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Abstract. The notion of probability plays an important role in almost all areas of
science and technology. In modern mathematics, however, probability theory means
nothing other than measure theory, and the operational characterization of the notion
of probability is not established yet. In this paper, based on the toolkit of algorithmic
randomness we present an operational characterization of the notion of probability,
called an ensemble, for general discrete probability spaces whose sample space is countably
infinite. Algorithmic randomness, also known as algorithmic information theory,
is a field of mathematics which enables us to consider the randomness of an individual
infinite sequence. We use an extension of Martin-Löf randomness with respect to a
generalized Bernoulli measure over the Baire space, in order to present the operational
characterization. In our former work K. Tadaki, arXiv:1611.06201, we developed an
operational characterization of the notion of probability for an arbitrary finite prob-
bility space, i.e., a probability space whose sample space is a finite set. We then
gave a natural operational characterization of the notion of conditional probability in
terms of ensemble for a finite probability space, and gave equivalent characterizations
of the notion of independence between two events based on it. Furthermore, we gave
equivalent characterizations of the notion of independence of an arbitrary number of
events/random variables in terms of ensembles for finite probability spaces. In particular,
we showed that the independence between events/random variables is equivalent
to the independence in the sense of van Lambalgen’s Theorem, in the case where the
underlying finite probability space is computable. In this paper, we show that we can
certainly extend these results over general discrete probability spaces whose sample
space is countably infinite.
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1 Introduction

The notion of probability plays an important role in almost all areas of science and technology. In modern mathematics, however, probability theory means nothing other than measure theory, and the operational characterization of the notion of probability is not established yet. In our former work [19, 20, 23], based on the toolkit of algorithmic randomness, we presented an operational characterization of the notion of probability for a finite probability space, i.e., a probability space whose sample space is a finite set.

Algorithmic randomness is a field of mathematics which enables us to consider the randomness of an individual infinite sequence. In the former work [19, 20, 23] we used the notion of Martin-Löf randomness with respect to Bernoulli measure to present the operational characterization for a finite probability space.

To clarify our motivation and standpoint, and the meaning of the operational characterization, let us consider a familiar example of a probabilistic phenomenon. We here consider the repeated throwings of a fair die. In this probabilistic phenomenon, as throwings progressed, a specific infinite sequence such as

3, 5, 6, 3, 4, 2, 3, 6, 1, 5, 3, 5, 4, 1, . . . . . .

is being generated, where each number is the outcome of the corresponding throwing of the die. Then the following naive question may arise naturally.

**Question:** What property should this infinite sequence satisfy as a probabilistic phenomenon?

In our former work [19, 20, 23] we tried to answer this question for finite probability spaces in general, including the throwing of a fair die. In the former work we characterized the notion of probability as an infinite sequence of outcomes in a probabilistic phenomenon of a specific mathematical property. We called such an infinite sequence of outcomes the operational characterization of the notion of probability. As the specific mathematical property, in the work [19, 20, 23] we adopted the notion of Martin-Löf randomness with respect to Bernoulli measure, a notion in algorithmic randomness.

In the work [20, 23] we put forward this proposal as a thesis (see Thesis 1 in Section 3 below), in particular, for finite probability spaces in general. We then checked the validity of the thesis based on our intuitive understanding of the notion of probability. Furthermore, we characterized equivalently the basic notions in probability theory in terms of the operational characterization. Namely, we equivalently characterized the notion of independence of random variables/events in terms of the operational characterization, and represented the notion of conditional probability in terms of the operational characterization in a natural way. The existence of these equivalent characterizations confirms further the validity of the thesis. See Tadaki [23] for the detail of our framework [19, 20, 23], which was developed especially for finite probability spaces in general.

The results above are about finite probability spaces. In this paper, we show that we can certainly extend the results above over general discrete probability spaces whose sample space is countably infinite.
1.1 Historical background

In the past century, there was a comprehensive attempt to provide an operational characterization of the notion of probability. Namely, von Mises developed a mathematical theory of repetitive events which was aimed at reformulating the theory of probability and statistics based on an operational characterization of the notion of probability [29, 30]. In a series of his comprehensive works which began in 1919, von Mises developed this theory and, in particular, introduced the notion of collective as a mathematical idealization of a long sequence of outcomes of experiments or observations repeated under a set of invariable conditions, such as the repeated tossings of a coin or of a pair of dice.

The collective plays a role as an operational characterization of the notion of probability, and is an infinite sequence of sample points in the sample space of a probability space. As the randomness property of the collective, von Mises assumes that all “reasonable” infinite subsequences of a collective satisfy the law of large numbers with the identical limit value, where the subsequences are selected using “acceptable selection rules.” Wald [32, 33] later showed that for any countable collection of selection rules, there are sequences which are collectives in the sense of von Mises. However, at the time it was unclear exactly what types of selection rules should be acceptable. There seemed to von Mises to be no canonical choice.

Later, with the development of computability theory and the introduction of generally accepted precise mathematical definitions of the notions of algorithm and computable function, Church [7] suggested that a selection rule be considered acceptable if and only if it is computable. In 1939, however, Ville [28] revealed the defect of the notion of collective. Namely, he showed that for any countable collection of selection rules, there is a sequence that is random in the sense of von Mises but has properties that make it clearly nonrandom. In the first place, the collective has an intrinsic defect that it cannot exclude the possibility that an event with probability zero may occur. (For the development of the theory of collectives from the point of view of the definition of randomness, see Downey and Hirschfeldt [9].)

In 1966, Martin-Löf [14] introduced the definition of random sequences, which is called Martin-Löf randomness nowadays, and plays a central role in the recent development of algorithmic randomness. At the same time, he introduced the notion of Martin-Löf randomness with respect to Bernoulli measure [14]. He then pointed out that this notion overcomes the defect of the collective in the sense of von Mises, and this can be regarded precisely as the collective which von Mises wanted to define. However, he did not develop probability theory based on Martin-Löf random sequence with respect to Bernoulli measure.

Algorithmic randomness is a field of mathematics which studies the definitions of random sequences and their property (see [16, 9] for the recent developments of the field). However, the recent research on algorithmic randomness would seem only interested in the notions of randomness themselves and their interrelation, and not seem to have made an attempt to develop probability theory based on Martin-Löf randomness with respect to Bernoulli measure in an operational manner so far.

1.2 Contribution of the paper

The subject of this paper is to make such an attempt for general discrete probability spaces whose sample space is countably infinite, as a sequel to our former work [19, 20, 23] where we developed a framework for an operational characterization of the notion of probability for general finite probabil-
ity spaces. In the former work we did this, precisely based on Martin-Löf randomness with respect to Bernoulli measure. In contrast, in this paper we present an operational characterization of the notion of probability for general discrete probability spaces, based on an extension of Martin-Löf randomness with respect to a generalized Bernoulli measure over the Baire space. Thus, the core mathematical concept of this paper is a Martin-Löf random infinite sequence over the sample space of a discrete probability space, with respect to a generalized Bernoulli measure on the Baire space. In this paper we call it an ensemble, instead of collective for distinction. The name “ensemble” comes from physics, in particular, from quantum mechanics and statistical mechanics. We propose to identify it with an infinite sequence of outcomes resulting from the infinitely repeated trials in a probabilistic phenomenon described by the discrete probability space. We show that the ensemble has enough properties to regard it as an operational characterization of the notion of probability for a discrete probability space, from the point of view of our intuitive understanding of the notion of probability.

Actually, in a similar manner to our former work \cite{19, 20, 23} for finite probability spaces, in this paper we can give a natural operational characterization of the notion of conditional probability in terms of ensemble for a discrete probability space, and give equivalent characterizations of the notion of independence between two events based on it. Furthermore, we can give equivalent characterizations of the notion of independence of an arbitrary number of events/random variables in terms of ensembles. In particular, we can show that the independence of events/random variables is equivalent to the independence in the sense of van Lambalgen’s Theorem \cite{27}, in the case where the underlying discrete probability space is computable.

From the operational point of view, we must be able to determine effectively whether each outcome of a trial is in the sample space of the underlying discrete probability space, or not. Thus, from that point of view, we must only consider discrete probability spaces whose sample spaces are recursive infinite sets. For mathematical generality, however, in this paper we make a weaker assumption about the sample spaces. Namely, we assume that the sample spaces of discrete probability spaces which we consider in this paper are simply recursively enumerable infinite sets. We think this recursive enumerability of the sample space to be sufficiently general for our purpose. On the other hand, we emphasize that a discrete probability space itself which we consider in this paper is not required to be computable at all (except for in the results related to van Lambalgen’s Theorem). Therefore the generalized Bernoulli measure which we consider in this paper is not necessarily computable while the measures considered in the field of algorithmic randomness so far are usually computable. Thus, the central results in this paper hold for any discrete probability space whose sample space is a recursively enumerable infinite set.

Modern probability theory originated from the axiomatic approach to probability theory, introduced by Kolmogorov \cite{12} in 1933, where the probability theory is precisely measure theory. One of the important roles of modern probability theory is, of course, in its applications to the general areas of science and technology. As we have already pointed out, however, an operational characterization of the notion of probability is still missing in modern probability theory. Thus, when we apply the results of modern probability theory, we have no choice but to make such applications thoroughly based on our intuition without formal means.

The aim of this paper, as well as of our former work \cite{19, 20, 23}, is to try to fill in this gap between modern probability theory and its applications. We present the operational characterization of the notion of probability as a rigorous interface between theory and practice, without appealing to our intuition for filling in the gap. Anyway, in our framework we keep modern probability theory
in its original form without any modifications, and propose the operational characterization of the notion of probability as an additional mathematical structure to it, which provides modern probability theory with more comprehensive and rigorous opportunities for applications.

1.3 Organization of the paper

The paper is organized as follows. We begin in Section 2 with some preliminaries to measure theory, computability theory, and algorithmic randomness. In Section 3, we review the fundamental framework of the operational characterization of the notion of probability for a finite probability space, which was introduced and developed by our former work [19, 20, 23].

We start our investigation to provide an operational characterization of the notion of probability for a discrete probability space in Section 4. We there develop measure theory on the Baire space. Although the Baire space is not compact and therefore it is hard to handle, we can certainly develop measure theory on it. In Section 5, we introduce the notion of discrete probability space for which the operational characterization of the notion of probability is presented. On this basis, we introduce the extension of Martin-Löf randomness with respect to a generalized Bernoulli measure over the Baire space in Section 6.

In Section 7 we introduce the notion of ensemble, and put forward a thesis which states to identify the ensemble as an operational characterization of the notion of probability for a discrete probability space. We then check the validity of the thesis. In Section 8 we start to construct our framework for developing the operational characterization, by characterizing operationally the notions of conditional probability and the independence between two events, in terms of ensembles. We then characterize operationally the notion of the independence of an arbitrary number of events/random variables in terms of ensembles in Section 9. In Section 10, we show that the independence notions, introduced in the preceding sections, are further equivalent to the notion of the independence in the sense of van Lambalgen’s Theorem, in the case where the underlying discrete probability space is computable, by generalizing van Lambalgen’s Theorem over our framework. Thus we show that the three independence notions, considered in this paper, are all equivalent in this case. We conclude this paper with a mention of the major application of our framework, i.e., the application to quantum mechanics, in Section 11.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Basic notation and definitions

We start with some notation about numbers and strings which will be used in this paper. \#S is the cardinality of S for any set S. \( \mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, 3, \ldots \} \) is the set of natural numbers, and \( \mathbb{N}^+ \) is the set of positive integers. \( \mathbb{Q} \) is the set of rationals, and \( \mathbb{R} \) is the set of reals.

An alphabet is a nonempty set. Let \( \Omega \) be an arbitrary alphabet throughout the rest of this subsection. A finite string over \( \Omega \) is a finite sequence of elements from the alphabet \( \Omega \). We use \( \Omega^* \) to denote the set of all finite strings over \( \Omega \), which contains the empty string denoted by \( \lambda \). We use \( \Omega^+ \) to denote the set \( \Omega^* \setminus \{\lambda\} \). For any \( \sigma \in \Omega^* \), \( |\sigma| \) is the length of \( \sigma \). Therefore \( |\lambda| = 0 \). For any \( \sigma \in \Omega^+ \) and \( k \in \mathbb{N}^+ \) with \( k \leq |\sigma| \), we use \( \sigma(k) \) to denote the \( k \)th element in \( \sigma \). Therefore, we have \( \sigma = \sigma(1)\sigma(2)\cdots\sigma(|\sigma|) \) for every \( \sigma \in \Omega^+ \). For any \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), we define the sets \( \Omega^n, \Omega^{\leq n}, \text{and} \Omega^{\geq n} \) as
follows:

\[ \Omega^n := \{ x \mid x \in \Omega^* & |x| = n \}, \]
\[ \Omega^{\leq n} := \{ x \mid x \in \Omega^* & |x| \leq n \}, \]
\[ \Omega^{\geq n} := \{ x \mid x \in \Omega^* & |x| \geq n \}. \]

A subset \( S \) of \( \Omega^* \) is called prefix-free if no string in \( S \) is a prefix of another string in \( S \).

An infinite sequence over \( \Omega \) is an infinite sequence of elements from the alphabet \( \Omega \), where the sequence is infinite to the right but finite to the left. We use \( \Omega^\infty \) to denote the set of all infinite sequences over \( \Omega \).

Let \( \alpha \in \Omega^\infty \). For any \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) we denote by \( \alpha \upharpoonright n \in \Omega^* \) the first \( n \) elements in the infinite sequence \( \alpha \), and for any \( n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \) we denote by \( \alpha(n) \) the \( n \)th element in \( \alpha \). Thus, for example, \( \alpha \upharpoonright 4 = \alpha(1) \alpha(2) \alpha(3) \alpha(4) \), and \( \alpha \upharpoonright 0 = \lambda \).

For any \( S \subset \Omega^* \), the set \( \{ \alpha \in \Omega^\infty \mid \exists n \in \mathbb{N} \alpha \upharpoonright n \in S \} \) is denoted by \( [S]^\prec \). Note that (i) \( [S]^\prec \subset [T]^\prec \) for every \( S \subset T \subset \Omega^* \), and (ii) for every set \( S \subset \Omega^* \) there exists a prefix-free set \( P \subset \Omega^* \) such that \( [S]^\prec = [P]^\prec \). For any \( \sigma \in \Omega^* \), we denote by \( [\sigma]^\prec \) the set \( \{ [\sigma] \}^\prec \), i.e., the set of all infinite sequences over \( \Omega \) extending \( \sigma \). Therefore \( [\lambda]^\prec = \Omega^\infty \).

For any function \( f \), the domain of definition of \( f \) is denoted by \( \text{dom} f \).

2.2 Measure theory on infinite sequences over a finite alphabet

A finite alphabet is a non-empty finite set. Let \( \Omega \) be an arbitrary finite alphabet throughout the rest of this subsection. We briefly review measure theory on \( \Omega^\infty \) according to Nies [16, Section 1.9]. See also Billingsley [3] for measure theory in general.

**Definition 1 (Outer measure).** Let \( \Gamma \) be a nonempty set. A real-valued function \( \mu \) defined on the class of all subsets of \( \Gamma \) is called an outer measure on \( \Gamma \) if the following conditions hold.

(i) \( \mu(\emptyset) = 0 \);

(ii) \( \mu(C) \leq \mu(D) \) for every subsets \( C \) and \( D \) of \( \Gamma \) with \( C \subset D \);

(iii) \( \mu(\bigcup_i C_i) \leq \sum_i \mu(C_i) \) for every sequence \( \{C_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \) of subsets of \( \Gamma \). \( \square \)

A probability measure representation over \( \Omega \) is a function \( r: \Omega^* \to [0, 1] \) such that

(i) \( r(\lambda) = 1 \) and

(ii) for every \( \sigma \in \Omega^* \) it holds that

\[ r(\sigma) = \sum_{a \in \Omega} r(\sigma a). \] (1)

A probability measure representation \( r \) over \( \Omega \) induces an outer measure \( \mu_r \) on \( \Omega^\infty \) in the following manner: A subset \( \mathcal{R} \) of \( \Omega^\infty \) is open if \( \mathcal{R} = [S]^\prec \) for some \( S \subset \Omega^* \). Let \( r \) be an arbitrary probability measure representation over \( \Omega \). For each open subset \( \mathcal{A} \) of \( \Omega^\infty \), we define \( \mu_r(\mathcal{A}) \) by

\[ \mu_r(\mathcal{A}) := \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}} r(\sigma), \]
where \( E \) is a prefix-free subset of \( \Omega^* \) with \( |E|^\omega = A \). Due to the equality (1) the sum is independent of the choice of the prefix-free set \( E \), and therefore the value \( \mu_r(A) \) is well-defined. Then, for any subset \( C \) of \( \Omega^\infty \), we define \( \mu_r(C) \) by

\[
\mu_r(C) := \inf\{\mu_r(A) \mid C \subset A \& A \text{ is an open subset of } \Omega^\infty\}.
\]

We can then show that \( \mu_r \) is an outer measure on \( \Omega^\infty \) such that \( \mu_r(\Omega^\infty) = 1 \).

A class \( F \) of subsets of \( \Omega^\infty \) is called a \( \sigma \)-field on \( \Omega^\infty \) if \( F \) includes \( \Omega^\infty \), is closed under complements, and is closed under the formation of countable unions. The Borel class \( \mathcal{B}_\Omega \) is the \( \sigma \)-field generated by all open sets on \( \Omega^\infty \). Namely, the Borel class \( \mathcal{B}_\Omega \) is defined as the intersection of all the \( \sigma \)-fields on \( \Omega^\infty \) containing all open sets on \( \Omega^\infty \). A real-valued function \( \mu \) defined on the Borel class \( \mathcal{B}_\Omega \) is called a probability measure on \( \Omega^\infty \) if the following conditions hold.

(i) \( \mu(\emptyset) = 0 \) and \( \mu(\Omega^\infty) = 1 \);

(ii) \( \mu(\bigcup_i D_i) = \sum_i \mu(D_i) \) for every sequence \( \{D_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \) of sets in \( \mathcal{B}_\Omega \) such that \( D_i \cap D_j = \emptyset \) for all \( i \neq j \).

Then, for every probability measure representation \( r \) over \( \Omega \), we can show that the restriction of the outer measure \( \mu_r \) on \( \Omega^\infty \) to the Borel class \( \mathcal{B}_\Omega \) is a probability measure on \( \Omega^\infty \). We denote the restriction of \( \mu_r \) to \( \mathcal{B}_\Omega \) by \( \mu_r \) just the same.

Then it is easy to see that

\[
\mu_r([\sigma]^\omega) = r(\sigma)
\]

for every probability measure representation \( r \) over \( \Omega \) and every \( \sigma \in \Omega^* \).

2.3 Computability

A partial computable function is a function \( f \) such that there exists a deterministic Turing machine \( \mathcal{M} \) with the properties that

(i) \( \text{dom } f \subset D \), where \( D \) denotes the set of all the inputs for \( \mathcal{M} \), and

(ii) for each input \( x \in D \), when executing \( \mathcal{M} \) with the input \( x \),

(a) if \( x \in \text{dom } f \) then the computation of \( \mathcal{M} \) eventually terminates and then \( \mathcal{M} \) outputs \( f(x) \);

(b) if \( x \notin \text{dom } f \) then the computation of \( \mathcal{M} \) does not terminate.

A partial computable function is also called a partial recursive function. A computable function is a partial computable function \( f \) such that \( \text{dom } f \) equals to \( D \) in the above definition of partial computable function. Namely, a computable function is a function \( f \) such that there exists a deterministic Turing machine \( \mathcal{M} \) with the properties that

(i) \( \text{dom } f \) equals to the set of all the inputs for \( \mathcal{M} \), and

(ii) for each \( x \in \text{dom } f \), when executing \( \mathcal{M} \) with the input \( x \), the computation of \( \mathcal{M} \) eventually terminates and then \( \mathcal{M} \) outputs \( f(x) \).
A computable function is also called a total recursive function.

We say that $\alpha \in \Omega^\infty$ is computable if the mapping $\mathbb{N} \ni n \mapsto \alpha|_n$ is a computable function. A real $a$ is called computable if there exists a computable function $g: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ such that $|a - g(k)| < 2^{-k}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. A real $a$ is called left-computable if there exists a computable, increasing sequence of rationals which converges to $a$, i.e., if there exists a computable function $h: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ such that $h(n) \leq h(n+1)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lim_{n \to \infty} h(n) = a$. On the other hand, a real $a$ is called right-computable if $-a$ is left-computable. It is then easy to see that, for every $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $a$ is computable if and only if $a$ is both left-computable and right-computable.

A recursively enumerable set is a set $S$ such that there exists a deterministic Turing machine $M$ with the properties that

(i) $S \subset D$, where $D$ denotes the set of all the inputs for $M$, and

(ii) for each input $x \in D$, when executing $M$ with the input $x$,

(a) if $x \in S$ then the computation of $M$ eventually terminates;

(b) if $x \notin S$ then the computation of $M$ does not terminate.

We write “r.e.” instead of “recursively enumerable.” A recursive set is a set $S$ such that there exists a deterministic Turing machine $M$ with the properties that

(i) $S \subset D$, where $D$ denotes the set of all the inputs for $M$, and

(ii) for each input $x \in D$, when executing $M$ with the input $x$, the computation of $M$ eventually terminates and then $M$ outputs 1 if $x \in S$ and 0 otherwise.

Note that every recursive set is an r.e. set, and every r.e. set is a countable set.

2.4 Martin-Löf randomness with respect to an arbitrary probability measure

In this subsection, we introduce the notion of Martin-Löf randomness [14] in a general setting.

