

Efficient algorithms for highly compressed data: The Word Problem in Generalized Higman Groups is in P

Jörn Laun

Institut für Formale Methoden der Informatik
Universität Stuttgart, Universitätsstraße 38
70199 Stuttgart, Germany
`laun@fmi.uni-stuttgart.de`

August 17, 2018

Abstract

This paper continues the 2012 STACS contribution by Diekert, Ushakov, and the author. We extend the results published in the proceedings in two ways.

First, we show that the data structure of power circuits can be generalized to work with arbitrary bases $q \geq 2$. This results in a data structure that can hold huge integers, arising by iteratively forming powers of q . We show that the properties of power circuits known for $q = 2$ translate to the general case. This generalization is non-trivial and additional techniques are required to preserve the time bounds of arithmetic operations that were shown for the case $q = 2$.

The extended power circuit model permits us to conduct operations in the Baumslag-Solitar group $BS(1, q)$ as efficiently as in $BS(1, 2)$. This allows us to solve the word problem in the generalization $H_4(1, q)$ of Higman's group, which is an amalgamated product of four copies of the Baumslag-Solitar group $BS(1, q)$ rather than $BS(1, 2)$ in the original form.

As a second result, we allow arbitrary numbers $f \geq 4$ of copies of $BS(1, q)$, leading to an even more generalized notion of Higman groups $H_f(1, q)$. We prove that the word problem of the latter can still be solved within the $\mathcal{O}(n^6)$ time bound that was shown for $H_4(1, 2)$.

Keywords: Data structures; Compression; Algorithmic group theory; Word Problem.

1 Introduction

This work is a sequel to the STACS paper [4] and its journal version [5]. However, we try to keep it self-contained by reiterating everything of importance from the two preceding papers. We extend their results to a more general version of power circuits. As a consequence, we can apply them to larger classes of groups.

The group H_4 was introduced by Higman in 1951 and served to provide the first known example of a finitely generated infinite simple group [6]. It belongs to a family H_f ($f \geq 1$) of groups with f generators and f relators:

$$H_f = \langle a_1, \dots, a_f \mid a_{i+1}a_i a_{i+1}^{-1} = a_i^2 \ (i \in \mathbb{Z}/f\mathbb{Z}) \rangle$$

For $f < 4$ these groups are trivial, which is easy to see for $f \in \{1, 2\}$, but surprisingly hard for $f = 3$. The latter case was proven by Hirsch [6], see also §23 in [12] and [1]. If $f \geq 4$, then H_f is infinite, see [7], Section 1.4. Since H_f has no non-trivial normal subgroups of finite index, taking a minimal non-trivial quotient results in a finitely generated infinite simple group.

Until recently, Higman’s Group H_4 was a candidate for a “natural” group with non-elementary word problem. This was suggested by the huge compression that this group allows. In fact, there are words of length n over the generators a_i and their inverses, which in the group are equal to $a_1^{\text{tow}_2(n)}$, where $\text{tow}_2(n)$ is the tower function (also called “tetration”) defined by $\text{tow}_q(0) = 1$ and $\text{tow}_q(n+1) = q^{\text{tow}_q(n)}$. However, in [4] it was shown that the word problem of H_4 is decidable in $\mathcal{O}(n^6 \cdot \log n)$ time and [5] improved this bound to $\mathcal{O}(n^6)$. Both results rely on a data structure called “power circuit” which was introduced by Miasnikov, Ushakov, and Won in [9]. Power circuits had already proven useful in algorithmic group theory. In fact, their invention was entailed by the wish to efficiently solve the word problem in the Baumslag-Gersten group $G_{(1,2)}$ (see [10] and Section 3) which shares with H_4 the property of huge compression. (In [10] the group $G_{(1,2)}$ is called “Baumslag group”. We use the equally common name “Baumslag-Gersten group” to avoid confusion with the Baumslag-Solitar group.) For $q = 2$, power circuits have been implemented [11] and there is a computer program solving the word problem in $G_{(1,2)}$.

This paper builds on the work of Diekert, Ushakov, and the author conducted in [4] and [5]. Its contributions are twofold: In Section 2, we extend power circuits to allow arbitrary bases $q \geq 2$. This necessitates changes in the reduction procedure, the core component of power circuits. In Section 4, we generalize Higman’s group H_4 by replacing the underlying group $\text{BS}(1, 2)$ by $\text{BS}(1, q) = \langle a, t \mid tat^{-1} = a^q \rangle$. Power circuits with base q are naturally suited for computations in this group.

Furthermore, with the help of rewriting systems, we give a constructive method of treating any group H_f ($f \geq 4$) rather than just H_4 . Combining this with base q power circuits leads to an algorithm for the word problem in generalized Higman groups $H_f(1, q)$ which retains the $\mathcal{O}(n^6)$ time bound proved in [5] for $q = 2$ and $f = 4$.

Notation and preliminaries Algorithms and decision problems are classified by their time complexity on a random-access machine (RAM). We use the notion of amortized analysis with respect to a potential function, see Section 17.3 in [3].

With regard to group theory, we use standard notation and facts that can be found in any textbook on the subject, e.g. [8]. In particular, we apply the technique of Britton reductions for solving the word problem in HNN extensions and amalgamated products.

Rewriting systems are of particular importance for this work. We assume that the reader is familiar with the basic notions of (local) confluence and termination. See for example the textbook [2] for a quick introduction.

2 Power circuits

Power circuits were introduced by Miasnikov, Ushakov, and Won in [9]. While the underlying ideas presented in this chapter originate from their work, there are some important differences. First, we use a different (and hopefully more accessible) notation, following [4] and [5]. We also allow multiple markings in one circuit. The most important modification, which also distinguishes this paper from [4] and [5], is the generalization from base 2 to arbitrary bases $q \geq 2$.

2.1 Power Circuit and Evaluation

For the rest of this paper, we fix an integer $q \geq 2$ for the base and the interval $D = \{-q+1, \dots, q-1\}$ (the set of digits). We start with a directed acyclic edge-labelled graph without multi-edges, given by $\Pi = (\Gamma, \delta)$. Here, Γ is a finite set which will act as the set of nodes (or vertices). The labelled edges (or arcs) are given by the map $\delta : \Gamma \times \Gamma \rightarrow D$ where $\delta(u, v) = 0$ means that there is no edge from u to v and $\delta(u, v) = e \neq 0$ implies an edge from u to v labelled with the number e . In other words, the edge set is $\text{supp } \delta$, the support of the map δ . In addition, we require that the directed graph $(\Gamma, \text{supp } \delta)$ is acyclic. We shall make this assumption throughout this paper without mentioning it again. For any operation on graphs introduced in this chapter, it will be obvious that acyclicity is preserved.

A marking of $\Pi = (\Gamma, \delta)$ is a mapping $M : \Gamma \rightarrow D$. Often we regard M as a labelled subset of the nodes of Π , where the subset is $\text{supp } M$ and the labels are given by $M|_{\text{supp } M} : \text{supp } M \rightarrow D$. In this sense, $M = 0$ (the constant zero marking) and $M = \emptyset$ (the empty marking) are the same.

Each node $u \in \Gamma$ induces in a natural way its successor marking Λ_u defined by

$$\Lambda_u : \Gamma \rightarrow D; v \mapsto M(u, v).$$

Intuitively, the successor marking of a node u consists of the target nodes of edges starting at u and their labels are given by those of the edges.

The evaluation function ε assigns a real number to each node and each marking of a graph Π . As Π is acyclic we can give an inductive definition of ε :

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon(\emptyset) &= 0 && \text{where } \emptyset \text{ is the empty marking,} \\ \varepsilon(M) &= \sum_{u \in \text{supp } M} M(u) \cdot \varepsilon(u) && \text{for all other markings } M, \\ \varepsilon(u) &= q^{\varepsilon(\Lambda_u)} && \text{for each node } u \in \Gamma \end{aligned}$$

Note that this implies $\varepsilon(u) = 1$ for all leaves u (nodes without outgoing edges). For every node $u \in \Gamma$ we have

$$\varepsilon(\Lambda_u) = \log_q \varepsilon(u).$$

Example 2.1. Figure 1 shows an example of such a graph for $q = 3$. The set of nodes is $\Gamma = \{u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4, u_5\}$ and δ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(u_2, u_1) &= +1, & \delta(u_3, u_1) &= +2, & \delta(u_4, u_1) &= -1, & \delta(u_4, u_2) &= -2, \\ \delta(u_4, u_3) &= +1, & \delta(u_5, u_2) &= +2, & \delta(u_5, u_3) &= +1, & \delta(u_5, u_4) &= -2. \end{aligned}$$

The nodes evaluate to

$$\varepsilon(u_1) = 1, \quad \varepsilon(u_2) = 3, \quad \varepsilon(u_3) = 9, \quad \varepsilon(u_4) = 9, \quad \text{and } \varepsilon(u_5) = \frac{1}{27}.$$




Figure 1: Example of an edge-labelled graph ($q = 3$)

Lemma 2.2. Let $\Pi = (\Gamma, \delta)$ be as described above. The following statements are equivalent:

- (i) $\varepsilon(u) \in q^{\mathbb{N}_0} = \{q^n : n \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ for every node $u \in \Gamma$
- (ii) $\varepsilon(\Lambda_u) \geq 0$ for every node $u \in \Gamma$
- (iii) $\varepsilon(M) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for every marking possible marking M in Π

Proof. This is easily seen by noetherian induction with respect to a topological order of Γ (i.e., an order compatible with the edges). \square

Definition 2.3. A power circuit is a finite acyclic edge-labelled graph $\Pi = (\Gamma, \delta)$ without multiple edges that meets the equivalent conditions of Lemma 2.2.

