

Enumeration for MSO-Queries on Compressed Trees

Markus Lohrey¹ and Markus L. Schmid²

¹Universität Siegen, Hölderlinstr. 3, 57076, Siegen, Germany,
lohrey@eti.uni-siegen.de

²Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Unter den Linden 6, D-10099, Berlin, Germany,
MLSchmid@MLSchmid.de

March 6, 2024

Abstract

We present a linear preprocessing and output-linear delay enumeration algorithm for MSO-queries over trees that are compressed in the well-established grammar-based framework. Time bounds are measured with respect to the size of the compressed representation of the tree. Our result extends previous work on the enumeration of MSO-queries over uncompressed trees and on the enumeration of document spanners over compressed text documents.

1 Introduction

The paradigm of *algorithmics on compressed data* (ACD) aims at solving fundamental computational tasks directly on compressed data objects, without prior decompression. This allows us to work in a completely compressed setting, where our data is always stored and processed in a compressed form. ACD works very well with respect to *grammar-based compression* with so-called straight-line programs (SLPs). Such SLPs use grammar-like formalisms in order to specify how to construct the data object from small building blocks. For example, an SLP for a string w is just a context-free grammar for the language $\{w\}$, which can be seen as a sequence of instructions that construct w from the terminal symbols. For instance, the SLP $S \rightarrow AA$, $A \rightarrow BBC$, $B \rightarrow ba$, $C \rightarrow cb$ (where S, A, B, C are nonterminals and a, b, c are terminals) produces the string $babacbbabac$. String SLPs are very popular and many results exist that demonstrate their wide-range applicability (see, e.g., [18, 4, 12, 20] for some recent publications, and the survey [28]). Moreover, SLPs achieve very good compression rates in practice (exponential in the best case) and are tightly related to dictionary based compression, in particular LZ77 and LZ78 [13, 36].

An important point is that the ACD paradigm may lead to substantial running time improvements over the uncompressed setting. Indeed, the algorithm's running time only depends on the size of the compressed input, so the smaller size of the input may directly translate into a lower running time. For example, if the same problem can be solved in linear time both in the uncompressed and in the compressed setting, then in the case that the input can be compressed from size n to size $\mathcal{O}(\log(n))$, the algorithm in the compressed setting is exponentially faster. This is not just hypothetically speaking. In the field of string algorithms several fundamental problems are known with this behaviour, e.g., string pattern matching [18].

Recently, the ACD paradigm has been combined with the enumeration perspective of query evaluation. In [37, 38, 34], the information extraction framework of document spanners is investigated in the compressed setting, and it has been shown that the results of regular spanners over SLP-compressed text documents can be enumerated with linear preprocessing and constant delay. Applying SLP-based ACD in the framework of document spanners suggests itself, since this is essentially a query model for string data (or sequences), and ACD is most famous in the realm of string algorithms.

We consider a different classical evaluation problem in the compressed setting: MSO-queries on trees. It is known that MSO-queries can be enumerated with linear preprocessing and output-linear delay [1, 2, 14, 25]. Output linear delay means that the delay is linearly bounded by the size of the next element that is enumerated. If the elements of the solution have constant size (like, e.g., for document

spanners), then constant delay and output-linear delay are the same. Our main result extends the work of [2, 14, 25] to the setting, where the tree is given in a compressed representation. Our data models are unranked forests, and as compression scheme, we consider forest straight-line programs (FSLPs) [21]. This is a convenient and versatile grammar-based compression scheme for unranked forests, which also covers other SLP-models from the literature. As usual, MSO-queries are represented by tree automata. Let us now explain the concept of SLP-compression of trees and forests in more detail.

Grammar-compression of trees and forests: An advantage of grammar-based compression is that it can be easily extended to other data types. For example, by using a context-free grammar formalism for trees, we can define tree SLPs [29, 32, 33] and use them for the compression of ranked trees. However, in the context of database theory, we are rather interested in unranked trees and forests as data model. A typical example of such data are XML tree structures. Therefore, we use *forest straight-line programs* (FSLPs) introduced in [21]. Let us sketch this model.

The set of rules of a string SLP essentially define a DAG (directed acyclic graph) whose inner nodes (resp., leaves) are the non-terminals (resp., terminals) of the grammar. The edges of the DAG are defined by the productions of the grammar (e. g., $S \rightarrow AB$ means that from S there is a left edge to A and a right edge to B). This DAG can also be seen as an *algebraic circuit* over the free monoid Σ^* where Σ is the terminal alphabet. FSLPs are also DAGs that represent circuits, but the underlying algebraic structure is the *forest algebra* (see [6]). The elements of this algebra are forests over the alphabet $\Sigma \cup \{*\}$ (i.e., ordered sequences of unranked trees with nodes labelled by symbols from $\Sigma \cup \{*\}$) with the restriction that the special symbol $*$ occurs at most once in a forest and moreover only at a leaf position. Intuitively, $*$ represents a substitution point where another forest can be plugged in. Such forests can be built from atomic forests of the form $a \in \Sigma$ (representing a single node-labelled a) and a_* (representing a node-labelled Σ with a single child labelled $*$) using two operations: the operation \ominus horizontally concatenates two forests (where $*$ is allowed to occur in at most one of them) and the operation \oplus substitutes in a forest F_1 containing $*$ the unique occurrence of $*$ by a second forest F_2 . The tree T_e in Figure 1 shows an expression in the forest algebra that evaluates to the tree T at the right of Figure 2. Now the DAG D at the left of Figure 2 is an FSLP, since it is a natural DAG representation of T_e . An FSLP produces a unique forest that we denote with $\llbracket D \rrbracket$. For the FSLP at the left of Figure 2 it is exactly the tree T at the right of Figure 2. Consequently, FSLPs follow a two stage approach: A forest is represented as the parse-tree of a forest algebra expression, and this parse-tree is then folded into a DAG.

Let us motivate our choice of FSLPs as compression scheme. First, FSLPs can describe node-labelled unranked forests and therefore cover a large number of tree structures (e.g. XML tree structures). Moreover, FSLPs also cover other popular tree compression schemes like top dags [5, 15, 24] and tree straight-line programs [19, 30]. Furthermore, there exist compressors such as TreeRePair that produce FSLPs¹ and show excellent compression ratios in practice. For a corpus of typical XML documents, the number of edges of the original tree is reduced to approximately 3% using TreeRePair on the first-child next-sibling encoding of the XML tree [30]. Other available grammar-based tree compressors are BPLEX [10] and CluX [7]. It is also known that for every forest with n nodes one can construct in linear time an FSLP of size $\mathcal{O}(n \log |\Sigma| / \log n)$ (so $\mathcal{O}(n / \log n)$ for a fixed Σ) [19]. Finally, notice that FSLPs generalize string SLPs (only use the horizontal concatenation \ominus).

Main result: The following is a preliminary statement of our main result. Upper bounds refer to data complexity.

Theorem 1.1. *For an MSO-query $\psi(X)$ with a free set variable X and a forest straight-line program D one can compute in preprocessing time $\mathcal{O}(|D|)$ a data structure that allows to enumerate with output-linear delay all $S \subseteq \text{nodes}(\llbracket D \rrbracket)$ such that $\llbracket D \rrbracket \models \Psi(S)$.*

The MSO-query $\psi(X)$ will be represented by a tree automaton \mathcal{A} (for an automaton model that is equivalent to MSO on unranked forests). We first reduce the enumeration problem from Theorem 1.1 to the following enumeration problem for binary trees: given a DAG D that represents a binary node-labelled tree T and a deterministic bottom-up tree automaton \mathcal{B} , enumerate all subsets $S \subseteq \text{leaves}(T)$ such that \mathcal{B} accepts the tree (T, S) (obtained by marking all leaves from S with a 1). This enumeration problem is then instantiated by the FSLP D (a DAG) and the forest algebra parse tree T represented by D . The nodes of the forest $\llbracket D \rrbracket$ uniquely correspond to the leaves of T (see Figures 1 and 2). The bottom-up tree

¹Actually, TreeRePair works for ranked trees. It can produce a tree SLP for the first-child-next-sibling of an unranked forest F . This tree SLP can be transformed in linear time into an equivalent FSLP for F [21].

automaton \mathcal{B} is obtained from the automaton \mathcal{A} using a known construction [26]. Since T is a binary tree, we could enumerate all sets $S \subseteq \text{leaves}(T)$ such that \mathcal{B} accepts (T, S) with linear preprocessing and output-linear delay by one of the algorithms in the literature, e. g., the one by Bagan [2]. But T is given by the DAG D and we cannot afford to explicitly construct T . Consequently, we have to adapt Bagan’s algorithm in such a way that it can be used directly on DAG-compressed trees, which is our main technical contribution.

Related results: Forest algebras have been also used in the context of MSO-enumeration on trees in [35, 26] for the purpose of enabling updates of the queried tree in logarithmic time by updating and re-balancing a forest algebra expression for the tree (see Appendix I.2 for more details). However no compression is achieved in [35, 26]. Working with a DAG-representation of a forest algebra expression (i.e., an FSLP) is a new aspect of our work and requires new algorithmic techniques. We discuss in Section 8 (and Appendix I in more detail) the possibilities and difficulties for also supporting updates in a compressed setting.

The arguably most simple way of compressing a tree is to fold it into a DAG. In the context of database theory, this type of compression has been investigated in [16, 9] for XPath and monadic datalog queries, but the enumeration perspective is not investigated. Moreover, the simple DAG-compression has other disadvantages in comparison to the grammar-based approach. In general, DAG-compression can achieve exponential compression, but there are also trees non-compressible by DAGs, but still exponentially compressible by FSLPs, e. g., unary trees of the form $f(f(\dots f(a)\dots))$. The experimental study of [30] also shows that in a practical setting DAG-compression cannot compete with grammar-based tree compression. Further work on the compression performance of DAGs for XML can be found in [8, 31].

Our work can also be seen as extending the results of [37, 38, 34] to the case of MSO queries on trees, instead of regular spanners on text documents. In this regard, we also provide an alternative proof for the result that regular spanners can be enumerated with linear preprocessing and constant delay over SLP-compressed texts [34] (the latter uses so-called enumerable compact sets with shifts).

In addition to Bagan’s algorithm, there are also other enumeration algorithms for MSO queries over uncompressed trees [14, 25]. However, Bagan’s algorithm seems to be the one that can be extended the best to the compressed setting.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Trees and Forests

Different rooted and finite trees will appear in this work. Note that forests are simply sequences of trees, and we should keep in mind that each definition of a certain tree model yields the corresponding concept of forests (which are just sequences of such trees).