Let $\Omega$ be an arbitrary finite alphabet, and $\mu$ be an arbitrary probability measure on $\Omega^\infty$. The basic idea of Martin-Löf randomness (with respect to the probability measure $\mu$) is as follows.

Basic idea of Martin-Löf randomness: The random infinite sequences over $\Omega$ are precisely sequences which are not contained in any effective null set on $\Omega^\infty$.

Here, an effective null set on $\Omega^\infty$ is a set $S \in \mathcal{B}_\Omega$ such that $\mu(S) = 0$ and moreover $S$ has some type of effective property. As a specific implementation of the idea of effective null set, we introduce the following notion.

Definition 2 (Martin-Löf test with respect to a probability measure). Let $\Omega$ be a finite alphabet, and let $\mu$ be a probability measure on $\Omega^\infty$. A subset $C$ of $\mathbb{N}^+ \times \Omega^*$ is called a Martin-Löf test with respect to $\mu$ if $C$ is an r.e. set such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ it holds that $C_n$ is a prefix-free subset of $\Omega^*$ and

$$\mu([C_n]^-) < 2^{-n},$$

where $C_n$ denotes the set $\{ \sigma \mid (n, \sigma) \in C \}$. \hfill $\square$
Let $C$ be a Martin-Löf test with respect to $\mu$. Then, it follows from (3) that $\mu \left( \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} [C_n]^\prec \right) = 0$. Therefore, the set $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} [C_n]^\prec$ serves as an effective null set. In this manner, the notion of an effective null set is implemented as a Martin-Löf test with respect to a probability measure in Definition 2.

Then, the notion of Martin-Löf randomness with respect to a probability measure is defined as follows, according to the basic idea of Martin-Löf randomness stated above.

**Definition 3 (Martin-Löf randomness with respect to a probability measure).** Let $\Omega$ be a finite alphabet, and let $\mu$ be a probability measure on $\Omega^\infty$. For any $\alpha \in \Omega^\infty$, we say that $\alpha$ is Martin-Löf random with respect to $\mu$ if $\alpha \notin \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} [C_n]^\prec$ for every Martin-Löf test $C$ with respect to $\mu$.

\[ \square \]

3 Operational characterization of the notion of probability for a finite probability space

In our former work [19, 20, 23] we provided an operational characterization of the notion of probability for a finite probability space. In this section we review the fundamental framework of the operational characterization for a finite probability space.

First, a finite probability space is defined as follows.

**Definition 4 (Finite probability space).** Let $\Omega$ be a finite alphabet. A finite probability space on $\Omega$ is a function $P : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

(i) $P(a) \geq 0$ for every $a \in \Omega$, and

(ii) $\sum_{a \in \Omega} P(a) = 1$.

The set of all finite probability spaces on $\Omega$ is denoted by $\mathbb{P}(\Omega)$.

Let $P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)$. The set $\Omega$ is called the sample space of $P$, and elements of $\Omega$ are called sample points or elementary events of $P$. For each $A \subseteq \Omega$, we define $P(A)$ by

\[ P(A) := \sum_{a \in A} P(a). \]

A subset of $\Omega$ is called an event on $P$, and $P(A)$ is called the probability of $A$ for every event $A$ on $P$.

In the framework [19, 20, 23], a finite alphabet $\Omega$ plays a role of the set of all possible outcomes of stochastic trials such experiments or observations. An operational characterization of the notion of probability which we provide for a finite probability space on $\Omega$ is an infinite sequence over $\Omega$. In order to provide it, we use the notion of Martin-Löf randomness with respect to Bernoulli measure. A Bernoulli measure is introduced in the following manner.

Let $\Omega$ be a finite alphabet, and let $P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)$. For each $\sigma \in \Omega^*$, we use $P(\sigma)$ to denote $P(\sigma_1)P(\sigma_2)\ldots P(\sigma_n)$ where $\sigma = \sigma_1\sigma_2\ldots\sigma_n$ with $\sigma_i \in \Omega$. Therefore $P(\lambda) = 1$, in particular. For each subset $S$ of $\Omega^*$, we use $P(S)$ to denote

\[ \sum_{\sigma \in S} P(\sigma). \]
Therefore $P(\emptyset) = 0$, in particular.

Consider a function $r : \Omega^* \to [0, 1]$ such that $r(\sigma) = P(\sigma)$ for every $\sigma \in \Omega^*$. It is then easy to see that the function $r$ is a probability measure representation over $\Omega$. The probability measure $\mu_r$ induced by $r$ is called a *Bernoulli measure on* $\Omega^\infty$, denoted $\lambda_P$. The Bernoulli measure $\lambda_P$ on $\Omega^\infty$ has the following property: For every $\sigma \in \Omega^*$,

$$\lambda_P ([\sigma]^\infty) = P(\sigma),$$

which results from (2).

Martin-Löf randomness with respect to Bernoulli measure, which is called *Martin-Löf P-randomness* in our framework, is defined as follows. This notion was, in essence, introduced by Martin-Löf [14], as well as the notion of Martin-Löf randomness with respect to Lebesgue measure.

**Definition 5** (Martin-Löf P-randomness, Martin-Löf [14]). Let $\Omega$ be a finite alphabet, and let $P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)$. For any $\alpha \in \Omega^\infty$, we say that $\alpha$ is Martin-Löf $P$-random if $\alpha$ is Martin-Löf random with respect to $\lambda_P$.

Let $\Omega$ be a finite alphabet, and let $P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)$. In the work [19, 20, 23], we propose to regard a Martin-Löf $P$-random sequence of sample points as an operational characterization of the notion of probability for a finite probability space $P$ on $\Omega$. Namely, we propose to identify a Martin-Löf $P$-random sequence of sample points with the *substance* of the notion of probability for a finite probability space $P$. Thus, since the notion of Martin-Löf $P$-random sequence plays a central role in our framework, in particular we call it an *ensemble*, as in Definition 6, instead of collective for distinction.

**Definition 6** (Ensemble). Let $\Omega$ be a finite alphabet, and let $P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)$. A Martin-Löf $P$-random infinite sequence over $\Omega$ is called an ensemble for the finite probability space $P$ on $\Omega$.

Consider an infinite sequence $\alpha \in \Omega^\infty$ of outcomes which is being generated by infinitely repeated trials described by the finite probability space $P$. The operational characterization of the notion of probability for the finite probability space $P$ is thought to be completed if the property which the infinite sequence $\alpha$ has to satisfy is determined. In the work [20, 23] we thus proposed the following thesis.

**Thesis 1** (Tadaki [20, 23]). Let $\Omega$ be a finite alphabet, and let $P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)$. An infinite sequence of outcomes in $\Omega$ which is being generated by infinitely repeated trials described by the finite probability space $P$ on $\Omega$ is an ensemble for $P$.

In the work [19, 20, 23], we confirmed the validity of Thesis 1 from the various aspects.

## 4 Measure theory on the Baire space

From now on, we start our investigation to provide an operational characterization of the notion of probability for a *discrete probability space*.

First, we develop measure theory on the *Baire space*. An *countable alphabet* is a countably infinite set. Let $\Omega$ be an arbitrary countable alphabet throughout the rest of this section. We introduce a measure on $\Omega^\infty$ by generalizing the argument given in Nies [16 Section 1.9], i.e.,
by generalizing the argument reviewed in Subsection 2.2 above. Although the space $\Omega^\infty$ is not compact and therefore it is hard to handle, we can certainly develop measure theory on $\Omega^\infty$.

**Definition 7** (Measure representation). A measure representation over $\Omega$ is a function $r: \Omega^* \to [0, 1]$ such that for every $\sigma \in \Omega^*$ it holds that

$$r(\sigma) = \sum_{a \in \Omega} r(\sigma a). \quad (4)$$

A measure representation $r$ over $\Omega$ induces an outer measure $\mu_r$ on $\Omega^\infty$ in the following manner: For any subset $S$ of $\Omega^*$, we use $r(S)$ to denote

$$\sum_{\sigma \in S} r(\sigma)$$

(may be $\infty$). For any subset $S$ of $\Omega^*$ and $\rho \in \Omega^*$, we use $S[\rho]$ to denote the set of all $\sigma \in S$ such that $\rho$ is a prefix of $\sigma$.

First, we show the following theorem. For any $S \subset \Omega^*$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by $S \upharpoonright n$ the set of all $\sigma \in \Omega^* \cap \Omega^\leq n$ such that $\sigma$ is a prefix of some element of $S$.

**Theorem 8.** Let $r$ be a measure representation over $\Omega$. Let $\rho \in \Omega^*$ and let $E$ be a prefix-free subset of $\Omega^*$. Then $r(E[\rho])$ converges and satisfies that $r(E[\rho]) \leq r(\rho)$.

**Proof.** First, we show the result in the case of $\rho = \lambda$, i.e., we show that $r(E) \leq r(\lambda)$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we use $E_{\leq n}$, $E_n$, and $E_{\geq n}$ to denote the sets $E \cap \Omega^\leq n$, $E \cap \Omega^n$, and $E \cap \Omega^{> n}$, respectively. In particular, we denote the set $E_{\geq n} \upharpoonright n$ by $\tilde{E}_{> n}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that $E_{\leq n} \cap \tilde{E}_{> n} = \emptyset$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, since $E$ is prefix-free.

We prove the following inequality by induction on $n \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$r(E_{\leq n} \cup \tilde{E}_{> n}) \leq r(\lambda). \quad (5)$$

Since $E_{\leq 0} \cup \tilde{E}_{> 0} \subset \{\lambda\}$, the inequality (5) holds for $n = 0$, obviously.

For an arbitrary $k \in \mathbb{N}$, assume that the inequality (5) holds for $n = k$. Then, we show that

$$r(E_{\leq k+1} \cup \tilde{E}_{> k+1}) \leq r(E_{\leq k} \cup \tilde{E}_{> k}). \quad (6)$$

First, we see that

$$r(E_{\leq k} \cup \tilde{E}_{> k}) = r(E_{\leq k}) + r(\tilde{E}_{> k}) = r(E_{\leq k}) + r(E_{> k} \upharpoonright \lambda), \quad (7)$$

where the first equality follows from the fact that $E_{\leq k} \cap \tilde{E}_{> k} = \emptyset$. We then see that

$$r(E_{> k} \upharpoonright \lambda) = \sum_{\sigma \in E_{> k} \upharpoonright \lambda} r(\sigma) = \sum_{\sigma \in E_{> k} \upharpoonright \lambda} \sum_{a \in \Omega} r(\sigma a) \geq \sum_{\tau \in E_{> k+1} \upharpoonright \lambda+1} r(\tau) = r(E_{> k+1} \upharpoonright \lambda+1), \quad (8)$$

$^1$The Baire space is the set of all infinite sequences of natural numbers. Since $\Omega$ is countably infinite, the set $\Omega^\infty$ is, in essence, the Baire space.
where the second equality follows from (4). Since \( r(E_{\geq k+1} \mid k+1) = r(E_{k+1}) + r(E_{\geq k+2} \mid k+1) \), it follows from (7) and (8) that
\[
R(E_{\leq k} \cup \bar{E}_{>k}) \geq R(E_{\leq k}) + R(E_{k+1}) + R(E_{\geq k+2} \mid k+1) = R(E_{\leq k+1}) + R(\bar{E}_{>k+1}),
\]
where the last equality follows from the fact that \( E_{\leq k+1} \cap \bar{E}_{>k+1} = \emptyset \). Thus, we have the inequality (5), as desired. Hence, from the assumption we have that the inequality (5) holds for \( n = k + 1 \).

Thus, the inequality (5) holds for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). It follows that \( R(E_{\leq n}) \leq R(E_{\leq n+1}) \leq r(\lambda) \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). Thus, \( R(E) \) converges and satisfies that \( R(E) \leq r(\lambda) \).

Next, we show the result \( R(E[\rho]) \leq r(\rho) \) in the general case of an arbitrary \( \rho \in \Omega^* \). Since \( E \) is prefix free, there exists a prefix-free subset \( F \) of \( \Omega^* \) such that \( E[\rho] = \{ \rho \sigma \mid \sigma \in F \} \). Consider a function \( q : \Omega^* \to [0,1] \) defined by \( q(\sigma) := R(\rho \sigma) \). Since \( r \) is a measure representation over \( \Omega \), it is easy to see that \( q \) is also a measure representation over \( \Omega \). Applying the result above to \( q \) and \( F \), we have \( q(F) \leq q(\lambda) \), which implies that \( R(E[\rho]) \leq r(\rho) \), as desired. This completes the proof.

**Theorem 9.** Let \( r \) be a measure representation over \( \Omega \). Let \( \rho \in \Omega^* \) and let \( E \) be a prefix-free subset of \( \Omega^* \). Suppose that \( [\rho]^{-} \subset [E[\rho]]^{-} \). Then \( R(E[\rho]) = r(\rho) \).

**Proof.** First, we show the result in the case of \( \rho = \lambda \), i.e., we show that \( R(E) = r(\lambda) \) if \( \Omega^\infty = [E]^{-} \). Note that \( \Omega \) is well-ordered, since it is a countably infinite set. Thus, every non-empty subset of \( \Omega \) has a least element.

Now, let us assume contrarily that \( \Omega^\infty = [E]^{-} \) but \( R(E) \neq r(\lambda) \). It follows from Theorem 8 that
\[
R(E) < r(\lambda). \quad (9)
\]
Based on this, we choose an infinite sequence \( \tau_0, \tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \ldots \) of elements of \( \Omega^* \) such that

(i) \( |\tau_n| = n \),

(ii) \( R(E[\tau_n]) < r(\tau_n) \), and

(iii) there exists \( a \in \Omega \) with the properties that \( \tau_n a = \tau_{n+1} \) and \( a \) is the least element of \( \Omega \) for which \( R(E[\tau_n a]) < r(\tau_n a) \)

for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), inductively, in the following manner.

First, we set \( \tau_0 := \lambda \). Obviously, \( |\tau_0| = 0 \) and we have \( R(E[\tau_0]) < r(\tau_0) \) due to (9). Assume that the sequence \( \tau_0, \tau_1, \tau_2, \ldots, \tau_k \) satisfying the properties (i), (ii), and (iii) above has already been chosen. Then
\[
R(E[\tau_k]) < r(\tau_k) \quad (10)
\]
holds, in particular. On the other hand, it follows from Theorem 8 that \( R(E[\tau_k a]) \leq r(\tau_k a) \) for every \( a \in \Omega \). Assume contrarily that \( R(E[\tau_k a]) = r(\tau_k a) \) for every \( a \in \Omega \). Then, since \( r \) is a measure representation over \( \Omega \), we have that
\[
R(E[\tau_k]) \geq \sum_{a \in \Omega} R(E[\tau_k a]) = \sum_{a \in \Omega} r(\tau_k a) = r(\tau_k).
\]
However, this contradicts the inequality (10). Thus, we have that \( r(E[\tau_ka_0]) < r(\tau_ka_0) \) for some \( a_0 \in \Omega \). We then choose a least \( a \in \Omega \) such that \( r(E[\tau ka]) < r(\tau ka) \), and set \( \tau_{k+1} := \tau ka \). As a result, the properties (i), (ii), and (iii) hold for the sequence \( \tau_0, \tau_1, \tau_2, \ldots, \tau_k, \tau_{k+1} \), certainly.

In this manner, we can generate an infinite sequence \( \tau_0, \tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \ldots \) of elements of \( \Omega^* \) satisfying the properties (i), (ii), and (iii) above.

Then, due to the properties (i) and (iii), there exists an infinite sequence \( \alpha \in \Omega^\infty \) such that \( \alpha|_n = \tau_n \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). Since \( \Omega^\infty = [E]< \) we have that \( \alpha \in [E]< \) and therefore \( \alpha|_{n_0} \in E \) for some \( n_0 \in \mathbb{N} \). This implies that \( \tau_{n_0} \in E \). Therefore, \( r(E[\tau_{n_0}]) = r(\tau_{n_0}) \) since \( E \) is prefix-free. However, this contracts the property (ii) above which implies that \( r(E[\tau_{n_0}]) < r(\tau_{n_0}) \). Hence, we have that \( r(E) = r(\lambda) \) if \( \Omega^\infty = [E]< \), as desired.

Next, we show the result in the general case, i.e., we show that \( r(E[\rho]) = r(\rho) \) if \( [\rho]< \subset [E[\rho]< \). Since \( E \) is prefix free, there exists a prefix-free subset \( F \) of \( \Omega^* \) such that \( E[\rho] = \{ \rho\sigma \mid \sigma \in F \} \). It follows that if \( [\rho]< \subset [E[\rho]< \) then \( \Omega^\infty = [F]< \). On the other hand, consider a function \( q : \Omega^* \to [0,1] \) defined by \( q(\sigma) := r(\rho\sigma) \). Since \( r \) is a measure representation over \( \Omega \), it is easy to see that \( q \) is also a measure representation over \( \Omega \). Applying the result above to \( q \) and \( F \), we have that if \( [\rho]< \subset [E[\rho]< \) then \( q(F) = q(\lambda) \), which implies that \( r(E[\rho]) = r(\rho) \), as desired. This completes the proof. \( \square \)

**Theorem 10.** Let \( r \) be a measure representation over \( \Omega \). Let \( E \) and \( F \) be prefix-free subsets of \( \Omega^* \). Suppose that \( [E]< \subset [F]< \). Then \( r(E) \leq r(F) \).

**Proof.** In the case where \( E \) is an empty set, the result is obvious. Thus, we assume that \( E \) is a nonempty set, in what follows. Therefore, since \( [E]< \subset [F]< \), \( F \) is also nonempty.

Let \( G \) be the set of all \( \sigma \in \Omega^* \) such that (i) \( [\sigma]< \subset [F]< \) and (ii) \( [\rho]< \not\subset [F]< \) for every proper prefix \( \rho \) of \( \sigma \). Since \( F \) is a nonempty set, \( G \) is also nonempty.

First, we show that \( r(F) = r(G) \). On the one hand, it is easy to see that \( [\sigma]< \subset [F[\sigma]< \) for every \( \sigma \in G \). Thus, it follows from Theorem 9 that

\[
r(F[\sigma]) = r(\sigma) \tag{11}
\]

for every \( \sigma \in G \). On the other hand, note that \( G \) is a prefix-free set. Therefore, we have that \( F[\sigma_1] \cap F[\sigma_2] = \emptyset \) for every \( \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in G \) with \( \sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2 \), in particular. Since some prefix of \( \rho \) is in \( G \) for every \( \rho \in F \), we have

\[
F = \bigcup_{\sigma \in G} F[\sigma].
\]

Hence, using (11) we have that

\[
r(F) = \sum_{\sigma \in G} r(F[\sigma]) = \sum_{\sigma \in G} r(\sigma) = r(G),
\]

as desired.

Next, we show that \( r(E) \leq r(G) \). As above, since \( G \) is prefix-free, we have that \( E[\sigma_1] \cap E[\sigma_2] = \emptyset \) for every \( \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in G \) with \( \sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2 \). Since \( [E]< \subset [F]< \), for each \( \rho \in E \) we see that \( [\rho]< \subset [F]< \) and therefore some prefix of \( \rho \) is in \( G \). Thus we have

\[
E = \bigcup_{\sigma \in G} E[\sigma].
\]
Hence, it follows from Theorem 8 that

\[ r(E) = \sum_{\sigma \in G} r(E[\sigma]) \leq \sum_{\sigma \in G} r(\sigma) = r(G), \]

as desired.

Thus, we have \( r(E) \leq r(G) = r(F) \). This completes the proof. \( \square \)

The following is immediate from Theorem 10.

**Corollary 11.** Let \( r \) be a measure representation over \( \Omega \). Let \( E \) and \( E' \) be prefix-free subsets of \( \Omega^* \). Suppose that \( [E]^\prec = [E']^\prec \). Then \( r(E) = r(E') \).

A subset \( R \) of \( \Omega^\infty \) is open if \( R = [S]^\prec \) for some \( S \subset \Omega^* \). It is easy to see that for every open subset \( A \) of \( \Omega^\infty \) there exists a prefix-free subset \( E \) of \( \Omega^* \) such that \( A = [E]^\prec \). For the set of all \( \sigma \in \Omega^* \) such that (i) \( [\sigma]^\prec \subset A \) and (ii) \( [\rho]^\prec \not\subset A \) for every proper prefix \( \rho \) of \( \sigma \) serves as such a prefix-free set \( E \).

Let \( r \) be an arbitrary measure representation over \( \Omega \). For each open subset \( A \) of \( \Omega^\infty \), we define \( r(A) \) by

\[ r(A) := r(E), \]

where \( E \) is a prefix-free subset of \( \Omega^* \) with \( [E]^\prec = A \). Due to Corollary 11, the real value \( r(E) \) is independent of the choice of the prefix-free set \( E \) and therefore the real value \( r(A) \) is well-defined.

Then, for any subset \( C \) of \( \Omega^\infty \), we define \( \mu_r(C) \) by

\[ \mu_r(C) := \inf \{ r(A) \mid C \subset A \& A \text{ is an open subset of } \Omega^\infty \}. \] (12)

We can then show the following theorem.

**Theorem 12.** Let \( r \) be a measure representation over \( \Omega \). Then \( \mu_r \) is an outer measure on \( \Omega^\infty \) such that \( \mu_r(A) = r(A) \) for every open subset \( A \) of \( \Omega^\infty \).

**Proof.** First, note that \( C \subset [[\lambda]]^\prec \) for every \( C \subset \Omega^\infty \), since \( [[\lambda]]^\prec = \Omega^\infty \). Therefore, since \( [[\lambda]]^\prec \) is an open subset of \( \Omega^\infty \) and \( r([[\lambda]]^\prec) = r(\lambda) \), for each \( C \subset \Omega^\infty \) we see that the infimum in the right-hand side of (12) exists as a non-negative real at most \( r(\lambda) \). Thus, \( \mu_r(C) \) is a non-negative real for every \( C \subset \Omega^\infty \).