Example 2.4. The graph in Figure 1 is not a power circuit due to $\varepsilon(u_5) \notin \mathbb{Z}$. In contrast, Figure 2 depicts a power circuit for $q = 2$. The values of the nodes are given for illustrative purposes only. In general, these numbers become too large to be computed. The marking M evaluates to $\varepsilon(M) = 29$.




Figure 2: Example of a power circuit ($q = 2$)

In Corollary 2.15 we will show that it can be efficiently tested whether a given graph is a power circuit. In [9], a power circuit does not have to satisfy the criteria of Lemma 2.2, but if it does, it is called proper. In this sense, we only deal with proper power circuits.

Figure 3 shows that a power circuit of linear size can contain markings with values the magnitude of the tower function.




Figure 3: Marking with value $\varepsilon(M) = \text{tow}_q(n)$

2.2 Arithmetic Operations

Let $\Pi = (\Gamma, \delta)$ be a power circuit and $u \in \Gamma$ a node. The operation `CLONE` with result $v = \text{CLONE}(u)$ creates a new node v with the same successor marking as u , but no incoming arcs. We extend this operation to markings M , by cloning

every single node in $\text{supp } M$. The resulting marking $\text{CLONE}(M)$ is defined as the marking consisting of all these clones, and the signs are copied from M :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CLONE}(M) : \Gamma \cup \{\text{CLONE}(u) : u \in \text{supp } M\} &\rightarrow D; \text{CLONE}(u) \mapsto M(u), \\ \Gamma \ni u &\mapsto 0. \end{aligned}$$

Example 2.5. *In Figure 4, the marking M consisting of two nodes is cloned.*




Figure 4: Cloning a marking ($q = 3$)

Now we can define arithmetic operations. Let $\Pi = (\Gamma, \delta)$ be a power circuit and let K and M be markings in Π . If the supports of K and M are disjoint, the mapping $K + M$ defined by $(K + M)(u) = K(u) + M(u)$ is a marking with $\varepsilon(K + M) = \varepsilon(K) + \varepsilon(M)$. In general, however, the operands K and M will not be disjoint. In this case we have nodes $u \in \text{supp } K \cap \text{supp } M$ with $K(u) + M(u) \notin D$, hence $K + M$ is not a valid marking. We solve this problem by cloning: for every node u with $K(u) + M(u) \notin D$, we create a clone $u' = \text{CLONE}(u)$ and modify $K + M$ by putting $(K + M)(u) := K(u)$ and $(K + M)(u') := M(u)$. We obtain a valid marking in the (now enlarged) circuit with value $\varepsilon(K) + \varepsilon(M)$.

Example 2.6. *In Figure 5, $\varepsilon(K) = 7$ and $\varepsilon(M) = 35$ are added. In the resulting marking, the node with value 1 cancels out, whereas both the original node with value 4 and its newly created clone are included.*

The second operation that we need is multiplication by a power of q . We observe that

$$\varepsilon(K) \cdot q^{\varepsilon(M)} = \sum_{u \in \text{supp } K} q^{\varepsilon(\Lambda_u)} \cdot q^{\varepsilon(M)} = \sum_{u \in \text{supp } K} q^{\varepsilon(\Lambda_u) + \varepsilon(M)},$$

so in principle we would just have to introduce new edges from each node in $\text{supp } K$ to each node in $\text{supp } M$. The label of such an edge would be the value that M assigns to the respective target node. This operation works as long as




Figure 5: Addition of markings ($q = 2$)

1. no cycles are introduced into the circuit,
2. no multi-edges between two nodes are introduced,
3. there are no edges between nodes in $\text{supp } K$, and
4. no other marking in the circuit is affected. (Note here, that the original value of K is lost in any case.)

Again, the solution is cloning. Create clones $K' := \text{CLONE}(K)$ and $M' := \text{CLONE}(M)$ and introduce new edges by putting $\delta(u, v) := M(v)$ for all $u \in \text{supp } K'$, $v \in \text{supp } M'$. Being clones, nodes in $\text{supp } K'$ and $\text{supp } M'$ have no incoming edges, which prevents cycles and multi-edges. Also, no other marking in the circuit depends on K' or M' directly (by containing these nodes) or indirectly (by containing nodes that are topologically above any node in K' or M'). An example (in which no further cloning is necessary) is shown in Figure 6.

Finally, note that the operation $M \mapsto -M$ which negates the value of M is easy to conduct without any complications or the need for cloning.




Figure 6: Multiplication of $\varepsilon(K)$ by $q^{\varepsilon(M)}$ ($q = 2$)

2.3 Reduction

The operations $K + M$ and $K \cdot q^M$ introduced in the previous section are quite efficient. Assuming that the graph is stored using adjacency lists, the time they take depends only on the size of the markings M and K , not on the size of the circuit. The price for this efficiency is that the structure of a power circuit can quickly become rather intransparent. In particular, it is unclear how (in)equality of the values of two markings can be determined in an arbitrary circuit. Again, note that evaluating the nodes or markings is not an option, due to the vast growth permitted by power circuits. For this reason, we restrict ourselves to a subclass of circuits and augment them with some additional data:

Definition 2.7. A reduced power circuit is a power circuit $\Pi = (\Gamma, \delta)$ together with a list (u_1, \dots, u_n) of its nodes and a bit vector $(b_1, \dots, b_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{B}^{n-1}$ such that

- (i) different nodes evaluate to different numbers, i.e., for all $u, v \in \Gamma$ with $u \neq v$, $\varepsilon(u) \neq \varepsilon(v)$,
- (ii) the list of nodes is sorted by value, i.e., $\varepsilon(u_1) < \varepsilon(u_2) < \dots < \varepsilon(u_n)$,
- (iii) $b_i = 1$ if and only if $q \cdot \varepsilon(u_i) = \varepsilon(u_{i+1})$.

Proposition 2.8. (cf. Prop. 5 in [4] and Section 2.1 in [9]) Given a reduced circuit and two markings K and M , the values $\varepsilon(K)$ and $\varepsilon(M)$ can be compared (yielding $<$, $=$, or $>$ as the result) in $\mathcal{O}(|\Gamma|)$ time. The algorithm can also determine whether $|\varepsilon(K) - \varepsilon(M)| = 1$.

Proof. Assume that we want to determine whether for a sum $\varepsilon = \sum_{i=0}^n \delta_i \cdot q^i$ with $|\delta_i| \leq 2q - 2$ we have $\varepsilon \leq -2$, $\varepsilon = -1$, $\varepsilon = 0$, $\varepsilon = +1$ or $\varepsilon \geq +2$. We can do this inductively using the following procedure:

- 1.) If $\delta_n = 0$, use induction on $\varepsilon = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \delta_i \cdot q^i$.
- 2.) If $|\delta_n| \geq 2$, then $|\varepsilon| \geq 2 \cdot q^n - \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (2q-2) \cdot q^i \geq 2$ and the sign of ε is the same as the sign of δ_n .
- 3.) If $|\delta_n| = 1$, look at δ_{n-1} . If $\delta_{n-1} = 0$ or if it has the same sign as δ_n , then $|\varepsilon| \geq q^n - \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} (2q-2) \cdot q^i = q^{n-1}(q-2) + 2 \geq 2$ since $q \geq 2$. Again, ε has the same sign as δ_n . If δ_{n-1} has the opposite sign of δ_n , use induction on $\varepsilon = \hat{\delta}_{n-1} \cdot q^{n-1} + \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} \delta_i \cdot q^i$, where $\hat{\delta}_{n-1} = \delta_n \cdot q + \delta_{n-1} \in \{-2q+2, \dots, 2q-2\}$.

The answer to the original question can be found by applying this algorithm to the mapping $M - K : \Gamma \rightarrow \{-2q+2, \dots, 2q-2\}$ given by $(M - K)(u) = M(u) - K(u)$. Note, that the absolute indices i of the δ_i are not actually needed. Instead one can use the information provided by the reduced circuit. \square

Corollary 2.9. *For two markings K and M in a reduced circuit, it can be tested in $\mathcal{O}(|\Gamma|)$ time whether $q^{\varepsilon(K)}$ divides $\varepsilon(M)$.*

Proof. Let u be the node of minimal value in $\text{supp } M$. Then $q^{\varepsilon(K)} \mid \varepsilon(M)$ if and only if $q^{\varepsilon(K)} \mid \varepsilon(u)$. Using Proposition 2.8, we can check the equivalent condition $\varepsilon(K) \leq \varepsilon(\Lambda_u)$. \square

Power circuits arising from a sequence of arithmetic operations are usually far from being reduced. Every cloning creates a pair of nodes with the same value. Therefore, we need an algorithm that given an arbitrary circuit produces an equivalent reduced circuit. In this context, equivalence means that for each node and each marking in the old circuit, there is one with the same value in the reduced circuit. Before giving the algorithm, we need some preparations.

Definition 2.10. *A list $u_1 \dots, u_k$ of nodes in a power circuit is called a chain (starting at u_1), if $q \cdot \varepsilon(u_i) = \varepsilon(u_{i+1})$ for all $1 \leq i < k$. It is called a maximal chain (starting at u_1), if it is not part of a longer chain (starting at u_1).*

Note that chains have nothing to do with paths in the graph. In arbitrary power circuits, chains are difficult to spot. However, in a reduced power circuit, they can be easily identified using the bit vector.

In a reduced circuit, the maximal chain starting at the unique node of value 1 is of particular interest. It is called the *base chain* of the power circuit. For later use, we define in Algorithm 1 a procedure `PROLONGBASECHAIN` prolonging this chain by one node without destroying the reducedness property of a circuit. The procedure `PROLONGBASECHAIN` takes $\mathcal{O}(|\Gamma|)$ time.

Now we can give an algorithm that reduces power circuits. Reduction is done node by node. This means that at any point during the reduction procedure, the circuit consists of a reduced part and a part that is not yet reduced. The nodes in the non-reduced part are processed in topological order. In this way, the procedure only has to work for nodes all of whose successors are already in the reduced part.

