2)-halting Turing machines.

Given the number of machines to run, $D(3)$ constitutes the first non trivial probability distribution to calculate. The busy beaver values for $n=3$ are $\sum(3)=6$ and $S(3)=14$.

Among the various facts for $D(3)$:

- * There are 4 294 368 machines that halt among the 15 059 072 in $(3,2)$. That is a fraction of 0.2851.
- * The longest string produced in $(3,2)$ is of length 7.
- * $D(3)$ has not all $\sum_1^4 2^n = 254$ strings shorter than 7 but 128 only, half of all the possible strings up to that length.
- * $D(3)$ preserves the string order of $D(2)$.[\(setlength\)](#)

$D(3)$ ratifies the tendency of classifying strings by length with exponentially decreasing values. The distribution comes sorted by length blocks from which one cannot easily say whether those at the bottom are more random-looking than those in the middle, but one can definitely say that the ones at the top, both for the entire distribution and by length block, are intuitively the simplest. Both 0^k and its reversed 1^k for $n \leq 8$ are always at the top of each block, with 0 and 1 at the top of them all. There is a single exception in which strings were not sorted by length, this is the string group 0101010 and 1010101 that are found four places further away from their length block, which we take as a second indication of a complexity classification becoming more visible since these 2 strings correspond to what one would intuitively consider less random-looking because they are easily described as the repetition of two bits.

$D(4)$ with 22 039 921 152 machines to run was the first true challenge, both in terms of programming specification and computational resources. The busy beaver values for $n=4$ are $\sum(3)=13$ and $S(n)=107$. Evidently every machine in $(n,2)$ for $n \leq 4$ is in $(4,2)$ because a rule in $(n,2)$ with $n \leq 4$ is a rule in $(4,2)$ in which a part of it is never used and halts, which is guaranteed to exist because the computation is exhaustive over $(4,2)$.

0 → 0.205	01101 → 0.000145	110111 → 0.0000138
1 → 0.205	10010 → 0.000145	111011 → 0.0000138
00 → 0.102	10110 → 0.000145	001001 → 0.0000117
01 → 0.102	01010 → 0.000137	011011 → 0.0000117
10 → 0.102	10101 → 0.000137	100100 → 0.0000117
11 → 0.102	00110 → 0.000127	110110 → 0.0000117
000 → 0.0188	01100 → 0.000127	010001 → 0.0000109
111 → 0.0188	10011 → 0.000127	011101 → 0.0000109
001 → 0.0180	11001 → 0.000127	100010 → 0.0000109
011 → 0.0180	00101 → 0.000124	101110 → 0.0000109
100 → 0.0180	01011 → 0.000124	000011 → 0.0000108
110 → 0.0180	10100 → 0.000124	001111 → 0.0000108
010 → 0.0171	11010 → 0.000124	110000 → 0.0000108
101 → 0.0171	00011 → 0.000108	111100 → 0.0000108
0000 → 0.00250	00111 → 0.000108	000110 → 0.0000107
1111 → 0.00250	11000 → 0.000108	011000 → 0.0000107
0001 → 0.00193	11100 → 0.000108	100111 → 0.0000107
0111 → 0.00193	01110 → 0.0000928	111001 → 0.0000107
1000 → 0.00193	10001 → 0.0000928	001101 → 0.0000101
1110 → 0.00193	000000 → 0.0000351	010011 → 0.0000101
0101 → 0.00191	111111 → 0.0000351	101100 → 0.0000101
1010 → 0.00191	000001 → 0.0000195	110010 → 0.0000101
0010 → 0.00190	011111 → 0.0000195	001100 → 9.943×10^{-6}
0100 → 0.00190	100000 → 0.0000195	110011 → 9.943×10^{-6}
1011 → 0.00190	111110 → 0.0000195	011110 → 9.633×10^{-6}
1101 → 0.00190	000010 → 0.0000184	100001 → 9.633×10^{-6}
0110 → 0.00163	010000 → 0.0000184	011001 → 9.3×10^{-6}
1001 → 0.00163	101111 → 0.0000184	100110 → 9.3×10^{-6}
0011 → 0.00161	111101 → 0.0000184	000101 → 8.753×10^{-6}
1100 → 0.00161	010010 → 0.0000160	010111 → 8.753×10^{-6}
00000 → 0.000282	101101 → 0.0000160	101000 → 8.753×10^{-6}
11111 → 0.000282	010101 → 0.0000150	111010 → 8.753×10^{-6}
00001 → 0.000171	101010 → 0.0000150	001110 → 7.863×10^{-6}
01111 → 0.000171	010110 → 0.0000142	011100 → 7.863×10^{-6}
10000 → 0.000171	011010 → 0.0000142	100011 → 7.863×10^{-6}
11110 → 0.000171	100101 → 0.0000142	110001 → 7.863×10^{-6}
00010 → 0.000166	101001 → 0.0000142	001011 → 6.523×10^{-6}
01000 → 0.000166	001010 → 0.0000141	110100 → 6.523×10^{-6}
10111 → 0.000166	010100 → 0.0000141	000111 → 6.243×10^{-6}
11101 → 0.000166	101011 → 0.0000141	111000 → 6.243×10^{-6}
00100 → 0.000151	110101 → 0.0000141	0000000 → 3.723×10^{-6}
11011 → 0.000151	000100 → 0.0000138	1111111 → 3.723×10^{-6}
01001 → 0.000145	001000 → 0.0000138	0101010 → 2.393×10^{-6}