Secondly, it follows from Theorem 10 that, for every open subsets \( A \) and \( B \) of \( \Omega^\infty \), if \( A \subset B \) then \( r(A) \leq r(B) \). This implies that \( \mu_r(A) = r(A) \) for every open subset \( A \) of \( \Omega^\infty \), as desired.

Since \( \emptyset \) is an open subset of \( \Omega^\infty \), we have \( \mu_r(\emptyset) = r(\emptyset) = 0 \). It is also easy to show that \( \mu_r(C) \leq \mu_r(D) \) for every subsets \( C \) and \( D \) of \( \Omega^\infty \) with \( C \subset D \). To see this, let \( C \) and \( D \) be arbitrary subsets of \( \Omega^\infty \) with \( C \subset D \), and let \( \varepsilon \) be an arbitrary positive real. Then there exists an open subset \( A \) of \( \Omega^\infty \) such that \( D \subset A \) and \( r(A) < \mu_r(D) + \varepsilon \). Since \( C \subset D \subset A \), it follows that \( \mu_r(C) < \mu_r(D) + \varepsilon \). Since \( \varepsilon \) is arbitrary, we have \( \mu_r(C) \leq \mu_r(D) \), as desired.

Finally, we show that \( \mu_r(\bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} C_i) \leq \sum_i \mu_r(C_i) \) for every sequence \( \{C_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \) of subsets of \( \Omega^\infty \). Let \( \{C_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \) be an arbitrary sequence of subsets of \( \Omega^\infty \). In the case where \( \sum_i \mu_r(C_i) \) diverges, the result is obvious. Thus, we assume that \( \sum_i \mu_r(C_i) \) converges, in what follows. Let \( \varepsilon \) be an arbitrary positive real. Then, for each \( i \) there exists an open subset \( A_i \) of \( \Omega^\infty \) such that \( C_i \subset A_i \) and

\[ r(A_i) < \mu_r(C_i) + \varepsilon 2^{-i}. \] (13)
Let $E$ be the set of all $\sigma \in \Omega^*$ such that (i) $[\sigma]^\prec \subset A_i$ for some $i$ and (ii) $[\rho]^\prec \not\subset A_i$ for every proper prefix $\rho$ of $\sigma$ and every $i$. Then, $E$ is a prefix-free subset of $\Omega^*$ and $[E]^\prec = \bigcup_i A_i$. Thus, we have

$$r\left(\bigcup_i A_i\right) = r(E).$$

(14)

For each $i$, let $E_i$ be the set of all $\sigma \in E$ such that (i) $[\sigma]^\prec \subset A_i$ but (ii) $[\sigma]^\prec \not\subset A_k$ for every $k < i$. It follows that $E = \bigcup_i E_i$ and $E_i \cap E_j = \emptyset$ for every $i \neq j$. Thus, we have

$$r(E) = \sum_i r(E_i)$$

(15)

On the other hand, for each $i$, since $[E_i]^\prec \subset A_i$ and $E_i$ is prefix-free, it follows from Theorem 10 that

$$r(E_i) \leq r(A_i).$$

(16)

Hence, since $\bigcup_i C_i \subset \bigcup_i A_i$, using (14), (15), (16), (13) we have that

$$\mu_r\left(\bigcup_i C_i\right) \leq \sum_i \mu_r(C_i) + \varepsilon 2^{-i} = \sum_i \mu_r(C_i) + \varepsilon.$$

Thus, since $\varepsilon$ is an arbitrary positive real, we have $\mu_r(\bigcup_i C_i) \leq \sum_i \mu_r(C_i)$, as desired.

Definition 13 (σ-field and measure). Let $\Gamma$ be a nonempty set. A class $\mathcal{F}$ of subsets of $\Gamma$ is called a $\sigma$-field in $\Gamma$ if $\mathcal{F}$ includes $\Gamma$, is closed under complements, and is closed under the formation of countable unions. A real-valued function $\mu$ defined on a $\sigma$-field $\mathcal{F}$ in $\Gamma$ is called a measure on $\mathcal{F}$ if the following conditions hold.

(i) $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$;

(ii) $\mu\left(\bigcup_i D_i\right) = \sum_i \mu(D_i)$ for every sequence $\{D_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of sets in $\mathcal{F}$ such that $D_i \cap D_j = \emptyset$ for all $i \neq j$.

Definition 14 (Carathéodory [4]). Let $\Gamma$ be a nonempty set, and let $\mu$ be an outer measure on $\Gamma$. A subset $G$ of $\Gamma$ is called $\mu$-measurable if

$$\mu(C \cap G) + \mu(C \setminus G) = \mu(C)$$

for every subset $C$ of $\Gamma$. The class of all $\mu$-measurable sets is denoted by $\mathcal{M}(\mu)$.

Carathéodory [4] showed the following central result of measure theory.

Theorem 15 (Carathéodory [4]). Let $\Gamma$ be a nonempty set, and let $\mu$ be an outer measure on $\Gamma$. Then $\mathcal{M}(\mu)$ is a $\sigma$-field in $\Gamma$, and $\mu$ restricted to $\mathcal{M}(\mu)$ is a measure on $\mathcal{M}(\mu)$.

The Borel class $\mathcal{B}_\Omega$ is the $\sigma$-field generated by all open sets on $\Omega^\infty$. Namely, the Borel class $\mathcal{B}_\Omega$ is defined as the intersection of all the $\sigma$-fields in $\Omega^\infty$ containing all open sets on $\Omega^\infty$.

Theorem 16. Let $r$ be a measure representation over $\Omega$. Then $\mathcal{B}_\Omega \subset \mathcal{M}(\mu_r)$. 
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Proof. First, note from Theorems \[12\] and \[15\] that \( \mathcal{M}(\mu_r) \) is a \( \sigma \)-field in \( \Omega^\infty \). Since the Borel class \( \mathcal{B}_\Omega \) is the \( \sigma \)-field generated by all open sets on \( \Omega^\infty \), it is sufficient to show that all open sets on \( \Omega^\infty \) are \( \mu_r \)-measurable. For showing this in turn, it is sufficient to prove that \( [\sigma]^\prec \) is \( \mu_r \)-measurable for every \( \sigma \in \Omega^\ast \), since \( \mathcal{M}(\mu_r) \) is a \( \sigma \)-field in \( \Omega^\infty \) and every subset of \( \Omega^\ast \) is at most countable.

Let \( \sigma \in \Omega^\ast \) and let \( \mathcal{C} \) be a subset of \( \Omega^\infty \). We show that \( \mu_r(\mathcal{C} \cap [\sigma]^\prec) + \mu_r(\mathcal{C} \setminus [\sigma]^\prec) \leq \mu_r(\mathcal{C}) \). Let \( \varepsilon \) be an arbitrary positive real. Then, there exists an open subset \( \mathcal{A} \) of \( \Omega^\infty \) such that \( \mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{A} \) and

\[
\mu_r(\mathcal{A}) < \mu_r(\mathcal{C}) + \varepsilon. \tag{17}
\]

Note that if \( \mathcal{D}_1 \) and \( \mathcal{D}_2 \) are open subsets of \( \Omega^\infty \) then \( \mathcal{D}_1 \cap \mathcal{D}_2 \) is also an open subset of \( \Omega^\infty \). This can be confirmed by the equality

\[
\mathcal{D}_1 \cap \mathcal{D}_2 = \{\rho \in \Omega^\ast \mid [\rho]^\prec \subset \mathcal{D}_1 \cap \mathcal{D}_2\}^\prec.
\]

Thus, \( \mathcal{A} \cap [\sigma]^\prec \) is an open set, in particular. Since \( \mathcal{A} \setminus [\sigma]^\prec = \mathcal{A} \cap [\Omega \setminus \{\sigma\}]^\prec \), we see that \( \mathcal{A} \setminus [\sigma]^\prec \) is also an open set. Since \( (\mathcal{A} \cap [\sigma]^\prec) \cap (\mathcal{A} \setminus [\sigma]^\prec) = \emptyset \), it follows from Lemma \[17\] below that

\[
r(\mathcal{A} \cap [\sigma]^\prec) + r(\mathcal{A} \setminus [\sigma]^\prec) = r(\mathcal{A}). \tag{18}
\]

Hence, since \( \mathcal{C} \cap [\sigma]^\prec \subset \mathcal{A} \cap [\sigma]^\prec \) and \( \mathcal{C} \setminus [\sigma]^\prec \subset \mathcal{A} \setminus [\sigma]^\prec \), using \[18\] and \[17\] we have that

\[
\mu_r(\mathcal{C} \cap [\sigma]^\prec) + \mu_r(\mathcal{C} \setminus [\sigma]^\prec) \leq r(\mathcal{A} \cap [\sigma]^\prec) + r(\mathcal{A} \setminus [\sigma]^\prec) < \mu_r(\mathcal{C}) + \varepsilon.
\]

Thus, since \( \varepsilon \) is an arbitrary positive real, we have \( \mu_r(\mathcal{C} \cap [\sigma]^\prec) + \mu_r(\mathcal{C} \setminus [\sigma]^\prec) \leq \mu_r(\mathcal{C}) \), as desired.

Then, it follows from the conditions (i) and (iii) of Definition \[1\] that

\[
\mu_r(\mathcal{C} \cap [\sigma]^\prec) + \mu_r(\mathcal{C} \setminus [\sigma]^\prec) = \mu_r(\mathcal{C}).
\]

Therefore, \( [\sigma]^\prec \) is \( \mu_r \)-measurable. This completes the proof. \( \Box \)

Lemma \[17\]. Let \( r \) be a measure representation over \( \Omega \). For every open subsets \( \mathcal{A} \) and \( \mathcal{B} \) of \( \Omega^\infty \), if \( \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} = \emptyset \) then \( r(\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}) = r(\mathcal{A}) + r(\mathcal{B}) \).

Proof. Let \( \mathcal{A} \) and \( \mathcal{B} \) be open subsets of \( \Omega^\infty \). Then there exist prefix-free subsets \( \mathcal{E} \) and \( \mathcal{F} \) of \( \Omega^\ast \) such that \( \mathcal{A} = [\mathcal{E}]^\prec \) and \( \mathcal{B} = [\mathcal{F}]^\prec \). Since \( \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} = \emptyset \), we see that \( \mathcal{E} \cap \mathcal{F} = \emptyset \) and \( \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{F} \) is prefix-free. Therefore, since \( \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B} = [\mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{F}]^\prec \), we have \( r(\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}) = r(\mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{F}) = r(\mathcal{E}) + r(\mathcal{F}) = r(\mathcal{A}) + r(\mathcal{B}) \). \( \Box \)

Thus, for every measure representation \( r \) over \( \Omega \), based on Theorem \[12\], \[16\] and \[15\] we see that the restriction of the outer measure \( \mu_r \) on \( \Omega^\infty \) to the Borel class \( \mathcal{B}_\Omega \) is a measure on \( \mathcal{B}_\Omega \). We denote the restriction of \( \mu_r \) to \( \mathcal{B}_\Omega \) by \( \mu_r \) just the same in what follows.

Then it follows from Theorem \[12\] that

\[
\mu_r([\sigma]^\prec) = r(\sigma) \tag{19}
\]

for every measure representation \( r \) over \( \Omega \) and every \( \sigma \in \Omega^\ast \).

Definition \[18\] (Probability measure representation). A probability measure representation over \( \Omega \) is a measure representation \( r \) over \( \Omega \) with \( r(\lambda) = 1 \).

Definition \[19\] (Probability measure). Let \( \Gamma \) be a nonempty set, and let \( \mathcal{F} \) be a \( \sigma \)-field in \( \Gamma \). A probability measure on \( \mathcal{F} \) is a measure \( \mu \) on \( \mathcal{F} \) with \( \mu(\Gamma) = 1 \).

Using \[19\], we see that, for every probability measure representation \( r \) over \( \Omega \), the measure \( \mu_r \) on \( \mathcal{B}_\Omega \) is a probability measure on \( \mathcal{B}_\Omega \).
5 Discrete probability spaces

In this paper we give an operational characterization of the notion of probability for a discrete probability space. A discrete probability space is defined as follows.

Definition 20 (Discrete probability space). Let \( \Omega \) be a countable alphabet. A discrete probability space on \( \Omega \) is a function \( P: \Omega \to \mathbb{R} \) such that

(i) \( P(a) \geq 0 \) for every \( a \in \Omega \), and

(ii) \( \sum_{a \in \Omega} P(a) = 1 \).

The set of all discrete probability spaces on \( \Omega \) is denoted by \( \mathcal{P}(\Omega) \).

Let \( P \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega) \). The set \( \Omega \) is called the sample space of \( P \), and elements of \( \Omega \) are called sample points or elementary events of \( P \). For each \( A \subset \Omega \), we define \( P(A) \) by

\[
P(A) := \sum_{a \in A} P(a).
\]

A subset of \( \Omega \) is called an event on \( P \), and \( P(A) \) is called the probability of \( A \) for every event \( A \) on \( P \).

Let \( \Omega \) be an arbitrary countable alphabet throughout the rest of this section. It plays a role of the set of all possible outcomes of a stochastic trial. An operational characterization of the notion of probability which we give for a discrete probability space on \( \Omega \) is an infinite sequence over \( \Omega \).

In order to provide such an operational characterization of the notion of probability we use an extension of Martin-Löf randomness over a countable alphabet. For that purpose, we first introduce the notion of a generalized Bernoulli measure on \( \Omega^\infty \) as follows.

Let \( P \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega) \). For each \( \sigma \in \Omega^* \), we use \( P(\sigma) \) to denote \( P(\sigma_1)P(\sigma_2)\ldots P(\sigma_n) \) where \( \sigma = \sigma_1\sigma_2\ldots \sigma_n \) with \( \sigma_i \in \Omega \). Therefore \( P(\lambda) = 1 \), in particular. For each subset \( S \) of \( \Omega^* \), we use \( P(S) \) to denote

\[
\sum_{\sigma \in S} P(\sigma).
\]

Therefore \( P(\emptyset) = 0 \), in particular.

Consider a function \( r: \Omega^* \to [0, 1] \) such that \( r(\sigma) = P(\sigma) \) for every \( \sigma \in \Omega^* \). It is then easy to see that the function \( r \) is a probability measure representation over \( \Omega \). The probability measure \( \mu_r \) on \( \mathcal{B}_\Omega \), induced by \( r \), is called a generalized Bernoulli measure on \( \Omega^\infty \), denoted \( \lambda_P \). The generalized Bernoulli measure \( \lambda_P \) on \( \Omega^\infty \) has the following property: For every \( \sigma \in \Omega^* \),

\[
\lambda_P ([\sigma]^{-}) = P(\sigma),
\]

which results from (19).

In this paper, we develop an operational characterization of the notion of probability for discrete probability spaces, whose sample space is countably infinite. From the operational point of view, we must be able to determine effectively whether each outcome of a trial is in the sample space of

---

\( ^2 \)Normally, a discrete probability space is a probability space whose sample space is finite or countably infinite. For distinction, a discrete probability space in this paper means a discrete probability space whose sample space is countably infinite.
the discrete probability space, or not. Thus, in this paper we consider discrete probability spaces whose sample spaces are recursive infinite sets. For the same reason, we must be able to determine effectively whether each outcome of a trial is in a given event of a discrete probability space, or not. Thus, in this paper we consider recursive events of discrete probability spaces. For mathematical generality, however, we make a weaker assumption especially about the sample spaces. Namely, we assume that the sample spaces are simply recursively enumerable infinite sets, when stating definitions and results throughout the rest of this paper.

It is convenient to introduce the notion of computable discrete probability space as follows.

**Definition 21** (Computability of discrete probability space). Let \( \Omega \) be an r.e. infinite set, and let \( P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega) \). We say that \( P \) is computable if there exists a partial recursive function \( f \) such that (i) \( \text{dom} f = \Omega \times \mathbb{N} \), (ii) \( f(\text{dom} f) \subset \mathbb{Q} \), and (iii) \( |P(a) - f(a, k)| \leq 2^{-k} \) for every \( a \in \Omega \) and \( k \in \mathbb{N} \).

We may try to weaken the notion of the computability for a discrete probability space as follows: Let \( \Omega \) be an r.e. infinite set, and let \( P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega) \). We say that \( P \) is left-computable if there exists a partial recursive function \( f \) such that (i) \( \text{dom} f = \Omega \times \mathbb{N} \), (ii) \( f(\text{dom} f) \subset \mathbb{Q} \), (iii) \( P(a) \geq f(a, k) \) for every \( a \in \Omega \) and \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), and (iv) \( \lim_{k \to \infty} f(a, k) = P(a) \) for every \( a \in \Omega \). On the other hand, we say that \( P \) is right-computable if there exists a partial recursive function \( f \) such that (i) \( \text{dom} f = \Omega \times \mathbb{N} \), (ii) \( f(\text{dom} f) \subset \mathbb{Q} \), (iii) \( P(a) \leq f(a, k) \) for every \( a \in \Omega \) and \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), and (iv) \( \lim_{k \to \infty} f(a, k) = P(a) \) for every \( a \in \Omega \). However, using the condition (ii) of Definition 20 we can see that these three computable notions for a discrete probability space coincide with one another, as the following proposition states.

**Proposition 22.** Let \( \Omega \) be an r.e. infinite set, and let \( P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega) \). The following conditions are equivalent to one another.

(i) \( P \) is computable.

(ii) \( P \) is left-computable.

(iii) \( P \) is right-computable.

---

6 Extension of Martin-Löf randomness over discrete probability spaces

In order to provide an operational characterization of the notion of probability we use an extension of Martin-Löf randomness over a generalized Bernoulli measure.

Martin-Löf randomness with respect to a generalized Bernoulli measure, which is called Martin-Löf \( P \)-randomness in this paper, is defined as follows.

**Definition 23** (Martin-Löf \( P \)-randomness). Let \( \Omega \) be an r.e. infinite set, and let \( P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega) \).

(i) A subset \( \mathcal{C} \) of \( \mathbb{N}^+ \times \Omega^* \) is called a Martin-Löf \( P \)-test if \( \mathcal{C} \) is an r.e. set such that for every \( n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \) it holds that \( \mathcal{C}_n \) is a prefix-free subset of \( \Omega^* \) and

\[
\lambda_P \left( [\mathcal{C}_n]^\infty \right) < 2^{-n},
\]

where \( \mathcal{C}_n := \{ \sigma \mid (n, \sigma) \in \mathcal{C} \} \).
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(ii) For any $\alpha \in \Omega^\infty$ and Martin-Löf $P$-test $C$, we say that $\alpha$ passes $C$ if there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ such that $\alpha \notin [C_n]^\prec$.

(iii) For any $\alpha \in \Omega^\infty$, we say that $\alpha$ is Martin-Löf $P$-random if for every Martin-Löf $P$-test $C$ it holds that $\alpha$ passes $C$. $\square$

Note that we do not require $P$ to be computable in Definition 23. Thus, the generalized Bernoulli measure $\lambda_P$ itself is not necessarily computable in Definition 23. Here, we say that a generalized Bernoulli measure $\lambda_P$ is computable if there exists a partial recursive function $g$ such that (i) $\text{dom } g = \Omega^* \times \mathbb{N}$, (ii) $g(\text{dom } g) \subset \mathbb{Q}$, and (iii) $|\lambda_P([\sigma]^-) - g(\sigma, k)| < 2^{-k}$ for all $\sigma \in \Omega^*$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Note also that in Definition 23 we do not require that $P(a) > 0$ for all $a \in \Omega$. Therefore, $P(a_0)$ may be 0 for some $a_0 \in \Omega$.

In Definition 23 we require that the set $C_\alpha$ is prefix-free in the definition of a Martin-Löf $P$-test $C$. However, we can eliminate this requirement while keeping the notion of Martin-Löf $P$-randomness the same. Namely, we can show the following theorem.

**Theorem 24.** Let $\Omega$ be an r.e. infinite set, and let $P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)$. For every r.e. subset $C$ of $\mathbb{N}^+ \times \Omega^*$ such that $\lambda_P([C_n]^\prec) < 2^{-n}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, there exists a Martin-Löf $P$-test $D \subset \mathbb{N}^+ \times \Omega^*$ such that $[C_n]^\prec = [D_n]^\prec$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. $\square$

Actually, from Theorem 24 we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 25.** Let $\Omega$ be an r.e. infinite set, and let $P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)$. Let $\alpha \in \Omega^\infty$. Then the following conditions are equivalent to each other.

(i) The infinite sequence $\alpha$ is Martin-Löf $P$-random.

(ii) For every r.e. subset $C$ of $\mathbb{N}^+ \times \Omega^*$ such that $\lambda_P([C_n]^\prec) < 2^{-n}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ such that $\alpha \notin [C_n]^\prec$. $\square$

Since there are only countably infinitely many algorithms, we can show the following theorem, as is shown for the usual Martin-Löf randomness for infinite binary sequences with respective to Lebesgue measure.

**Theorem 26.** Let $\Omega$ be an r.e. infinite set, and let $P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)$. Then $\text{ML}_P \in \mathcal{B}_\Omega$ and $\lambda_P(\text{ML}_P) = 1$, where $\text{ML}_P$ is the set of all Martin-Löf $P$-random sequences over $\Omega$.

*Proof.* Since there are only countably infinitely many Turing machines, there are only countably infinitely many Martin-Löf $P$-tests $C^1, C^2, C^3, \ldots$. For each $i \in \mathbb{N}^+$, let $\text{NML}_P^i$ be the set of all $\alpha \in \Omega^\infty$ which does not pass $C_i$.