Algorithm 1: Procedure PROLONGBASECHAIN

input : a reduced power circuit $\Pi = (\Gamma, \delta)$

output: a reduced power circuit $\Pi' = (\Gamma \dot{\cup} \{u\}, \delta')$ which is Π with an additional node u prolonging the base chain of Π

- 1 Let $\Gamma = (v_0, \dots, v_n)$ be the ordered list of the nodes of the reduced circuit Γ . Using this list and the bit vector, find the smallest $i \geq 0$ such that $\varepsilon(v_i) > q^i$.
 - 2 Write i as a q -ary number $i = \sum_{\ell=0}^{i-1} \alpha_\ell \cdot q^\ell$ and use this to define the marking $M(v_\ell) = \alpha_\ell$ with value $\varepsilon(M) = i$. Insert a new node u with $\Lambda_u = M$ into the circuit.
 - 3 Place u in the ordered list of nodes between v_{i-1} and v_i .
 - 4 Check whether $q \cdot \varepsilon(u) = \varepsilon(v_i)$ by applying Proposition 2.8 to Λ_u and Λ_{v_i} (both are contained in the reduced circuit Π). Set the bit vector for u accordingly.
-

This approach allows us to generalize the reduction procedure. Instead of reducing the entire circuit, we can take into account that parts of it might already be reduced. This will turn out to be useful in applications. The procedure EXTENDREDUCTION described in Algorithm 2 takes as input not only the power circuit but also a list \mathcal{M} of markings that need to be adjusted during reduction in order to preserve their value.

Proposition 2.11. (cf. [4], Thm. 6) *The procedure EXTENDREDUCTION is correct and takes $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}((|\Gamma| + |U|) \cdot (|U| + m))$ time. The circuit growth $|\Gamma' \setminus \Gamma|$ is bounded by $2|U|$.*

Proof. At first, a topological order is computed. The time for this is bounded by the size of the subgraph U (nodes and edges), which is $\mathcal{O}(|U|^2)$. In the main loop starting at line 2, the nodes are eliminated from U one by one. Let $n = |\Gamma| + |U|$ be the initial size of the whole graph. Since Γ grows by $\mathcal{O}(|U|)$ during the procedure (although we keep calling it Γ for convenience), $\mathcal{O}(n)$ is the correct bound for the size of Γ .

For each node $u_i \in U$, its position in the ordering of Γ has to be found in step 5. Since u_j is chosen to be topologically minimal, the successor marking Λ_u is contained in the reduced circuit Γ , so u can be compared to any node $v \in \Gamma$ in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time. Using binary search, $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ comparisons are sufficient, taking $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n \cdot |U|)$ time in total.

For the insertion of u_i in Γ , we distinguish two cases. In the first one (step 7), there is no node in Γ with the same value as u_i . In this case, u_i is moved from U to Γ without any modification. Markings containing u_i (including successor markings, i.e., edges with target u_i) are not affected either.

The second case (step 11), where there is a node v_j with the same value as u_i is more difficult. Figure 7 shows an example. The idea is to delete u_i and replace it in all markings M (both markings from M and successor markings of nodes

Algorithm 2: Procedure EXTENDREDUCTION

input : a graph $\Pi = (\Gamma \dot{\cup} U, \delta)$ such that $(\Gamma, \delta|_{\Gamma \times \Gamma})$ is a reduced power circuit, a list $\mathcal{M} = (M_1, \dots, M_m)$ of markings in Π

output: a reduced power circuit $\Pi' = (\Gamma', \delta')$ with $\Gamma \subseteq \Gamma'$ and $\delta'|_{\Gamma \times \Gamma} = \delta|_{\Gamma \times \Gamma}$, a list $\mathcal{M}' = (M'_1, \dots, M'_m)$ of markings in Π' such that $\varepsilon(M_i) = \varepsilon(M'_i)$

- 1 Compute a topological order of U , i.e., $U = (u_1, \dots, u_k)$ such that $\delta(u_i, u_j) \neq 0$ implies $i > j$.
- 2 **for** $i = 1, \dots, k$ **do**
- 3 $U := U \setminus \{u_i\}$
- 4 If $\Gamma = \emptyset$, set $\Gamma := \{u_1\}$ (a circuit with just one node is obviously reduced) and continue with the iteration $i = 2$.
- 5 Let $\Gamma = (v_1, v_2, \dots)$ be the ordered list of the nodes of the reduced circuit Γ . Using binary search, find the minimal j such that $\varepsilon(u_i) \leq \varepsilon(v_j)$. Comparing u_i to some v_j is done by comparing Λ_{u_i} to Λ_{v_j} . Both markings are in the reduced part, so Proposition 2.8 applies.
- 6 **if** $\varepsilon(\Lambda_{u_i}) < 0 = \varepsilon(\Lambda_{v_1})$ **then** the graph Π is not a power circuit; abort the algorithm.
- 7 **if** $\varepsilon(u_i) < \varepsilon(v_j)$ (or no such v_j exists) **then**
- 8 $\Gamma := \Gamma \cup \{u_i\}$
- 9 Insert u_i into Γ 's sorted list of nodes between v_{j-1} and v_j .
- 10 Set the bit vector for u_i according to whether $\varepsilon(\Lambda_{u_i}) + 1 = \varepsilon(\Lambda_{v_j})$.
- 11 **else** $\varepsilon(u_i) = \varepsilon(v_j)$
- 12 Find the last node v_k of the maximal chain starting at v_j and create $v := \text{CLONE}(v_k)$.
- 13 Multiply the value of v by q by adding 1 to Λ_v : Let v_ℓ be the first node in the base chain with $\Lambda_v(v_\ell) < q - 1$. If such v_ℓ does not exist, call `PROLONGBASECHAIN` to create it. Set $\Lambda_v(v_1) = \dots = \Lambda_v(v_{\ell-1}) = 0$ and increment $M(v_\ell)$ by one.
- 14 Insert v in the ordered list after v_k and set the bit vector for v by comparing Λ_v to $\Lambda_{v_{k+1}}$.
- 15 **foreach** $M \in \{\text{supp } \Lambda_u : u \in U\} \cup \mathcal{M}$ with $u_i \in \text{supp } M$ **do**
- 16 Replace u_i in M by v_j , i.e., set $M(v_j) := M(v_j) + M(u_i)$ and $M(u_i) := 0$. If now $M(v_j) = \alpha \notin D$, write $\alpha = \beta \cdot q + \gamma$ with $\gamma \in D$, set $M(v_j) := \gamma$ and add β to $M(v_{j+1})$. If again $M(v_{j+1}) \notin D$, repeat. This terminates at the latest at the newly created node v which is not marked by M .

in U) by v_j . This may cause v_j to be “overmarked” by M , i.e., $M(v_j) \notin D$. For example, in the simplest case $q = 2$, if $M(v_j) = M(u_i) = 1$, then $M(v_j) = 2$ after the replacement. The solution is inspired by the idea of carry digits used when

adding two q -ary numbers: if $|M(v_j)| \geq q$, subtract the appropriate number $\alpha \cdot q$ and add α to the value that M assigns to the next node v_{j+1} in the chain, which has q times the value of v_j . The carry might propagate to the end of the chain, which is why we preventively prolonged it by one node v_{k+1} .

Note that the time bound for one execution of step 15 is not $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(|\Gamma|)$, but rather $\mathcal{O}(|\Gamma| \cdot \# \text{of markings})$. Since this is not sufficient to prove the claimed bound, instead we count the total amount of time spent in step 15 during the whole procedure. The key observation is that for every carry that has to be moved to the next node in the chain, the number $C := \sum_{\mathcal{M}} \sum_{v \in \Gamma \cup U} |M(v)|$ decreases. Initially $C \leq (q-1) \cdot (n \cdot (|U| + m))$, so the total time complexity of step 15 is $\mathcal{O}(n \cdot (|U| + m))$. \square

Remark 2.12. *Not all markings need to be included in \mathcal{M} . Since Π remains a subcircuit of Π' and the values of nodes in Γ do not change, all markings whose support is completely contained in Γ are automatically preserved. Only markings using nodes in U have to be put into \mathcal{M} . In most applications, \mathcal{M} consists only of a constant number of markings.*

Remark 2.13. *The bound for the circuit growth given in Proposition 2.11 is a rather crude one. A more detailed analysis shows that calling PROLONGBASECHAIN is only necessary once every time $|\Gamma|$ grows by a factor q . If one does some “cleaning up” in the circuit (for instance delete unmarked nodes with no incoming edges), [9] shows that the growth during reduction is even bounded by 1. However, this bound is of no importance in our applications since cloning during arithmetic operations increases the size by $\mathcal{O}(|U|)$ anyway.*

In practice, the circuit size rarely ever increases at all during reduction. Usually, the circuit even shrinks.

Theorem 2.14. *(cf. [4], Cor. 7) There is a procedure REDUCE which given a power circuit $\Pi = (\Gamma, \delta)$ and a list $\mathcal{M} = (M_1, \dots, M_m)$ of markings in Π , returns a reduced circuit $\Pi' = (\Gamma', \delta')$ and a list $\mathcal{M}' = (M'_1, \dots, M'_m)$ of markings in Π' such that $\varepsilon(M_i) = \varepsilon(M'_i)$ ($1 \leq i \leq m$). REDUCE takes $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(|\Gamma|^2 + |\Gamma| \cdot m)$ time and the size of Γ' is bounded by $2|\Gamma|$.*

Proof. Invoke EXTENDREDUCTION taking \emptyset as the reduced part and the whole circuit as U . \square

Step 6 in EXTENDREDUCTION tests whether $\varepsilon(\Lambda_u) \geq 0$. This is one of the equivalent conditions specified in Lemma 2.2 for a graph to be a power circuit. Therefore, reduction is at the same time a test whether a graph is a power circuit:

Corollary 2.15. *([4], Cor. 8) Given a dag $\Pi = (\Gamma, \delta)$ it can be determined in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(|\Gamma|^2)$ time whether Π is a power circuit.* \square




Figure 7: Reduction step ($q = 2$)

2.4 Compactness

In this section, we will show that using a richer data structure for reduced circuits, the time complexity of `EXTENDREDUCTION` can be reduced to $\mathcal{O}((|\Gamma| + |U|) \cdot |U|)$. This eliminates the logarithmic factors both for `REDUCE` and for the test presented in Corollary 2.15. We start by taking a closer look at power sums.

