

Re: More of an Algorithms question

>>> with 3 bits, no?

>>

>>Are there any other files with fewer than 4 bits that you have overlooked in

>>your count?

>

>Ok, I see my confusion.

>

>I failed to take into account files with less than $(n-1)$ bits.

>

>I get it now -- thanks.

>

>quasi

Ok, but then along the lines of what I was thinking, the following claim is valid:

In any lossless compression scheme, less than half of the files with n or fewer bits can be compressed.

quasi

.

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ [**Re: More of an Algorithms question**](#)

◇ *From:* LC Killingbeck

• *References:*

- ◆ [**More of an Algorithms question**](#)

◇ *From:* Filter

- ◆ [**Re: More of an Algorithms question**](#)

◇ *From:* Richard Harter

- ◆ [**Re: More of an Algorithms question**](#)

◇ *From:* quasi

- ◆ [**Re: More of an Algorithms question**](#)

◇ *From:* Dave Seaman

- ◆ [**Re: More of an Algorithms question**](#)

◇ *From:* quasi

- ◆ [**Re: More of an Algorithms question**](#)

◇ *From:* Dave Seaman

- ◆ [**Re: More of an Algorithms question**](#)

◇ *From:* quasi

- Prev by Date: [**Re: More of an Algorithms question**](#)

- Next by Date: [**Re: Well Ordering the Reals**](#)

- Previous by thread: [**Re: More of an Algorithms question**](#)

- Next by thread: [**Re: More of an Algorithms question**](#)

- Index(es):

- ◆ [**Date**](#)

- ◆ [**Thread**](#)