Table 4. The top 129 strings from $D(4)$ with highest probability from a total of 1832 different produced strings.

Among the various facts from these results:

- * There are 5 970 768 960 machines that halt among the 22 039 921 152 in (4,2). That is a fraction of 0.27.
- * A total number of 1824 strings were produced in (4,2).
- * The longest string produced is of length 14 (only 8 among all the 2^{14} possible were generated).
- * The busy beaver machines (writing more 1s than any other and halting) found in (4,2) had very low probability among all the halting machines: $pr(1111 \setminus 1111111101) = 2.01 \times 10^{-9}$. Because of the reverted string (1011111111111), the total probability of finding a busy beaver in (4,2) is therefore 4.02×10^{-9} only (or twice that number if the complemented string with the maximum number of 0s is taken).
- * The longest strings in (4,2) were in the string group formed by: 1101010101010101, 1101010100010101, 1010101010101011 and 1010100010101011, each with 5.4447×10^{-10} probability, i.e. an even smaller probability than for the busy beavers, and therefore the most random in the classification.
- * (4,2) produces all strings up to length 8, then the number of strings larger than 8 decreases. The following are the number of strings by length $|\{s: |s|=l\}|$ generated and represented in $D(4)$ from a total of 1824 different strings. From $i=1, \dots, 15$ the values l of $|\{s: |s|=n\}|$ are 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128, 256, 486, 410, 252, 112, 46, 8, and 0, which indicated all 2^l strings where generated for $n \leq 8$.
- * While the probability of producing a string with an odd number of 1s is the same than the probability of producing a string with an even number of 1s (and therefore the same for 0s), the probability of producing a string of odd length is .559 and .441 for even length.
- * As in $D(3)$, where we report that one string group (0101010 and its reversal), in $D(4)$ 399 strings climbed to the top and were not sorted among their length groups.
- * In $D(4)$ string length was no longer a determinant for string positions. For example, between positions 780 and 790, string lengths are: 11, 10, 10, 11, 9, 10, 9, 9, 9, 10 and 9 bits.
- * $D(4)$ preserves the string order of $D(3)$ except in 17 places out of 128 strings in $D(3)$ ordered from highest to lowest string frequency. The maximum rank

distance among the farthest two differing elements in $D(3)$ and $D(4)$ was 20, with an average of 11.23 among the 17 misplaced cases and a standard deviation of about 5 places. The Spearman's rank correlation coefficient between the two rankings had a critical value of 0.98, meaning that the order of the 128 elements in $D(3)$ compared to their order in $D(4)$ were in an interval confidence of high significance with almost null probability to have produced by chance. $\langle \text{setlength} \rangle$

number n of 1s	pr(n)
1	0.472
2	0.167
3	0.0279
4	0.00352
5	0.000407
6	0.0000508
7	6.5×10^{-6}
8	1.31×10^{-6}
9	2.25×10^{-7}
10	3.62×10^{-8}
11	1.61×10^{-8}
12	1.00×10^{-8}
13	4.02×10^{-9}