Node-labelled ordered trees are trees, where nodes are labelled with symbols from some alphabet Σ and may have an arbitrary number of children (i.e., the trees are unranked). Moreover, the children are linearly ordered. A typical example of such trees are XML tree structures. A node-labelled ordered tree can be defined as structure $T = (V, E, R, \lambda)$, where V is the set of nodes, E is the set of edges, R is the sibling relation (i.e., $(u, v) \in R$ if and only if v is the right sibling of u), and $\lambda : V \rightarrow \Sigma$ is the function that assigns labels to nodes. In the following, when we speak of a tree, we always mean a node-labelled ordered tree. A *forest* is a (possibly empty) ordered sequence of trees. We write $\mathcal{F}(\Sigma)$ for the set of all forests. The size $|F|$ of a forest is the number of nodes of F . Forests are the structures on which we want to enumerate query results.

We also use a term representation for forests, i. e., we write elements of $\mathcal{F}(\Sigma)$ as strings over the alphabet $\Sigma \cup \{(\cdot)\}$. For example, the forest from Figure 6 (in the Appendix) has the term representation $a(ba(a))bcb(c(ab))$ (or $a(b, a(a)), b, c, b(c(a, b))$ with commas for better readability).

Node-labelled binary trees (binary trees for short) are the special case of the trees from the previous paragraph, where every node is either a leaf or has two children (a left and a right child). It is then more common to replace the two relations E (edge relation) and R (sibling relation) by the relations E_ℓ (left edges) and E_r (right edges), where $(u, v) \in E_\ell$ (resp., $(u, v) \in E_r$) if v is the left (resp., right) child of u . We write $E = E_\ell \cup E_r$ for the set of all edges. Our binary trees have the additional property that Σ is partitioned into two disjoint sets Σ_0 and Σ_2 labelling leaves and internal nodes, respectively. We use the above term notation for general trees also for binary trees. With $\text{leaves}(T)$ we denote the set of leaves of

the binary tree T . We number the leaves of T from left to right starting with 0. The number assigned to $v \in \text{leaves}(T)$ is the *leaf number* of v ; see the binary tree in Figure 1, where the leaf numbers are written in blue color. Binary trees will be used for describing algebraic expressions (mainly expressions in the so-called forest algebra).

Unordered trees are trees, without node labels and without an order on the children of a node. They will be used as auxiliary data structures in our algorithms. An unordered tree will be defined as a pair (V, E) , where V is the set of nodes and E is the edge relation. An unordered forest is a disjoint union of unordered trees.

Trees with edge weights: We also have to consider (possibly unordered) trees, where the edges are labelled with weights from a monoid M . We then add to the description of the tree a function $\gamma : E \rightarrow M$ that assigns weights to edges. In our specific application, M will be the monoid $(\mathbb{N}, +)$. But there are further applications, where a different choice of M is needed; we will present one such situation in Appendix H. Since $M = (\mathbb{N}, +)$ in our application, we write the monoid additively, i.e., we use $+$ for the monoid operation and 0 for the neutral element. But let us emphasize that we do not use that M is commutative. The weights can be lifted from edges to paths in the natural way: let $(v_1, v_2, v_3, \dots, v_{d-1}, v_d)$ be the unique path from v_1 to a descendant v_d in the tree, i.e., $(v_i, v_{i+1}) \in E$ for all $i \in [1, d-1]$. We then define $\gamma(v_1, v_d)$ as the sum $\sum_{i=1}^{d-1} \gamma(v_i, v_{i+1})$. For a leaf v of the tree T we define $\gamma(v) = \gamma(r, v)$, where r is the root of T , and for a set of leaves S we define $\gamma(S) = \{\gamma(v) : v \in S\}$.

2.2 Monadic Second Order Logic Over Forests

We consider MSO-formulas that are interpreted over forests $F = (V, E, R, \lambda)$. Since any first-order variable x (that takes elements from V as values) can be replaced by a set variable X (an MSO-formula can express that X is a singleton set), we can restrict to MSO-formulas where all free variables are set variables. If Ψ is an MSO-formula with free set variables X_1, \dots, X_k and $S_1, \dots, S_k \subseteq V$ are node sets, then we write $(F, S_1, \dots, S_k) \models \Psi$ if the formula Ψ holds in the forest F if the variable X_i is set to S_i . To make the exposition less technical, we further restrict to MSO-formulas with a single free set variable X . This is actually no restriction; see Appendix A. The restriction to MSO-formulas with a single free set variable is a common one that can be found elsewhere in the literature; see, e.g., [3, 16].

2.3 Tree Automata

We consider two types of tree automata: deterministic bottom-up tree automata that work on binary trees and nondeterministic stepwise tree automata that work on general trees. Since they should implement queries on trees, they will be interpreted as selecting nodes from trees (this aspect is explained in more detail later on).

A **deterministic bottom-up tree automaton** (over the alphabets Σ_0, Σ_2) is represented by a tuple $\mathcal{B} = (Q, \Sigma_0, \Sigma_2, \delta_0, \delta_2, Q_f)$, where Q is a finite set of states, Σ_0 is the set of leaf node labels, Σ_2 is the set of labels for internal nodes, $Q_f \subseteq Q$ is the set of final states, $\delta_0 : \Sigma_0 \rightarrow Q$ assigns states to leaves of a tree, and $\delta_2 : Q \times Q \times \Sigma_2 \rightarrow Q$ assigns states to internal nodes depending on the node label and the states of the two children. For a given binary tree T we define the state $\mathcal{B}(T)$ as the unique state to which \mathcal{B} evaluates the tree T . It is inductively defined as follows, where $a \in \Sigma_0$ and $f \in \Sigma_2$:

- $\mathcal{B}(a) = \delta_0(a)$ and
- $\mathcal{B}(f(T_1, T_2)) = \delta_2(\mathcal{B}(T_1), \mathcal{B}(T_2), f)$ for trees T_1 and T_2 .

The binary tree T is accepted by \mathcal{B} if and only if $\mathcal{B}(T) \in Q_f$. With $L(\mathcal{B})$ we denote the set of binary trees accepted by \mathcal{B} . We use the abbreviation dBUTA for deterministic bottom-up tree automaton.

Stepwise tree automata (nSTAs for short) are an automaton model for forests that is equivalent to MSO-logic [11]. In fact, we only use known results for nSTAs (Theorems 2.1 and 4.2 below). Therefore we skip the definition of nSTAs in the main part of the paper; the interested reader can find the definition in Appendix B. With $L(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{F}(\Sigma)$ we denote the set of forests accepted by \mathcal{A} .

Tree automata can represent queries on trees and forests as follows. For a forest F (note that this includes trees) and a subset S of its nodes, we identify the pair (F, S) with the forest that is obtained

from F by relabelling every a -labelled node v of F ($a \in \Sigma$) with $(a, \beta) \in \Sigma \times \{0, 1\}$, where $\beta = 1$ if and only if $v \in S$. Intuitively, (F, S) represents the forest F from which the nodes in S have been selected (or the forest F together with a possible query result S). Our nSTAs become node-selecting, by taking $\Sigma \times \{0, 1\}$ as the set of node labels. Such an nSTA \mathcal{A} selects the node set S from a forest $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Sigma)$ if and only if $(F, S) \in L(\mathcal{A})$.

Our dBUTAs only need the ability to select leaves of binary trees, which means that we define them over the alphabets $\Sigma_0 \times \{0, 1\}$ (for leaf nodes) and Σ_2 (for internal nodes), i. e., we run them on pairs (T, S) , where T is a binary tree and S is a subset of its leaves.

In the following, we assume that all nSTAs and dBUTAs are node-selecting in the above sense. For the forest $F = (V, E, R, \lambda)$ and an nSTA \mathcal{A} we write

$$\text{select}(\mathcal{A}, F) = \{S \subseteq V : (F, S) \in L(\mathcal{A})\}$$

for the node set selected by the nSTA \mathcal{A} . Similarly, for a binary tree T and a dBUTA \mathcal{B} we define

$$\text{select}(\mathcal{B}, T) = \{S \subseteq \text{leaves}(T) : (T, S) \in L(\mathcal{B})\}.$$

It is known that MSO-formulas (that are interpreted over forests) can be translated into equivalent automata (and vice versa). More precisely, we use the following well-known fact:

Theorem 2.1 (c.f. [11]). *From an MSO-formula $\Psi(X)$ one can construct an nSTA \mathcal{A} such that for every forest $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Sigma)$ with node set V we have $\text{select}(\mathcal{A}, F) = \{S \subseteq V : (F, S) \models \Psi(X)\}$.*

Our main goal is to enumerate all sets $S \subseteq V$ such that $(F, S) \models \Psi(X)$ holds. By Theorem 2.1 this is equivalent to enumerate all S such that (F, S) is accepted by an nSTA. We will therefore ignore MSO logic in the following and directly start from an nSTA.

2.4 Enumeration Algorithms

We use the standard RAM model (with two restrictions for the register length; see the end of this section and the end of Section 3.2). An enumeration algorithm A produces on input I an *output sequence* $(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_m, \text{EOE})$, where EOE is the *end-of-enumeration* marker. We say that A on input I *enumerates* a set S if and only if the output sequence is $(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_m, \text{EOE})$, $|S| = m$ and $S = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_m\}$. The *preprocessing time* (of A on input I) is the time that elapses between starting $A(I)$ and the output of the first element, and the *delay* is the time that elapses between any two elements of the output sequence. The preprocessing time and the delay of A is the maximum preprocessing time and delay, respectively, over all possible inputs of length at most n (viewed as a function of n).

The gold standard in the area of enumeration algorithms is (i) *linear preprocessing* and (ii) *output-linear delay*. Linear preprocessing means that the preprocessing phase needs time $\mathcal{O}(|I|)$ and output-linear delay means that for every output s_i the delay is $\mathcal{O}(|s_i|)$. If every output s_i has constant size (which for the RAM model means that it occupies a constant number of registers), then output-linear delay is the same as constant delay.

We are interested in enumeration algorithms that enumerate the set $\text{select}(\mathcal{A}, F)$ for a fixed nSTA \mathcal{A} and a forest F . The input is F , while \mathcal{A} is fixed and not part of the input, i. e., we measure data complexity. Theorem 4.1 below also addresses the dependence in the size of \mathcal{A} , but we made no effort to optimize the latter.

The special feature of this work is that the input forest F is not given explicitly, but in a potentially highly compressed form, and the enumeration algorithm must be able to handle this compressed representation rather than decompressing it. This aspect shall be explained in detail in the next section.

Recall that we deal with weights from a monoid M (written in additive notation). We assume that an element of M can be stored in a single register of our RAM and that for given $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in M$, $\gamma_1 + \gamma_2$ can be computed in constant time on the RAM. In our application, M is the monoid $(\mathbb{N}, +)$, for which this assumption clearly holds (in Section 3.2 we say more about the bit lengths of the integers).

3 Tree compression

We are interested in enumerating the result of MSO-queries on *compressed forests*. For compression, we use the well-established grammar-based framework that has been investigated in the context of trees and




Figure 1: A forest algebra expression.

forests before [5, 23, 21, 29, 30]. For this, we first need to introduce the representation of trees by directed acyclic graphs.