2.4.1 Compact power sums

A power sum is a formal sum $S = \sum_{i \geq 0} \alpha_i \cdot q^i$ whose coefficients α_i are in D and only finitely many of them are non-zero. The value $\varepsilon(S) \in \mathbb{Z}$ of the power sum S is defined in the obvious way. On the set of all power sums, we define a rewriting system \mathcal{P} generated by the rules

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \quad & \alpha \cdot q^i + \beta \cdot q^{i+1} \longrightarrow (\alpha - q) \cdot q^i + (\beta + 1) \cdot q^{i+1} && \text{for } \alpha > 0, \beta < 0, \\ (2) \quad & \alpha \cdot q^i + \beta \cdot q^{i+1} \longrightarrow (\alpha + q) \cdot q^i + (\beta - 1) \cdot q^{i+1} && \text{for } \alpha < 0, \beta > 0, \end{aligned}$$

and for $i < j$

$$\begin{aligned} (3) \quad & \alpha \cdot q^i + (q - 1) \cdot (q^{i+1} + \dots + q^j) + \beta \cdot q^{j+1} \\ & \longrightarrow (\alpha - q) \cdot q^i + (\beta + 1) \cdot q^{j+1} && \text{for } \alpha > 0, \beta < q - 1, \\ (4) \quad & \alpha \cdot q^i + (-q + 1) \cdot (q^{i+1} + \dots + q^j) + \beta \cdot q^{j+1} \\ & \longrightarrow (\alpha + q) \cdot q^i + (\beta - 1) \cdot q^{j+1} && \text{for } \alpha < 0, \beta > -q + 1. \end{aligned}$$

None of these rules changes the value of the power sum. We omit the proof for the following lemma, since it consists of a long but simple enumeration of cases.

Lemma 2.16. *The rewriting system \mathcal{P} is locally confluent.* \square

Lemma 2.17. *The rewriting system \mathcal{P} is terminating (noetherian) and hence confluent ([2], Thm. 1.1.13).*

Proof. Let $S_1 \xRightarrow[\mathcal{P}]{}^* S_2 \xRightarrow[\mathcal{P}]{}^* \dots$ be a sequence of rewritings. Since none of the rules of \mathcal{P} increases the number of non-zero coefficients, this number must eventually reach a minimum. Thus, ignoring a finite number of terms, we can assume that the number of non-zeros is constant within the sequence. No rule in \mathcal{P} moves a non-zero coefficient to the left (in the direction of smaller exponents). As the value of the S_i is fixed, non-zeros cannot be moved indefinitely to the right either. Again, by disregarding a finite prefix of the sequence, we assume that the positions of the non-zero coefficients are fixed. At this point, no application of (3) or (4) is possible any more. Finally, rules of type (1) and (2) move pairs of consecutive coefficients with opposite signs to the left (or remove them), which can also occur only finitely often. Thus, the sequence S_1, S_2, \dots is eventually constant. \square

We call power sums that are irreducible with respect to \mathcal{P} compact. If $S = \sum_{i \geq 0} \alpha_i q^i$ is compact, then so is $-S = \sum_{i \geq 0} (-\alpha_i) q^i$.

Proposition 2.18.

- (i) *For each power sum there is a unique compact power sum of the same value.*
- (ii) *Compact power sums have the minimal number of non-zero coefficients among all power sums of the same value.*

(iii) If S and T are compact power sums, then $\varepsilon(T) = \varepsilon(S) + 1$ if and only if

$$S = U \cdot q^{i+1} + \alpha_i \cdot q^i + \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \alpha_j \cdot q^j \quad \text{and}$$

$$T = U \cdot q^{i+1} + \beta_i \cdot q^i + \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \beta_j \cdot q^j$$

for some power sum U , $\beta_i = \alpha_i + 1$, and for each $0 \leq j < i$ either $\alpha_j = q - 1$ and $\beta_j = 0$ or $\alpha_j = 0$ and $\beta_j = -q + 1$.

(iv) The usual order on D gives rise to a lexicographical order on power sums (where coefficients of higher powers of q are compared before those of lower powers). Restricted to compact power sums, this lexicographical order coincides with the order by values.

Proof. For (i) it suffices to show that for two power sums S and T of the same value, we have $S \xleftrightarrow[\mathcal{P}]{}^* T$. This is true, since applying the rules of \mathcal{P} forward or backward, one can turn any power sum into an ordinary q -ary number with coefficients from $\{0, \dots, q-1\}$. (For instance, for positive values of S , use rules of type (1) backward and rules of type (2) forward to push negative coefficients to the right.)

Claim (ii) follows from the fact that no rule increases the number of non-zero coefficients.

For the “if” part of (iii), we observe that component-wise subtraction yields

$$T - S = q^i - (q-1) \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} q^j,$$

which evaluates to 1. For the “only if” part, let $S = \sum_{\ell \geq 0} \alpha_\ell \cdot q^\ell$ be compact. Consider $S' = \sum_{\ell \geq 1} \alpha_\ell \cdot q^\ell + (\alpha_0 + 1)$. If S' is a valid power sum (i.e. $\alpha_0 + 1 \in D$) and S' is compact, it already has the desired form (for $i = 0$). Otherwise we have one of the following cases:

- 1.) S' is not a valid power sum, since $\alpha_0 = q - 1$. Let $k > 0$ be the maximum number such that $\alpha_0 = \dots = \alpha_k = q - 1$. We transform S' into

$$(\alpha_{k+1} + 1) \cdot q^{k+1} + \sum_{\ell > k+1} \alpha_\ell \cdot q^\ell$$

and use induction on $(\alpha_{k+1} + 1) \cdot q^0 + \sum_{\ell > k+1} \alpha_\ell \cdot q^{\ell-k-1}$.

- 2.) A rule of type (1) can be applied. We have $\alpha_0 = 0$ and $\alpha_1 < 0$. Applying the rule gives

$$S' \xrightarrow[(1)]{} \sum_{\ell \geq 2} \alpha_\ell \cdot q^\ell + (\alpha_1 + 1) \cdot q + (-q + 1).$$

Use induction on $\sum_{\ell \geq 2} \alpha_\ell \cdot q^{\ell-1} + (\alpha_1 + 1)$.

- 3.) A rule of type (3) can be applied. We have $\alpha_0 = 0$ and $\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_k = q - 1$ and $\alpha_{k+1} < q - 1$ for some $k \geq 1$. This yields

$$S' \xrightarrow{(3)} \sum_{\ell > k+1} \alpha_\ell \cdot q^\ell + (\alpha_{k+1} + 1) \cdot q^{k+1} + (-q + 1)$$

and induction applies to $\sum_{\ell > k} \alpha_\ell \cdot q^{\ell-k-1} + (\alpha_{k+1} + 1)$.

Finally, (iv) is a consequence of (iii). \square

The notion of compactness was introduced in [9] for $q = 2$ and subsequently used in [5]. Our definition is a generalization that inherits most of the original characteristics.

There is, however, one important difference: it is much less obvious for $q > 2$ how to make a power sum compact in linear time. In the case $q = 2$ it suffices to apply the rules of \mathcal{P} from left to right. Yet, if for instance $q = 3$, the application of rule (1) to

$$1 + q + q^2 + q^3 - 2q^4 \xrightarrow{(1)} +q + q^2 - 2q^3 - q^4$$

turns the previously compact prefix $1 + q + q^2 + q^3$ into the \mathcal{P} -reducible sum $1 + q + q^2 - 2q^3$.

Proposition 2.19. *Any power sum $S = \sum_{i=0}^n \alpha_i \cdot q^i$ can be transformed into a compact power sum with the same value in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time.*

Proof. Any two power sums S and T with $\varepsilon(S) = \varepsilon(T)$ can be transformed into each other using only replacements of the form

$$\alpha \cdot q^{i-1} + \beta \cdot q^i \longrightarrow (\alpha \pm q) \cdot q^{i-1} + (\beta \mp 1) \cdot q^i. \quad (\star_i^\pm)$$

Moreover, at most one application of (\star_i^+) or (\star_i^-) is needed for each i . In fact, whether (\star_i^+) or (\star_i^-) or neither is needed, depends only on S and T . This can be seen using induction on i .

Let $T = \sum_{i=0}^{n+1} \beta_i \cdot q^i$ be the compact power sum with $\varepsilon(S) = \varepsilon(T)$. Define $J_i \in \{+1, -1, 0\}$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$) depending on whether the replacement (\star_i^+) or (\star_i^-) or neither of them occurs in the sequence $S \xrightarrow{(\star_i^\pm)}^* T$. For notational convenience,

we define $J_0 = J_{n+2} = 0$ and $\alpha_{n+1} = 0$. Then we have $\beta_i = \alpha_i + J_i - q \cdot J_{i+1}$ for $0 \leq i \leq n+1$.