Table 5. Probabilities of finding n 1s (or 0s) in $(4, 2)$.

string group	occurrences
0, 1	1224440064
01, 10	611436144
00, 11	611436144
001, 011, 100, 110	215534184
000, 111	112069020
010, 101	102247932
0001, 0111, 1000, 1110	23008080
0010, 0100, 1011, 1101	22675896
0000, 1111	14917104
0101, 1010	11425392
0110, 1001	9712752
0011, 1100	9628728
00001, 01111, 10000, 11110	2042268
00010, 01000, 10111, 11101	1984536
01001, 01101, 10010, 10110	1726704
00000, 11111	1683888
00110, 01100, 10011, 11001	1512888
00101, 01011, 10100, 11010	1478244
00011, 00111, 11000, 11100	1288908
00100, 11011	900768
01010, 10101	819924
01110, 10001	554304
000001, 011111, 100000, 111110	233064
000010, 010000, 101111, 111101	219552
000000, 111111	209436
010110, 011010, 100101, 101001	169896
001010, 010100, 101011, 110101	167964
000100, 001000, 110111, 111011	164520
001001, 011011, 100100, 110110	140280
010001, 011101, 100010, 101110	129972

Table 6. String groups formed by reversion and complementation followed by the total machines producing them.

These are the top 10 string groups (i.e. with their reverted and complemented counterparts) appearing sooner than expected and getting away from their length blocks. That is, their lengths were greater than the next string in the classification order): 11111111, 11110111, 000000000, 111111111, 000010000, 111101111, 111111110, 010101010, 101010101, 000101010. This means these string groups had greater algorithmic probability and therefore less algorithmic complexity than shorter strings.

5.1.1 Same length string distribution

length n	pr(n)
1	0.410
2	0.410
3	0.144
4	0.0306
5	0.00469
6	0.000818
7	0.000110
8	0.0000226
9	4.69×10^{-6}
10	1.42×10^{-6}
11	4.9×10^{-7}
12	1.69×10^{-7}

Table 7. The probability of producing a string of length n exponentially decreases as n linearly increases. The slowdown in the rate of decrease for string length $l > 8$ is due to the few longer strings produced in (4,2).




Figure 1. (4,2) frequency distribution by string length.




Figure 2. Probability density function of bit strings of length $l = 8$ from $(4, 2)$. The histogram (left) shows the probabilities to fall within a version (right) shows how well the distribution fits a Pareto distribution (dashed) with location parameter $k = 10$. The reader may see the lines overlap. $D(4)$ (and the sub-distributions it contains) is therefore log-normal.

Table 8 displays some statistical information of the distribution. The distribution is skewed to the right, the mass of the distribution is therefore concentrated on the left with a long right tail, as shown in Figure 2.

	value
mean	0.00391
median	0.00280
variance	0.0000136
kurtosis	23
skewness	3.6

Table 8. Statistical values of the empirical distribution function $D(4)$ for strings of length $l = 8$.

5.2 Algorithmic complexity tables

Program-size (C) complexity values from the output probability distribution $D(4)$ by application of the coding theorem.

Columns in table 9 show the strings after the evaluation of their algorithmic complexity, the program-size length (the algorithmic complexity) through the application of the coding theorem to the algorithmic probabilities values obtained from $D(4)$.