Let $i \in \mathbb{N}^+$. We see that $\text{NML}_P^i = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} [C_n^i]^\prec$ and therefore $\text{NML}_P^i \in \mathcal{B}_\Omega$. Since

$$\lambda_P(\text{NML}_P^i) \leq \lambda_P\left([C_n^i]^\prec\right) < 2^{-n}$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, we have $\lambda_P(\text{NML}_P^i) = 0$. Thus, since $\Omega^\infty \setminus \text{ML}_P = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \text{NML}_P^i$, it follows that $\text{ML}_P \in \mathcal{B}_\Omega$ and $\lambda_P(\Omega^\infty \setminus \text{ML}_P) = 0$. In particular, the latter implies that $\lambda_P(\text{ML}_P) = 1$, as desired. $\square$
7 Ensemble

Let $\Omega$ be an arbitrary r.e. infinite set throughout this section. In this section we present an operational characterization of the notion of probability for a discrete probability space, and consider its validity. We propose to regard a Martin-Löf $P$-random sequence of sample points as an operational characterization of the notion of probability for a discrete probability space $P$. Namely, we propose to identify a Martin-Löf $P$-random sequence of sample points with the substance of the notion of probability for a discrete probability space $P$. Thus, since the notion of Martin-Löf $P$-random sequence plays a central role in our framework, in particular we call it an ensemble, as in Definition 27. The name “ensemble” comes from physics, in particular, from quantum mechanics and statistical mechanics.\footnote{The notion of ensemble plays a fundamental role in quantum mechanics and statistical mechanics. However, the notion is very vague in physics from a mathematical point of view. We propose to regard a Martin-Löf $P$-random sequence of quantum states as a formal definition of the notion of ensemble in quantum mechanics and statistical mechanics [21, 22, 24, 25].}

Definition 27 (Ensemble). Let $P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)$. A Martin-Löf $P$-random infinite sequence over $\Omega$ is called an ensemble for the discrete probability space $P$ on $\Omega$.

Let $P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)$. Consider an infinite sequence $\alpha \in \Omega^\infty$ of outcomes which is being generated by infinitely repeated trials described by the discrete probability space $P$. The operational characterization of the notion of probability for the discrete probability space $P$ is thought to be completed if the property which the infinite sequence $\alpha$ has to satisfy is determined. We thus propose the following thesis.

Thesis 2. Let $P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)$. An infinite sequence of outcomes in $\Omega$ which is being generated by infinitely repeated trials described by the discrete probability space $P$ on $\Omega$ is an ensemble for $P$.

Let us check the validity of Thesis 2. First of all, what is “probability”? It would seem very difficult to answer this question completely and sufficiently. However, we may enumerate the necessary conditions which the notion of probability is considered to have to satisfy according to our intuitive understanding of the notion of probability. In the subsequent subsections, we check that the notion of ensemble satisfies these necessary conditions.

7.1 Event with probability one

Let $P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)$, and let us consider an infinite sequence $\alpha \in \Omega^\infty$ of outcomes which is being generated by infinitely repeated trials described by the discrete probability space $P$ on $\Omega$. The first necessary condition which the notion of probability for the discrete probability space $P$ is considered to have to satisfy is the condition that an elementary event with probability one always occurs in the infinite sequence $\alpha$, i.e., the condition that for every $a \in \Omega$ if $P(a) = 1$ then $\alpha$ is of the form $\alpha = aaaaa \ldots$. This intuition that an elementary event with probability one occurs certainly is particularly supported by the notion of probability in quantum mechanics, as we will see in what follows.

In our former work [23], we confirmed the fact that an elementary event with probability one occurs certainly, in particular, in quantum measurements over a finite-dimensional quantum
system, i.e., a quantum system whose state space is a finite-dimensional Hilbert space. Note that the number of possible measurement outcomes is normally finite in measurements over a finite-dimensional quantum system. To be specific, projective measurements over a finite-dimensional quantum system gives a measurement outcome from a finite set.

In contrast, in this paper we consider a stochastic trial where the number of elementary events is countable infinite. Nonetheless, we can still confirm the fact that an elementary event with probability one occurs certainly in quantum measurements, even in the case where the number of elementary events is infinite. In order to see this, we consider quantum measurements over an infinite-dimensional quantum system, where the number of possible measurement outcomes is normally infinite.

First, we recall some of the central postulates of quantum mechanics. Due to the above reasons, we here consider the postulates of quantum mechanics for an infinite-dimensional quantum system, i.e., for a quantum system whose state space is an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space, in particular. See von Neumann [31], Prugovecki [18], Arai and Ezawa [1], Blank, Exner, and Havlíček [2], Hall [11], Teschl [26], and Moretti [13] for the detail of the formulation of the postulates of quantum mechanics in the infinite-dimensional case as well as the related mathematical notions and results such as self-adjoint operators, spectral measures, and spectral theorem.

The first postulate of quantum mechanics is about state space and state vector.

**Postulate 1** (State space and state vector). Associated to any isolated physical system is a (separable complex) Hilbert space known as the state space of the system. The system is completely described by its state vector, which is a non-zero vector in the system’s state space.

The second postulate of quantum mechanics is about observables of quantum systems.

**Postulate 2** (Observables). A physical quantity of a quantum system, called an observable, is described by a self-adjoint operator on the state space of the system.

Let $H$ be a (separable complex) Hilbert space. We denote by $(\cdot, \cdot)$ the inner-product defined on $H$. The domain of definition of an operator $A$ on $H$ is denoted by $D(A)$. We use $\mathcal{P}(H)$ to denote the set of projectors on $H$. The Borel class on $\mathbb{R}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{B}$. Then, in order to state the third postulate of quantum mechanics, we need the spectral theorem below (see e.g. Arai and Ezawa [11 Section 2.9.4] for this form of the spectral theorem).

**Theorem 28** (The spectral theorem). For every self-adjoint operator $A$ on a Hilbert space $H$, there exists a unique spectral measure $E: \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{P}(H)$ such that

$$D(A) = \left\{ \Psi \in H \middle| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \lambda^2 d(\Psi, E(\lambda)\Psi) < \infty \right\}$$

and

$$\langle \Phi, A\Psi \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \lambda d(\Phi, E(\lambda)\Psi)$$

for every $\Psi \in D(A)$ and $\Phi \in H$. The spectral measure $E: \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{P}(H)$ is called the spectral measure of $A$.

The third postulate of quantum mechanics is about measurements on quantum systems. This is the so-called Born rule, i.e., the probability interpretation of the wave function.
Postulate 3 (The Born rule). Consider measurements of an observable of a quantum system. Let $A$ be a self-adjoint operator describing the observable. If the state of the quantum system is described by a state vector $\Psi$ immediately before the measurement, then the probability that the measured value of the observable is found in a Borel set $J$ on $\mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$\frac{\langle \Psi, E(J)\Psi \rangle}{\langle \Psi, \Psi \rangle},$$

where $E$ is the spectral measure of $A$.

Postulate 3 describes the effects of measurements on quantum systems using the notion of probability, whereas it does not mention the operational definition of the notion of probability. On the other hand, there is a postulate about quantum measurements with no reference to the notion of probability. This is given in Dirac [8, Section 10], and describes a special case of quantum measurements which are performed upon a quantum system in an eigenstate of an observable, i.e., a state represented by an eigenvector of an observable.

Postulate 4 (Dirac [8]). If the dynamical system is in an eigenstate of a real dynamical variable $\xi$, belonging to the eigenvalue $\xi'$, then a measurement of $\xi$ will certainly gives as result the number $\xi'$.

Here, the “dynamical system” means quantum system.

Based on Postulates 1, 2, 3, and 4 above, we can show that an elementary event with probability one occurs certainly in quantum mechanics. To see this, let us consider a quantum system with infinite-dimensional state space, and measurements of an observable of the quantum system described by a self-adjoint operator $A$. Suppose that the probability that the measured value of the observable is equal to a real $\lambda_0$ is one in the measurement of the observable performed upon the system in a state represented by a state vector $\Psi_0$. Then, it follows from Postulate 3 that

$$\frac{\langle \Psi_0, E(\{\lambda_0\})\Psi_0 \rangle}{\langle \Psi_0, \Psi_0 \rangle} = 1,$$

where $E$ is the spectral measure of $A$. Thus, since $E(\{\lambda_0\})$ is a projector on $H$, we have that

$$E(\{\lambda_0\})\Psi_0 = \Psi_0. \quad (21)$$

We here note the following theorem (see Arai and Ezawa [1, Theorem 2.84 (i)]).

**Theorem 29.** Let $A$ be a self-adjoint operator on a Hilbert space $H$, and let $E$ be the spectral measure of $A$. Then we have that $\{\Psi \in H \mid A\Psi = \lambda\Psi\} = \{E(\{\lambda\})\Psi \mid \Psi \in H\}$ for every real $\lambda$.

It follows from (21) and Theorem 29 that $\Psi_0$ is an eigenvector of $A$ belonging to the eigenvalue $\lambda_0$. Therefore, we have that immediately before the measurement, the quantum system is in an eigenstate of the observable $A$, belonging to the eigenvalue $\lambda_0$. While Postulate 4 is mathematically vague, it is natural to identify the “real dynamical variable” referred to in Postulate 4 with an observable in our terminology above. Thus, under this identification, it follows from Postulate 4 that the measurement of $A$ will certainly gives as result the number $\lambda_0$. Hence, it turns out that an elementary event with probability one occurs certainly in quantum mechanics.
The above consideration can be generalized to show that an arbitrary event with probability one occurs certainly in quantum mechanics. To see this, let us again consider a quantum system with infinite-dimensional state space, and measurements of an observable of the quantum system described by a self-adjoint operator $A$. Suppose that the probability that the measured value of the observable is found in a Borel set $J$ on $\mathbb{R}$ is one in the measurement of the observable performed upon the system in a state represented by a state vector $\Psi_0$. Then, it follows from Postulate 3 that

$$\frac{\langle \Psi_0, E(J)\Psi_0 \rangle}{\langle \Psi_0, \Psi_0 \rangle} = 1,$$

where $E$ is the spectral measure of $A$. Thus, since $E(J)$ is a projector on $H$, we have that

$$E(J)\Psi_0 = \Psi_0. \quad (22)$$

Now, we define a Borel function $f: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ by the condition that $f(\lambda)$ is 1 if $\lambda \in J$ and 0 otherwise. Then, we can define a operator $f(A)$ such that

(i) $$D(f(A)) = \left\{ \Psi \in H \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} |f(\lambda)|^2 d\langle \Psi, E(\lambda)\Psi \rangle < \infty \right. \right\}$$

and

$$\langle \Phi, f(A)\Psi \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(\lambda)d\langle \Phi, E(\lambda)\Psi \rangle$$

for every $\Psi \in D(A)$ and $\Phi \in H$, and

(ii) if $\Psi$ is an eigenvector of $A$ belonging to an eigenvalue $\lambda$ then $\Psi$ is an eigenvector of $f(A)$ belonging to the eigenvalue $f(\lambda)$.

See e.g. Prugovečki [18, Chapter 2] or Arai and Ezawa [1, Chapter 2] for the detail of the definition and property of the operator $f(A)$. It is then easy to show that

$$f(A) = E(J). \quad (23)$$

Thus, $f(A)$ is a self-adjoint operator. It describes an observable whose measurement is done by first performing the measurement of the observable described by $A$, and then simply applying the function $f$ to the measured value. On the other hand, it follows from (22) and (23) that $\Psi_0$ is an eigenvector of $f(A)$ belonging to the eigenvalue 1. Therefore, we have that immediately before the measurement, the quantum system is in an eigenstate of the observable $f(A)$, belonging to the eigenvalue 1. Thus, applying Postulate 4 under the identification of the “real dynamical variable” referred to in Postulate 4 with the observable described by $f(A)$ as above, we have that the measurement of $f(A)$ will certainly gives as result the number 1. Since $f(\lambda) = 1$ if and only if $\lambda \in J$, this can be rephrased as that the measurement of $A$ will certainly gives as result a number in $J$. Hence, it turns out that an event with probability one occurs certainly in quantum mechanics.

Theorem 30 below states that an elementary event with probability one always occurs in an ensemble, and thus shows that the notion of ensemble coincides with our intuition about the notion of probability, in particular, in quantum mechanics.
Theorem 30. Let \( \Omega \) be an r.e. infinite set, and let \( P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega) \). Let \( a \in \Omega \). Suppose that \( \alpha \) is an ensemble for the discrete probability space \( P \) and \( P(a) = 1 \). Then \( \alpha \) consists only of \( a \), i.e., \( \alpha =aaaaaa \ldots \).

Theorem 30 follows immediately from a more general result, Theorem 31 below, which states that an elementary event with probability zero never occurs in an ensemble.

Theorem 31. Let \( \Omega \) be an r.e. infinite set, and let \( P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega) \). Let \( a \in \Omega \). Suppose that \( \alpha \) is an ensemble for the discrete probability space \( P \) and \( P(a) = 0 \). Then \( \alpha \) does not contain \( a \).

Proof. We define \( C \) as the set \( \{(n, \rho a) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \& \rho \in (\Omega \setminus \{a\})^*\} \). Then \( C_n \) is a prefix-free subset of \( \Omega^* \) for every \( n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \). Since \( \Omega \) is an r.e. set, the set \( C \) is an r.e. subset of \( \mathbb{N}^+ \times \Omega^* \). For each \( n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \), since \( P(\sigma) = 0 \) for every \( \sigma \in C_n \), we have \( \lambda_P ([C_n]^\prec) = P(C_n) = 0 < 2^{-n} \). Hence, \( C \) is Martin-Löf \( P \)-test.

Since \( \alpha \) is Martin-Löf \( P \)-random, it passes \( C \). Let us assume contrarily that \( \alpha \) contains \( a \). Then there exists a prefix \( \sigma \) of \( \alpha \) such that \( \sigma = \rho a \) for some \( \rho \in (\Omega \setminus \{a\})^* \). Since \( \sigma \in C_n \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \), we have that \( \alpha \in [C_n]^\prec \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \). Therefore \( \alpha \) does not pass \( C \). Thus, we have a contradiction, and the proof is completed.

7.2 The law of large numbers

Let \( P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega) \), and let us consider an infinite sequence \( \alpha \in \Omega^\infty \) of outcomes which is being generated by infinitely repeated trials described by the discrete probability space \( P \) on \( \Omega \). The second necessary condition which the notion of probability for the discrete probability space \( P \) is considered to have to satisfy is the condition that the law of large numbers holds for \( \alpha \). Theorem 32 below confirms that this certainly holds. Note here that we have to prove that the law of large numbers holds for \( \alpha \) even in the case where \( P \) is not computable. This is because a discrete probability space is not computable, in general. However, we can certainly prove it, as shown in Theorem 32.

Theorem 32 (The law of large numbers). Let \( \Omega \) be an r.e. infinite set, and let \( P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega) \). For every \( \alpha \in \Omega^\infty \), if \( \alpha \) is an ensemble for \( P \) then for every \( a \in \Omega \) it holds that

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{N_a(\alpha|n)}{n} = P(a),
\]

where \( N_a(\sigma) \) denotes the number of the occurrences of \( a \) in \( \sigma \) for every \( a \in \Omega \) and \( \sigma \in \Omega^* \).

In order to prove Theorem 32, we need Theorem 33 below, which is Theorem 11 of Tadaki [23].

Theorem 33 (The law of large numbers, Tadaki [19, 20, 23]). Let \( \Theta \) be a finite alphabet, and let \( Q \in \mathbb{P}(\Theta) \). For every \( \alpha \in \Theta^\infty \), if \( \alpha \) is an ensemble for \( Q \) then for every \( a \in \Theta \) it holds that

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{N_a(\alpha|n)}{n} = Q(a),
\]

where \( N_a(\sigma) \) denotes the number of the occurrences of \( a \) in \( \sigma \) for every \( a \in \Theta \) and \( \sigma \in \Theta^* \).

In order to prove Theorem 32, we also need the following theorem.
Theorem 34. Let $\Omega$ be an r.e. infinite set, and let $P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)$. Let $A_1, \ldots, A_L$ be r.e. subsets of $\Omega$ such that $\Omega = \bigcup_{i=1}^{L} A_i$ and $A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset$ for every $i \neq j$. Let $\Theta = \{a_1, \ldots, a_L\}$ be a finite alphabet such that $a_i \neq a_j$ for every $i \neq j$. Suppose that $\alpha$ is an ensemble for $P$. Let $\beta$ be an infinite sequence over $\Theta$ obtained by replacing all occurrences of elements of $A_i$ in $\alpha$ by $a_i$ for each $i = 1, \ldots, L$. Then $\beta$ is an ensemble for $Q$, where $Q \in \mathbb{P}(\Theta)$ such that $Q(a_i) := P(A_i)$ for every $i = 1, \ldots, L$.

Proof. We show the contraposition. Suppose that $\beta$ is not Martin-Löf $Q$-random. Then there exists a Martin-Löf $Q$-test $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathbb{N}^+ \times \Theta^*$ such that
\[
\beta \notin [\mathcal{T}]^<
\] (24)
for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. For each $\tau \in \Theta^*$, let $f(\tau)$ be the set of all $\sigma \in \Omega^*$ such that, when replacing all occurrences of elements of $A_i$ in $\sigma$ by $a_i$ for each $i = 1, \ldots, L$, the resulting finite string equals to $\tau$. Then, since $Q(a_i) = \sum_{a \in A_i} P(a)$ for every $i = 1, \ldots, L$, we have that
\[
\lambda_Q([\tau]^\prec) = Q(\tau) = P(f(\tau)) = \lambda_P([f(\tau)]^\prec)
\] (25)
for each $\tau \in \Theta^*$. We then define $S$ to be a subset of $\mathbb{N}^+ \times \Theta^*$ such that $S_n = \bigcup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_n} f(\tau)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Since $\mathcal{T}_n$ is a prefix-free subset of $\Theta^*$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, we see that $S_n$ is a prefix-free subset of $\Omega^*$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, we also see that
\[
\lambda_P([S_n]^\prec) \leq \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_n} \lambda_P([f(\tau)]^\prec) = \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_n} \lambda_Q([\tau]^\prec) = \lambda_Q([\mathcal{T}_n]^\prec) < 2^{-n},
\]
where the first equality follows from (25) and the second equality follows from the prefix-freeness of $\mathcal{T}_n$. Moreover, since all of $A_1, \ldots, A_L$, and $\mathcal{T}$ are r.e., $S$ is also r.e. Thus, $S$ is a Martin-Löf $P$-test.

On the other hand, note that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, if $\beta \notin [\mathcal{T}_n]^<$ then $\alpha \notin [S_n]^<$. Thus, it follows from (24) that $\alpha \notin [S_n]^<$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Hence, $\alpha$ is not Martin-Löf $P$-random. This completes the proof. \hfill \Box

Theorem 32 is then proved as follows.

Proof of Theorem 32. Let $a \in \Omega$. We define $Q \in \mathbb{P}(\{0,1\})$ by the condition that $Q(1) = P(a)$ and $Q(0) = 1 - P(a)$. Let $\beta$ be the infinite binary sequence obtained from $\alpha$ by replacing all $a$ by 1 and all other elements of $\Omega$ by 0 in $\alpha$. Note that $\Omega \setminus \{a\}$ is r.e., since $\Omega$ is r.e. Thus, since $Q(0) = \sum_{x \in \Omega \setminus \{a\}} P(x)$, it follows from Theorem 34 that $\beta$ is Martin-Löf $Q$-random. On the other hand, obviously, we have that $N_1(\beta|_n) = N_a(\alpha|_n)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Thus, using Theorem 33 we have that
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{N_a(\alpha|_n)}{n} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{N_1(\beta|_n)}{n} = Q(1) = P(a).
\]
This completes the proof. \hfill \Box

The following is immediate from Theorem 32.

Corollary 35. Let $\Omega$ be an r.e. infinite set, and let $P, Q \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)$. If there exists $\alpha \in \Omega^\infty$ which is both an ensemble for $P$ and an ensemble for $Q$, then $P = Q$. \hfill \Box
7.3 Computable shuffling

This subsection considers the third necessary condition which the notion of probability for a discrete probability space is considered to have to satisfy.

Let \( P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega) \). Assume that an observer \( A \) performs an infinite reputation of trials described by the discrete probability space \( P \), and thus is generating an infinite sequence \( \alpha \in \Omega^\infty \) of outcomes of the trials as

\[
\alpha = a_1a_2a_3a_4a_5a_6a_7a_8 \ldots .
\]

with \( a_i \in \Omega \). According to our thesis, Thesis 2 \( \alpha \) is an ensemble for \( P \). Consider another observer \( B \) who wants to adopt the following subsequence \( \beta \) of \( \alpha \) as the outcomes of the trials:

\[
\beta = a_2a_3a_5a_7a_{11}a_{13}a_{17} \ldots ,
\]

where the observer \( B \) only takes into account the \( n \)th elements \( a_n \) in the original sequence \( \alpha \) such that \( n \) is a prime number. According to Thesis 2 \( \beta \) has to be an ensemble for \( P \), as well. However, is this true?

Consider this problem in a general setting. Assume as before that an observer \( A \) performs an infinite reputation of trials described by the discrete probability space \( P \), and thus is generating an infinite sequence \( \alpha \in \Omega^\infty \) of outcomes of the trials. According to Thesis 2 \( \alpha \) is an ensemble for \( P \). Now, let \( f: \mathbb{N}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^+ \) be an injection. Consider another observer \( B \) who wants to adopt the following sequence \( \beta \) as the outcomes of the trials:

\[
\beta = \alpha(f(1))\alpha(f(2))\alpha(f(3))\alpha(f(4))\alpha(f(5))\ldots .
\]

instead of \( \alpha \). According to Thesis 2 \( \beta \) has to be an ensemble for \( P \), as well. However, is this true?