It remains to compute the values J_i ($1 \leq i \leq n+1$). These are the unique solution of the following system of conditions ($0 \leq i \leq n+1$):

$$\begin{aligned} (\diamond_i) \quad & \alpha_{i-1} + J_{i-1} + q \cdot J_i \in D \text{ and } \alpha_i + J_i + q \cdot J_{i+1} \in D \text{ and} \\ & \text{sign}(\alpha_{i-1} + J_{i-1} + q \cdot J_i) \cdot \text{sign}(\alpha_i + J_i + q \cdot J_{i+1}) \neq -1 \text{ and} \\ & \text{if } \text{sign}(\alpha_{i-1} + J_{i-1} + q \cdot J_i) = \text{sign}(\alpha_i + J_i + q \cdot J_{i+1}) = \pm 1, \\ & \text{then } \alpha_i + J_i + q \cdot J_{i+1} \neq \pm(q-1). \end{aligned}$$

For $i = 2, \dots, n+1$ and for all $j, k \in \{-1, 0, +1\}$ we define $\mathcal{J}_i[j, k]$ to be the set of possible values for J_i , provided that $J_{i-2} = j$ and $J_{i-1} = k$:

$\mathcal{J}_i[j, k] := \{J_i : \text{there are } J_1, \dots, J_{i-3} \text{ such that}$

$$J_0 = 0, J_1, \dots, J_{i-3}, J_{i-2} = j, J_{i-1} = k, J_i \text{ satisfy } (\diamond_0), \dots, (\diamond_{i-1})\}$$

Since (\diamond_{i-1}) only affects $J_{i-2}, J_{i-1}, J_i, \alpha_{i-2}, \alpha_{i-1}$, the sets $\mathcal{J}_i[\cdot, \cdot]$ can be computed in constant time using $\mathcal{J}_{i-1}[\cdot, \cdot]$. After this, the solution J_{n+1}, \dots, J_1 can be read from right to left. \square

Example 2.20. Suppose that $q = 3$ and we want to make $S = 1 + q - 2q^2 - 2q^3 + q^4 - q^5$ compact. We get:

$\mathcal{J}_i[j, k]$	$i = 2$	$i = 3$	$i = 4$	$i = 5$	$i = 6$	$i = 7$
$j = -1, k = -1$	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	$\{0\}$	\emptyset	\emptyset
$j = -1, k = 0$	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	$\{-1, 0\}$	\emptyset
$j = -1, k = +1$	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset
$j = 0, k = -1$	\emptyset	\emptyset	$\{-1\}$	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset
$j = 0, k = 0$	$\{0\}$	$\{-1\}$	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	$\{0\}$
$j = 0, k = +1$	$\{+1\}$	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset
$j = +1, k = -1$	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset
$j = +1, k = 0$	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset
$j = +1, k = +1$	\emptyset	$\{0\}$	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset

Since $J_7 = 0$, we deduce from the last column that $J_5 = J_6 = 0$ as well. The only 0 in the column for $i = 6$ with $k = 0$ yields $J_4 = -1$ and so on. We end up with $J_0 = J_1 = J_2 = 0, J_3 = J_4 = -1, J_5 = J_6 = J_7 = 0$ which results in $T = 1 + q + q^2 - q^5$.

2.4.2 Power circuits and trees

Property (iv) of Proposition 2.18 is the main motivation for the following definition.

Definition 2.21. (cf. [5], Def. 5) A power $\Pi = (\Gamma, \delta)$ circuit is called *treed* (a convenient shorthand for “reduced and equipped with additional data in the form of a tree”), if

- (i) Π is reduced (i.e., different nodes evaluate to different values and it is equipped with an ordered list $\Gamma = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$ and a bit vector, see Definition 2.7)
- (ii) Π is equipped with a directed tree T in which each node has up to $|D|$ outgoing edges, labelled with pairwise distinct values from D (and ordered from left to right by increasing values). For each leaf in T , the unique path from the root to this leaf must consist of exactly $n = |\Gamma|$ edges. The sequence of labels $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ of such a path (read from the leaf to the root) corresponds to a marking $M : u_i \mapsto \alpha_i$. For all leaves, the power sum $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \cdot q^i$ (which evaluates to $\varepsilon(M)$) must be compact. Any marking represented as a leaf in this way is called compact.




Figure 8: Treed power circuit ($q = 2$) with compact marking M

- (iii) All successor markings Λ_u ($u \in \Gamma$) are compact.
- (iv) Any node $v \in \Gamma$ that is contained in the support of some marking (compact or not) is not the top node of a maximal chain.
- (v) For each level in the tree, there is a list containing the nodes of this level.

Example 2.22. Figure 8 shows an example of a treed circuit (for $q = 2$) alongside the tree containing its markings. Note that the order of the nodes is implicitly given by the lowest level of the tree.

The most time consuming step in EXTENDREDUCTION was to find the position of a new node in the sorted list of Γ . Using binary search, this took $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ time. If Γ is treed and Λ_u is compact, we can improve this to $\mathcal{O}(n)$: the position of the leaf corresponding to Λ_u already tells the position of u in Γ . In order to adjust the bit vector, we have to read the paths from the root of the

tree to the respective leaves and check the condition given by Proposition 2.18 (iii). Yet, making a circuit treed is more complicated than just reducing it.

For the time analysis, we use amortization with respect to a potential function pot , mapping power circuits to numbers, see 17.3 in [3]. An algorithm on power circuits is said to run in amortized time t , if the real running time is bounded by $t + \text{pot}(\Pi) - \text{pot}(\Pi')$, where Π is the input and Π' is the resulting circuit. Thus, an algorithm may take longer than its indicated amortized time, as long as it decreases the potential by the same amount. The potential can be thought of as a debt which is accumulated whenever the algorithm does not terminate in time.

Definition 2.23. *For a power circuit $\Pi = (\Gamma, \delta)$, the number of maximal chains is denoted $\text{ch}(\Pi)$. The potential of Π is $\text{pot}(\Pi) = \text{ch}(\Pi) \cdot |\Gamma|$.*

In a situation where $\Pi = (\Gamma \dot{\cup} U, \delta)$ is a graph with an embedded power circuit $\Pi' = (\Gamma, \delta|_{\Gamma \times \Gamma})$, we define $\text{ch}(\Pi) := \text{ch}(\Pi')$ and $\text{pot}(\Pi) := \text{pot}(\Pi')$.

Lemma 2.24. *There is a procedure INSERTNODE, which takes a treed power circuit $\Pi = (\Gamma, \delta)$ and a compact marking M in Π and which inserts a new node u with $\Lambda_u = M$ into Π . INSERTNODE runs in amortized time $\mathcal{O}(|\Gamma|)$.*

Proof. Since M is compact, the position of v in the ordered list of nodes is determined by the position of the leaf corresponding to M in the tree. The bit vector can be adjusted by comparing M to the successor markings of the nodes immediately before and after v .

The tree has to be “stretched” by inserting a new level corresponding to v . All edges on this level are labelled 0, since no marking contains the new node v . Using the lists of nodes of the same level, this takes $\mathcal{O}(|\Gamma|)$ time.

The insertion of v increases $|\Gamma|$ and in some cases also $\text{ch}(\Pi)$. Thus, the potential grows by up to $|\Gamma| + \text{ch}(\Pi) + 1 \in \mathcal{O}(|\Gamma|)$. \square

Incrementing a compact marking by 1 is easier than doing the same with an arbitrary marking. Let M be a compact marking in a treed circuit, in which u_1, u_2 are the unique nodes with values 1 and 2 respectively (assuming they exist). If $M(u_1) < q - 1$, $M(u_1)$ can be incremented directly. If $M(u_1) = q - 1$, then $M(u_2) < q - 1$ thanks to compactness. Set $M(u_1) := 0$ and increment $M(u_2)$. However, the resulting marking is not always compact.

Lemma 2.25. *There is a procedure COMPACTIFYMARKING which, given an arbitrary marking M in a treed circuit $\Pi = (\Gamma, \delta)$, computes a compact marking M' with $\varepsilon(M') = \varepsilon(M)$ in $\mathcal{O}(|\Gamma|)$ time.*

Proof. This is based on the following observation: if $S = \sum_{i=n}^m \alpha_i \cdot q^i$ is a power sum, then in the corresponding compact power sum T only the coefficients of q^n, \dots, q^{m+1} can be non-zero. Hence, for each individual chain $C \subseteq \Gamma$, we can apply the algorithm from Proposition 2.19 to the power sum defined by $M|_C$. Note that a node for q^{m+1} exists due to Property (iv) of the treed circuit Π . \square

Strictly speaking, we have not proved that the resulting circuit is treed. In fact, Condition (iv) demanding an unmarked node at the top of every chain

might have been lost during compactification. We will fix this shortly. For now, we content ourselves with the observation that the problem does not arise when COMPACTIFYMARKING is called during PROLONGBASECHAIN. In this special case, the successor marking of the new node with value q^i only uses nodes with much smaller values from the base chain (approximately the first $\log_q i$). This shows:

Corollary 2.26. *The procedure PROLONGBASECHAIN given in Algorithm 1 can be adapted for treed power circuits. The amortized time complexity is $\mathcal{O}(|\Gamma|)$. \square*

Corollary 2.27. *There is a procedure INCREMENTMARKING which, given a compact marking M in a treed power circuit $\Pi = (\Gamma, \delta)$, computes a compact marking M' with $\varepsilon(M') = \varepsilon(M) + 1$ and leaves Π treed. INCREMENTMARKING takes $\mathcal{O}(|\Gamma|)$ amortized time and increases the circuit size by $1 + \text{ch}(\Pi) - \text{ch}(\Pi')$.*

Proof. As discussed above, incrementing M by 1 only affects the two nodes with values 1 and 2. As a consequence, the compactification process of the incremented marking is limited to the base chain of Π .

In order to fulfill Condition (iv) of Definition 2.21, we invoke PROLONGBASECHAIN which creates a new node u . If u is the new top node of the base chain, we are done. Otherwise the insertion of u has linked two maximal chains, decreasing $\text{ch}(\Pi)$ by one. We use the released potential to pay for the $\mathcal{O}(|\Gamma|)$ time used so far and repeat. \square

For treed circuits, the procedure EXTENDTREE given in Algorithm 3 replaces EXTENDREDUCTION.