0→2.29	10110→12.76	100100→16.38	0100000→19.10
1→2.29	01010→12.83	110110→16.38	1011111→19.10
00→3.29	10101→12.83	010001→16.49	1111101→19.10
01→3.29	00110→12.95	011101→16.49	0000100→19.38
10→3.29	01100→12.95	100010→16.49	0010000→19.38
11→3.29	10011→12.95	101110→16.49	1101111→19.38
000→5.74	11001→12.95	000011→16.49	1111011→19.38
111→5.74	00101→12.98	001111→16.49	0001000→19.45
001→5.79	01011→12.98	110000→16.49	1110111→19.45
011→5.79	10100→12.98	111100→16.49	0000110→19.64
100→5.79	11010→12.98	000110→16.52	0110000→19.64
110→5.79	00011→13.18	011000→16.52	1001111→19.64
010→5.87	00111→13.18	100111→16.52	1111001→19.64
101→5.87	11000→13.18	111001→16.52	0101110→19.68
0000→8.64	11100→13.18	001101→16.59	0111010→19.68
1111→8.64	01110→13.39	010011→16.59	1000101→19.68
0001→9.02	10001→13.39	101100→16.59	1010001→19.68
0111→9.02	000000→14.80	110010→16.59	0010001→20.04
1000→9.02	111111→14.80	001100→16.62	0111011→20.04
1110→9.02	000001→15.64	110011→16.62	1000100→20.04
0101→9.03	011111→15.64	011110→16.66	1101110→20.04
1010→9.03	100000→15.64	100001→16.66	0001001→20.09
0010→9.04	111110→15.64	011001→16.76	0110111→20.09
0100→9.04	000010→15.73	100110→16.76	1001000→20.09
1011→9.04	010000→15.73	000101→16.80	1110110→20.09
1101→9.04	101111→15.73	010111→16.80	0010010→20.11
0110→9.26	111101→15.73	101000→16.80	0100100→20.11
1001→9.26	010010→15.93	111010→16.80	1011011→20.11
0011→9.28	101101→15.93	001110→16.96	1101101→20.11
1100→9.28	010101→16.02	011100→16.96	0010101→20.15
00000→11.79	101010→16.02	100011→16.96	0101011→20.15
11111→11.79	010110→16.10	110001→16.96	1010100→20.15
00001→12.51	011010→16.10	001011→17.23	1101010→20.15
01111→12.51	100101→16.10	110100→17.23	0100101→20.16
10000→12.51	101001→16.10	000111→17.29	0101101→20.16
11110→12.51	001010→16.12	111000→17.29	1010010→20.16
00010→12.55	010100→16.12	0000000→18.03	1011010→20.16
01000→12.55	101011→16.12	1111111→18.03	0001010→20.22
10111→12.55	110101→16.12	0101010→18.68	0101000→20.22
11101→12.55	000100→16.15	1010101→18.68	1010111→20.22
00100→12.69	001000→16.15	0000001→18.92	1110101→20.22
11011→12.69	110111→16.15	0111111→18.92	0100001→20.26
01001→12.76	111011→16.15	1000000→18.92	0111101→20.26
01101→12.76	001001→16.38	1111110→18.92	1000010→20.26
10010→12.76	011011→16.38	0000010→19.10	1011110→20.26

Table 9. Top 180 strings sorted from lowest to highest algorithmic complexity calculated from $D(4)$ by applying the coding theorem.

The largest complexity value $\max \{C(s) : s \in D(4)\} = 29$ bits. The output strings (1111111111101 and 1011111111111) produced by the busy beavers in (4,2) were close to the maximal complexity in this space for the number of printed 1s among all the produced strings, with a program-size complexity of 28 bits.




Figure 3. (4,2) output log-frequency plot, ordered from most to less frequent string, the slope is clearly exponential.

5.2.1 Same length string complexity

The classification table 10 allows to make a comparison of the structure of the strings related to their calculated complexity among all the strings of the same length extracted from $D(4)$.