3.1 Representing Trees by DAGs

An *unordered DAG* (with edge weights from the monoid M) is a triple $D = (V, E, \gamma)$, where V is a finite set of vertices, $E \subseteq V \times I \times V$ is the set of edges and the function $\gamma : E \rightarrow M$ assigns weights to edges. Here, I is a finite (unordered) index set, whose elements are used in order to distinguish multiple edges between the same endpoints. For D being a DAG, we require that the binary relation $\{(u, v) \in V \times V : \exists i \in I : (u, i, v) \in E\}$ is acyclic. The size $|D|$ of D is defined as $|E|$. The outdegree (resp., indegree) of a vertex v is the number of edges of the form (v, i, u) (resp., (u, i, v)).

A path (from v_1 to v_n) is a word $\pi = v_1 i_1 \cdots v_{n-1} i_{n-1} v_n$ such that $n \geq 1$ and $(v_k, i_k, v_{k+1}) \in E$ for all $1 \leq k \leq n-1$. The length of this path π is $n-1$ and its weight is the sum $\gamma(\pi) = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \gamma(v_k, i_k, v_{k+1})$. If $n=1$ (in which case we have $\pi = v_1$) we speak of an empty path. To define the (unordered) tree $\text{unfold}_D(v)$ for a vertex v we take for the node set all paths $v_1 d_1 \cdots v_{n-1} d_{n-1} v_n$ with $v_1 = v$ and $n \geq 1$. There is an edge from a path $\pi = v_1 i_1 \cdots v_{n-1} i_{n-1} v_n$ to every path of the form $\pi' = \pi j v'$ ($j \in I, v' \in V$) and the weight of this edge is $\gamma(v_n, j, v')$. For $v \in V$ and $U \subseteq V$ let $\text{path}_D(v, U)$ be the set of all paths from v to some vertex in U .

A (node-labelled) *binary DAG* (with edge weights) is a tuple $D = (V, E, \lambda, \gamma, v_0)$, where (V, E, γ) is a DAG as above with the index set $I = \{\ell, r\}$, v_0 is the root vertex and $\lambda : V \rightarrow \Sigma_0 \cup \Sigma_2$ is the vertex-labelling function. Moreover, for every $v \in V$, if v is a leaf in D (i.e., has outdegree zero), then $\lambda(v) \in \Sigma_0$, and if v has non-zero outdegree, then $\lambda(v) \in \Sigma_2$ and v has exactly two outgoing edges of the form (v, ℓ, v_1) (a left edge) and (v, r, v_2) (a right edge). We also omit the edge weight function γ from the description of the binary DAG D if it is not important and write $D = (V, E, \lambda, v_0)$ in this case.

We define the tree $\text{unfold}_D(v)$ for a binary DAG D as above. It becomes a binary node-labelled tree if we define the node labelling function λ as follows: for a path $\pi = v_1 i_1 \cdots i_{n-1} i_{n-1} v_n$ we set $\lambda(\pi) = \lambda(v_n)$. Moreover, the edge from a path π to a path $\pi j v'$ ($j \in \{\ell, r\}, v' \in V$) is a left (resp., right) edge if $j = \ell$ (resp., $j = r$). Finally, we define the binary tree $\text{unfold}(D)$ as $\text{unfold}_D(v_0)$.

3.2 Forest Straight-Line Programs

We next define the concept of forest straight-line programs, which combines the DAG-representation of trees with forest algebras.

Forest algebras: Recall that $\mathcal{F}(\Sigma)$ is the set of all forests with node labels from Σ . Let us fix a distinguished symbol $*$ $\notin \Sigma$. The set of forests $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Sigma \cup \{*\})$ such that $*$ has a unique occurrence in F and this occurrence is at a leaf node is denoted by $\mathcal{F}_*(\Sigma)$. Elements of $\mathcal{F}_*(\Sigma)$ are called *forest contexts*. Note that $\mathcal{F}(\Sigma) \cap \mathcal{F}_*(\Sigma) = \emptyset$. Following [6], we define the *forest algebra* as the 2-sorted algebra $\mathbf{F}(\Sigma) = (\mathcal{F}(\Sigma) \cup \mathcal{F}_*(\Sigma), \ominus, \oplus, \varepsilon, *)$, where $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{F}(\Sigma)$ is the empty forest, $*$ $\in \mathcal{F}_*(\Sigma)$ is the empty forest context, and \ominus (*horizontal concatenation*) and \oplus (*vertical concatenation*) are partially defined binary operations on $\mathcal{F}(\Sigma) \cup \mathcal{F}_*(\Sigma)$ that are defined as follows:

- For $F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{F}(\Sigma) \cup \mathcal{F}_*(\Sigma)$ such that $F_1 \in \mathcal{F}(\Sigma)$ or $F_2 \in \mathcal{F}(\Sigma)$, we set $F_1 \ominus F_2 = F_1 F_2$ (i.e., we concatenate the corresponding sequences of trees).




Figure 2: An example FSLP D (left side) that describes the tree $\llbracket D \rrbracket$ on the right side. The forest algebra expression that corresponds to D 's unfolding is shown in Figure 1.

- For $F_1 \in \mathcal{F}_*(\Sigma)$ and $F_2 \in \mathcal{F}(\Sigma) \cup \mathcal{F}_*(\Sigma)$, $F_1 \oplus F_2$ is obtained by replacing in F_1 the unique occurrence of $*$ by F_2 .

Note that $(\mathcal{F}(\Sigma), \ominus, \varepsilon)$ and $(\mathcal{F}_*(\Sigma), \oplus, *)$ are monoids. For $a \in \Sigma$, we write a_* for the forest context $a(*)$ which consists of an a -labelled root with a single child labelled with $*$. Note that $a = a_* \oplus \varepsilon$. In [6] the forest algebra is introduced as a two sorted algebra with the two sorts $\mathcal{F}(\Sigma)$ and $\mathcal{F}_*(\Sigma)$. Our approach with partially defined concatenation operators is equivalent.

A *forest algebra expression* is an expression over the algebra $\mathbb{F}(\Sigma)$ with atomic subexpressions of the form a and a_* for $a \in \Sigma$. Such an expression can be identified with a node-labelled binary tree, where every internal node is labelled with the operator \ominus or \oplus and every leaf is labelled with a symbol a or a_* for $a \in \Sigma$. Not all such trees are valid forest algebra expressions. For instance $a_* \ominus a_*$ is not valid, since it would produce a forest with two occurrences of $*$. It is easy to check with a dBUTA \mathcal{B}_0 with three states (see Appendix C), whether a binary tree is a valid forest algebra expression. We will only consider valid forest algebra expressions in the following. We write $\mathcal{E}(\Sigma)$ for the set of all valid forest algebra expressions. Elements of $\mathcal{E}(\Sigma)$ will be denoted with T_e . With $\llbracket T_e \rrbracket \in \mathcal{F}(\Sigma) \cup \mathcal{F}_*(\Sigma)$ we denote the forest or forest context obtained by evaluating T_e in the forest algebra. The empty forest ε and the empty forest context $*$ are not allowed in forest algebra expressions, which is not a restriction as long as we only want to produce non-empty forests and forest contexts; see [20, Lemma 3.27].

The leaves of $T_e \in \mathcal{E}(\Sigma)$ are in a one-to-one correspondence with the nodes of the forest $\llbracket T_e \rrbracket$. The T_e -number of a node of $\llbracket T_e \rrbracket$ is defined as the leaf number of the corresponding leaf of T_e . Note that every node of $\llbracket T_e \rrbracket$ is uniquely identified by its T_e -number. Figure 1 shows a forest algebra expression. The forest produced by this expression is shown on the right of Figure 2. Every node is labelled with its T_e -number in blue.

A **forest straight-line program** (over Σ), FSLP for short, is a binary DAG $D = (V, E, \lambda, v_0)$ (without edge weights for the moment) such that $\text{unfold}(D) \in \mathcal{E}(\Sigma)$ and $F := \llbracket \text{unfold}(D) \rrbracket \in \mathcal{F}(\Sigma)$. We also write $\llbracket D \rrbracket$ for this forest F . FSLPs were introduced in [32] in a more grammar-like but equivalent way. An FSLP where all internal vertices are labelled with \ominus is just a string straight-line program.

We now add edge weights to an FSLP. Consider an FSLP $D = (V, E, \lambda, v_0)$ with $T_e = \text{unfold}(D)$. Recall that we refer to the nodes of $F := \llbracket D \rrbracket = \llbracket T_e \rrbracket$ by their T_e -numbers. We will call these numbers also the D -numbers. Another representation of the nodes of $\llbracket D \rrbracket$ is given by paths from the root vertex v_0 to the leaves of the DAG D . These paths correspond to the leaves of the expression T_e and hence to the nodes of the forest F . The D -number of a node of F can be easily computed when walking down a path π from the root v_0 to a leaf of D if we assign to every edge $(u, d, v) \in E$ an integer weight $\gamma(u, d, v)$, called the *offset* of the edge. For left edges we set $\gamma(u, \ell, v) = 0$. Now consider a right edge (u, r, v_2) and let (u, ℓ, v_1) be the corresponding left edge for u . Then we define $\gamma(u, r, v_2)$ as the number of leaves in the tree $\text{unfold}_D(v_1)$. With this weight function γ , the D -number of the node of F that corresponds to the path π is exactly the weight $\gamma(\pi)$. Note that the D -number of a node v is not the same as the preorder

number of v .

Figure 2 shows an FSLP D on the left with the corresponding forest $\llbracket D \rrbracket$ (actually, a tree) on the right. Every edge of D is labelled with its offset. The red path in D determines the red c -labelled node in the tree $\llbracket D \rrbracket$. The D -number of this node is 14, which is the sum of edge weights of the red path.

We make the assumption that RAM-algorithms for an FSLP-compressed forest F have registers of word length $\mathcal{O}(\log |F|)$. This is a standard assumption in the area of algorithms for compressed data. It allows to store the D -number of a node of F in a register.

4 Main result and its proof outline

In this section we outline our enumeration algorithm for MSO-queries on FSLP-compressed forests. As explained before, we can directly start with an nSTA \mathcal{A} . The main result of the paper is:

Theorem 4.1. *From an nSTA \mathcal{A} with m states and an FSLP D one can compute in preprocessing time $\mathcal{O}(|D|) \cdot 2^{\mathcal{O}(m^4)}$ a data structure that allows to enumerate the set $\text{select}(\mathcal{A}, \llbracket D \rrbracket)$ with output-linear delay. In the enumeration, nodes of $\llbracket D \rrbracket$ are represented by their D -numbers.*

The first step in our proof of Theorem 4.1 is a reduction to binary trees. We use the following result that is implicitly shown in [26]; see also Appendix D. Let $\Sigma_0 = \{a, a_* : a \in \Sigma\}$ and $\Sigma_2 = \{\ominus, \oplus\}$:

Theorem 4.2 (c.f. [26]). *From an nSTA \mathcal{A} over Σ with m states one can construct a dBUTA \mathcal{B} over Σ_0, Σ_2 with $2^{m^2} + 2^{m^4} + 1$ states such that $L(\mathcal{B}) = \{T_e \in \mathcal{E}(\Sigma) : \llbracket T_e \rrbracket \in L(\mathcal{A})\}$.*

Theorem 4.2 is stated in [26] (except for the size bound) using the concept of finite transition algebras, which is equivalent to nSTAs.