Proposition 2.28. *The procedure EXTENDTREE is correct and runs in amortized time $\mathcal{O}((|\Gamma| + |U|) \cdot (|U| + m))$. The circuit growth $|\Gamma' \setminus \Gamma|$ is bounded by $4 \cdot |U| + \text{ch}(\Pi) - \text{ch}(\Pi')$.*

Proof. The basic structure of EXTENDTREE is the same as that of EXTENDREDUCTION, so we focus on the differences. Let $n = |\Gamma| + |U|$. Between cycles of the main loop, we keep up the following invariants for all markings $M \in \mathcal{M} \cup \{\Lambda_u : u \in U\}$:

- (a) If the support of M is completely contained in Γ , M is compact.
- (b) Γ is treed. In particular, Condition (iv) holds, which means that for all nodes $v \in \text{supp } M \cap \Gamma$, the top node of the maximal chain starting at v is not marked by M .

At the beginning, both invariants are true by definition.

The time complexity for finding v_j in step 5 is reduced to $\mathcal{O}(n)$ due to the representation of the markings in the tree.

If Γ contains no node with the same value as u_i , we can insert it as we did in EXTENDREDUCTION. Remember that Λ_{u_i} is compact due to (a). The case when $\varepsilon(u_i) = \varepsilon(v_j)$ also resembles EXTENDREDUCTION and has the same (now amortized) time bound.

Algorithm 3: Procedure EXTENDTREE

input : a graph $\Pi = (\Gamma \dot{\cup} U, \delta)$ such that $(\Gamma, \delta|_{\Gamma \times \Gamma})$ is a treed power circuit, a list $\mathcal{M} = (M_1, \dots, M_m)$ of markings in Π with $\text{supp } M_i \not\subseteq \Gamma$

output: a treed power circuit $\Pi' = (\Gamma', \delta')$ with $\Gamma \subseteq \Gamma'$ and $\delta'|_{\Gamma \times \Gamma} = \delta|_{\Gamma \times \Gamma}$, a list $\mathcal{M}' = (M'_1, \dots, M'_m)$ of compact markings in Π' such that $\varepsilon(M_i) = \varepsilon(M'_i)$

- 1 Compute a topological order $U = (u_1, \dots, u_k)$.
- 2 **for** $i = 1, \dots, k$ **do**
- 3 $U := U \setminus \{u_i\}$
- 4 **if** $\Gamma = \emptyset$ **then** set $\Gamma := \{u_1\}$, create a tree for u_1 and insert all markings with support $\{u_1\}$. Continue with $i = 2$.
- 5 Traversing the lowest level of the tree, find the first node v_j in the ordered list $\Gamma = (v_1, v_2, \dots)$ such that $\varepsilon(u_i) \leq \varepsilon(v_j)$.
- 6 **if** $\varepsilon(\Lambda_{u_i}) < 0$ **then** abort the algorithm.
- 7 **if** $\varepsilon(u_i) < \varepsilon(v_j)$ (or no such v_j exists) **then**
- 8 Insert u_i into Γ using INSERTNODE.
- 9 **else** $\varepsilon(u_i) = \varepsilon(v_j)$
- 10 Prolong the maximal chain v_j, v_{j+1}, \dots, v_k by a new node by creating a copy of Λ_{v_k} and applying INCREMENTMARKING and INSERTNODE.
- 11 **foreach** marking M with $u_i \in \text{supp } M$ **do**
- 12 Replace u_i in M by v_j by adding $M(u_i)$ to $M(v_j)$ and setting $M(u_i) := 0$. If, after this, $M(v_j) \notin D$, add $\pm q$ to $M(v_j)$ and decrease $M(v_{j+1})$ by ± 1 . Repeat if $M(v_{j+1}) \notin D$ and so on.
- 13 **foreach** marking $M \in \mathcal{M} \cap \{\Lambda_u : u \in U\}$ of which u_i was the last node not in Γ **do** COMPACTIFYMARKING(M).
- 14 **repeat**
- 15 Prolong the maximal chain starting at v_j using INCREMENTMARKING and INSERTNODE
- 16 **until** the newly created node is the top of the chain

All markings M whose support is completely contained in Γ after the processing of u_i must be made compact in order to regain (a). This is done in step 13. After that, we have to restore Condition (iv). Using the same argument as in Corollary 2.27, step 14 takes $\mathcal{O}(n)$ amortized time and causes the circuit to grow by at most $2 + \text{ch}(\Pi) - \text{ch}(\Pi')$ nodes. Together with step 10, the overall circuit growth during EXTENDTREE is bounded by $4 \cdot |U| + \text{ch}(\Pi) - \text{ch}(\Pi')$. \square

Theorem 2.29. (Treed analogon of Theorem 2.14) *There is a procedure MAKE-TREE which given a power circuit $\Pi = (\Gamma, \delta)$ and a list $\mathcal{M} = (M_1, \dots, M_m)$ of markings in Π , returns a treed circuit $\Pi' = (\Gamma', \delta')$ and a list $\mathcal{M}' = (M'_1, \dots, M'_m)$ of compact markings in Π' such that $\varepsilon(M_i) = \varepsilon(M'_i)$ ($1 \leq i \leq m$). MAKE-TREE*

takes $\mathcal{O}(|\Gamma|^2 + |\Gamma| \cdot m)$ time and the size of Γ' is bounded by $4|\Gamma|$. \square

Remark 2.30. (*Working with treed power circuits*)

The usual strategy when solving a problem using power circuits is to create one power circuit and keep all integers as markings in this circuit. The power circuit is kept in treed form in order that comparisons can be done efficiently at any time. For each arithmetic operation, the markings corresponding to the operands are cloned, and the operation (addition or multiplication by a power of two) is performed on the clones. Finally, EXTENDTREE is called with the set of clones as U to regain a treed circuit. This takes $\mathcal{O}((|\Gamma| + |U|) \cdot |U|)$ time and this time bound also absorbs everything else done during the operation.

For an estimate of the time complexity of an entire algorithm, we need to keep track of the circuit size $|\Gamma|$ as well as the size ω of the supports of the markings. The latter is usually called the “weight” of the circuit and determines the growth during each operation. The cost for one operation is $\mathcal{O}((|\Gamma| + \omega) \cdot \omega)$. If we start with a comparatively small circuit and ω remains constant during the algorithm (which is normally the case), then after s operations the circuit size is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(s \cdot \omega)$ and the time by $\mathcal{O}(s^2 \omega^2)$. In our main application – the solution of the word problem in Higman’s group – s will turn out to be quadratic and ω linear in the input size n , leading to an $\mathcal{O}(n^6)$ time algorithm.

Remark 2.31. *Seen from the outside, EXTENDREDUCTION and EXTENDTREE as well as REDUCE and MAKETREE behave very much alike. In applications, all four procedures are used as “black boxes” and of the resulting circuits only the weaker property of reducedness is used. Therefore, in order to simplify nomenclature, we will speak of “reduction” and “reduced” circuits, subsuming both concepts. The reader may then choose whether to use the simpler reduction concept at the cost of logarithmic factors or to go through the more complicated procedures for treed power circuits with better asymptotic time complexity.*

3 The Word Problem in Generalized Baumslag-Gersten groups

Although the main goal of this paper is to solve the word problem in Higman’s groups, we sidetrack briefly to present another generalization that is made possible by power circuits with arbitrary base q .

The Baumslag-Gersten group is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} G_{(1,2)} &= \langle a, b \mid a^{a^b} = a^2 \rangle \\ &= \langle a, b \mid (bab^{-1})a(bab^{-1})^{-1} = a^2 \rangle \\ &\simeq \langle a, b, t \mid tat^{-1} = a^2, bab^{-1} = t \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

This is an HNN extension of $BS(1, 2)$ generated by a and t . Replacing $BS(1, 2)$ by $BS(1, q)$ (for $q \geq 2$), we get a family of generalized Baumslag-Gersten

groups:

$$\begin{aligned} G_{(1,q)} &= \langle a, b \mid a^{a^b} = a^q \rangle \\ &\simeq \langle a, b, t \mid tat^{-1} = a^q, bab^{-1} = t \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 3.1. *The word problem for the generalized Baumslag-Gersten group $G_{(1,q)}$ is solvable in $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ time. \square*

The proof of Theorem 3.1 is literally the same as that for $G_{(1,2)}$ which was given in [4] and [5], except that the new base q power circuits from Section 2 are used.

4 The Word Problem in Generalized Higman groups

We generalize the groups H_f defined in the introduction by replacing the underlying Baumslag-Solitar group $BS(1, 2)$ by $BS(1, q)$.

Definition 4.1. *The (generalized) Higman group $H_f(1, q)$ is defined as*

$$H_f(1, q) = \langle a_1, \dots, a_f \mid a_{i+1}a_i a_{i+1}^{-1} = a_i^q \ (i \in \mathbb{Z}/f\mathbb{Z}) \rangle. \quad (1)$$

While $H_f = H_f(1, 2)$ ($f > 4$) retains all the important properties of H_4 (infinite, huge compression, no non-trivial normal subgroup of finite index), this is not entirely true for $H_f(1, q)$ in general. For example, for all $f \geq 1$, the homomorphism given by

$$\begin{aligned} H_f(1, 3) &\twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}; \\ a_1 &\mapsto 1, \\ a_2, \dots, a_f &\mapsto 0 \end{aligned}$$

sends $H_f(1, 3)$ onto a finite non-trivial group.