We can confirm this by restricting the ability of \( B \), that is, by assuming that every observer can select elements from the original sequence \( \alpha \) only in an effective manner. This means that the function \( f: \mathbb{N}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^+ \) has to be a computable function. Theorem 36 below shows this result.

In other words, Theorem 36 states that ensembles for \( P \) are closed under computable shuffling.

**Theorem 36** (Closure property under computable shuffling). Let \( \Omega \) be an r.e. infinite set, and let \( P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega) \). Suppose that \( \alpha \) is an ensemble for \( P \). Then, for every injective function \( f: \mathbb{N}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^+ \), if \( f \) is computable then the infinite sequence

\[
\alpha_f := \alpha(f(1))\alpha(f(2))\alpha(f(3))\alpha(f(4))\ldots .
\]

is an ensemble for \( P \).

**Proof.** We show the contraposition. Suppose that \( \alpha_f \) is not Martin-Löf \( P \)-random. Then there exists a Martin-Löf \( P \)-test \( C \subset \mathbb{N}^+ \times \Omega^* \) such that

\[
\alpha_f \in [C_n]^<
\]

for every \( n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \). For each \( \sigma \in \Omega^+ \), let \( F(\sigma) \) be the set of all \( \tau \in \Omega^+ \) such that

(i) |\( \tau \)| = \( \max f(\{1, 2, \ldots, |\sigma|\}) \), and

(ii) for every \( k = 1, 2, \ldots, |\sigma| \) it holds that \( \sigma(k) = \tau(f(k)) \).
Then, since \( f \) is an injection and \( \sum_{a \in \Omega} P(a) = 1 \), we have that
\[
\lambda_P \left( [F(\sigma)]^\prec \right) = P(F(\sigma)) = P(\sigma) = \lambda_P \left( [\sigma]^\prec \right)
\] (27)
for each \( \sigma \in \Omega^+ \). We then define \( D \) to be a subset of \( \mathbb{N}^+ \times \Omega^* \) such that \( D_n = \bigcup_{\sigma \in C_n} F(\sigma) \) for every \( n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \). Note here that, for each \( n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \), \( \lambda \notin C_n \) since \( \lambda_P \left( [C_n]^\prec \right) < 2^{-n} < 1 \). Then, since \( C_n \) is a prefix-free subset of \( \Omega^* \) for every \( n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \), we see that \( D_n \) is also a prefix-free subset of \( \Omega^* \) for every \( n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \). For each \( n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \), we see that
\[
\lambda_P \left( [D_n]^\prec \right) \leq \sum_{\sigma \in C_n} \lambda_P \left( [F(\sigma)]^\prec \right) = \sum_{\sigma \in C_n} \lambda_P \left( [\sigma]^\prec \right) = \lambda_P \left( [C_n]^\prec \right) < 2^{-n},
\]
where the first equality follows from (27) and the second equality follows from the prefix-freeness of \( C_n \). Moreover, since \( f \) is an injective computable function and both \( \Omega \) and \( C \) are r.e., it is easy to see that \( D \) is r.e. Thus, \( D \) is a Martin-Löf \( P \)-test.

On the other hand, we see that, for every \( n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \), if \( \alpha_f \in [C_n]^\prec \) then \( \alpha \in [D_n]^\prec \). Thus, it follows from (26) that \( \alpha \in [D_n]^\prec \) for every \( n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \). Hence, \( \alpha \) is not Martin-Löf \( P \)-random. This completes the proof. \( \square \)

### 7.4 Selection by partial computable generalized selection functions

As the forth necessary condition which the notion of probability for a discrete probability space \( P \) on \( \Omega \) is considered to have to satisfy, in this subsection we consider the condition that infinite sequences over \( \Omega \) of outcomes each of which is obtained by an infinite reputation of the trials described by the discrete probability space \( P \) are closed under the selection by a partial computable generalized selection function on \( \Omega^* \), which is a generalization of the notion of partial computable selection function used in the definition of von Mises-Wald-Church stochasticity over an r.e. infinite alphabet. The notion of von Mises-Wald-Church stochasticity itself is investigated in the theory of collectives \([29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35] \)\(^4\). For motivating the forth necessary condition, we carry out a thought experiment in what follows, as in the preceding subsection.

Let \( P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega) \), and let us assume that an observer \( A \) performs an infinite reputation of trials described by the discrete probability space \( P \), and thus is generating an infinite sequence \( \alpha \in \Omega^\infty \) of outcomes of the trials as
\[
\alpha = a_1a_2a_3a_4a_5a_6 \ldots \ldots
\]
with \( a_i \in \Omega \). According to Thesis 2, \( \alpha \) is an ensemble for \( P \).

Consider another observer \( B \) who wants to refute Thesis 2. For that purpose, the observer \( B \) adopts a subsequence \( \beta = b_1b_2b_3b_4 \ldots \ldots \) with \( b_i \in \Omega \) of \( \alpha \) in the following manner: Whenever a new outcome \( a_n \) is generated by the observer \( A \), the observer \( B \) investigates the prefix \( a_1a_2a_3 \ldots a_n \) of \( \alpha \) generated so far by the observer \( A \). Then, based on the prefix, the observer \( B \) decides whether the next outcome \( a_{n+1} \) should be appended to the tail of \( b_1b_2b_3 \ldots b_k \) which have been adopted so far by \( B \) as a prefix of \( \beta \). In this manner the observer \( B \) is generating the subsequence \( \beta \) of \( \alpha \). Note that the length of \( \beta \) may or may not be infinite.

On the other hand, the observer \( A \) is a defender of Thesis 2. Therefore, the observer \( A \) tries to inhibit the observer \( B \) from breaking Thesis 2. For that purpose, the observer \( A \) never generates

---

\(^4\)See Downey and Hirschfeldt ([9] Section 7.4) for a treatment of the mathematics of the notion of von Mises-Wald-Church stochasticity itself from a modern point of view.
the next outcome \(a_{n+1}\) before the observer \(B\) decides whether this \(a_{n+1}\) should be appended to the tail of \(b_1b_2b_3\ldots b_k\). This is because if for each \(n\) the observer \(B\) knows the outcome \(a_{n+1}\) before the decision for \(a_{n+1}\) to be appended or to be ignored, then the observer \(B\) can easily generate an infinite subsequence \(\beta\) of \(\alpha\) which does not satisfy Thesis \(2\). Thus, due to this careful behavior of the observer \(A\), the observer \(B\) has to make the decision of the choice of the next outcome \(a_{n+1}\), based only on the prefix \(a_1a_2a_3\ldots a_n\) of \(\alpha\), without knowing the outcome \(a_{n+1}\). Then, according to Thesis \(2\), \(\beta\) has to be an ensemble for \(P\), as well as \(\alpha\). However, is this true?

We can confirm this by restricting the ability of \(B\), that is, by assuming that the observer \(B\) can make the decision of the choice of the next outcome, only in an effective manner based on the prefix \(a_1a_2a_3\ldots a_n\) of \(\alpha\) generated so far by the observer \(A\).

Put more mathematically, we introduce some notations. A generalized selection function is a function \(f\) such that \(\text{dom } f \subset \Omega^*\) and \(f(\text{dom } f) \subset \{\text{YES, NO}\}\). We think of \(f\) as the decision of \(B\) whether or not to choose the next outcome \(\alpha(n + 1)\) based on the prefix \(\alpha|_n\) of \(\alpha\) in generating \(\beta\). For any \(\gamma \in \Omega^\infty\), \(k \in \mathbb{N}^+\), and generalized selection function \(g\), let \(s_g(\gamma, k)\) be the \(k\)th number \(\ell \in \mathbb{N}\) such that \(g(\gamma|_\ell) = \text{YES}\), i.e., the least number \(\ell \in \mathbb{N}\) such that \(#\{m \leq \ell \mid g(\gamma|_m) = \text{YES}\} = k\), if such \(\ell\) exists.

First, consider the case where \(f(\alpha|_n)\) is not defined for some \(n \in \mathbb{N}\). Let \(m\) be the least number of such \(n\). Then, this case means that the observer \(B\) does not make the decision of the choice of the next outcome \(\alpha(m + 1)\) based on the prefix \(\alpha|_m\), and is stalled. Therefore, the length of \(\beta\) remains finite in this case. Thus, the observer \(B\) cannot refute Thesis \(2\) in this case, since Thesis \(2\) only refers to the property of an infinite sequence of outcomes which is being generated by infinitely repeated trials. Hence, Thesis \(2\) survives in this case.

Secondly, consider the case where \(f(\alpha|_n)\) is defined for all \(n \in \mathbb{N}\) and \(\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid f(\alpha|_n) = \text{YES}\}\) is a finite set. In this case, the length of \(\beta\) remains also finite. Thus, the observer \(B\) does not refute Thesis \(2\) and therefore Thesis \(2\) survives also in this case.

Finally, consider the remaining case, where \(f(\alpha|_n)\) is defined for all \(n \in \mathbb{N}\) and the set \(\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid f(\alpha|_n) = \text{YES}\}\) is infinite. Then, \(s_f(\alpha, k)\) is defined and \(\beta(k) = \alpha(s_f(\alpha, k) + 1)\) for all \(k \in \mathbb{N}^+\). Hence, \(\beta\) is an infinite sequence over \(\Omega\), and thus Thesis \(2\) can be applied to \(\beta\) in this case. Therefore, according to Thesis \(2\), \(\beta\) has to be an ensemble for \(P\), as well as \(\alpha\). However, is this true? Actually, we can confirm this by restricting the ability of \(B\), that is, by assuming that \(f\) has to be a partial computable generalized selection function. Here, a partial computable generalized selection function is a generalized selection function which is a partial recursive function. Theorem \(37\) below shows this result. It states that ensembles for an arbitrary discrete probability space are closed under the selection by a partial computable generalized selection function. Hence, Thesis \(2\) survives in this case as well.

In this way, based on Theorem \(37\), we confirm that the forth condition certainly holds for ensembles for an arbitrary discrete probability space.

**Theorem 37** (Closure property under the selection by a partial computable generalized selection function). Let \(\Omega\) be an r.e. infinite set, and let \(P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)\). Suppose that \(\alpha\) is an ensemble for \(P\). Let \(f\) be a partial computable generalized selection function with \(\text{dom } f \subset \Omega^*\). Suppose that \(f(\alpha|_k)\) is defined for all \(k \in \mathbb{N}\) and \(\{k \in \mathbb{N} \mid f(\alpha|_k) = \text{YES}\}\) is an infinite set. Then an infinite sequence \(\beta\) such that \(\beta(k) = \alpha(s_f(\alpha, k) + 1)\) for all \(k \in \mathbb{N}^+\) is an ensemble for \(P\).

**Proof.** We show the contraposition. Suppose that \(\beta\) is not Martin-Löf \(P\)-random. Then there exists
a Martin-Löf $P$-test $C \subset \mathbb{N}^+ \times \Omega^*$ such that

$$\beta \in [C_n]^- \quad (28)$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. For any $\sigma, \tau \in \Omega^+$, we say that $\sigma$ is selected by $f$ from $\tau$ if $f(\tau|_k)$ is defined for all $k = 0, 1, \ldots, |\tau| - 1$ and there exists a strictly increasing function $h: \{1, \ldots, |\sigma|\} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that

(i) $\{k \in \{1, \ldots, |\tau|\} \mid f(\tau|_{k-1}) = \text{YES} \} = h(\{1, \ldots, |\sigma|\})$,

(ii) $h(|\sigma|) = |\tau|$, and

(iii) $\tau(h(k)) = \sigma(k)$ for all $k = 1, \ldots, |\sigma|$.

For each $\sigma \in \Omega^+$, let $F(\sigma)$ be the set of all $\tau \in \Omega^*$ such that $\sigma$ is selected by $f$ from $\tau$. We also set $F(\lambda) := \{\lambda\}$. It is then easy to see that $F(\sigma)$ is a prefix-free subset of $\Omega^*$ for every $\sigma \in \Omega^*$.

We show that

$$\lambda_P([F(\sigma)]^-) \leq \lambda_P([\sigma]^-) \quad (29)$$

for all $\sigma \in \Omega^*$ by the induction on the length of $|\sigma|$. First, the inequality (29) holds for the case of $|\sigma| = 0$, obviously. For an arbitrary $n \in \mathbb{N}$, assume that (29) holds for all $\sigma \in \Omega^n$. Let $\sigma \in \Omega^{n+1}$. We then denote the prefix of $\sigma$ of length $n$ by $\rho$, and denote $\sigma(|\sigma|)$ by $a$. Therefore $\sigma = \rho a$. Note that

$$G(\tau) := \{v \in \Omega^* \mid \tau v a \in F(\sigma)\}$$

is a prefix-free subset of $\Omega^*$ for every $\tau \in \Omega^*$. Therefore, we have that

$$\sum_{v \in G(\tau)} \lambda_P([v]^-) = \lambda_P([G(\tau)]^-) \leq 1 \quad (30)$$

for each $\tau \in \Omega^*$. Thus, for each $\sigma \in \Omega^*$, we see that

$$\lambda_P([F(\sigma)]^-) = \sum_{v \in F(\sigma)} \lambda_P([v]^-) = \sum_{\tau \in F(\rho)} \sum_{v \in G(\tau)} \lambda_P([\tau v a]^-)$$

$$= \sum_{\tau \in F(\rho)} \sum_{v \in G(\tau)} \lambda_P([\tau]^-) \lambda_P([v]^-) P(a)$$

$$\leq \sum_{\tau \in F(\rho)} \lambda_P([\tau]^-) P(a) = \lambda_P([F(\rho)]^-) P(a)$$

$$\leq \lambda_P([\rho]^-) P(a) = \lambda_P([\sigma]^-),$$

where the second equality follows from the fact that the mapping

$$\{(\tau, v) \mid \tau \in F(\rho) \& v \in G(\tau)\} \ni (\tau, v) \mapsto \tau v a \in F(\sigma)$$

is a bijection, the first inequality follows from (30), and the second inequality follows from the assumption. Therefore (29) holds for all $\sigma \in \Omega^{n+1}$. Hence, (29) holds for all $\sigma \in \Omega^*$, as desired.

We then define $D$ to be a subset of $\mathbb{N}^+ \times \Omega^*$ such that $D_n = \bigcup_{\sigma \in C_n} F(\sigma)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Since $C_n$ is a prefix-free subset of $\Omega^*$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, we see that $D_n$ is also a prefix-free subset of $\Omega^*$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, we see that

$$\lambda_P([D_n]^-) \leq \sum_{\sigma \in C_n} \lambda_P([F(\sigma)]^-) \leq \sum_{\sigma \in C_n} \lambda_P([\sigma]^-) = \lambda_P([C_n]^-) < 2^{-n},$$
where the second inequality follows from (29) and the equality follows from the prefix-freeness of $\mathcal{C}_n$. Moreover, since $\Omega$ and $\mathcal{C}$ are r.e., we see that $\mathcal{D}$ is also r.e. Thus, $\mathcal{D}$ is a Martin-Löf $P$-test.

On the other hand, we see that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, if $\beta \in [\mathcal{C}_n]^\prec$ then $\alpha \in [\mathcal{D}_n]^\prec$. Thus, it follows from (28) that $\alpha \in [\mathcal{D}_n]^\prec$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Hence, $\alpha$ is not Martin-Löf $P$-random. This completes the proof.

Theorem 36 and Theorem 37 show that certain closure properties hold for ensembles for an arbitrary discrete probability space. In the subsequent sections, we will see that various strong closure properties of another type hold for the ensembles.

8 Conditional probability and the independence between two events

In this section we operationally characterize the notions of conditional probability and the independence between two events on a discrete probability space, in terms of ensembles.

Let $\Omega$ be a countable alphabet, and let $P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)$. Let $A \subset \Omega$ be an event on the discrete probability space $P$. For each ensemble $\alpha$ for $P$, we use $C_A(\alpha)$ to denote the infinite binary sequence such that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, its $n$th element $(C_A(\alpha))(n)$ is 1 if $\alpha(n) \in A$ and 0 otherwise. The pair $(P, A)$ induces a finite probability space $C(P, A) \in \mathbb{P}^\alpha$ such that $(C(P, A))(1) = P(A)$ and $(C(P, A))(0) = 1 - P(A)$. Note that the notions of $C_A(\alpha)$ and $C(P, A)$ in our theory together correspond to the notion of mixing in the theory of collectives by von Mises [30]. We can then show the following theorem.

**Theorem 38.** Let $\Omega$ be an r.e. infinite set, and let $P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)$. Let $A \subset \Omega$ be a recursive event on the discrete probability space $P$. Suppose that $\alpha$ is an ensemble for the discrete probability space $P$. Then $C_A(\alpha)$ is an ensemble for the finite probability space $C(P, A)$.

**Proof.** We show the result using Theorem 34. First, since $\Omega$ is r.e. and $A$ is a recursive subset of $\Omega$, both $\Omega \setminus A$ and $A$ are r.e. Obviously, we have $\Omega = (\Omega \setminus A) \cup A$ and $(\Omega \setminus A) \cap A = \emptyset$. Note that $C_A(\alpha)$ is an infinite sequence over $\{0, 1\}$ obtained both by replacing all occurrences of elements of $\Omega \setminus A$ in $\alpha$ by 0 and by replacing all occurrences of elements of $A$ in $\alpha$ by 1. Note, moreover, that $C(P, A)$ is a finite probability space on $\{0, 1\}$ such that $(C(P, A))(0) = P(\Omega \setminus A)$ and $(C(P, A))(1) = P(A)$. Thus, it follows from Theorem 34 that $C_A(\alpha)$ is an ensemble for $C(P, A)$.

We show that the notion of conditional probability in a discrete probability space can be represented by an ensemble in a natural manner. For that purpose, first we recall the notion of conditional probability in a discrete probability space.

Let $\Omega$ be a countable alphabet, and let $P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)$. Let $B \subset \Omega$ be an event on the discrete probability space $P$. Suppose that $P(B) > 0$. Then, for each event $A \subset \Omega$, the conditional probability of $A$ given $B$, denoted $P(A|B)$, is defined as $P(A \cap B)/P(B)$. This notion defines a finite or discrete probability space $P_B \in \mathbb{P}(B)$ such that $P_B(\alpha) = P(\{\alpha\}|B)$ for every $\alpha \in B$.

When an infinite sequence $\alpha \in \Omega^\infty$ contains infinitely many elements from $B$, Filtered$_B(\alpha)$ is defined as an infinite sequence in $B^\infty$ obtained from $\alpha$ by eliminating all elements of $\Omega \setminus B$ occurring in $\alpha$. If $\alpha$ is an ensemble for the discrete probability space $P$ and $P(B) > 0$, then $\alpha$ contains infinitely many elements from $B$ due to Theorem 32. Therefore, Filtered$_B(\alpha)$ is properly defined in this case. Note that the notion of Filtered$_B(\alpha)$ in our theory corresponds to the notion of partition in the theory of collectives by von Mises [30].

We can then show Theorem 39 below, which states that ensembles are closed under conditioning.
Theorem 39 (Closure property under conditioning). Let $\Omega$ be an r.e. infinite set, and let $P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)$. Let $B \subset \Omega$ be a recursive event on the discrete probability space $P$ with $P(B) > 0$. For every ensemble $\alpha$ for $P$, it holds that $\text{Filtered}_B(\alpha)$ is an ensemble for $P_B$.

Proof. In the case of $B = \Omega$, we have $P_B = P$ and $\text{Filtered}_B(\alpha) = \alpha$. Therefore the result is obvious. Thus, in what follows, we assume that $B$ is a proper subset of $\Omega$. In what follows, we further assume that $B$ is an infinite set. The case in which $B$ is a finite subset of $\Omega$ can be handled more easily by simplifying the proof given below, and thus we omit the proof for such a case.

First, we choose any particular $a \in \Omega \setminus B$ and define $Q \in \mathbb{P}(B \cup \{a\})$ by the condition that $Q(x) := \sum_{y \in \Omega \setminus B} P(y)$ if $x = a$ and $Q(x) := P(x)$ otherwise. Note here that

$$1 - Q(a) = P(B),$$

and therefore

$$Q(a) < 1. \quad (32)$$

Let $\beta$ be the infinite sequence over $B \cup \{a\}$ obtained by replacing all occurrences of elements of $\Omega \setminus B$ in $\alpha$ by $a$. Since $\alpha$ is Martin-Löf $P$-random and $\Omega \setminus B$ is r.e., in a similar manner to the proof of Theorem 34, we can show that $\beta$ is Martin-Löf $Q$-random. Hence, in order to complete the proof, it is sufficient to show that if $\text{Filtered}_B(\alpha)$ is not Martin-Löf $P_B$-random then $\beta$ is not Martin-Löf $Q$-random.