Proof sketch for Theorem 4.1. We can apply Theorem 4.2 to the nSTA \mathcal{A} from Theorem 4.1. First recall that the leaves of $T_e \in \mathcal{E}(\Sigma)$ (with $\llbracket T_e \rrbracket \in \mathcal{F}(\Sigma)$) can be identified with the nodes of the forest $\llbracket T_e \rrbracket$. Hence, for a subset $S \subseteq \text{leaves}(T_e)$, we can view (T_e, S) (i. e., the tree T_e with the leaves from S selected; see Section 2.3) as a forest algebra expression from $\mathcal{E}(\Sigma \times \{0, 1\})$ such that $\llbracket (T_e, S) \rrbracket = (\llbracket T_e \rrbracket, S)$ (for this, we identify $(a, i)_*$ with (a_*, i) for $i \in \{0, 1\}$).

With Theorem 4.2 we obtain from the nSTA \mathcal{A} in Theorem 4.1 a dBUTA \mathcal{B} such that for every forest algebra expression T_e and every subset $S \subseteq \text{leaves}(T_e)$ we have: $(\llbracket T_e \rrbracket, S) \in L(\mathcal{A})$ iff $(T_e, S) \in L(\mathcal{B})$.

If the forest algebra expression T_e would be given explicitly (say, by a pointer structure) then we could use Bagan's algorithm from [2] in order to enumerate all sets S with $(T_e, S) \in L(\mathcal{B})$. But in the situation of Theorem 4.1 the expression T_e is not given explicitly but it is the unfolding $T_e = \text{unfold}(D)$ of the input FSLP D , which is a binary DAG. Let $F := \llbracket D \rrbracket = \llbracket T_e \rrbracket$ be the forest produced by the FSLP D . The nodes of F correspond to paths from the root to a leaf in the DAG D . We built an edge-labelled DAG from D by labelling every edge of the DAG D by its offset. The offsets are positive integers. All offsets can be easily computed in time $\mathcal{O}(|D|)$ by computing in a bottom-up parse for every node v of the DAG D the number of leaves of the tree $\text{unfold}_D(v)$. Recall that the sum of the offsets on a path π from the root to a leaf in D is exactly the D -number of the node of F that corresponds to the path π . It therefore suffices to prove the following theorem:

Theorem 4.3. *From a dBUTA \mathcal{B} with m states and a node-labelled binary DAG $D = (V, E, \lambda, \gamma, v_0)$ with edge weights from the monoid M , one can compute in preprocessing time $\mathcal{O}(|D| \cdot m^2)$ a data structure that allows to enumerate the set $\{\gamma(S) : S \in \text{select}(\mathcal{B}, \text{unfold}(D))\}$ with output-linear delay.²*

We obtain Theorem 4.1 by specializing M to $(\mathbb{N}, +)$ and taking for D an FSLP, whose edge weights are the offsets. By choosing for M a different, more complicated, monoid consisting of affine transformations on \mathbb{N} , one can also prove a variant of Theorem 4.1, where every node of $\llbracket D \rrbracket$ is represented by its preorder number (which is a more canonical representative of the node compared to the D -number); see Appendix H for details.

We will prove Theorem 4.3 (and hence Theorem 4.1) in Section 6 with the last missing piece moved to Section 7. The proof builds on Bagan's enumeration algorithm from [2], which solves the problem from

²For a general weight function γ , there may exist different sets $S_1, S_2 \in \text{select}(\mathcal{B}, \text{unfold}(D))$ such that $\gamma(S_1) = \gamma(S_2)$. In this case, our enumeration algorithm will enumerate the set $\gamma(S_1)$ twice. On the other hand, for the above weight function defined by offsets, we have $\gamma(S_1) \neq \gamma(S_2)$ whenever $S_1 \neq S_2$.




Figure 3: A witness tree: automaton states are in green, node names (if written) are in blue. The path from q_2 to r_3 is shown on the right with the nodes that branch off from the path.

Theorem 4.3 (without the weight function γ) for the case of a binary tree that is given explicitly and not as the unfolding of a DAG. In the following, we explain Bagan’s original algorithm. Then, in Section 7 we explain the main algorithmic tool that allows us to extend Bagan’s algorithm to DAGs. \square

5 Bagan’s algorithm for binary trees

Let $T = (V, E_\ell, E_r, \lambda, \gamma)$ be a node-labelled binary tree with edge weights as described in Section 2.1. The weights are from a monoid M . For a node $v \in V$ we denote with T_v the subtree rooted in v . For $S \subseteq \text{leaves}(T)$ and $v \in V$ we define $S_v = S \cap \text{leaves}(T_v)$.

Let $\mathcal{B} = (Q, \Sigma_0 \times \{0, 1\}, \Sigma_2, \delta_0, \delta_2, Q_f)$ be a dBUTA. We will first ignore the weights from the monoid M . Hence, we are interested in the non-empty sets in $\text{select}(\mathcal{B}, T)$ (whether $\emptyset \in \text{select}(\mathcal{B}, T)$ can be checked in the preprocessing). Bagan [2] was the first who presented an algorithm with output-linear delay for enumerating these sets. In the following we explain Bagan’s algorithm in a slightly different way that will be convenient for our extension to DAG-compressed binary trees, which will be the main building block for our enumeration algorithm for FSLP-compressed forests. Our discussion will be informal; see Appendix E for a formal treatment.

The goal of Bagan’s algorithm is to enumerate all non-empty sets $S \in \text{select}(\mathcal{B}, T)$ together with a witness that $(T, S) \in L(\mathcal{B})$ holds. A first step towards such a witness is to replace in T every node $v \in V$ by the pair (v, q) (a so-called *configuration*), where q is the unique state $q = \mathcal{B}(T_v, S_v)$ at which \mathcal{B} arrives in node v . Let us call this tree the *configuration tree*.

The delay for producing a solution S must be in $\mathcal{O}(|S|)$ (i.e., we need output-linear delay), but the configuration tree has size $|T|$ and is therefore too big. A next step towards a solution is to prune the configuration tree by keeping only those nodes that are on a path from the root to a leaf from S . This yields a tree with only $|S|$ many leaves that we call the *pruned configuration tree*. It is shown in Figure 3 for an example, where $S = \{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$. The old node names of T are written in blue, automaton states are written in green. All tree nodes of the new pruned configuration tree are from the following set of so-called *active configurations*:

$$\text{Conf}^a(T) = \{(v, q) : \exists S \subseteq \text{leaves}(T_v) : S \neq \emptyset, q = \mathcal{B}(T_v, S)\}.$$

But the pruned configuration tree is still too big because it may contain long paths of unary nodes (nodes with a single child except for the last node on the path). In Figure 3 these are the red paths. The edges on these paths can be described as follows. The configurations that were removed in the pruning are from the set

$$\text{Conf}^\emptyset(T) = \{(v, q) \in V \times Q : q = \mathcal{B}(T_v, \emptyset)\}.$$

The configurations $(w_1, s_1), \dots, (w_5, s_5)$ in Figure 3 on the right are from this set. On the set of active configurations $\text{Conf}^a(T)$ we define a weighted edge relation \rightarrow as follows: For active configurations

$(u, p), (v, q) \in \text{Conf}^a(T)$ with u internal in T and labelled with $f \in \Sigma_2$, there is an edge $(u, p) \rightarrow (v, q)$ with weight $\gamma((u, p), (v, q)) = \gamma(u, v)$ if there is $(v', q') \in \text{Conf}^0(T)$ such that one of the following two cases holds:

- $(u, v) \in E_\ell, (u, v') \in E_r$ and $\delta_2(q, q', f) = p$,
- $(u, v) \in E_r, (u, v') \in E_\ell$ and $\delta_2(q', q, f) = p$.

Then all the edges of the unary paths in the pruned configuration tree (the red paths in Figure 3) are of the above form $(u, p) \rightarrow (v, q)$. The configuration $(v', q') \in \text{Conf}^0(T)$ is a configuration to which an additional edge branches off from the red unary paths (configurations $(w_1, s_1), \dots, (w_5, s_5)$ in Figure 3). We define the edge weighted graph $T \otimes \mathcal{B} = (\text{Conf}^a(T), \rightarrow, \gamma)$. Since \mathcal{B} is deterministic and T is a tree, $T \otimes \mathcal{B}$ is an unordered forest.

The final idea is to contract the red paths in Figure 3 to single edges; this results in a tree of size $\mathcal{O}(|S|)$, which is called a *witness tree* W . To define (and construct) witness trees it is useful to define a further set of configurations, the so-called *useful configurations*: An active configuration $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^a(T)$ is useful if either v is a leaf in T or v has the children v_1, v_2 in T and there exist states $q_1, q_2 \in Q$ such that $\delta_2(q_1, q_2, \lambda(v)) = q$ and $(v_1, q_1), (v_2, q_2) \in \text{Conf}^a(T)$. We denote the set of useful configurations with $\text{Conf}^u(T)$. Note that $\text{Conf}^u(T) \subseteq \text{Conf}^a(T)$. The useful configurations are the leaves and the binary nodes in witness trees. In Figure 3 these are the configurations $(u_1, r_1), (u_2, r_2), (u_3, r_3)$ and $(v_2, p_2), (v_3, p_3)$.

Let us now give a the formal definition of witness trees:

Definition 5.1. A *witness tree* W for a configuration $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^a(T)$ is a tree with root (v, q) . It is constructed recursively: If $v \in \text{leaves}(T)$ then (v, q) is the only node of W . Assume now that $v \notin \text{leaves}(T)$. Then (v, q) has a single child, which is a configuration from $(v', q') \in \text{Conf}^u(T)$ such that $(v, q) \rightarrow^* (v', q')$ (we may have $(v', q') = (v, q)$ in which case we introduce a copy of (v, q)).³ If $v' \in \text{leaves}(T)$ then (v', q') is a leaf of W . Otherwise, let $(v', v_1) \in E_\ell$ and $(v', v_2) \in E_r$. Then there exist states q_1, q_2 such that $\delta_2(q_1, q_2, \lambda(v')) = q'$, $(v_1, q_1), (v_2, q_2) \in \text{Conf}^a(T)$ and the two children of (v', q') are (v_1, q_1) and (v_2, q_2) . The node (v_i, q_i) ($i \in \{1, 2\}$) is the root for a witness tree for (v_i, q_i) .

For a witness tree W , let $S(W)$ be the set of all $v \in \text{leaves}(T)$ such that some (v, q) is a leaf of W . The following lemma is proved in Appendix E.