0000000→18.03	1001000→20.09	0101001→20.42	0000111→20.99
1111111→18.03	1110110→20.09	0110101→20.42	0001111→20.99
0101010→18.68	0010010→20.11	1001010→20.42	1110000→20.99
1010101→18.68	0100100→20.11	1010110→20.42	1111000→20.99
0000001→18.92	1011011→20.11	0001100→20.48	0011110→21.00
0111111→18.92	1101101→20.11	0011000→20.48	0111100→21.00
1000000→18.92	0010101→20.15	1100111→20.48	1000011→21.00
1111110→18.92	0101011→20.15	1110011→20.48	1100001→21.00
0000010→19.10	1010100→20.15	0110110→20.55	0111110→21.03
0100000→19.10	1101010→20.15	1001001→20.55	1000001→21.03
1011111→19.10	0100101→20.16	0011010→20.63	0011001→21.06
1111101→19.10	0101101→20.16	0101100→20.63	0110011→21.06
0000100→19.38	1010010→20.16	1010011→20.63	1001100→21.06
0010000→19.38	1011010→20.16	1100101→20.63	1100110→21.06
1101111→19.38	0001010→20.22	0100010→20.68	0001110→21.08
1111011→19.38	0101000→20.22	1011101→20.68	0111000→21.08
0001000→19.45	1010111→20.22	0100110→20.77	1000111→21.08
1110111→19.45	1110101→20.22	0110010→20.77	1110001→21.08
0000110→19.64	0100001→20.26	1001101→20.77	0010011→21.10
0110000→19.64	0111101→20.26	1011001→20.77	0011011→21.10
1001111→19.64	1000010→20.26	0010110→20.81	1100100→21.10
1111001→19.64	1011110→20.26	0110100→20.81	1101100→21.10
0101110→19.68	0000101→20.29	1001011→20.81	0110001→21.13
0111010→19.68	0101111→20.29	1101001→20.81	0111001→21.13
1000101→19.68	1010000→20.29	0001101→20.87	1000110→21.13
1010001→19.68	1111010→20.29	0100111→20.87	1001110→21.13
0010001→20.04	0000011→20.38	1011000→20.87	0011100→21.19
0111011→20.04	0011111→20.38	1110010→20.87	1100011→21.19
1000100→20.04	1100000→20.38	0011101→20.93	0001011→21.57
1101110→20.04	1111100→20.38	0100011→20.93	0010111→21.57
0001001→20.09	0010100→20.39	1011100→20.93	1101000→21.57
0110111→20.09	1101011→20.39	1100010→20.93	1110100→21.57

Table 10. Classification—from less to more random—for 7-bit strings extracted from $D(4)$.

5.2.2 Halting summary




Figure 4. Graphs showing the halting probabilities among $(n,2)$, $n < 5$. The list plot on the left shows the decreasing probability of the machines while the paired bar chart on the right allows a visual comparison between both halting and non-halting machines side by side.

In summary, among the (running over a tape filled with 0 only): 12, 3 044, 2 147 184 and 2 985 384 480 Turing machines in $(n,2)$, $n < 5$, there were 36, 10 000, 7 529 536 and 11 019 960 576 that halted, that is slightly decreasing fractions of 0.333..., 0.3044, 0.2851 and 0.2709 respectively.

Full results can be found online at <http://www.mathrix.org/experimentalAIT/>

5.3 Runtimes investigation

Runtimes much longer than the lengths of their respective halting programs are rare and the empirical distribution approaches the *a priori* computable probability distribution on all possible runtimes predicted in [calude]. As reported in [calude] “long” runtimes are effectively rare. The longer it takes

to halt, the less likely it is to stop.




Figure 5. Runtimes distribution in (4,2).

	$t=1$	$t=2$	$t=3$	$t=4$	$t=5$	$t=6$	$t=7$	
n=1	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
n=2	0	1.0	0.60	0.45	0.21	0.11	0.052	0.025
n=3	0	0	0.40	0.46	0.64	0.57	0.50	0.36
n=4	0	0	0	0.092	0.15	0.29	0.39	0.45
n=5	0	0	0	0	0	0.034	0.055	0.16
n=6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0098
n=7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
n=8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
n=9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
n=10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

Table 11. Probability that a n -bit string among all $n < 10$ bit strings is produced at times $t < 8$.