Thus, let us assume that $\text{Filtered}_B(\alpha)$ is not Martin-Löf $P_B$-random. Then there exists a Martin-Löf $P_B$-test $C \subset B \times \mathbb{N}^+$ such that

$$\text{Filtered}_B(\alpha) \in \mathcal{C}_n^\prec \quad (33)$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. For each $\sigma \in B^+$, let $F(\sigma)$ be the set of all finite strings over $B \cup \{a\}$ of the form $a^{k_1}\sigma_1a^{k_2}\sigma_2\ldots \sigma_{L-1}a^{k_L}\sigma_L$ for some $k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_L \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\sigma = \sigma_1\sigma_2\ldots \sigma_L$ with $\sigma_i \in B$. Note that $F(\sigma)$ is a prefix-free subset of $(B \cup \{a\})^*$ for every $\sigma \in B^+$. For each $\sigma \in B^+$, we see that

$$\lambda_Q \left( [F(\sigma)]^\prec \right) = \sum_{k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_L = 0}^{\infty} \lambda_Q \left( a^{k_1}\sigma_1a^{k_2}\sigma_2\ldots \sigma_{L-1}a^{k_L}\sigma_L \right)^\prec$$

$$= \sum_{k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_L = 0}^{\infty} \lambda_Q ( [\sigma]^\prec ) Q(a)^{k_1}Q(a)^{k_2}\ldots Q(a)^{k_L}$$

$$= \lambda_Q ( [\sigma]^\prec ) \left( \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} Q(a)^k \right)^L$$

$$= \lambda_Q ( [\sigma]^\prec ) \frac{1}{(1 - Q(a))^L}$$

$$= \lambda_Q ( [\sigma]^\prec ) \frac{1}{P(B)^L}$$

$$= \lambda_{P_B} ( [\sigma]^\prec ),$$

where we use (32) and (31) in the forth and fifth equalities, respectively. We then define $D$ to be a subset of $\mathbb{N}^+ \times (B \cup \{a\})^*$ such that $D_n = \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{C}_n} F(\sigma)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Note here that, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}^+, \lambda \notin \mathcal{C}_n$ since $\lambda_P ( [\mathcal{C}_n]^\prec ) < 2^{-n} < 1$. Then, since $\mathcal{C}_n$ is a prefix-free subset of $B^*$ for every
$n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, we see that $\mathcal{D}_n$ is a prefix-free subset of $(B \cup \{a\})^*$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, we see that
\[
\lambda_Q([\mathcal{D}_n]^{-}) \leq \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{C}_n} \lambda_Q([F(\sigma)]^{-}) = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{C}_n} \lambda_{P_B}([\sigma]^{-}) = \lambda_{P_B}([\mathcal{C}_n]^{-}) < 2^{-n},
\]
where the first equality follows from (33) and the second equality follows from the prefix-freeness of $\mathcal{C}_n$. Moreover, since $\mathcal{C}$ is r.e., $\mathcal{D}$ is also r.e. Thus, $\mathcal{D}$ is a Martin-Löf $Q$-test.

On the other hand, since $\text{Filtered}_B(\alpha)$ is the infinite sequence over $B$ obtained from $\beta$ by eliminating all occurrences of the symbol $a$ in $\beta$, we see that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, if $\text{Filtered}_B(\alpha) \in [\mathcal{C}_n]^{-}$ then $\beta \in [\mathcal{D}_n]^{-}$. Thus, it follows from (33) that $\beta \in [\mathcal{D}_n]^{-}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Hence, $\beta$ is not Martin-Löf $Q$-random. This completes the proof.

Let $\Omega$ be a countable alphabet, and let $P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)$. For any events $A, B \subseteq \Omega$ on the discrete probability space $P$, we say that $A$ and $B$ are independent on $P$ if $P(A \cap B) = P(A)P(B)$. In the case of $P(B) > 0$, it holds that $A$ and $B$ are independent on $P$ if and only if $P(A|B) = P(A)$.

Theorem 40 below gives operational characterizations of the notion of the independence between two events in terms of ensembles.

Let $\Omega$ be a finite alphabet. For any $\alpha, \beta \in \Omega^\infty$, we say that $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are equivalent if there exists $P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)$ such that $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are both an ensemble for $P$.

**Theorem 40.** Let $\Omega$ be an r.e. infinite set, and let $P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)$. Let $A, B \subset \Omega$ be recursive events on the discrete probability space $P$. Suppose that $P(B) > 0$. Then the following conditions are equivalent to one another.

(i) The events $A$ and $B$ are independent on $P$.

(ii) For every ensemble $\alpha$ for the discrete probability space $P$, it holds that $C_A(\alpha)$ is equivalent to $C_{A \cap B}(\text{Filtered}_B(\alpha))$.

(iii) There exists an ensemble $\alpha$ for the discrete probability space $P$ such that $C_A(\alpha)$ is equivalent to $C_{A \cap B}(\text{Filtered}_B(\alpha))$.

**Proof.** Suppose that $\alpha$ is an arbitrary ensemble for the discrete probability space $P$. Then, on the one hand, it follows from Theorem 38 that $C_A(\alpha)$ is Martin-Löf $C(P, A)$-random. On the other hand, it follows from $P(B) > 0$ and Theorem 38 that $\text{Filtered}_B(\alpha)$ is an ensemble for $P_B$. Therefore, $C_{A \cap B}(\text{Filtered}_B(\alpha))$ is Martin-Löf $C(P_B, A \cap B)$-random. This follows from Theorem 38 if $B$ is an infinite set and from Theorem 17 of Tadaki [23] otherwise.

Assume that the condition (i) holds. Then $P_B(A \cap B) = P(A)$. It follows that $C(P_B, A \cap B) = C(P, A)$. Therefore, for an arbitrary ensemble $\alpha$ for the discrete probability space $P$, we see that $C_A(\alpha)$ and $C_{A \cap B}(\text{Filtered}_B(\alpha))$ are equivalent. Thus, we have the implication (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii).

Since there exists an ensemble $\alpha$ for the discrete probability space $P$ by Theorem 28, the implication (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii) is obvious.

Finally, the implication (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) is shown as follows. Assume that the condition (iii) holds. Then there exist an ensemble $\alpha$ for the discrete probability space $P$ and a finite probability space $Q \in \mathbb{P}([0, 1])$ such that both $C_A(\alpha)$ and $C_{A \cap B}(\text{Filtered}_B(\alpha))$ are Martin-Löf $Q$-random. It follows from the consideration at the beginning of this proof that $C_A(\alpha)$ is Martin-Löf $C(P, A)$-random, and $C_{A \cap B}(\text{Filtered}_B(\alpha))$ is Martin-Löf $C(P_B, A \cap B)$-random. Using Corollary 35 we see that $C(P, A) = Q = C(P_B, A \cap B)$, and therefore $P(A) = P_B(A \cap B)$. Thus, the condition (i) holds, and the proof is completed. 
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9 The independence of an arbitrary number of events/random variables

In this section we operationally characterize the notion of the independence of an arbitrary number of events/random variables on a discrete probability space in terms of ensembles.

First, we consider the operational characterizations of the notion of the independence of an arbitrary number of random variables, in terms of ensembles. Let \( \Omega \) be an arbitrary countable alphabet, and let \( P \) be an arbitrary discrete probability space on \( \Omega \). A random variable on \( \Omega \) is a function \( X: \Omega \rightarrow \Omega' \) where \( \Omega' \) is a countable alphabet. Let \( X_1: \Omega \rightarrow \Omega_1, \ldots, X_n: \Omega \rightarrow \Omega_n \) be random variables on \( \Omega \). For any predicate \( F(v_1, \ldots, v_n) \) with variables \( v_1, \ldots, v_n \), we use \( F(X_1, \ldots, X_n) \) to denote the event

\[
\{ a \in \Omega \mid F(X_1(a), \ldots, X_n(a)) \}
\]

on \( P \). We say that the random variables \( X_1, \ldots, X_n \) are independent on \( P \) if for every \( x_1 \in \Omega_1, \ldots, x_n \in \Omega_n \) it holds that

\[
P(X_1 = x_1 \& \ldots \& X_n = x_n) = P(X_1 = x_1) \cdots P(X_n = x_n).
\]

We use \( X_1 \times \cdots \times X_n \) to denote a random variable \( Y: \Omega \rightarrow \Omega_1 \times \cdots \times \Omega_n \) on \( \Omega \) such that

\[
Y(a) = (X_1(a), \ldots, X_n(a))
\]

for every \( a \in \Omega \). Note here that \( \Omega_1 \times \cdots \times \Omega_n \) is a countable alphabet, since \( \Omega_1, \ldots, \Omega_n \) are all countable alphabets.

For any random variable \( X: \Omega \rightarrow \Omega' \) on \( \Omega \), we use \( X(P) \) to denote a discrete probability space \( P' \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega') \) such that \( P'(x) = P(X = x) \) for every \( x \in \Omega' \).

Let \( \Omega_1, \ldots, \Omega_n \) be countable alphabets. For any \( P_1 \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega_1), \ldots, P_n \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega_n) \), we use

\[
P_1 \times \cdots \times P_n
\]

to denote a discrete probability space \( Q \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega_1 \times \cdots \times \Omega_n) \) such that

\[
Q(a_1, \ldots, a_n) = P_1(a_1) \cdots P_n(a_n)
\]

for every \( a_1 \in \Omega_1, \ldots, a_n \in \Omega_n \). Then the notion of the independence of random variables can be rephrased as follows.

**Proposition 41.** Let \( \Omega \) be a countable alphabet, and let \( P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega) \). Let \( X_1: \Omega \rightarrow \Omega_1, \ldots, X_n: \Omega \rightarrow \Omega_n \) be random variables on \( \Omega \). Then the random variables \( X_1, \ldots, X_n \) are independent on \( P \) if and only if

\[
(X_1 \times \cdots \times X_n)(P) = X_1(P) \times \cdots \times X_n(P).
\]

**Proof.** Let \( x_1 \in \Omega_1, \ldots, x_n \in \Omega_n \). On the one hand, we have

\[
((X_1 \times \cdots \times X_n)(P))(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = P((X_1 \times \cdots \times X_n) = (x_1, \ldots, x_n))
\]
\[
= P(X_1 = x_1 \& \ldots \& X_n = x_n).
\]
On the other hand, we have
\[
(X_1(P) \times \cdots \times X_n(P))(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = (X_1(P))(x_1) \cdots (X_n(P))(x_n)
= P(X_1 = x_1) \cdots P(X_n = x_n).
\]

Thus, the result follows from the definition of the independence of random variables. \(\square\)

Let \(\Omega\) be a countable alphabet, and let \(X : \Omega \to \Omega'\) be a random variable on \(\Omega\). For any \(\alpha \in \Omega^\infty\), we use \(X(\alpha)\) to denote an infinite sequence \(\beta\) over \(\Omega'\) such that \(\beta(k) = X(\alpha(k))\) for every \(k \in \mathbb{N}^+\). We can then show the following theorem, which states that ensembles are closed under the mapping by a random variable.

**Theorem 42** (Closure property under the mapping by a random variable). Let \(\Omega\) and \(\Omega'\) be r.e. infinite sets, and let \(P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)\). Let \(X : \Omega \to \Omega'\) be a random variable on \(\Omega\). Suppose that \(X\) is a partial recursive function\(^5\). If \(\alpha\) is an ensemble for \(P\) then \(X(\alpha)\) is an ensemble for \(X(P)\).

**Proof.** We show the contraposition. Suppose that \(X(\alpha)\) is not Martin-Löf \((P)\)-random. Then there exists a Martin-Löf \((P)\)-test \(S \subset \mathbb{N}^+ \times (\Omega')^*\) such that
\[
X(\alpha) \in [S_n]^{-}\quad(35)
\]
for every \(n \in \mathbb{N}^+\). For each \(\sigma \in (\Omega')^*\), let \(f(\sigma)\) be the set of all \(\tau \in \Omega^*\) such that (i) \(|\tau| = |\sigma|\) and (ii) \(X(\tau(k)) = \sigma(k)\) for every \(k = 1, 2, \ldots, |\sigma|\). Then, since
\[
(X(P))(x) = \sum_{a \in X^{-1}(\{x\})} P(a)
\]
for every \(x \in \Omega'\), we have that
\[
\lambda_{X(P)}([\sigma]^{-}) = (X(P))(\sigma) = P(f(\sigma)) = \lambda_{P}([f(\sigma)]^{-})\quad(36)
\]
for each \(\sigma \in (\Omega')^*\). We then define \(T\) to be a subset of \(\mathbb{N}^+ \times \Omega^*\) such that \(T_n = \bigcup_{\sigma \in S_n} f(\sigma)\) for every \(n \in \mathbb{N}^+\). Since \(S_n\) is a prefix-free subset of \((\Omega')^*\) for every \(n \in \mathbb{N}^+\), we see that \(T_n\) is a prefix-free subset of \(\Omega^*\) for every \(n \in \mathbb{N}^+\). For each \(n \in \mathbb{N}^+\), we also see that
\[
\lambda_{P}([T_n]^{-}) \leq \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \lambda_{P}([f(\sigma)]^{-}) = \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \lambda_{X(P)}([\sigma]^{-}) = \lambda_{X(P)}([S_n]^{-}) < 2^{-n},
\]
where the first equality follows from \((36)\) and the second equality follows from the prefix-freeness of \(S_n\). Moreover, since \(X\) is a partial recursive function with \(\text{dom}X = \Omega\) and \(S\) is r.e., it follows that \(T\) is r.e. Thus, \(T\) is a Martin-Löf \(P\)-test.

On the other hand, note that, for every \(n \in \mathbb{N}^+\), if \(X(\alpha) \in [S_n]^{-}\) then \(\alpha \in [T_n]^{-}\). Thus, it follows from \((35)\) that \(\alpha \in [T_n]^{-}\) for every \(n \in \mathbb{N}^+\). Hence, \(\alpha\) is not Martin-Löf \(P\)-random. This completes the proof. \(\square\)

\(^5\)The domain of definition of \(X\) is precisely \(\Omega\) and not a proper subset of \(\Omega\).
We introduce the notion of the independence of ensembles as follows. Let \( \Omega_1, \ldots, \Omega_n \) be countable alphabets. For any \( \alpha_1 \in \Omega_1^\infty, \ldots, \alpha_n \in \Omega_n^\infty \), we use

\[
\alpha_1 \times \cdots \times \alpha_n
\]

to denote an infinite sequence \( \alpha \) over \( \Omega_1 \times \cdots \times \Omega_n \) such that \( \alpha(k) = (\alpha_1(k), \ldots, \alpha_n(k)) \) for every \( k \in \mathbb{N}^+ \). Thus, \( \alpha_1 \times \cdots \times \alpha_n \in (\Omega_1 \times \cdots \times \Omega_n)^\infty \) for every \( \alpha_1 \in \Omega_1^\infty, \ldots, \alpha_n \in \Omega_n^\infty \). For any \( \sigma_1 \in \Omega_1^\ast, \ldots, \sigma_n \in \Omega_n^\ast \) with \( |\sigma_1| = \cdots = |\sigma_n| \), we define \( \sigma_1 \times \cdots \times \sigma_n \) in a similar manner, where we define \( \lambda \times \lambda \) as \( \lambda \), in particular. Thus, \( \sigma_1 \times \cdots \times \sigma_n \in (\Omega_1 \times \cdots \times \Omega_n)^\ast \) for every \( \sigma_1 \in \Omega_1^\ast, \ldots, \sigma_n \in \Omega_n^\ast \) with \( |\sigma_1| = \cdots = |\sigma_n| \).

**Definition 43** (Independence of ensembles). Let \( \Omega_1, \ldots, \Omega_n \) be r.e. infinite sets, and let \( P_1 \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega_1), \ldots, P_n \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega_n) \). Let \( \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \) be ensembles for \( P_1, \ldots, P_n \), respectively. We say that \( \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \) are independent if \( \alpha_1 \times \cdots \times \alpha_n \) is an ensemble for \( P_1 \times \cdots \times P_n \).

In Definition 43 note that \( \Omega_1 \times \cdots \times \Omega_n \) is an r.e. infinite set, since each of \( \Omega_1, \ldots, \Omega_n \) is an r.e. infinite set. Thus, the notion of Martin-Löf \( P_1 \times \cdots \times P_n \)-randomness given by Definition 23 can be properly applied to the infinite sequence \( \alpha_1 \times \cdots \times \alpha_n \) over \( \Omega_1 \times \cdots \times \Omega_n \). Note that the notion of the independence of ensembles in our theory corresponds to the notion of independence of collectives in the theory of collectives by von Mises [30].

Theorem 45 below gives equivalent characterizations of the notion of the independence of random variables in terms of that of ensembles. To prove Theorem 45 we first show the following proposition.

**Proposition 44.** Let \( \Omega \) be a countable alphabet. Let \( \alpha \in \Omega^\infty \), and let \( X_1 : \Omega \to \Omega_1, \ldots, X_n : \Omega \to \Omega_n \) be random variables on \( \Omega \). Then \( (X_1 \times \cdots \times X_n)(\alpha) = X_1(\alpha) \times \cdots \times X_n(\alpha) \).

**Proof.** For each \( k \in \mathbb{N}^+ \), we see that

\[
((X_1 \times \cdots \times X_n)(\alpha))(k) = (X_1 \times \cdots \times X_n)(\alpha(k))
\]

\[
= (X_1(\alpha(k)), \ldots, X_n(\alpha(k)))
\]

\[
= ((X_1(\alpha))(k), \ldots, (X_n(\alpha))(k))
\]

\[
= (X_1(\alpha) \times \cdots \times X_n(\alpha))(k).
\]

This completes the proof. \( \square \)

**Theorem 45.** Let \( \Omega \) and \( \Omega_1, \ldots, \Omega_n \) be r.e. infinite sets, and let \( P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega) \). Let \( X_1 : \Omega \to \Omega_1, \ldots, X_n : \Omega \to \Omega_n \) be random variables on \( \Omega \). Suppose that all of \( X_1, \ldots, X_n \) are partial recursive functions. Then the following conditions are equivalent to one another.

(i) The random variables \( X_1, \ldots, X_n \) are independent on \( P \).

(ii) For every ensemble \( \alpha \) for \( P \), the ensembles \( X_1(\alpha), \ldots, X_n(\alpha) \) are independent.

(iii) There exists an ensemble \( \alpha \) for \( P \) such that the ensembles \( X_1(\alpha), \ldots, X_n(\alpha) \) are independent.

\footnote{The domain of definition of each \( X_i \) is precisely \( \Omega \) and not a proper subset of \( \Omega \).}
Proof. Assume that the condition (i) holds. Let \( \alpha \) be an arbitrary ensemble for the discrete probability space \( P \). First, for each \( i = 1, \ldots, n \), since \( X_i \) is a partial recursive function, it follows from Theorem \( \ref{thm:recursive-randomness} \) that \( X_i(\alpha) \) is Martin-L"of \( (X_i(P)) \)-random. On the other hand, since \( X_i \) is a partial recursive function for every \( i = 1, \ldots, n \), we see that \( X_1 \times \cdots \times X_n \) is a partial recursive function with \( \text{dom } f = \Omega \) and \( f(\text{dom } f) \subseteq \Omega_1 \times \cdots \times \Omega_n \). Note here that \( \Omega_1 \times \cdots \times \Omega_n \) is an r.e. infinite set. Thus, it follows from Theorem \( \ref{thm:recursive-randomness} \) that \( (X_1 \times \cdots \times X_n)(\alpha) \) is Martin-L"of \( (X_1 \times \cdots \times X_n)(P) \)-random. Therefore, by Proposition \( \ref{prop:projection-randomness} \) and Proposition \( \ref{prop:product-randomness} \) we see that \( X_1(\alpha) \times \cdots \times X_n(\alpha) \) is Martin-L"of \( X_1(P) \times \cdots \times X_n(P) \)-random. Thus, the ensembles \( X_1(\alpha), \ldots, X_n(\alpha) \) are independent. Hence, we have the implication (i) \( \Rightarrow \) (ii).

Since there exists an ensemble \( \alpha \) for the discrete probability space \( P \) by Theorem \( \ref{thm:finite-independent-ensemble} \), the implication (ii) \( \Rightarrow \) (iii) is obvious.

Finally, the implication (iii) \( \Rightarrow \) (i) is shown as follows. Assume that the condition (iii) holds. Then there exists an ensemble \( \alpha \) for \( P \) such that \( X_1(\alpha) \times \cdots \times X_n(\alpha) \) is Martin-L"of \( X_1(P) \times \cdots \times X_n(P) \)-random. It follows from Proposition \( \ref{prop:projection-randomness} \) that \( (X_1 \times \cdots \times X_n)(\alpha) \) is Martin-L"of \( X_1(P) \times \cdots \times X_n(P) \)-random. On the other hand, since \( X_i \) is a partial recursive function for every \( i = 1, \ldots, n \), it follows from Theorem \( \ref{thm:recursive-randomness} \) that \( (X_1 \times \cdots \times X_n)(\alpha) \) is Martin-L"of \( (X_1 \times \cdots \times X_n)(P) \)-random. Thus, using Corollary \( \ref{cor:product-independent} \) we have \( X_1(P) \times \cdots \times X_n(P) = (X_1 \times \cdots \times X_n)(P) \). Therefore, it follows from Proposition \( \ref{prop:projection-randomness} \) that the random variables \( X_1, \ldots, X_n \) are independent on \( P \). This completes the proof.

Next, we consider the operational characterizations of the notion of the independence of an arbitrary number of events, in terms of ensembles.

Let \( \Omega \) be an arbitrary countable alphabet, and let \( P \) be an arbitrary discrete probability space on \( \Omega \). Let \( A_1, \ldots, A_n \) be arbitrary events on the discrete probability space \( P \). We say that the events \( A_1, \ldots, A_n \) are independent on \( P \) if for every \( i_1, \ldots, i_k \) with \( 1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_k \leq n \) it holds that

\[
P(A_{i_1} \cap \cdots \cap A_{i_k}) = P(A_{i_1}) \cdots P(A_{i_k}).
\]

For any \( A \subseteq \Omega \), we use \( \chi_A \) to denote a function \( f : \Omega \to \{0, 1\} \) such that \( f(a) := 1 \) if \( a \in A \) and \( f(a) := 0 \) otherwise. Note that \( C_A (\alpha) = \chi_A (\alpha) \) for every \( A \subseteq \Omega \) and \( \alpha \in \Omega^\infty \). It is then easy to show the following proposition.