Lemma 5.2. *The following holds for every $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^a(T)$:*

- Every witness tree W contains at most $4|S(W)|$ many nodes.
- If $\mathcal{B}(T_v, S) = q$ for some non-empty $S \subseteq \text{leaves}(T_v)$ then there is a unique witness tree W for (v, q) with $S = S(W)$.
- If there is a witness W for (v, q) then $\mathcal{B}(T_v, S(W)) = q$.

By this lemma, it suffices to enumerate all witness trees W for (r, q_f) where r is the root of T and q_f goes over all final states. Fix one q_f . The construction of witness trees for (r, q_f) follows the recursive definition of Definition 5.1. In order to systematically enumerate all witness trees, we have to fix a linear order on all witness trees such that from a witness tree W we can construct the next witness tree W' . One option (that is explained in more detail in Appendix E) is to list the nodes of a witness tree in preorder, say w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n . When we construct for a node $w = (v, q)$ of a witness tree the children of w , there are several choices according to Definition 5.1. We can order those choices linearly and assign to node w the choice number $c(w)$ if we took for w the $c(w)$ -th choice during the construction of the witness tree (for a leaf w we may set $c(w) = 0$). The choice sequence $c(w_1), c(w_2), \dots, c(w_n)$ then uniquely encodes the witness tree (since it can be constructed from the choice sequence). Moreover, we can order choice sequences lexicographically. It is then easy to construct from a given witness tree W the lexicographically next witness tree W' in time $\mathcal{O}(|W'|)$.

One can also show that all precomputations can be done in linear time; see Appendix E for a proof of the following lemma.

Lemma 5.3. *The sets $\text{Conf}^a(T)$, $\text{Conf}^u(T)$, $\text{Conf}^0(T)$, and the forest $T \otimes \mathcal{B}$ can be computed bottom-up on the tree T in time $\mathcal{O}(|T| \cdot |Q|^2)$.*

³Here, ' \rightarrow^* ' is the reflexive-transitive closure of ' \rightarrow '.

6 Bagan's algorithm for DAGs

Assume now that the binary tree T is given by a node-labelled binary DAG $D = (V, E, \lambda, \gamma, v_0)$ with edge weights from the monoid M . Thus, we have $T = \text{unfold}(D)$. Then, the forest $T \otimes \mathcal{B}$ can also be represented by a small DAG. To see this, first recall that the sets $\text{Conf}^a(T)$, $\text{Conf}^u(T)$, and $\text{Conf}^\emptyset(T)$ can be computed bottom-up for T ; see Lemma 5.3. In particular, if the subtrees T_v and T_w are isomorphic ($T_v \cong T_w$ for short) then for every state $q \in Q$ and every $x \in \{a, u, \emptyset\}$ we have $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^x(T)$ if and only if $(w, q) \in \text{Conf}^x(T)$. We can therefore define sets $\text{Conf}^x(D) \subseteq V \times Q$ by saying that $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^x(D)$ if and only if $(\tilde{v}, q) \in \text{Conf}^x(T)$, where \tilde{v} is any one of the tree nodes represented by the DAG node v (formally, \tilde{v} is a path in D from v_0 to v). The sets $\text{Conf}^a(D)$, $\text{Conf}^u(D)$, and $\text{Conf}^\emptyset(D)$ can be precomputed in time $\mathcal{O}(|D| \cdot |Q|^2)$ using exactly the same bottom-up computation as for Lemma 5.3.

We then define, analogously to $T \otimes \mathcal{B}$, the unordered DAG $D \otimes \mathcal{B} = (\text{Conf}^a(D), E', \gamma')$ with edge weights and index set $I = \{\ell, r\}$. To define the edge set $E' \subseteq \text{Conf}^a(D) \times \{\ell, r\} \times \text{Conf}^a(D)$, let $d \in \{\ell, r\}$ and $(v, q), (v', q') \in \text{Conf}^a(D)$ such that $\lambda(v) = f \in \Sigma_2$. Then, there is an edge $((v, q), d, (v', q')) \in E'$ of weight $\gamma(v, d, v')$ iff there is $(v'', q'') \in \text{Conf}^\emptyset(D)$ such that one of the following cases holds:

- $d = \ell$, $(v, \ell, v'), (v, r, v'') \in E$ and $\delta_2(q', q'', f) = q$.
- $d = r$, $(v, r, v'), (v, \ell, v'') \in E$ and $\delta_2(q'', q', f) = q$.

By a bottom-up computation along D , we can compute $D \otimes \mathcal{B}$ in time $\mathcal{O}(|D| \cdot |Q|^2)$ analogously to $T \otimes \mathcal{B}$.

If $T_v \cong T_w$ then $T_v \otimes \mathcal{B} \cong T_w \otimes \mathcal{B}$. More precisely, if ι is the isomorphism from T_v to T_w , then the mapping $(x, q) \mapsto (\iota(x), q)$ is an isomorphism from $T_v \otimes \mathcal{B}$ to $T_w \otimes \mathcal{B}$. We therefore obtain:

Lemma 6.1. $T \otimes \mathcal{B} \cong \text{unfold}(D \otimes \mathcal{B})$.

Our goal is to run the enumeration algorithm from Section 5 for the tree $T = \text{unfold}(D)$. Of course, we cannot afford to construct T explicitly; it can be of exponential size. The solution is the following: we enumerate witness trees W in the same way as we did before, but we want to work with the DAG $D \otimes \mathcal{B}$ instead of the forest $T \otimes \mathcal{B}$. More precisely, the algorithm should produce all witness trees W for $T = \text{unfold}(D)$. There is only one step, which is problematic. In Definition 5.1 one has to choose a configuration $(v', q') \in \text{Conf}^u(T)$ that can be reached from a configuration $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^a(T)$ in the forest $T \otimes \mathcal{B}$. The original variant of the algorithm of [2] precomputes a fixed linear order on the set of these (v', q') . In the DAG-version of the witness tree construction we have a configuration $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^a(D)$ and we want to extend the witness tree W below (v, q) . It is clearly not sufficient to merely enumerate all $(v', q') \in \text{Conf}^u(D)$ that are reachable from (v, q) in $D \otimes \mathcal{B}$ and continue the witness tree construction in (v', q') . What we have to do is to enumerate all paths from $\text{path}_{D \otimes \mathcal{B}}((v, q), \text{Conf}^u(D))$, i. e., all paths π from (v, q) to some configuration in $\text{Conf}^u(D)$. These paths correspond to the configurations in $\text{Conf}^u(T)$ that are reachable from (\tilde{v}, q) in $T \otimes \mathcal{B}$, where \tilde{v} is any one of the tree nodes represented by the DAG node v . In fact, it is not necessary to print out the actual paths $\pi \in \text{path}_{D \otimes \mathcal{B}}((v, q), \text{Conf}^u(D))$. We only need to keep from the path π its endpoint that we denote with $\omega(\pi)$ and its weight $\gamma(\pi)$. Hence, our new goal is to prove the following result:

Theorem 6.2. *Let $D = (V, E, \gamma)$ be an unordered DAG with edge weights from the monoid M and let $V_0 \subseteq V$ be a distinguished set of target vertices. In time $\mathcal{O}(|D|)$ one can compute a data structure that allows to enumerate for a given start node $s \in V$ in constant delay all pairs $\langle \omega(\pi_1), \gamma(\pi_1) \rangle, \dots, \langle \omega(\pi_k), \gamma(\pi_k) \rangle$ where $\text{path}_D(s, V_0) = \{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_k\}$.⁴*

Note that the data structure that is computed in the preprocessing phase from D and V_0 can be used for every start vertex s .

Once we have shown Theorem 6.2, it is easy to complete Bagan's algorithm for DAGs and thus prove Theorem 4.3. We build in the preprocessing phase the data structure from Theorem 6.2 for the DAG $D \otimes \mathcal{B}$ and take for V_0 the set $\text{Conf}^u(D)$. If during the construction of a witness tree W , we want to extend the current partial witness tree at a copy of configuration $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^a(D)$,⁵ we have to start the enumeration algorithm from Theorem 6.2 with $s = (v, q)$. Each time a pair $\langle (v', q'), \gamma' \rangle$ is produced by the

⁴In general, we might have $\langle \omega(\pi_i), \gamma(\pi_i) \rangle = \langle \omega(\pi_j), \gamma(\pi_j) \rangle$ for $i \neq j$, although this does not happen in our specific application, where the edge weights are offsets.

⁵In contrast to Section 5 the witness tree W may contain many copies of the same configuration (v, q) , i. e., several nodes that are labelled with the same configuration $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^a(D)$.

Algorithm 1: path_enumeration(s)

```
variables:  $v \in V, \gamma \in M, \text{stack } S \in (V_2 \times M)^*, \text{flag} \in \{0, 1\}$ 
1  $v := s; \gamma := 0; \text{stack} := \varepsilon; \text{flag} := 1;$ 
2 while true do
3   if flag = 1 then print  $\langle \omega_r[v], \gamma + \gamma_r[v] \rangle$  end;
4   flag := 1;
5   if  $v \in V_2$  then
6     if  $v[r] \in V_2$  then  $S.\text{push}\langle v[r], \gamma + \gamma(v, r, v[r]) \rangle$  end;
7      $v := v[\ell]; \gamma := \gamma + \gamma(v, \ell, v[\ell]);$ 
8   else if  $\text{stack} \neq \varepsilon$  then
9      $\langle v', \gamma' \rangle := S.\text{pop}; v := v'; \gamma := \gamma'; \text{flag} := 0;$ 
10  else
11  | print EOE; stop;
```

algorithm, we extend the current partial witness tree with an edge from (v, q) to (v', q') of weight $\gamma(v')$. Then we continue the extension of the witness tree in (v', q') . As in Section 5, the size of the witness tree W is $4|S(W)|$ (see Lemma 5.2), and we spend constant time for each node of W . For the latter, it is important that the algorithm from Theorem 6.2 works in constant delay. During the construction of the witness tree W we store for every node $w = (q, v)$ of W the sum of the edge weights from the root of W to w . For every leaf $w = (q, v)$ of the witness tree we then print the weight stored for w ; this yields the sets $\gamma(S)$ in Theorem 4.3.

7 Path enumeration in DAGs

In this section we sketch the proof of Theorem 6.2; see Appendix G for details. In a preprocessing phase, taking time $\mathcal{O}(|D|)$, we reduce to the simpler case, where (i) the DAG $D = (V, E, \gamma)$ is *binary* (every vertex v has outdegree zero or two) and (ii) V_0 is the set of leaves of D . For a vertex $v \in V_2 := V \setminus V_0$ we write $v[\ell]$ (resp., $v[r]$) for the left (resp., right) child of v . For a vertex v we denote by $\omega_r[v] \in V_0$ the unique leaf that is reached from v by only following right edges, and we define $\gamma_r[v]$ to be the sum of the weights along this path of right edges. This data can be easily computed in time $\mathcal{O}(|D|)$. Now, the task is to enumerate for a given vertex s all pairs $\langle \omega(\pi_1), \gamma(\pi_1) \rangle, \dots, \langle \omega(\pi_k), \gamma(\pi_k) \rangle$, where $\{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_k\} = \text{path}_D(s, V_0)$. We assume for simplicity that $\gamma(\pi_i) \neq \gamma(\pi_j)$ whenever $i \neq j$ (which holds in our application; see the footnote in Theorem 6.2); see Appendix G for the general case.