	$t=1$	$t=2$	$t=3$	$t=4$	$t=5$	$t=6$	$t=7$	Total
n=1	0.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.20
n=2	0	0.14	0.046	0.016	0.0045	0.0012	0.00029	0.20
n=3	0	0	0.030	0.017	0.014	0.0063	0.0028	0.070
n=4	0	0	0	0.0034	0.0032	0.0031	0.0022	0.012
n=5	0	0	0	0	0	0.00037	0.00031	0.00069
n=6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
n=7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
n=8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
n=9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
n=10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0.21	0.14	0.076	0.037	0.021	0.011	0.0057	

Table 12. Probability that a n -bit string with $n < 10$ is produced at time $t < 7$.

Among the various miscellaneous facts from these results:

- * All 1-bit strings were produced at $t = 1$.
- * 2-bit strings were produced at all $2 < t < 14$ times.
- * $t = 3$ was the time at which the first 2 bit strings of different lengths were produced ($n = 2$ and $n = 3$).
- * Strings produced before 8 steps account for 49% of the strings produced by all (4,2) halting machines.
- * There were 496 string groups produced by (4,2), that is strings that are not symmetric under reversion or complementation.
- * There is a relation between t and n ; no n -bit string is produced before $t < n$. This is obvious because a machine needs at least t steps to print t symbols.
- * At every time t there was at least one string of length n for $1 < n < t$. (setlength)

6 Discussion

Intuitively, one may be persuaded to assign a lower or higher algorithmic complexity to some strings when looking at tables 9 and 10, because they may seem simpler or more random than others of the same length. We think that very short strings may appear to be more or less random but may be as hard to produce as others of the same length, because Turing machines producing them may require the same quantity of resources to print them out and halt as they would with others of the same (very short) length.

For example, is 0101 more or less complex than 0011? Is 001 more or less complex than 010? The string 010 may seem simpler than 001 to us because we may picture it as part of a larger sequence of alternating bits, forgetting

that such is not the case and that 010 actually was the result of a machine that produced it when entering into the halting state, using this extra state to somehow delimit the length of the string. No satisfactory argument may exist to say whether 010 is really more or less random than 001, other than actually running the machines and looking at their objective ranking according to the formalism and method described herein. The situation changes for larger strings, when an alternating string may in effect strongly suggest that it should be less random than other strings because a short description is possible in terms of the simple alternation of bits. Some strings may also assume their correct rank when the calculation is taken further, for example if we were able to compute $D(5)$.

On the other hand, it may seem odd that the program size complexity of a string of length l is systematically larger than l when l can be produced by a *print* function of length $l + \{\text{the length of the print program}\}$, and indeed one can interpret the results exactly in this way. The surplus can be interpreted as a constant product of a *print* phenomenon which is particularly significant for short strings. But since it is a constant, one can subtract it from all the strings. For example, subtracting 1 from all values brings the complexity results for the shortest strings to exactly their size, which is what one would expect from the values for algorithmic complexity. On the other hand, subtracting the constant preserves the relative order, even if larger strings continue having algorithmic complexity values larger than their lengths. What we provide herein, besides the numerical values, is a hierarchical structure from which one can tell whether a string is of greater, lesser or equal algorithmic complexity.

The *print program* assumes the implicit programming of the halting configuration. In C language, for example, this is delimited by the semicolon. The fact then that a single bit string requires a 2 bit “program” may be interpreted as the additional information represented by the length of the string; the fact that a string is of length n is not the result of an arbitrary decision but it is encoded in the producing machine. In other words, the string not only carries the information of its n bits, but also of the delimitation of its length. This is different to, for example, approaching the algorithmic complexity by means of cellular automata—there being no encoded halting state, one has to manually stop the computation upon producing a string of a certain arbitrary length according to an arbitrary stopping time. This is a research program that we have explored before[zenildelahaye] and that we may analyze in further detail somewhere else.