In this section, we will prove:

Theorem 4.2. *Let $q \geq 2, f \geq 4$. The word problem for the generalized Higman group $H_f(1, q)$ can be solved in $\mathcal{O}(n^6)$ time.*

The key observation for the solution of the word problem is the decomposition of $H_f(1, q)$ into a series of amalgamations of f copies of the Baumslag-Solitar group $BS(1, q) = \langle a, t \mid tat^{-1} = t^q \rangle$, see [7].

$$H_f(1, q) = G_{1, \dots, f-1} *_{F_{1, f-1}} G_{f-1, f, 1},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} G_{1, \dots, f-1} &= \langle a_1, \dots, a_{f-1} \mid a_{i+1}a_i a_{i+1}^{-1} = a_i^q \ (1 \leq i < f-1) \rangle \text{ and} \\ G_{f-1, f, 1} &= \langle a_{f-1}, a_f, a_1 \mid a_f a_{f-1} a_f^{-1} = a_{f-1}^q, a_1 a_f a_1^{-1} = a_f^q \rangle \end{aligned}$$

and in both cases $F_{1,f-1}$ is the subgroup generated by a_1 and a_{f-1} , which in fact freely generate $F_{1,f-1}$ (if $f \geq 4$). Furthermore, we can break $G_{1,\dots,f-1}$ and $G_{f-1,f,1}$ down to

$$\begin{aligned} G_{1,\dots,f-1} &= G_{1,2} *_{F_2} G_{2,3} *_{F_3} \dots *_{F_{f-2}} G_{f-2,f-1} \text{ and} \\ G_{f-1,f,1} &= G_{f-1,f} *_{F_f} G_{f,1}, \end{aligned}$$

where $G_{i,i+1} = \langle a_i, a_{i+1} \mid a_{i+1}a_i a_{i+1}^{-1} = a_i^2 \rangle$ and the indices are read in $\mathbb{Z}/f\mathbb{Z}$.

Each group $G_{i,i+1}$ is a copy of the Baumslag-Solitar group $\text{BS}(1, q)$ and thus isomorphic to the semidirect product $\mathbb{Z}[1/q] \rtimes \mathbb{Z}$ which consists of pairs $(u, k) \in \mathbb{Z}[1/q] \rtimes \mathbb{Z}$. The isomorphism is given by $a_i \mapsto (1, 0)$ and $a_{i+1} \mapsto (0, 1)$. In $\mathbb{Z}[1/q] \rtimes \mathbb{Z}$, we have the following formulae for multiplication and inversion:

$$\begin{aligned} (u, k)(v, \ell) &= (u + v \cdot q^k, k + \ell) \\ (u, k)^{-1} &= (-u \cdot q^{-k}, -k) \end{aligned}$$

When dealing with more than one group $G_{i,i+1}$, we add i as a subscript to those pairs designating an element of $G_{i,i+1}$.

In order to solve the word problem for $H_f(1, q)$, we first need a solution for the subgroup membership problem of $F_{1,e}$ in $G_{1,\dots,e}$ (with $e \geq 3$; this covers both $G_{1,\dots,f-1}$ and $G_{f-1,f,1}$). Furthermore, we have to do this in an effective way, i.e., given a sequence of pairs $(u, k)_i$ which represents an element of $F_{1,e}$, we have to find a corresponding sequence of pairs of the form $(u, 0)_1$ and $(0, \ell)_{e-1}$.

We start by giving a reduction system \mathcal{L} for $G_{1,\dots,e}$:

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \quad & (u, k)_i(v, \ell)_i \longrightarrow (u + v \cdot q^k, k + \ell)_i && \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq e \\ (2) \quad & (u, k)_i(v, 0)_{i+1} \longrightarrow (u, k + v)_i && \text{for } 1 \leq i < e \text{ and } v \in \mathbb{Z} \\ (3) \quad & (u, 0)_{i+1}(v, \ell)_i \longrightarrow (v \cdot q^u, \ell + u)_i && \text{for } 1 \leq i < e \text{ and } u \in \mathbb{Z} \\ (4) \quad & (u, k)_{i+1}(0, \ell)_i \longrightarrow (u + \ell \cdot q^k, k)_{i+1} && \text{for } 1 \leq i < e \\ (5) \quad & (0, k)_i(v, \ell)_{i+1} \longrightarrow (k + v, \ell)_{i+1} && \text{for } 1 \leq i < e \end{aligned}$$

The system \mathcal{L} is not confluent in general, but the following property holds:

Proposition 4.3. *If w is an \mathcal{L} -reduced word that equals 1 in $G_{1,\dots,e}$, then w is the empty word. \square*

This resembles Britton's Lemma for HNN extensions. In fact, Bass-Serre theory provides a unifying notion (and proof) for both phenomena. We give no further proof here, but instead apply the system \mathcal{L} to the subgroup membership problem.

Let \mathcal{L}' be the system \mathcal{L} extended by the rules

$$\begin{aligned} (6) \quad & (x_1, -x_2)_1(x_2, -x_3)_2 \dots (x_{e-2}, -x_{e-1})_{e-2}(\tilde{x}_{e-1}, x_e)_{e-1} \\ & \longrightarrow (x_1, 0)_1(\tilde{x}_{e-1} - x_{e-1}, x_e)_{e-1} \quad \text{and} \\ (7) \quad & (-x_{e-1} \cdot q^{x_e}, x_e)_{e-1}(-x_{e-2} \cdot q^{x_{e-1}}, x_{e-1})_{e-2} \dots (-x_2 \cdot q^{x_3}, x_3)_2(x_1 \cdot q^{x_2}, \tilde{x}_2)_1 \\ & \longrightarrow (0, x_e)_{e-1}(x_1, \tilde{x}_2 - x_2)_1, \end{aligned}$$

where all $x_i \neq 0$.

The new rules respect the group structure, and hence Proposition 4.3 holds for \mathcal{L}' as well. The new rules are not length-increasing, since $e \geq 3$.

Starting with an arbitrary sequence w of pairs $(u, k)_i$ representing an element in $G_{1, \dots, e}$, one can compute an equivalent \mathcal{L}' -reduced word \hat{w} with linearly many operations: First, compute an \mathcal{L} -reduced word \tilde{w} , then apply rules (6) and (7). Note that the latter leave \tilde{w} \mathcal{L} -reduced. Only the second pair generated by either of these rules can be part of another application of (6) or (7). Therefore, \tilde{w} can be \mathcal{L}' -reduced with one pass from left to right.

Proposition 4.4. *Let w be a sequence of pairs $(u, k)_i$ which represents an element of the subgroup $F_{1, e} \leq G_{1, \dots, e}$. If w is \mathcal{L}' -reduced, then w is already an alternating sequence of pairs of types $(u, 0)_1$ and $(0, \ell)_{e-1}$.*

Proof. Let $w = (u_1, k_1)_{i_1} (u_2, k_2)_{i_2} \dots (u_n, k_n)_{i_n}$. We assume that

$$w \sim \tilde{w} = (v_1, 0)_1 (0, \ell_1)_{e-1} (v_2, 0)_1 (0, \ell_2)_{e-1} \dots \in F_{1, e}$$

and that \tilde{w} contains no trivial pairs $(0, 0)_i$ which makes \tilde{w} \mathcal{L} -reduced. The case where \tilde{w} starts with $(0, \ell_1)_{e-1} (v_1, 0)_1 \dots$ is similar. The sequence

$$\tilde{w}^{-1} w = \dots (-v_2, 0)_1 (0, -\ell_1)_{e-1} (-v_1, 0)_1 (u_1, k_1)_{i_1} (u_2, k_2)_{i_2} (u_3, k_3)_{i_3} \dots$$

equals 1 in $G_{1, \dots, e}$ and must therefore \mathcal{L} -reduce to the empty sequence. Note that both \tilde{w}^{-1} and w are \mathcal{L} -reduced, so any \mathcal{L} -reduction can only occur at the border between the two words.

Clearly, we cannot have $i_1 \geq 3$ or else $\tilde{w}^{-1} w$ would be \mathcal{L} -reduced. If $i_1 = 2$, then a reduction of type (2) is possible if $k_1 = 0$ and $u_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$, in which case we get $(-v_1, 0)_1 (u_1, 0)_2 \xrightarrow{(2)} (-v_1, u_1)_1$. But after that, the sequence is \mathcal{L} -reduced since $k_1 = 0$ and $u_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ imply $i_2 \neq 1$.

Hence, we are left with $i_1 = 1$. In that case, we get $(-v_1, 0)_1 (u_1, k_1)_1 \xrightarrow{(1)} (-v_1 + u_1, k_1)_1$. If this is $(0, 0)_1$, we have $(u_1, k_1)_{i_1} = (v_1, 0)_1$ and we proceed inductively with the remaining sequence. Otherwise, we must have $u_1 = v_1$ in order to continue applying rules. If $e \geq 4$, the next rule can only apply to $(0, k_1)_1 (u_2, k_2)_{i_2}$, so $i_2 = 2$ and we get $(0, k_1)_1 (u_2, k_2)_2 \xrightarrow{(5)} (k_1 + u_2, k_2)_2$. Again, the sequence is \mathcal{L} -reduced unless $u_2 = -k_1$. We iterate this argument until we arrive at

$$\tilde{w}^{-1} w \xrightarrow[\mathcal{L}]{*} \dots (-v_2, 0)_1 (0, -\ell_1)_{e-1} (0, k_{e-2})_{e-2} (u_{e-1}, k_{e-1})_{i_{e-1}} \dots$$

On the way, we have found $u_1 = v_1, u_2 = -k_1, u_3 = -k_2, \dots, u_{e-2} = -k_{e-3}$, and $i_j = j$ for $1 \leq j \leq e-2$. One further reduction of type (4) brings us to

$$\tilde{w}^{-1} w \xrightarrow[\mathcal{L}]{*} \dots (-v_2, 0)_1 (k_{e-2} \cdot q^{-\ell_1}, -\ell_1)_{e-1} (u_{e-1}, k_{e-1})_{i_{e-1}} \dots$$

Since $\ell_1 \neq 0$, the next reduction requires $i_{e-1} = e-1$. Thus, rule (6) of \mathcal{L}' can be applied to the prefix $(u_1, k_1)_1 \dots (u_{e-1}, k_{e-1})_{e-1}$ of the original word w . \square