We will now explain our path enumeration algorithm (Algorithm 1). We ignore Lines 3 and 4, and the flag variable for the moment. Let T_s be the tree obtained from unfolding the DAG D starting from s . By the assumption from the previous paragraph, the nodes of T_s can be identified with the pairs $\langle v, \gamma \rangle$, where γ is the weight of a path from s to $v \in V$. Such a pair is stored by the algorithm. The current pair $\langle v, \gamma \rangle$ is updated according to a preorder traversal of T_s : If v is an inner vertex (Line 5), then we move on to its left child (Line 7) and store its right child on the stack (Line 6). When we reach a leaf (Line 8), we pop the topmost stack element (Line 9) and continue the traversal there, unless the stack is empty, in which case the algorithm terminates (Line 11). The weight γ is correctly updated in Lines 6, 7 and 9.

We also print all pairs $\langle \omega(\pi_1), \gamma(\pi_1) \rangle, \dots, \langle \omega(\pi_k), \gamma(\pi_k) \rangle$ from Theorem 6.2, which are exactly the pairs $\langle v, \gamma \rangle$ where v is a leaf of D and γ is the weight of a path from s to v . However, printing these pairs when we see them during the preorder traversal would not result in a constant delay. Instead, whenever we visit a pair $\langle v, \gamma \rangle$, we print the pair $\langle \omega_r[v], \gamma + \gamma_r[v] \rangle$, i. e., the leaf reached from v by only moving along right edges together with the weight of the corresponding path (note that this pair is among those pairs that have to be enumerated). This is done in Line 3 (assume for now that the flag is 1). This, however, leads to duplicates whenever the variable v is updated in Line 9 due to a pop of the stack, since then $\langle \omega_r[v], \gamma + \gamma_r[v] \rangle$ has already been produced in an earlier iteration where we have visited an ancestor of $\langle v, \gamma \rangle$ (this was the reason why $\langle v, \gamma \rangle$ ended up on the stack in the first place). Consequently, we use the flag to avoid this: whenever the new pair $\langle v, \gamma \rangle$ is obtained by popping from the stack (Line 9), we set the flag to 0 to avoid that we output $\langle \omega_r[v], \gamma + \gamma_r[v] \rangle$ in the next iteration of Line 3. Moreover, since v is an inner vertex (otherwise $\langle v, \gamma \rangle$ would not be on the stack), we know that we will next descend from

$\langle v, \gamma \rangle$ to its left child in Line 7, which corresponds to visiting a new node of T_s . Thus, we know that $\langle \omega_r[v], \gamma + \gamma_r[v] \rangle$ has not been produced before, and therefore it is now correct to output $\langle \omega_r[v], \gamma + \gamma_r[v] \rangle$ when we reach Line 3 the next time. This explains why we set the flag back to 1 every time we reach Line 3 with the flag being 0.

Let $\langle u, \zeta \rangle$ be a leaf of T_s . If $\langle u, \zeta \rangle$ is a left child, then it is produced when $v = u$ and $\gamma = \zeta$ (because $\omega_r[u] = u$ and $\gamma_r[\zeta] = 0$), which happens at some point. If $\langle u, \zeta \rangle$ is a right child then it is not explicitly visited, since only right children that are inner nodes are pushed on the stack (Line 6). We nevertheless print $\langle u, \zeta \rangle$ when we visit the highest ancestor (in the sense of being closest to the root) of $\langle u, \zeta \rangle$ in T_s from which only right edges lead to $\langle u, \zeta \rangle$. Hence, we produce exactly $\langle \omega(\pi_1), \gamma(\pi_1) \rangle, \dots, \langle \omega(\pi_k), \gamma(\pi_k) \rangle$ where $\{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_k\} = \text{path}_D(s, V_0)$.

The delay of Algorithm 1 is constant since there cannot be two consecutive iterations of the while loop where the flag is 0.

8 Conclusions

We conclude with a brief discussion of related aspects of our result. It is possible to support in time $\mathcal{O}(\log |F|)$ relabelling updates, i. e., updates that change the current label of a given node v to a given label $a \in \Sigma$. By updating the path in the FSLP that represents v , such an update can be carried out in time linear in the depth of the FSLP. By using the linear time balancing theorem from [20, Corollary 3.28], the depth can be assumed to be $\mathcal{O}(\log |F|)$. We conjecture that the deletion and insertion updates from [26] can be also implemented in time $\mathcal{O}(\log |F|)$ when F is given by an FSLP. However, [26] uses a quite technical notion of balancedness for forest algebra parse trees and it is not clear how to preserve this notion of balancedness when the parse tree is compressed as a DAG. See Appendix I for a more detailed discussion of these aspects.

For the case that M is a group, Theorem 6.2 can also be proven by using a known technique for the real-time traversal of SLP-compressed strings (see [22, 32]). However, if we want to represent the nodes of the solution sets in Theorem 4.1 by their preorder numbers (the arguably more intuitive representation) instead of their D -numbers we need for M a monoid, which is not a group (see Appendix H). Another disadvantage is that the real-time traversal of SLP-compressed strings needs a tree data structure that provides so-called next link queries. While such data structures can be constructed in linear time, this is not straightforward and would significantly complicate an implementation of our algorithm. In general, we believe that our approach is simple to implement, which makes an experimental analysis in the vein of [30] possible.

Acknowledgments

The second author is supported by the German Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, DFG) – project number 522576760 (gefördert durch die Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) – Projektnummer 522576760).

References

- [1] Antoine Amarilli, Pierre Bourhis, Stefan Mengel, and Matthias Niewerth. Enumeration on trees with tractable combined complexity and efficient updates. In *Proceedings of the 38th ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGAI Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, PODS 2019*, pages 89–103. ACM, 2019.
- [2] Guillaume Bagan. MSO queries on tree decomposable structures are computable with linear delay. In Zoltán Ésik, editor, *Computer Science Logic, 20th International Workshop, CSL 2006, 15th Annual Conference of the EACSL, Szeged, Hungary, September 25-29, 2006, Proceedings*, volume 4207 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 167–181. Springer, 2006.
- [3] Guillaume Bagan. *Algorithmes et complexité des problèmes d'énumération pour l'évaluation de requêtes logiques. (Algorithms and complexity of enumeration problems for the evaluation of logical queries)*. PhD thesis, University of Caen Normandy, France, 2009.

- [4] Hideo Bannai, Momoko Hirayama, Danny HucKe, Shunsuke Inenaga, Artur Jez, Markus Lohrey, and Carl Philipp Reh. The smallest grammar problem revisited. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 67(1):317–328, 2021.
- [5] Philip Bille, Inge Li Gørtz, Gad M. Landau, and Oren Weimann. Tree compression with top trees. *Information and Computation*, 243:166–177, 2015.
- [6] Miłkołaj Bojańczyk and Igor Walukiewicz. Forest algebras. In *Proceedings of Logic and Automata: History and Perspectives [in Honor of Wolfgang Thomas]*, volume 2 of *Texts in Logic and Games*, pages 107–132. Amsterdam University Press, 2008.
- [7] Stefan Böttcher, Rita Hartel, and Christoph Krislin. Clux - clustering XML sub-trees. In *ICEIS 2010 - Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Enterprise Information Systems, Volume 1, DISI, Funchal, Madeira, Portugal, June 8 - 12, 2010*, pages 142–150, 2010.
- [8] Mireille Bousquet-Mélou, Markus Lohrey, Sebastian Maneth, and Eric Nöth. XML compression via directed acyclic graphs. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 57(4):1322–1371, 2015.
- [9] Peter Buneman, Martin Grohe, and Christoph Koch. Path queries on compressed XML. In *Proceedings of 29th International Conference on Very Large Data Bases, VLDB 2003, Berlin, Germany, September 9-12, 2003*, pages 141–152, 2003.
- [10] Giorgio Busatto, Markus Lohrey, and Sebastian Maneth. Efficient memory representation of XML document trees. *Inf. Syst.*, 33(4-5):456–474, 2008.
- [11] Julien Carme, Joachim Niehren, and Marc Tommasi. Querying unranked trees with stepwise tree automata. In Vincent van Oostrom, editor, *Rewriting Techniques and Applications, 15th International Conference, RTA 2004, Aachen, Germany, June 3-5, 2004, Proceedings*, volume 3091 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 105–118. Springer, 2004.
- [12] Katrin Casel, Henning Fernau, Serge Gaspers, Benjamin Gras, and Markus L. Schmid. On the complexity of the smallest grammar problem over fixed alphabets. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 65(2):344–409, 2021.
- [13] Moses Charikar, Eric Lehman, Ding Liu, Rina Panigrahy, Manoj Prabhakaran, Amit Sahai, and Abhi Shelat. The smallest grammar problem. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 51(7):2554–2576, 2005.
- [14] Bruno Courcelle. Linear delay enumeration and monadic second-order logic. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 157(12):2675–2700, 2009.
- [15] Bartłomiej Dudek and Paweł Gawrychowski. Slowing down top trees for better worst-case compression. In *Proceedings of the Annual Symposium on Combinatorial Pattern Matching, CPM 2018*, volume 105 of *LIPICs*, pages 16:1–16:8. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2018.
- [16] Markus Frick, Martin Grohe, and Christoph Koch. Query evaluation on compressed trees (extended abstract). In *18th IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS 2003), 22-25 June 2003, Ottawa, Canada, Proceedings*, page 188. IEEE Computer Society, 2003.
- [17] Moses Ganardi. Compression by Contracting Straight-Line Programs. In *Proceedings of the 29th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA 2021)*, volume 204 of *LIPICs*, pages 45:1–45:16. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021.
- [18] Moses Ganardi and Paweł Gawrychowski. Pattern matching on grammar-compressed strings in linear time. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2022, Virtual Conference / Alexandria, VA, USA, January 9 - 12, 2022*, pages 2833–2846, 2022.
- [19] Moses Ganardi, Danny HucKe, Artur Jez, Markus Lohrey, and Eric Noeth. Constructing small tree grammars and small circuits for formulas. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 86:136–158, 2017.