It is important to point out that after the application of the coding theorem one often gets a non-integer value when calculating $C(s)$ from $m(s)$. Even though when interpreted as the size in bits of the program produced by a Turing machine should be taken to its closest integer value (or the ceiling value) because the size of a program can only be given in an integer number of bits. The non-integer values are, however, useful to provide a finer structure providing information on the exact places in which strings have been ranked.

An open question is how much of the relative string order (hence the relative algorithmic probability and the relative algorithmic complexity) of $D(n)$ will be preserved when calculating $D(i)$ for larger Turing machine spaces such that $0 < n < i$. As reported here, $D(n)$ preserves most of the string orders of $D(n-1)$ for $1 < n < 5$. While each space $(n,2)$ contains all $(n-1,2)$ machines, the exponential increase in number of machines when adding states may easily produce strings such that the order of the previous distribution is changed. What the results presented here show, however, is that each new space of larger machines contributes in the same proportion to the number of strings produced in the smaller spaces, in such a way that they preserve much of the previous string order of the distributions of smaller spaces, as shown by calculating the Spearman coefficient indicating a very strong ranking correlation. In fact, some of the ranking variability between the distributions of spaces of machines with different numbers of states occurred later in the classification, likely due to the fact that the smaller spaces missed the production of some strings. For example, the first rank difference between $D(3)$ and $D(4)$ occurred in place 20, meaning that the string order in $D(3)$ was strictly preserved in $D(4)$ up to the top 20 strings sorted from higher to lower frequency. Moreover, one may ask whether the actual frequency values of the strings converge.

7 Concluding remarks

We have provided numerical tables with values of the algorithmic complexity for short strings. The experimental approach for calculating $D(n)$ gives us valuable insights into the structure of a real calculated algorithmic complexity structure giving rise to theoretical questions and potential practical applications. On the one hand, the calculation of $D(n)$ provides an empirical and *natural* distribution that does not depend on an additive constant and may be used in Bayesian contexts as a prior distribution. On the other hand, it might turn out to have valuable applications, especially because of the known issues explained in 1 related to the problem of approaching the complexity of short strings by means of compression algorithms often failing for short strings.

The presented approach provides numerical evaluations of C using the same formalism of Turing machines as defined by Rado in his busy beaver problem[rado] and described in 2.4. This direct approach by way of algorithmic probability reduces the impact of the additive constant involved in the choice of computing model (or programming language), shedding light on the behavior of small Turing machines and tangibly grasping the concept of the algorithmic complexity of a string by exposing its structure on the basis of a complexity ranking.

To our knowledge this is the first time that numerical values of algorithmic complexity are provided and tabulated. We wanted to provide a table of values useful for several purposes, both to make conjectures about the continuation of the distribution—perhaps providing a statistical framework for a statistical calculation of the algorithmic complexity for longer strings—as well as to shed light on both the behavior of small Turing machines and the use of empirical approaches for practical applications of algorithmic complexity to the real-world.⁹ The full results and complete tables are available online available at <http://www.mathrix.org/experimentalAIT/>