**Proposition 46.** Let \( \Omega \) be a countable alphabet, and let \( P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega) \). Let \( A_1, \ldots, A_n \subseteq \Omega \). Then the events \( A_1, \ldots, A_n \) are independent on \( P \) if and only if the random variables \( \chi_{A_1}, \ldots, \chi_{A_n} \) are independent on \( P \). \( \square \)

Using Proposition 46 Theorem 45 results in Theorem 47 below, which gives equivalent characterizations of the notion of the independence of an arbitrary number of events in terms of that of ensembles.

**Theorem 47.** Let \( \Omega \) be an r.e. infinite set, and let \( P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega) \). Let \( A_1, \ldots, A_n \) be recursive events on the discrete probability space \( P \). Then the following conditions are equivalent to one another:

(i) The events \( A_1, \ldots, A_n \) are independent on \( P \).

(ii) For every ensemble \( \alpha \) for \( P \), the ensembles \( C_{A_1}(\alpha), \ldots, C_{A_n}(\alpha) \) are independent.

(iii) There exists an ensemble \( \alpha \) for \( P \) such that the ensembles \( C_{A_1}(\alpha), \ldots, C_{A_n}(\alpha) \) are independent. \( \square \)
10 Further equivalence of the notions of independence on computable discrete probability spaces

In the preceding section we saw that the independence of an arbitrary number of events/random variables and that of ensembles are equivalent to each other on an arbitrary discrete probability space. In this section we show that these independence notions are further equivalent to the notion of the independence in the sense of van Lambalgen’s Theorem [27] in the case where the underlying discrete probability space is computable. Thus, the three independence notions are equivalent to one another in this case. To show the equivalence, we generalize van Lambalgen’s Theorem [27] over our framework first.

10.1 A generalization of van Lambalgen’s Theorem

To study a generalization of van Lambalgen’s Theorem, first we generalize the notion of Martin-Löf P-randomness over relativized computation and introduce the notion of Martin-Löf P-randomness relative to an oracle. The relativized computation is a generalization of normal computation. For each \( k = 1, \ldots, \ell \), let \( \beta_k \) be an arbitrary infinite sequence over an r.e. infinite set. In the relativized computation, a (deterministic) Turing machine is allowed to refer to \( \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \) as an oracle during the computation. Namely, in the relativized computation, a Turing machine can query \( (k, n) \in \{1, \ldots, \ell\} \times \mathbb{N}^+ \) at any time and then obtains the response \( \beta_k(n) \) during the computation. Such a Turing machine is called an oracle Turing machine. The relativized computation is more powerful than normal computation, in general.

Let \( \Omega \) be an r.e. infinite set, and let \( P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega) \). We define the notion of a Martin-Löf P-test relative to \( \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \) as a Martin-Löf P-test where the Turing machine computing the Martin-Löf P-test is an oracle Turing machine which can refer to any elements of each of the sequences \( \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \) during the computation. Based on this notion, we define the notion of Martin-Löf P-randomness relative to infinite sequences in the same manner as (ii) and (iii) of Definition 23. Formally, the notion of Martin-Löf P-randomness relative to infinite sequences is defined as follows.

**Definition 48** (Martin-Löf P-randomness relative to infinite sequences). Let \( \Omega \) be an r.e. infinite set, and let \( P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega) \). For each \( k = 1, \ldots, \ell \), let \( \beta_k \) be an infinite sequence over an r.e. infinite set. A subset \( C \) of \( \mathbb{N}^+ \times \Omega^* \) is called a Martin-Löf P-test relative to \( \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \) if the following holds.

(i) There exists an oracle Turing machine \( M \) such that

\[
C = \{ x \in \mathbb{N}^+ \times \Omega^* \mid M \text{ accepts } x \text{ relative to } \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \};
\]

(ii) For every \( n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \) it holds that \( C_n \) is a prefix-free subset of \( \Omega^* \) and \( \lambda_P([C_n]^\prec) < 2^{-n} \) where \( C_n := \{ \sigma \mid (n, \sigma) \in C \} \).

For any \( \alpha \in \Omega^\infty \), we say that \( \alpha \) is Martin-Löf P-random relative to \( \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \) if for every Martin-Löf P-test \( C \) relative to \( \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \) there exists \( n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \) such that \( \alpha \notin [C_n]^\prec \). \( \square \)

Just like in the definition of a Martin-Löf P-test given in Definition 48, we require in Definition 48 that the set \( C_n \) is prefix-free in the definition of a Martin-Löf P-test relative to \( \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \). However, as in the case of a Martin-Löf P-test, we can eliminate this requirement while keeping
the notion of Martin-Löf $P$-randomness relative to $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell$ the same. Namely, we can show the following theorem, corresponding to Theorem 24.

**Theorem 49.** Let $\Omega$ be an r.e. infinite set, and let $P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)$. For each $k = 1, \ldots, \ell$, let $\beta_k$ be an infinite sequence over an r.e. infinite set. Suppose that a subset $C$ of $\mathbb{N}^+ \times \Omega^*$ satisfies the following two conditions:

(i) There exists an oracle Turing machine $M$ such that

$$C = \{x \in \mathbb{N}^+ \times \Omega^* | M \text{ accepts } x \text{ relative to } \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell\};$$

(ii) For every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ it holds that $\lambda_P([C_n]^c) < 2^{-n}$ where $C_n := \{\sigma | (n, \sigma) \in C\}$.

Then there exists a Martin-Löf $P$-test $D$ relative to $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell$ such that $[C_n]^c \prec [D_n]^c$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. \qed

From Theorem 49 we have the following theorem, corresponding to Theorem 25.

**Theorem 50.** Let $\Omega$ be an r.e. infinite set, and let $P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)$. For each $k = 1, \ldots, \ell$, let $\beta_k$ be an infinite sequence over an r.e. infinite set. Let $\alpha \in \Omega^\infty$. Then the following conditions are equivalent to each other.

(i) The infinite sequence $\alpha$ is Martin-Löf $P$-random relative to $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell$.

(ii) For every subset $C$ of $\mathbb{N}^+ \times \Omega^*$, if

(a) there exists an oracle Turing machine $M$ such that

$$C = \{x \in \mathbb{N}^+ \times \Omega^* | M \text{ accepts } x \text{ relative to } \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell\},$$

(b) for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ it holds that $\lambda_P([C_n]^c) < 2^{-n},$

then there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ such that $\alpha \notin [C_n]^c$. \qed

The following holds, obviously.

**Proposition 51.** Let $\Omega$ be an r.e. infinite set, and let $P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)$. For each $k = 1, \ldots, \ell$, let $\beta_k$ be an infinite sequence over an r.e. infinite set. For every $\alpha \in \Omega^\infty$, if $\alpha$ is Martin-Löf $P$-random relative to $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell$ then $\alpha$ is Martin-Löf $P$-random.

The converse does not necessarily hold. In the case where $\alpha$ is Martin-Löf $P$-random, the converse means that the Martin-Löf $P$-randomness of $\alpha$ is independent of $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell$ in a certain sense.

We here recall van Lambalgen’s Theorem. Let $\beta$ be an infinite binary sequence. For any $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}^\infty$, we say that $\alpha$ is Martin-Löf random relative to $\beta$ if $\alpha$ is Martin-Löf $U$-random relative to $\beta$ where $U$ is a discrete probability space on $\mathbb{N}$ such that (i) $U(0) = U(1) = 1/2$ and (ii) $U(n) = 0$ for every $n \geq 2$. Based on this notion of Martin-Löf randomness relative to an infinite sequence, van Lambalgen’s Theorem is stated as follows.
Theorem 52 (van Lambalgen’s Theorem, van Lambalgen [27]). Let \( \alpha, \beta \in \{0, 1\}^\infty \), and let \( \alpha \oplus \beta \) denote the infinite binary sequence

\[
\alpha(1)\beta(1)\alpha(2)\beta(2)\alpha(3)\beta(3)\ldots.
\]

Then the following conditions are equivalent.

(i) \( \alpha \oplus \beta \) is Martin-Löf random.

(ii) \( \alpha \) is Martin-Löf random relative to \( \beta \) and \( \beta \) is Martin-Löf random.

We generalize van Lambalgen’s Theorem as follows.

Theorem 53 (Generalization of van Lambalgen’s Theorem I). Let \( \Omega_1 \) and \( \Omega_2 \) be r.e. infinite sets, and let \( P_1 \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega_1) \) and \( P_2 \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega_2) \). Let \( \alpha_1 \in \Omega_1^\infty \) and \( \alpha_2 \in \Omega_2^\infty \). For each \( k = 1, \ldots, \ell \), let \( \beta_k \) be an infinite sequence over an r.e. infinite set. Suppose that \( P_1 \) is computable. Then \( \alpha_1 \times \alpha_2 \) is Martin-Löf \( P_1 \times P_2 \)-random relative to \( \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \) if and only if \( \alpha_1 \) is Martin-Löf \( P_1 \)-random relative to \( \alpha_2, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \) and \( \alpha_2 \) is Martin-Löf \( P_2 \)-random relative to \( \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \).

The proof of Theorem 53 is obtained by generalizing and elaborating the proof of van Lambalgen’s Theorem given in Nies [16, Section 3.4]. The detail of the proof of Theorem 53 is given in the subsequent two subsections. Note that in Theorem 53 the computability of \( P_1 \) is assumed while that of \( P_2 \) is not required.

We have Theorem 54 below based on Theorem 53. Note that the computability of \( P_n \) is not required in Theorem 54.

Theorem 54 (Generalization of van Lambalgen’s Theorem II). Let \( n \geq 2 \). Let \( \Omega_1, \ldots, \Omega_n \) be r.e. infinite sets, and let \( P_1 \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega_1), \ldots, P_n \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega_n) \). Let \( \alpha_1 \in \Omega_1^\infty, \ldots, \alpha_n \in \Omega_n^\infty \). For each \( k = 1, \ldots, \ell \), let \( \beta_k \) be an infinite sequence over an r.e. infinite set. Suppose that \( P_1, \ldots, P_{n-1} \) are computable. Then \( \alpha_1 \times \cdots \times \alpha_n \) is Martin-Löf \( P_1 \times \cdots \times P_n \)-random relative to \( \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \) if and only if for every \( k = 1, \ldots, n \) it holds that \( \alpha_k \) is Martin-Löf \( P_k \)-random relative to \( \alpha_{k+1}, \ldots, \alpha_n, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \).

Proof. We show the result by induction on \( n \geq 2 \). In the case of \( n = 2 \), the result holds since it is precisely Theorem 53.

For an arbitrary \( m \geq 2 \), assume that the result holds for \( n = m \). Let \( \Omega_1, \ldots, \Omega_{m+1} \) be r.e. infinite sets, and let \( P_1 \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega_1), \ldots, P_{m+1} \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega_{m+1}) \). Let \( \alpha_1 \in \Omega_1^\infty, \ldots, \alpha_{m+1} \in \Omega_{m+1}^\infty \). For each \( k = 1, \ldots, \ell \), let \( \beta_k \) be an infinite sequence over an r.e. infinite set. Suppose that \( P_1, \ldots, P_m \) are computable. Then, by applying Theorem 53 with \( P_1 \times \cdots \times P_m \) as \( P_1 \), \( P_{m+1} \) as \( P_2 \), \( \alpha_1 \times \cdots \times \alpha_m \) as \( \alpha_1 \), and \( \alpha_{m+1} \) as \( \alpha_2 \) in Theorem 53, we have that \( (\alpha_1 \times \cdots \times \alpha_m) \times \alpha_{m+1} \) is Martin-Löf \( (P_1 \times \cdots \times P_m) \times P_{m+1} \)-random relative to \( \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \) if and only if \( \alpha_1 \times \cdots \times \alpha_m \) is Martin-Löf \( P_1 \times \cdots \times P_m \)-random relative to \( \alpha_{m+1}, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \) and \( \alpha_{m+1} \) is Martin-Löf \( P_{m+1} \)-random relative to \( \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \). Thus, by applying the result for \( n = m \) we have the result for \( n = m + 1 \). This completes the proof.

10.2 The proof of the “only if” part of Theorem 53

We prove the following theorem, from which the “only if” part of Theorem 53 follows.
Theorem 55. Let $\Omega_1$ and $\Omega_2$ be r.e. infinite sets, and let $P_1 \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega_1)$ and $P_2 \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega_2)$. Let $\alpha_1 \in \Omega_1^\infty$ and $\alpha_2 \in \Omega_2^\infty$. For each $k = 1, \ldots, \ell$, let $\beta_k$ be an infinite sequence over an r.e. infinite set. Suppose that $P_1$ is right-computable. If $\alpha_1 \times \alpha_2$ is Martin-Löf $P_1 \times P_2$-random relative to $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell$ then $\alpha_1$ is Martin-Löf $P_1$-random relative to $\alpha_2, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell$ and $\alpha_2$ is Martin-Löf $P_2$-random relative to $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell$.

In order to prove Theorem 55 we use the notion of universal Martin-Löf $P$-test relative to infinite sequences.

Definition 56 (Universal Martin-Löf $P$-test relative to infinite sequences). Let $\Omega$ be an r.e. infinite set, and let $P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)$. Let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}^+$, and let $\Theta_1, \ldots, \Theta_\ell$ be r.e. infinite sets. An oracle Turing machine $M$ is called a universal Martin-Löf $P$-test relative to $\ell$ infinite sequences over $\Theta_1, \ldots, \Theta_\ell$ if for every $\beta_1 \in \Theta_1^\infty, \ldots, \beta_\ell \in \Theta_\ell^\infty$ there exists $C$ such that

(i) $C = \{ x \in \mathbb{N}^+ \times \Omega^* \mid M \text{ accepts } x \text{ relative to } \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \}$,

(ii) for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ it holds that $C_n$ is a prefix-free subset of $\Omega^*$ and $\lambda_P ([C_n]^\prec) < 2^{-n}$ where

$$C_n := \{ \sigma \mid (n, \sigma) \in C \},$$

and

(iii) for every Martin-Löf $P$-test $\mathcal{D}$ relative to $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell$,

$$\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} [\mathcal{D}_n]^\prec \subset \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} [C_n]^\prec.$$

It is then easy to show the following theorem.

Theorem 57. Let $\Omega$ be an r.e. infinite set, and let $P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)$. Let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}^+$, and let $\Theta_1, \ldots, \Theta_\ell$ be r.e. infinite sets. Suppose that $P$ is right-computable. Then there exists a universal Martin-Löf $P$-test relative to $\ell$ infinite sequences over $\Theta_1, \ldots, \Theta_\ell$.

Then, using Theorems 57 we can prove Theorem 55 as follows.

Proof of Theorem 55. Let $\Omega_1$ and $\Omega_2$ be r.e. infinite sets, and let $P_1 \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega_1)$ and $P_2 \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega_2)$. Let $\alpha_1 \in \Omega_1^\infty$ and $\alpha_2 \in \Omega_2^\infty$. Let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}^+$, and let $\Theta_1, \ldots, \Theta_\ell$ be r.e. infinite sets. Let $\beta_1 \in \Theta_1^\infty, \ldots, \beta_\ell \in \Theta_\ell^\infty$.

First, we show that if $\alpha_1 \times \alpha_2$ is Martin-Löf $P_1 \times P_2$-random relative to $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell$ then $\alpha_2$ is Martin-Löf $P_2$-random relative to $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell$. Actually, we prove the contraposition. Thus, let us assume that $\alpha_2$ is not Martin-Löf $P_2$-random relative to $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell$. Then there exists a Martin-Löf $P_2$-test $\mathcal{S}$ relative to $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell$ such that

$$\alpha_2 \in [\mathcal{S}_n]^\prec$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. For each $\sigma_2 \in \Omega_2^*$, we use $F(\sigma_2)$ to denote the set

$$\{ \sigma_1 \times \sigma_2 \mid \sigma_1 \in \Omega_1^* \& |\sigma_1| = |\sigma_2| \}.$$

Then, since $P_2(\sigma_2) = \sum_{a_1 \in \Omega_1} (P_1 \times P_2)(a_1, a_2)$ for every $a_2 \in \Omega_2$, we have that

$$\lambda_{P_2} ([\sigma_2]^\prec) = P_2(\sigma_2) = (P_1 \times P_2)(F(\sigma_2)) = \lambda_{P_1 \times P_2} ([F(\sigma_2)]^\prec)$$

(38)
for each $\sigma_2 \in \Omega_2^*$. We then define $T$ to be a subset of $\mathbb{N}^* \times (\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2)^*$ such that $T_n = \bigcup_{\sigma_2 \in S_n} F(\sigma_2)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Since $S_n$ is a prefix-free subset of $\Omega_2^*$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, we see that $T_n$ is a prefix-free subset of $(\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2)^*$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, we also see that

$$
\lambda_{P_1 \times P_2} (|T_n|^{-}) \leq \sum_{\sigma_2 \in S_n} \lambda_{P_1 \times P_2} (|F(\sigma_2)|^{-}) = \sum_{\sigma_2 \in S_n} \lambda_{P_2} (|\sigma_2|^{-}) = \lambda_{P_2} (|S_n|^{-}) < 2^{-n},
$$

where the first equality follows from (38) and the second equality follows from the prefix-freeness of $S_n$. Moreover, since $S$ is r.e. relative to $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell$ and $\Omega_1$ is r.e., we see that $T$ is r.e. relative to $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell$. Thus, $T$ is a Martin-Löf $P_1 \times P_2$-test relative to $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell$. On the other hand, note that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, if $\alpha_2 \in [S_n]^\prec$ then $\alpha_1 \times \alpha_2 \in [T_n]^\prec$. Thus, it follows from (37) that $\alpha_1 \times \alpha_2 \in [T_n]^\prec$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Hence, $\alpha_1 \times \alpha_2$ is not Martin-Löf $P_1 \times P_2$-random relative to $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell$.

Next, we show that if $\alpha_1 \times \alpha_2$ is Martin-Löf $P_1 \times P_2$-random relative to $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell$ then $\alpha_1$ is Martin-Löf $P_1$-random relative to $\alpha_2, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell$. Since $P_1$ is right-computable, it follows from Theorem 57 that there exists a universal Martin-Löf $P_1$-test relative to $\ell + 1$ infinite sequences over $\Omega_2, \Theta_1, \ldots, \Theta_\ell$. Thus, there exists an oracle Turing machine $M$ such that for every $\gamma \in \Omega_2^\infty$ there exists $C$ such that

(i) $C = \{ x \in \mathbb{N}^+ \times \Omega_1^* \mid M$ accepts $x$ relative to $\gamma, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \}$,

(ii) for every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ it holds that $C_n$ is a prefix-free subset of $\Omega_1^*$ and $\lambda_{P_1} ([C_n]^\prec) < 2^{-n}$, and

(iii) for every Martin-Löf $P_1$-test $D$ relative to $\gamma, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell$,

$$
\bigcap_{n=1}^\infty [D_n]^\prec \subseteq \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty [C_n]^\prec.
$$

We choose any particular $a \in \Omega_2^*$. Then, for each $\sigma \in \Omega_2^*$, let $U^\sigma$ be the set of all $x \in \mathbb{N}^+ \times \Omega_1^*$ such that $M$ accepts $x$ relative to $\sigma a^{\infty}, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell$ with oracle access only to the prefix of $\sigma a^{\infty}$ of length $|\sigma|$ in the first infinite sequence. Here, $\sigma a^{\infty}$ denotes the infinite sequence over $\Omega_2$ which is the concatenation of the finite string $\sigma$ and the infinite sequence consisting only of $a$. It follows that

$$
\lambda_{P_1} ([U^\sigma_n]^\prec) < 2^{-n}
$$

for every $\sigma \in \Omega_2^*$ and every $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, where $U^\sigma_n := \{ \tau \mid (n, \tau) \in U^\sigma \}$. For each $k, n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, let

$$
G_n(k) = \{ u \times \sigma \mid u \in \Omega_1^k \& \sigma \in \Omega_2^k \& \text{Some prefix of } u \text{ is in } U^\sigma_n \}.
$$

Then, it is easy to see that $G_n(k)$ is r.e. relative to $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell$ uniformly in $n$ and $k$. Note that

$$
[G_n(k)]^\prec = \bigcup_{\sigma \in \Omega_2^k} \bigcup_{u \in S_n(k, \sigma)} [u \times \sigma]^\prec,
$$

for every $n, k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, where $S_n(k, \sigma) := \{ u \in \Omega_1^k \mid \text{Some prefix of } u \text{ is in } U^\sigma_n \}$. Therefore, for each
Let \( n, k \in \mathbb{N}^+ \), we see that

\[
\lambda_{P_1 \times P_2} \left( (G_n(k)^\prec) \right) = \sum_{\sigma \in \Omega^k_2} \sum_{u \in S_n(k, \sigma)} \lambda_{P_1 \times P_2} \left( (u \times \sigma)^\prec \right) = \sum_{\sigma \in \Omega^k_2} \lambda_{P_2} \left( (\sigma)^\prec \right) \sum_{u \in S_n(k, \sigma)} \lambda_{P_1} \left( (u)^\prec \right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{\sigma \in \Omega^k_2} \lambda_{P_2}(\sigma^\prec) \lambda_{P_1} \left( \left[ U_n^\sigma \cap \Omega_1^{\leq k} \right]^\prec \right) \leq \sum_{\sigma \in \Omega^k_2} \lambda_{P_2}(\sigma^\prec) \lambda_{P_2}(\sigma^\prec)
\]

\[
< \sum_{\sigma \in \Omega^k_2} 2^{-n} \lambda_{P_2}(\sigma^\prec) = 2^{-n},
\]

where the last inequality follows from (39) (and the fact that \( \lambda_{P_2}(\sigma^\prec) > 0 \) for some \( \sigma \in \Omega^k_2 \)). On the other hand, it follows that \( (G_n(k)^\prec) \subseteq (G_n(k+1)^\prec) \) for every \( n, k \in \mathbb{N}^+ \). For each \( n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \), let

\[
G_n = \bigcup_{k=1}^\infty G_n(k). \quad \text{Then} \quad G_n \text{ is r.e. relative to } \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \text{ uniformly in } n, \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_{P_1 \times P_2}(G_n^\prec) \leq 2^{-n}
\]

for every \( n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \). We define \( \mathcal{A} \) to be a subset of \( \mathbb{N}^+ \times (\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2)^* \) such that \( \mathcal{A}_n = G_{n+1} \) for every \( n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \). Then \( \mathcal{A} \) is r.e. relative to \( \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \) and

\[
\lambda_{P_1 \times P_2}(\mathcal{A}_n^\prec) < 2^{-n}
\]

for every \( n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \).