- [20] Moses Ganardi, Artur Jez, and Markus Lohrey. Balancing straight-line programs. *Journal of the ACM*, 68(4):27:1–27:40, 2021.
- [21] Adrià Gascón, Markus Lohrey, Sebastian Maneth, Carl Philipp Reh, and Kurt Sieber. Grammar-based compression of unranked trees. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 64(1):141–176, 2020.
- [22] Leszek Gasieniec, Roman M. Kolpakov, Igor Potapov, and Paul Sant. Real-time traversal in grammar-based compressed files. In *Proceedings to the 2005 Data Compression Conference, DCC 2005*, page 458. IEEE Computer Society, 2005.
- [23] Pawel Gawrychowski and Artur Jez. LZ77 Factorisation of Trees. In *Proceedings of the 36th IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science, FSTTCS 2016*, volume 65 of *LIPICs*, pages 35:1–35:15. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2016.
- [24] Lorenz Hübschle-Schneider and Rajeev Raman. Tree compression with top trees revisited. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Symposium on Experimental Algorithms, SEA 2015*, volume 9125 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 15–27. Springer, 2015.
- [25] Wojciech Kazana and Luc Segoufin. Enumeration of monadic second-order queries on trees. *ACM Trans. Comput. Log.*, 14(4):25:1–25:12, 2013.
- [26] Sarah Kleest-Meißner, Jonas Marasus, and Matthias Niewerth. MSO queries on trees: Enumerating answers under updates using forest algebras. *CoRR*, abs/2208.04180, 2022.
- [27] Ming Li and Paul M. B. Vitányi. *An Introduction to Kolmogorov Complexity and Its Applications, Third Edition*. Texts in Computer Science. Springer, 2008.
- [28] Markus Lohrey. Algorithmics on SLP-compressed strings: A survey. *Groups Complexity Cryptology*, 4(2):241–299, 2012.
- [29] Markus Lohrey. Grammar-based tree compression. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Developments in Language Theory, DLT 2015*, volume 9168 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 46–57. Springer, 2015.
- [30] Markus Lohrey, Sebastian Maneth, and Roy Mennicke. XML tree structure compression using repair. *Information Systems*, 38(8):1150–1167, 2013.
- [31] Markus Lohrey, Sebastian Maneth, and Carl Philipp Reh. Compression of unordered XML trees. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Database Theory, ICDT 2017*, volume 68 of *LIPICs*, pages 18:1–18:17. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2017.
- [32] Markus Lohrey, Sebastian Maneth, and Carl Philipp Reh. Constant-time tree traversal and subtree equality check for grammar-compressed trees. *Algorithmica*, 80(7):2082–2105, 2018.
- [33] Markus Lohrey, Sebastian Maneth, and Manfred Schmidt-Schauß. Parameter reduction and automata evaluation for grammar-compressed trees. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 78(5):1651–1669, 2012.
- [34] Martin Muñoz and Cristian Riveros. Constant-delay enumeration for SLP-compressed documents. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on Database Theory, ICDT 2023*, volume 255 of *LIPICs*, pages 7:1–7:17. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023.
- [35] Matthias Niewerth. MSO queries on trees: Enumerating answers under updates using forest algebras. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2018, Oxford, UK, July 09-12, 2018*, pages 769–778, 2018.
- [36] W. Rytter. Application of Lempel-Ziv factorization to the approximation of grammar-based compression. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 302(1–3):211–222, 2003.
- [37] Markus L. Schmid and Nicole Schweikardt. Spanner evaluation over slp-compressed documents. In *PODS’21: Proceedings of the 40th ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGAI Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, Virtual Event, China, June 20-25, 2021*, pages 153–165, 2021.

- [38] Markus L. Schmid and Nicole Schweikardt. Query evaluation over SLP-represented document databases with complex document editing. In *Proceedings of 41st Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, PODS 2022*, pages 79–89. ACM, 2022.
- [39] Yasuo Tabei, Yoshimasa Takabatake, and Hiroshi Sakamoto. A succinct grammar compression. In *Proceedings of the 24th Annual Symposium on Combinatorial Pattern Matching, CPM 2013*, volume 7922 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 235–246. Springer, 2013.

APPENDIX

A Details for Section 2.2

We show how to reduce the number of set variables in MSO-formulas to one. Consider an MSO-formula Ψ with $k \geq 1$ free set variables and let $F = (V, E, R, \lambda)$ be a forest. We then add to the alphabet of node labels k new symbols $1, 2, \dots, k$ and add for every node $v \in V$ fresh leaves v_1, \dots, v_k (in this order, where v_1 becomes the first child of v) together with the edges $(v, v_1), \dots, (v, v_k)$. We label v_i with i . If F' denotes the resulting forest then it is straightforward to translate Ψ into an MSO-formula Ψ' with a single free set variable such that

- for all subsets $S_1, \dots, S_k \subseteq V$ we have $(F, S_1, \dots, S_k) \models \Psi$ iff $(F', S') \models \Psi'$, where $S' = \{v_i : v \in S_i, 1 \leq i \leq k\}$ and
- if S' is a set of nodes of Ψ' such that $(F', S') \models \Psi'$ then $S' \subseteq \{v_i : v \in V, 1 \leq i \leq k\}$.

Hence, an enumeration algorithm for the set $\{S' : (F', S') \models \Psi'\}$ directly yields an enumeration algorithm for the set $\{(S_1, \dots, S_k) : (F, S_1, \dots, S_k) \models \Psi\}$.

When the forest F is given in compressed form by an FSLP D (see Section 3.2), it is straightforward to compute from D a new FSLP D' that produces the above forest F' . For this one has to replace every vertex in D that is labelled with a (resp., a_*) by a subFSLP that produces the forest $1, 2, \dots, k, a$ (resp., the forest context $1, 2, \dots, k, a_*$).

Finally, note that if we have the preorder numbers for a set of nodes $S' \subseteq \{v_i : v \in V, 1 \leq i \leq k\}$ then we can easily compute the preorder numbers of the nodes in $S_i = \{v \in V : v_i \in S'\} \subseteq V$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. For every preorder number m of a node from S' we put $m \operatorname{div} (k+1)$ into the set of preorder numbers of nodes from $S_{m \operatorname{mod} (k+1)}$. A similar argument holds for the D -numbers from Section 3.2.

B Details for Section 2.3

Stepwise tree automata are an automaton model for forests that is equivalent to MSO-logic [11].⁶ We follow the definition from [26]. A nondeterministic stepwise tree automaton (nSTA for short) over the alphabet Σ is a tuple $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, \iota, q_0, q_f)$ with the following properties:

- Q is a finite set of states,
- $\delta \subseteq Q \times Q \times Q$ is the transition relation,
- $\iota : \Sigma \rightarrow 2^Q$ assigns a set of local initial states to each alphabet symbol,
- q_0 is the global initial state, and
- q_f is the global final state.

Let $F = (V, E, R, \lambda) \in \mathcal{F}(\Sigma)$ be a forest with root nodes $v_1, \dots, v_k \in V$; v_1 is the left-most root and v_k is the right-most root. If F is a tree, we have $v_1 = v_k$. For states $q_1, q_2 \in Q$, a (q_1, q_2) -run of \mathcal{A} on the forest F is given by three mappings $\rho_0 : V \rightarrow Q$ (called λ_{pre} in [26]), $\rho_1 : V \rightarrow Q$ (called λ_{self} in [26]), and $\rho_f : V \rightarrow Q$ (called λ_{post} in [26]) such that the following conditions hold:

⁶Stepwise tree automata are defined in such a way that they can run on forests, so they should be called stepwise forest automata, but we prefer to use the existing terminology.

- $\rho_0(v_1) = q_1$,
- $\rho_f(v_k) = q_2$,
- $\rho_0(v) \in \iota(\lambda(u))$ if v is the first child of u ,
- $\rho_0(v) = \rho_f(u)$ if u is the left sibling of v (this includes the case where $u = v_i$ and $v = v_{i+1}$ for some $1 \leq i \leq k-1$),
- $\rho_1(v) \in \iota(\lambda(v))$ if v is a leaf, and
- $\rho_1(v) = \rho_f(u)$ if u is the last child of v ,
- $(\rho_0(v), \rho_1(f), \rho_f(v)) \in \delta$ for all nodes v .

A forest F is accepted by \mathcal{A} if its has a (q_0, q_f) -run. With $L(\mathcal{A})$ we denote the set of forests accepted by \mathcal{A} .

C Details for Section 3.2

The dBUTA \mathcal{B}_0 for checking whether a given forest algebra expression is valid has the state set $\{0, 1, \text{failure}\}$ and the transition functions δ_0 and δ_2 are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_0(a) &= 0, \delta_0(a_*) = 1 \\
\delta_2(0, 0, \ominus) &= 0, \delta_2(0, 1, \ominus) = \delta_2(1, 0, \ominus) = 1, \delta_2(1, 1, \ominus) = \text{failure} \\
\delta_2(1, 0, \oplus) &= 0, \delta_2(1, 1, \oplus) = 1, \delta_2(0, 0, \oplus) = \delta_2(0, 1, \oplus) = \text{failure} \\
\delta_2(p, q, \oplus) &= \text{failure if } p = \text{failure or } q = \text{failure}
\end{aligned}$$

Then a forest algebra expression tree T is a *valid forest algebra expression* if and only if $\mathcal{B}_0(T) \in \{0, 1\}$. If $\mathcal{B}_0(T) = 0$ then $\llbracket T \rrbracket \in \mathcal{F}(\Sigma)$ and if $\mathcal{B}_0(T) = 1$ then $\llbracket T \rrbracket \in \mathcal{F}_*(\Sigma)$.