Bibliography

- [brady] A. H. Brady, The Determination of the Value of Rado's Noncomputable Function $\sum (k)$ for Four-State Turing Machines. *Math. Comput.* 40, 647-665, 1983. [delahayezenil] J-P. Delahaye and H. Zenil, On the Kolmogorov-Chaitin complexity for short sequences. in C.S. Calude (ed.) *Randomness and Complexity: From Leibniz to Chaitin*. World Scientific, 2007. [chaitin] G.J. Chaitin, *Algorithmic Information Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 1987. [chaitin2] G.J. Chaitin, Computing the busy beaver function, in: T.M. Cover, B. Gopinath (Eds.), *Open Problems in Communication and Computation*, Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, pp.108–112, 1987. [calude] C.S. Calude, *Information and Randomness: An Algorithmic Perspective*. (Texts in Theoretical Computer Science. An EATCS Series), Springer; 2nd. edition, 2002. [calude2] C.S. Calude and M.A. Stay, Most programs stop quickly or never halt, *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 40 295–308, 2005. [caludeomega] C.S. Calude, M.J. Dinneen, and C-K. Shu, Computing a glimpse of randomness, *Experimental Mathematics*, 11(2): 369-378, 2002. [hertel] J. Hertel, *Computing the Uncomputable Rado Sigma Function: An Automated, Symbolic Induction Prover for Nonhalting Turing Machines*, The Mathematica Journal 11:2 2009. [holkner] A. Holkner, *Acceleration Techniques for Busy Beaver Candidates*, Proceedings of the Second Australian Undergraduate Students' Computing Conference, 2004. [stout] Q.F. Stout, The Complex Behaviour Of Simple Machines [kirchherr] W. Kirchherr, M. Li and P. Vitányi, *The miraculous universal distribution*, *Math. Intelligencer*. 19(4), 7–15, 1997. [kolmogorov] A. N. Kolmogorov. *Three approaches to the quantitative definition of information*. Problems of Information and Transmission, 1(1): 1–7, 1965. [lempel] A. Lempel and J. Ziv, *On the Complexity of Finite Sequences*, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 22(1), pp. 75-81, 1976. [levin] L. Levin, *Laws of information conservation (non-growth) and aspects of the foundation of probability theory*. Problems In Form. Transmission 10, 206–210, 1974. [levin2] L. Levin, *On a Concrete Method of Assigning Complexity Measures*, *Doklady Akademii nauk SSSR*, vol.18(3), pp. 727-731, 1977. [levin3] L. Levin. *Universal Search Problems*. 9(3): 265-266, 1973 (c). (submitted: 1972, reported in talks: 1971). English translation in: B.A.Trakhtenbrot. *A Survey of Russian Approaches to Perebor (Brute-force Search) Algorithms*. Annals of the History of Computing 6(4): 384-400, 1984. [li] M. Li, P. Vitányi, *An Introduction to Kolmogorov Complexity and Its Applications*, Springer, 3rd. Revised edition, 2008. [lin] S. Lin and T. Rado, *Computer Studies of Turing Machine Problems*, J. ACM. 12, 196–212, 1965. [machlin] R. Machlin, and Q. F. Stout, The Complex Behavior of Simple Machines. *Physica 42D*. 85-98, 1990. [marxen] H. Marxen and

9. For example, the authors of this paper have undertaken efforts to characterize and classify images by their complexity [zenil], for which these tables may be of great use.

J. Buntrock. *Attacking the busy beaver 5*, Bull EATCS 40, 247–251, 1990. **[rado]** T. Rado, *On noncomputable Functions*, *Bell System Technical J.* 41, 877–884, May 1962. **[solomonoff]** R. Solomonoff, *A Preliminary Report on a General Theory of Inductive Inference*. (Revision of Report V-131), Contract AF 49(639)-376, Report ZTB-138, Zator Co., Cambridge, Mass., Nov, 1960. **[speidel]** U. Speidel, *A note on the estimation of string complexity for short strings*, 7th International Conference on Information, Communications and Signal Processing (ICICS), 2009. **[turing]** A.M. Turing, *On Computable Numbers, with an Application to the Entscheidungsproblem*, Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society. 2 42: 230–65, 1936, published in 1937. **[wolfram]** S. Wolfram, *A New Kind of Science*, Wolfram Media, 2002. **[zenildelahaye]** H. Zenil and J.P. Delahaye, “On the Algorithmic Nature of the World,” in Gordana Dodig-Crnkovic and Mark Burgin (eds), *Information and Computation*, World Scientific, 2010. **[zenil]** H. Zenil, J.P. Delahaye and C. Gaucherel, *Information content characterization and classification of images by physical complexity*, arXiv: 1006.0051v1 [cs.CC]. **[busyhz]** H. Zenil, *busy beaver*, from The Wolfram Demonstrations Project, <http://demonstrations.wolfram.com/BusyBeaver/>.