For the amalgamated product $H_f(1, q) = G_{1, \dots, f-1} *_{F_{1, f-1}} G_{f-1, f, 1}$, a property similar to 4.3 holds:

Proposition 4.5. *Let $w = w_1 w_2 \dots w_s$ be a non-empty sequence with $w_i \in \{(u, k)_i : 1 \leq i < f-1\}^*$ or $w_i \in \{(u, k)_i : f-1 \leq i \leq f\}^*$, alternatingly. If w equals 1 in $H_f(1, q)$, then $w_i \in F_{1, f-1}$ for some index i . \square*

Algorithm 4: Procedure for solving the word problem in $H_f(1, q)$

input : a word w over a_i, a_i^{-1} ($1 \leq i \leq f$)
output: the answer to $w \stackrel{?}{=} 1$ in $H_f(1, q)$

- 1 Rewrite the input w by replacing each $a_i^{\pm 1}$ by $(\pm 1, 0)_i$.
- 2 Break w into subsequences $w = w_1 w_2 \dots w_s$ such that in each w_j the subscripts of all pairs are either in $\{1, 2, \dots, f-2\}$ or in $\{f-1, f\}$.
- 3 Let $t := 0$.
- 4 **while** $(t = 0 \wedge s > 1) \vee (0 < t < s)$ **do**
- 5 **if** $t = 0 \wedge s > 1$ **then**
- 6 \mathcal{L}' -reduce w_1 . If w_1 becomes empty, remove it (thereby decreasing s) and continue with the next iteration.
- 7 **if** $w_1 \in F_{1, f-1}$ **then**
- 8 Merge w_1 and w_2 . Before doing so, if w_1 and w_2 are from different groups (one from $G_{1, \dots, f-1}$ and the other one from $G_{f-1, f, 1}$), swap all the pairs in w_1 using the following rules:
 $(x, 0)_1 \leftrightarrow (0, x)_f$ and $(0, x)_{f-2} \leftrightarrow (x, 0)_{f-1}$
- 9 **else**
- 10 Increment t by one.
- 11 **else** $(0 < t < s)$
- 12 **if** w_t and w_{t+1} are both from $G_{1, \dots, f-1}$ or both from $G_{f-1, f, 1}$ **then**
- 13 Merge w_t and w_{t+1} .
- 14 Decrement t by one.
- 15 **else**
- 16 \mathcal{L}' -reduce w_{t+1} . If w_{t+1} becomes empty, remove it and continue with the next iteration.
- 17 **if** $w_{t+1} \in F_{1, f-1}$ **then**
- 18 Perform the replacements $(x, 0)_1 \leftrightarrow (0, x)_f$ and $(0, x)_{f-2} \leftrightarrow (x, 0)_{f-1}$ in w_{t+1} , then merge it with w_t .
- 19 Decrement t by one.
- 20 **else**
- 21 Increment t by one.
- 22 **return** whether $s = 0$.

From this proposition, we can derive Algorithm 4 which solves the word problem in $H_f(1, q)$. In this algorithm, the word $w = w_1 w_2 \dots w_s$ is split into

$w_1 \dots w_t$ and $w_{t+1} \dots w_s$. The first part is an \mathcal{L}' -reduced alternating sequence of group elements from $G_{1, \dots, f-1}$ or $G_{f-1, f, 1}$ with no w_i ($1 \leq i \leq t$) being in the subgroup $F_{1, f-1}$. In each loop cycle either t increases, or t decreases by one and at the same time, some w_i is merged with w_{i+1} , which means that s decreases. Thus, the loop is executed only linearly often.

In order to get a time bound for Algorithm 4, it remains to show how to perform the tests arithmetic operations on the pairs $(u, k)_i$ efficiently.

Since power circuits are designed to work with integers, we have to avoid fractions for the first components of pairs $(u, k)_i \in G_{i, i+1} \simeq \mathbb{Z}[1/q] \rtimes \mathbb{Z}$. Therefore, we use the triple notation introduced in [4]. For $u, x, k \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $x \leq 0 \leq k$, let

$$[u, x, k]_i := (u \cdot q^x, x + k)_i \in G_{i, i+1}.$$

If U, X , and K are markings in a base q power circuit, we call $T_i = [U, X, K]_i$ a triple marking and define its value by $\varepsilon(T_i) = [\varepsilon(U), \varepsilon(X), \varepsilon(K)]_i \in G_{i, i+1}$.

Any element of $G_{i, i+1}$ can be written as a triple, but not in a unique way. For instance, $[2, 0, 0]_i = (2, 0)_i = [4, -1, 1]_i$, if $q = 2$. The group operations translate to formulae for multiplication and inversion of triples:

$$\begin{aligned} [u, x, k] \cdot [v, y, \ell] &= [u \cdot q^{-y} + v \cdot q^k, x + y, k + \ell] \\ [u, x, k]^{-1} &= [-u, -k, -x] \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, $[u, x, k]_i \in \langle a_i \rangle \leq G_{i, i+1}$ if and only if $x = -k$ and $u \cdot q^x \in \mathbb{Z}$. Similarly, $[u, x, k]_i \in \langle a_{i+1} \rangle \leq G_{i, i+1}$ if and only if $u = 0$, and finally $[u, x, k]_i$ is the group identity if and only if $u = 0$ and $x = -k$.

At the beginning of Algorithm 4, we create a power circuit with base q consisting of a single node u with $\varepsilon(u) = 1$. We represent each pair $(u, k)_i$ by a triple marking. Of the three markings in each initial triple, two are zero (empty) and the third has either value $+1$ or -1 and can be created using u . Let ω be the sum of the sizes of (the supports of) all these markings. We call ω the weight of the circuit. From the multiplication formula for triples we see that ω never increases during the algorithm, keeping in mind that after an operation we can “forget” the operand and just keep the result. The initial value of ω is exactly $n = |w|$.

After step 1, we reduce the circuit, which takes $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ time. From now on, we keep Π reduced following the strategy proposed in Remark 2.30. The swapping operation $(x, 0) \leftrightarrow (0, x)$ works in the following way for triples:

$$\begin{aligned} [u, x, k] &\mapsto \begin{cases} [0, 0, u \cdot q^x] & \text{if } x = -k \text{ and } q^x \mid u \text{ and } u \geq 0 \\ [0, u \cdot q^x, 0] & \text{if } x = -k \text{ and } q^x \mid u \text{ and } u < 0 \end{cases} \\ [0, x, k] &\mapsto [x + k, 0, 0] \end{aligned}$$

The whole algorithm computes $\mathcal{O}(n)$ many times an \mathcal{L}' -irreducible word. Each of these computations necessitates $\mathcal{O}(n)$ arithmetic operations (and subsequent calls to EXTENDREDUCTION). The circuit size remains bounded by $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \cdot \omega) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(n^3)$. Thus, one call of EXTENDREDUCTION takes $\mathcal{O}(n^3 \cdot \omega) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(n^4)$ time. We get a total time bound of $\mathcal{O}(n^6)$.

This concludes the proof of Theorem 4.2.

5 Conclusion

We have shown that the word problem for the generalized Higman groups $H_f(1, q)$ is solvable in polynomial time. An important ingredient for this result was the extension of the power circuit data structure to arbitrary bases $q \geq 2$. From an algorithmic point of view, this is an interesting result in itself and may provide a useful tool in group theory as well as other areas.

The techniques used in this paper do not apply to the even more general groups $H_f(p, q)$ and $G_{(p, q)}$, where the underlying Baumslag-Solitar group $BS(1, q)$ is replaced by $BS(p, q) = \langle a, t \mid ta^p t^{-1} = a^q \rangle$ for some $p \geq 1$. This is because $BS(p, q)$ is not a semi-direct product when $p > 1$. The word problem for these groups is open. Note that even for $f < 4$ the group $H_f(p, q)$ can be non-trivial if $p > 1$.

References

- [1] Daniel Allcock. Triangles of Baumslag-Solitar Groups. *Canadian J. of Math.*, to appear.
- [2] Ronald V. Book and Friedrich Otto. *String-rewriting systems*. Springer, 1993.
- [3] Thomas H. Cormen, Charles E. Leiserson, Ronald L. Rivest, and Clifford Stein. *Introduction to Algorithms*. MIT Press, 3rd edition edition, 2009.
- [4] Volker Diekert, Jörn Laun, and Alexander Ushakov. Efficient algorithms for highly compressed data: The Word Problem in Higman’s group is in P. In *Proceedings of STACS*, 2012.
- [5] Volker Diekert, Jörn Laun, and Alexander Ushakov. Efficient algorithms for highly compressed data: The word problem in Higman’s group is in P. *IJAC*, 2013. To appear. Preprint available on arXiv.org.
- [6] Graham Higman. A finitely generated infinite simple group. *J. London Math. Soc.*, 26:61–64, 1951.
- [7] Jean-Pierre Serre. *Trees*. Springer, 2nd corr. printing edition, 2002.
- [8] Roger Lyndon and Paul Schupp. *Combinatorial Group Theory*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer, 2001.
- [9] Alexei G. Myasnikov, Alexander Ushakov, and Dong Wook Won. Power circuits, exponential algebra, and time complexity. *ArXiv e-prints*, abs/1006.2570, 2010. To appear in *IJAC*.
- [10] Alexei G. Myasnikov, Alexander Ushakov, and Dong Wook Won. The Word Problem in the Baumslag group with a non-elementary Dehn function is polynomial time decidable. *Journal of Algebra*, 345(1):324–342, 2011.

- [11] Alexei G. Myasnikov and Sasha Ushakov. Cryptography And Groups (CRAG). Software Library.
- [12] B. H. Neumann. An Essay on Free Products of Groups with Amalgamations. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 246(919):503–554, 1954.