Now, assume that \( \alpha_1 \) is not Martin-Löf \( P_1 \)-random relative to \( \alpha_2, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \). Then there exists

\[ \mathcal{C} = \{ x \in \mathbb{N}^+ \times \Omega_1^\prec \mid \mathcal{M} \text{ accepts } x \text{ relative to } \alpha_2, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \}, \]

\[ \alpha_1 \in \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty [C_n]^\prec. \]

Let \( n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \). Then there exists \( m \in \mathbb{N}^+ \) such that \( \alpha_1 \mid_m \in C_{n+1} \). Then, there exists \( k \geq m \) such that \( \mathcal{M} \) accepts \( (n+1, \alpha_1 \mid_m) \) relative to \( \alpha_2, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \) with oracle access only to the prefix of \( \alpha_2 \) of length \( k \) in the first infinite sequence \( \alpha_2 \). It follows that \( \alpha_1 \mid_m \in U_{n+1}^{\alpha_2 \mid_k} \). Thus, \( \alpha_1 \mid_k \times \alpha_2 \mid_k \in G_{n+1}(k) \), and therefore \( \alpha_1 \times \alpha_2 \in [G_{n+1}(k)]^\prec \subseteq [G_{n+1}]^\prec = [\mathcal{A}_n]^\prec \). Hence, it follows from Theorem 50 that \( \alpha_1 \times \alpha_2 \) is not Martin-Löf \( P_1 \times P_2 \)-random relative to \( \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \). This completes the proof. \( \square \)

### 10.3 The proof of the “if” part of Theorem 53

Next, we prove the following theorem, from which the “if” part of Theorem 53 follows.

**Theorem 58.** Let \( \Omega_1 \) and \( \Omega_2 \) be r.e. infinite sets, and let \( P_1 \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega_1) \) and \( P_2 \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega_2) \). Let \( \alpha_1 \in \Omega_1^\infty \) and \( \alpha_2 \in \Omega_2^\infty \). For each \( k = 1, \ldots, \ell \), let \( \beta_\ell \) be an infinite sequence over an r.e. infinite set. Suppose that \( P_1 \) is left-computable. If \( \alpha_1 \) is Martin-Löf \( P_1 \)-random relative to \( \alpha_2, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \) and \( \alpha_2 \) is Martin-Löf \( P_2 \)-random relative to \( \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \), then \( \alpha_1 \times \alpha_2 \) is Martin-Löf \( P_1 \times P_2 \)-random relative to \( \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \).
Proof. Suppose that \( \alpha_1 \times \alpha_2 \) is not Martin-Löf \( P_1 \times P_2 \)-random relative to \( \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \). Then there exists a Martin-Löf \( P \)-test \( V \) relative to \( \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \) such that

1. \( V_d \) is prefix-free for every \( d \in \mathbb{N}^+ \),
2. \( \lambda_{P_1 \times P_2} ([V_d]^-) < 2^{-2d} \) for every \( d \in \mathbb{N}^+ \), and
3. \( \alpha_1 \times \alpha_2 \in [V_d]^- \) for every \( d \in \mathbb{N}^+ \).

On the one hand, for each \( x \in \Omega_2^* \), we use \([\emptyset \times x]\) to denote the set 
\[
\{ \gamma_1 \times \gamma_2 \mid \gamma_1 \in \Omega_1^\infty, \gamma_2 \in \Omega_2^\infty, \text{ and } x \text{ is a prefix of } \gamma_2 \}.
\]
On the other hand, for each \( x \in \Omega_2^* \) and \( W \subset (\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2)^* \), we use \( F(W, x) \) to denote the set of all \( \sigma_1 \in \Omega_1^* \) such that there exists \( \sigma_2 \in \Omega_2^* \) for which (i) \( |\sigma_1| = |\sigma_2| \), (ii) \( \sigma_1 \times \sigma_2 \in W \), and (iii) \( \sigma_2 \) is a prefix of \( x \). It is then easy to see that
\[
P_1(F(W, x))P_2(x) = \lambda_{P_1 \times P_2} ([W]^- \cap [\emptyset \times x])
\]
for every \( x \in \Omega_2^* \) and every prefix-free subset \( W \) of \( (\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2)^\leq|x| \). For each \( d \in \mathbb{N}^+ \), let
\[
S_d = \{ x \in \Omega_2^+ \mid 2^{-d} < P_1(F(V_d \cap (\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2)^\leq|x|), x) \}.
\]
Since \( P_1 \) is left-computable, \( S_d \) is r.e. relative to \( \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \) uniformly in \( d \).

Let \( d \in \mathbb{N}^+ \). Let \( \{x_i\} \) be a listing of the minimal strings in \( S_d \). It follows from \( (40) \) that
\[
2^{-d}\lambda_{P_2} ([x_i]|^-) = 2^{-d}P_2(x_i) \leq P_1(F(V_d \cap (\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2)^\leq|x_i|), x_i)P_2(x_i)
\]
\[
= \lambda_{P_1 \times P_2} ([V_d \cap (\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2)^\leq|x_i|]^- \cap [\emptyset \times x_i])
\]
\[
\leq \lambda_{P_1 \times P_2} ([V_d]^- \cap [\emptyset \times x_i]).
\]
Since the sets \([V_d]^- \cap [\emptyset \times x_i]\) are pairwise disjoint, we have
\[
\sum_i 2^{-d}\lambda_{P_2} ([x_i]|^-) \leq \sum_i \lambda_{P_1 \times P_2} ([V_d]^- \cap [\emptyset \times x_i]) \leq \lambda_{P_1 \times P_2} ([V_d]^-) < 2^{-2d}.
\]
Thus, since \( \lambda_{P_2} ([S_d]|^-) = \sum_i \lambda_{P_2} ([x_i]|^-) \) and \( d \) is an arbitrary positive integer, we have that
\[
\lambda_{P_2} ([S_d]|^-) < 2^{-d}
\]
for every \( d \in \mathbb{N}^+ \). For each \( d \in \mathbb{N}^+ \), let \( T_d = \bigcup_{c=d}^\infty S_{c+1} \). It follows that
\[
\lambda_{P_2} ([T_d]|^-) \leq \sum_{c=d}^\infty \lambda_{P_2} ([S_{c+1}]^-) < 2^{-d}
\]
for each \( d \in \mathbb{N}^+ \), and \( T_d \) is r.e. relative to \( \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \) uniformly in \( d \).

Now, let us assume that \( \alpha_2 \) is Martin-Löf \( P_2 \)-random relative to \( \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \). We will then show that \( \alpha_1 \) is not Martin-Löf \( P_1 \)-random relative to \( \alpha_2, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell \), in what follows. If \( \alpha_2 \in [S_d]|^- \) for infinitely many \( d \), then we have that \( \alpha_2 \in [T_d]|^- \) for every \( d \), and therefore using Theorem \( 50 \) we
have that $\alpha_2$ is not Martin-Löf $P_2$-random relative to $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell$. This contradicts the assumption. Thus, there must exists $d_0 \in \mathbb{N}^+$ such that $\alpha_2 \notin [S_d]^\prec$ for every $d > d_0$.

For each $d, n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, let

$$H_d(n) = \{ w \in \Omega^n_1 | [w \times \alpha_2|_n]^\prec \in [\mathcal{V}_d \cap (\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2)^{\leq n}]^\prec \}.$$  

Let $d, n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, and let $w_1, \ldots, w_m$ be a listing of all elements of $H_d(n)$. Since $[w_i \times \alpha_2|_n]^\prec \in [\mathcal{V}_d \cap (\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2)^{\leq n}]^\prec \cap [0 \times \alpha_2|_n]$ for every $i = 1, \ldots, m$, and the sets $\{[w_i \times \alpha_2|_n]^\prec\}_i$ are pairwise disjoint, we see that

$$\lambda_{P_1} ([H_d(n)]^\prec) \lambda_{P_2} ([\alpha_2|_n]^\prec) = \left( \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_{P_1} ([w_i]^\prec) \right) \lambda_{P_2} ([\alpha_2|_n]^\prec)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_{P_1} ([w_i]^\prec) \lambda_{P_2} ([\alpha_2|_n]^\prec)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_{P_1 \times P_2} ([w_i \times \alpha_2|_n]^\prec)$$

$$= \lambda_{P_1 \times P_2} \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^m [w_i \times \alpha_2|_n]^\prec \right)$$

$$\leq \lambda_{P_1 \times P_2} \left( [\mathcal{V}_d \cap (\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2)^{\leq n}]^\prec \cap [0 \times \alpha_2|_n] \right).$$

Assume that $d > d_0$. Then, since $\alpha_2 \notin [S_d]^\prec$, we have $\alpha_2|_n \notin S_d$. It follows from (40) that

$$\lambda_{P_1 \times P_2} \left( [\mathcal{V}_d \cap (\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2)^{\leq n}]^\prec \cap [0 \times \alpha_2|_n] \right) = P_1 (\mathcal{F} (\mathcal{V}_d \cap (\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2)^{\leq n}, \alpha_2|_n)) \leq 2^{-d} \lambda_{P_2} ([\alpha_2|_n]^\prec).$$

Therefore, using (41) we have

$$\lambda_{P_1} ([H_d(n)]^\prec) \lambda_{P_2} ([\alpha_2|_n]^\prec) \leq 2^{-d} \lambda_{P_2} ([\alpha_2|_n]^\prec).$$

Since $\alpha_2$ is Martin-Löf $P_2$-random relative to $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell$, we can show that $\lambda_{P_2} ([\alpha_2|_n]^\prec) > 0$, in a similar manner to the proof of Theorem 31. Hence, we see that

$$\lambda_{P_1} ([H_d(n)]^\prec) \leq 2^{-d}$$

for every $d > d_0$ and $n$.

On the other hand, we see that $[H_d(n)]^\prec \subset [H_d(n+1)]^\prec$ for every $d$ and $n$. For each $d \in \mathbb{N}^+$, let $H_d = \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty H_{d+d_0}(n)$. It follows from (42) that $\lambda_{P_1} ([H_d]^\prec) < 2^{-d}$ for every $d \in \mathbb{N}^+$. It is easy to see that

$$H_d(n) = \{ w \in \Omega^n_1 | \text{Some prefix of } w \times \alpha_2|_n \text{ is in } \mathcal{V}_d \}$$

for every $d, n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. It follows that $H_d$ is r.e. relative to $\alpha_2, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell$ uniformly in $d$.

Let $d \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Since $\alpha_1 \times \alpha_2 \in [\mathcal{V}_d + d_0]^\prec$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ such that $(\alpha_1 \times \alpha_2)|_n \in \mathcal{V}_{d+d_0}$. It follows that $\alpha_1|_n \times \alpha_2|_n \in \mathcal{V}_{d+d_0} \cap (\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2)^{\leq n}$, and therefore $\alpha_1|_n \in H_{d+d_0}(n)$. It follows that $\alpha_1 \in [H_{d+d_0}(n)]^\prec \subset [H_d]^\prec$. Therefore, $\alpha_1 \in [H_d]^\prec$ for every $d \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Hence, using Theorem 50 we have that $\alpha_1$ is not Martin-Löf $P_1$-random relative to $\alpha_2, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_\ell$, as desired. This completes the proof.  

\[ \square \]
10.4 Equivalence between the three independence notions on computable discrete probability spaces

Theorem 59 below gives an equivalent characterization of the notion of the independence of ensembles in terms of Martin-Löf $P$-randomness relative to an oracle.

**Theorem 59 (Generalization of van Lambalgen’s Theorem III).** Let $n \geq 2$. Let $\Omega_1, \ldots, \Omega_n$ be r.e. infinite sets, and let $P_1 \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega_1), \ldots, P_n \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega_n)$. Let $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ be ensembles for $P_1, \ldots, P_n$, respectively. Suppose that $P_1, \ldots, P_{n-1}$ are computable. Then the ensembles $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ are independent if and only if for every $k = 1, \ldots, n-1$ it holds that $\alpha_k$ is Martin-Löf $P_k$-random relative to $\alpha_{k+1}, \ldots, \alpha_n$.

**Proof.** Theorem 59 follows immediately from Theorem 54.

Combining Theorem 45 with Theorem 59, we obtain the following theorem.

**Theorem 60.** Let $\Omega$ and $\Omega_1, \ldots, \Omega_n$ be r.e. infinite sets, and let $P \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$. Let $X_1: \Omega \to \Omega_1, \ldots, X_n: \Omega \to \Omega_n$ be random variables on $\Omega$. Suppose that (i) all of $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ are partial recursive functions and (ii) $X_1(P), \ldots, X_{n-1}(P)$ are computable. Then the following conditions are equivalent to one another.

(i) The random variables $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ are independent on $P$.

(ii) For every ensemble $\alpha$ for $P$ and every $k = 1, \ldots, n-1$ it holds that $X_k(\alpha)$ is Martin-Löf $X_k(P)$-random relative to $X_{k+1}(\alpha), \ldots, X_n(\alpha)$.

(iii) There exists an ensemble $\alpha$ for $P$ such that for every $k = 1, \ldots, n-1$ it holds that $X_k(\alpha)$ is Martin-Löf $X_k(P)$-random relative to $X_{k+1}(\alpha), \ldots, X_n(\alpha)$

**Proof.** Let $\alpha$ be an arbitrary ensemble for $P$. Then it follows from Theorem 42 that $X_1(\alpha), \ldots, X_n(\alpha)$ are ensembles for $X_1(P), \ldots, X_n(P)$, respectively. Therefore, in the case where $X_1(P), \ldots, X_{n-1}(P)$ are computable, using Theorem 59 we have that the ensembles $X_1(\alpha), \ldots, X_n(\alpha)$ are independent if and only if for every $k = 1, \ldots, n-1$ it holds that $X_k(\alpha)$ is Martin-Löf $X_k(P)$-random relative to $X_{k+1}(\alpha), \ldots, X_n(\alpha)$. Thus, Theorem 60 follows from Theorem 45.

In Theorem 60 the computability of $X_1(P), \ldots, X_{n-1}(P)$ is required. The computability of $X_1(P), \ldots, X_{n-1}(P)$ follows from the computability of $P$ together with the partial recursiveness of $X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}$, as the following theorem states.

**Theorem 61.** Let $\Omega$ and $\Omega'$ be r.e. infinite sets, and let $X: \Omega \to \Omega'$ be random variables on $\Omega$. Suppose that $X$ is a partial recursive function. For every $P \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$, if $P$ is computable then $X(P)$ is computable.

**Proof.** Since $X$ is a partial recursive function and $\Omega'$ is r.e., it is easy to see that $X(P)$ is left-computable for every computable $P \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$. Thus, the result follows from Proposition 22.

Note that the converse of Theorem 61 does not holds. Namely, even under the partial recursiveness of $X$, the computability of $X(P)$ does not necessarily imply the computability of $P$.

Theorem 60 results in the following theorem, using Theorem 61.

---

The computability of $P_n$ is not required in the theorem.
**Theorem 62.** Let $\Omega$ and $\Omega_1, \ldots, \Omega_n$ be r.e. infinite sets, and let $P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)$. Let $X_1: \Omega \to \Omega_1, \ldots, X_n: \Omega \to \Omega_n$ be random variables on $\Omega$. Suppose that (i) all of $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ are partial recursive functions and (ii) $P$ is computable. Then the following conditions are equivalent to one another.

(i) The random variables $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ are independent on $P$.

(ii) For every ensemble $\alpha$ for $P$ and every $k = 1, \ldots, n - 1$ it holds that $X_k(\alpha)$ is Martin-Löf $X_k(P)$-random relative to $X_{k+1}(\alpha), \ldots, X_n(\alpha)$.

(iii) There exists an ensemble $\alpha$ for $P$ such that for every $k = 1, \ldots, n - 1$ it holds that $X_k(\alpha)$ is Martin-Löf $X_k(P)$-random relative to $X_{k+1}(\alpha), \ldots, X_n(\alpha)$.

Theorem 45 and Theorem 62 together show that the three independence notions we have considered so far: the independence of random variables, the independence of ensembles, and the independence in the sense of van Lambalgen’s Theorem, are equivalent to one another on an arbitrary computable discrete probability space.

Now, Theorem 63 below follows from Theorem 60.

**Theorem 63.** Let $\Omega$ be an r.e. infinite set, and let $P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)$. Let $A_1, \ldots, A_n$ be recursive events on the discrete probability space $P$. Suppose that the finite probability space $C(P, A_k)$ is computable for every $k = 1, \ldots, n - 1$. Then the following conditions are equivalent to one another.

(i) The events $A_1, \ldots, A_n$ are independent on $P$.

(ii) For every ensemble $\alpha$ for $P$ and every $k = 1, \ldots, n - 1$ it holds that $C_{A_k}(\alpha)$ is Martin-Löf $C(P, A_k)$-random relative to $C_{A_{k+1}}(\alpha), \ldots, C_{A_n}(\alpha)$.

(iii) There exists an ensemble $\alpha$ for $P$ such that for every $k = 1, \ldots, n - 1$ it holds that $C_{A_k}(\alpha)$ is Martin-Löf $C(P, A_k)$-random relative to $C_{A_{k+1}}(\alpha), \ldots, C_{A_n}(\alpha)$.

**Proof.** The result is obtained by applying Theorem 60 to the random variables $\chi_{A_1}, \ldots, \chi_{A_n}$ as $X_1, \ldots, X_n$, respectively, and then using Proposition 46.

Theorem 63 results in the following theorem, using Theorem 61.

**Theorem 64.** Let $\Omega$ be an r.e. infinite set, and let $P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega)$. Let $A_1, \ldots, A_n$ be recursive events on the discrete probability space $P$. Suppose that $P$ is computable. Then the following conditions are equivalent to one another.

(i) The events $A_1, \ldots, A_n$ are independent on $P$.

(ii) For every ensemble $\alpha$ for $P$ and every $k = 1, \ldots, n - 1$ it holds that $C_{A_k}(\alpha)$ is Martin-Löf $C(P, A_k)$-random relative to $C_{A_{k+1}}(\alpha), \ldots, C_{A_n}(\alpha)$.

(iii) There exists an ensemble $\alpha$ for $P$ such that for every $k = 1, \ldots, n - 1$ it holds that $C_{A_k}(\alpha)$ is Martin-Löf $C(P, A_k)$-random relative to $C_{A_{k+1}}(\alpha), \ldots, C_{A_n}(\alpha)$.

Theorem 47 and Theorem 61 together show that the three independence notions are equivalent to one another for recursive events on an arbitrary computable discrete probability space.
11 Concluding remarks

In this paper we have developed an operational characterization of the notion of probability for a discrete probability space.

In our former work [19, 20, 23], as the first step for developing a framework for an operational characterization of the notion of probability, we considered the case of a finite probability space, where the sample space is finite. In this paper, as the next step of the research of this line, we have considered the case of discrete probability space, where the sample space is countably infinite. Actually, in this case we have been able to develop a framework for an operational characterization of the notion of probability, in the same manner as the case of a finite probability space.

The major application of our framework is to quantum mechanics. The notion of probability plays a crucial role in quantum mechanics. It appears in quantum mechanics as the so-called Born rule, i.e., the probability interpretation of the wave function. In modern mathematics which describes quantum mechanics, however, probability theory means nothing other than measure theory, and therefore any operational characterization of the notion of probability is still missing in quantum mechanics. In this sense, the current form of quantum mechanics is considered to be imperfect as a physical theory which must stand on operational means.

In a series of works [21, 22, 24, 25], as a major application of the framework introduced and developed by our former work [19, 20, 23], we presented a refinement of the Born rule, based on the notion of ensemble for a finite probability space, for the purpose of making quantum mechanics perfect, in the case where the number of possible measurement outcomes is finite. Specifically, we used the notion of ensemble for a finite probability space, in order to state the refined rule of the Born rule, for specifying the property of the results of quantum measurements in an operational way. We then presented a refinement of the Born rule for mixed states, based on the notion of ensemble for a finite probability space. In particular, we gave a precise definition for the notion of mixed state. Finally, we showed that all of the refined rules of the Born rule for both pure states and mixed states can be derived from a single postulate, called the principle of typicality, in a unified manner. We did this from the point of view of the many-worlds interpretation of quantum mechanics [10].

In the works [21, 22, 24, 25] above, for simplicity, we considered only the case of finite-dimensional quantum systems and measurements over them. As the next step of the research, it is natural to consider the case of infinite-dimensional quantum systems, and measurements over them where the set of possible measurement outcomes is countably infinite. Actually, in this case, based on the framework developed by this paper we can certainly develop a framework for an operational refinement of the Born rule and the principle of typicality, using the notion of ensemble for a discrete probability space. We can do this in almost the same manner as the finite case developed through the works [21, 22, 24, 25]. A full paper which describes the detail of the application of our framework to infinite-dimensional quantum systems is in preparation.
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