D Proof of Theorem 4.2

The following construction is from [26] (see the definition before [26, Lemma 4.3]). We fix the nSTA $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, \iota, q_0, q_f)$. Recall that $\Sigma_0 = \{a, a_* : a \in \Sigma\}$ and $\Sigma_2 = \{\ominus, \oplus\}$. Let $\mathcal{P} = 2^{Q^2} \cup 2^{Q^4} \cup \{\text{failure}\}$ be the set of states of the dBUTA \mathcal{B} . The transition mappings $\delta_0 : \Sigma_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ and $\delta_2 : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{P} \times \Sigma_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ of \mathcal{B} are defined as follows, where $P_1, P_2 \subseteq Q^2$ and $Q_1, Q_2 \subseteq Q^4$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_0(a) &= \{\langle p_1, p_2 \rangle \in Q^2 : \exists q \in \iota(a) : (p_1, q, p_2) \in \delta\} \\
\delta_0(a_*) &= \{\langle p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4 \rangle \in Q^4 : p_3 \in \iota(a), (p_1, p_4, p_2) \in \delta\} \\
\delta_2(P_1, P_2, \ominus) &= \{\langle p_1, p_3 \rangle : \exists p_2 \in Q : \langle p_1, p_2 \rangle \in P_1, \langle p_2, p_3 \rangle \in P_2\} \\
\delta_2(P_1, Q_2, \ominus) &= \{\langle p_1, p_3, q_1, q_2 \rangle : \exists p_2 \in Q : \langle p_1, p_2 \rangle \in P_1, \\
&\quad \langle p_2, p_3, q_1, q_2 \rangle \in Q_2\} \\
\delta_2(Q_1, P_2, \ominus) &= \{\langle p_1, p_3, q_1, q_2 \rangle : \exists p_2 \in Q : \langle p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2 \rangle \in Q_1, \\
&\quad \langle p_2, p_3 \rangle \in P_2\} \\
\delta_2(Q_1, P_2, \oplus) &= \{\langle p_1, p_2 \rangle : \exists q_1, q_2 \in Q : \langle p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2 \rangle \in Q_1, \\
&\quad \langle q_1, q_2 \rangle \in P_2\} \\
\delta_2(Q_1, Q_2, \oplus) &= \{\langle p_1, p_2, p_5, p_6 \rangle : \exists p_3, p_4 \in Q : \langle p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4 \rangle \in Q_1, \\
&\quad \langle p_3, p_4, p_5, p_6 \rangle \in Q_2\}
\end{aligned}$$

In all cases, where δ_0 and δ_2 are not defined by the above rules, we return **failure**. One can show that for every $T_e \in \mathcal{E}(\Sigma)$ with $F = \llbracket T_e \rrbracket \in \mathcal{F}(\Sigma)$ and all states $p, q \in Q$ we have: there is a (p, q) -run of \mathcal{A} on F if and only if $(p, q) \in \mathcal{B}(T_e)$. This is the content of [26, Lemma 4.5] (for forests). Hence, we can take (q_0, q_f) as the unique final state of \mathcal{B} . \square

E Details for Section 5

In this section we give a more detailed explanation of Bagan's algorithm from [2]. In Section E.1 we introduce some notation from [2]. In Section E.2 we explain Bagan's algorithm in a slightly different way using so-called witness trees. This concept will make the generalization to DAG-compressed trees easier.

E.1 Notations from Bagan's paper

Let $T = (V, E_\ell, E_r, \lambda, \gamma)$ be a node-labelled binary tree with edge weights as described in Section 2.1. The weights are from a monoid M . In the following we write the monoid M of edge weights in multiplicative notation, i.e., we write $\gamma_1 \cdot \gamma_2$ for the product of two monoid elements and we write 1 for the neutral element of the monoid. This is motivated by the fact that later we present a non-commutative monoid of edge weights that allows to prove the variant of Theorem 4.1 where nodes of $\llbracket D \rrbracket$ are represented by their preorder numbers; see Appendix H.

For a node $v \in V$ we denote with T_v the subtree rooted in v . For $S \subseteq \text{leaves}(T)$ and $v \in V$ we define $S_v = S \cap \text{leaves}(T_v)$.

Let $\mathcal{B} = (Q, \Sigma_0 \times \{0, 1\}, \Sigma_2, \delta_0, \delta_2, Q_f)$ be a dBUTA. We will first ignore the weights from the monoid M . Hence, we are interested in the set $\text{select}(\mathcal{B}, T)$. Bagan [2] was the first who presented an algorithm with output-linear delay for enumerating this set. In the following we explain Bagan's algorithm in a slightly different way that will be convenient for our extension of Bagan's algorithm to DAG-compressed binary trees, which is the main building block for our enumeration algorithm for FSLP-compressed forests.

Let us repeat the main notations from [2]. On a run of \mathcal{B} on T or on subtrees of T , each node is labelled by some state, and we denote the resulting pairs from $V \times Q$ as *configurations*. Each configuration (v, q) induces the set of leaf sets $S \subseteq \text{leaves}(T_v)$ that cause \mathcal{B} on the leaf-marked tree (T_v, S) to end up in state q at the root v , i.e., $q = \mathcal{B}(T_v, S)$. We can ignore configurations (v, q) for which no such leaf set S exists, and focus on the other ones, that we call *possible*. Moreover, we consider (v, q) as *active*, if there is at least one non-empty $S \subseteq \text{leaves}(T_v)$ with $q = \mathcal{B}(T_v, S)$; otherwise, the configuration (v, q) is not involved in the generation of the solution sets. Finally, if v has children v_1 and v_2 , then we consider (v, q) as a *useful* configuration if $q = \mathcal{B}(T_v, S)$ for a set $S \subseteq \text{leaves}(T_v)$ with $S_{v_1} \neq \emptyset \neq S_{v_2}$ (recall that S_{v_i} is the part of S that lies in T_{v_i}). Intuitively, this means that in the run of \mathcal{B} on (T_v, S) , the final configuration (v, q) represents a useful branch that partitions S into two non-empty parts. For leaves v , we consider all active configuration (v, q) also as useful. Let us now cast these intuition in formal definitions as also done in [2]. First, for $v \in V$ and $q \in Q$ we define certain subsets of $\text{leaves}(T_v)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}^p(v, q) &= \{S \subseteq \text{leaves}(T_v) : q = \mathcal{B}(T_v, S)\} \\ \mathcal{S}^a(v, q) &= \mathcal{S}^p(v, q) \setminus \{\emptyset\} \\ \mathcal{S}^u(v, q) &= \{S \in \mathcal{S}^a(v, q) : S_{v'} \neq \emptyset \text{ for every child } v' \text{ of } v\} \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mathcal{S}^u(v, q) = \mathcal{S}^a(v, q)$ for a leaf v . For $x \in \{p, a, u\}$ we define

$$\text{Conf}^x(T) = \{(v, q) : \mathcal{S}^x(v, q) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Configurations in $\text{Conf}^p(T)$ (resp., $\text{Conf}^a(T)$, $\text{Conf}^u(T)$) are called *possible* (resp., *active*, *useful*). In addition we define

$$\text{Conf}^\emptyset(T) = \{(v, q) \in V \times Q : q = \mathcal{B}(T_v, \emptyset)\}.$$

Note that $\text{Conf}^u(T) \subseteq \text{Conf}^a(T) \subseteq \text{Conf}^p(T)$.

Let u be internal with left child v and right child v' , and let (u, p) be an active configuration. Intuitively, the set $\mathcal{S}^a(u, p)$ can be constructed from all sets $\mathcal{S}^p(v, q)$ and $\mathcal{S}^p(v', q')$, where (v, q) and (v', q') are possible configurations and $\delta_2(q, q', \lambda(u)) = p$. More precisely, $\mathcal{S}^a(u, p)$ contains all sets $S \cup S'$, where $S \in \mathcal{S}^p(v, q)$ and $S' \in \mathcal{S}^p(v', q')$ with $S \neq \emptyset$ or $S' \neq \emptyset$. Here q and q' range over all states such that (v, q) and (v', q') are possible configurations and $\delta_2(q, q', \lambda(u)) = p$. This directly leads to a recursion, which is the base of the enumeration algorithm: We construct the next set of $\mathcal{S}^a(u, p)$ by combining the next sets from $\mathcal{S}^p(v, q)$ and $\mathcal{S}^p(v', q')$. However, since one (but not both) of these two sets can be empty, there may be long paths in this recursion that do not produce any new elements. To formalize this issue, we define an unordered edge-weighted forest

$$T \otimes \mathcal{B} = (\text{Conf}^a(T), \rightarrow, \gamma).$$

Its set of nodes is $\text{Conf}^a(T)$. For $(u, p), (v, q) \in \text{Conf}^a(T)$ with u internal and $\lambda(u) = f \in \Sigma_2$, there is an edge $(u, p) \rightarrow (v, q)$ if there is $(v', q') \in \text{Conf}^\emptyset(T)$ such that one of the following two cases holds:

- $(u, v) \in E_\ell, (u, v') \in E_r$ and $\delta_2(q, q', f) = p$,
- $(u, v) \in E_r, (u, v') \in E_\ell$ and $\delta_2(q', q, f) = p$.

The weight of the edge $(u, p) \rightarrow (v, q)$ is $\gamma((u, p), (v, q)) = \gamma(u, v)$. Since \mathcal{B} is deterministic and T is a tree, $T \otimes \mathcal{B}$ is indeed a forest.

Lemma E.1. *The sets $\text{Conf}^p(T)$, $\text{Conf}^a(T)$, $\text{Conf}^u(T)$, $\text{Conf}^\emptyset(T)$, and the forest $T \otimes \mathcal{B}$ can be computed bottom-up on the tree T in time $\mathcal{O}(|T| \cdot |Q|^2)$.*

Proof. We first show how to compute $\text{Conf}^p(T)$, $\text{Conf}^a(T)$, $\text{Conf}^u(T)$, $\text{Conf}^\emptyset(T)$. Recall that δ_0 maps from $\Sigma_0 \times \{0, 1\}$ to Q . For an a -labelled leaf v of T and $q \in Q$ we have:

- $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^p(T)$ iff $q \in \{\delta_0(a, 0), \delta_0(a, 1)\}$,
- $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^a(T)$ iff $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^u(T)$ iff $q = \delta_0(a, 1)$,
- $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^\emptyset(T)$ iff $q = \delta_0(a, 0)$.

Assume now that $(v, v_1) \in E_\ell, (v, v_2) \in E_r$ and $\lambda(v) = f$. Let $P_{f,q} = \{(q_1, q_2) \in Q^2 : \delta_2(q_1, q_2, f) = q\}$. We have:

- $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^p(T)$ if and only if there is $(q_1, q_2) \in P_{f,q}$ with $(v_1, q_1), (v_2, q_2) \in \text{Conf}^p(T)$,
- $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^a(T)$ if and only if there is $(q_1, q_2) \in P_{f,q}$ with $(v_1, q_1), (v_2, q_2) \in \text{Conf}^p(T)$ and $\{(v_1, q_1), (v_2, q_2)\} \cap \text{Conf}^a(T) \neq \emptyset$,
- $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^u(T)$ if and only if there is $(q_1, q_2) \in P_{f,q}$ with $(v_1, q_1), (v_2, q_2) \in \text{Conf}^a(T)$,
- $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^\emptyset(T)$ if and only if there is $(q_1, q_2) \in P_{f,q}$ with $(v_1, q_1), (v_2, q_2) \in \text{Conf}^\emptyset(T)$.

This allows to compute for each node $v \in V$ the set of states $q \in Q$ such that $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^x(T)$ for $x \in \{p, a, u, \emptyset\}$. To obtain the time bound $\mathcal{O}(|T| \cdot |Q|^2)$, we iterate for each f -labelled node v over all state pairs $(q_1, q_2) \in Q^2$, compute $\delta_2(q_1, q_2, f)$ and then add the configuration (v, q) to the set $\text{Conf}^p(T)$, $\text{Conf}^a(T)$, $\text{Conf}^u(T)$, or $\text{Conf}^\emptyset(T)$, depending on the membership of (v_1, q_1) and (v_2, q_2) in these sets.

In order to compute $T \otimes \mathcal{B}$, we proceed again bottom-up on T . Assume that $(v, v_1) \in E_\ell, (v, v_2) \in E_r$ and $\lambda(v) = f$. We iterate over all state pairs $(q_1, q_2) \in Q^2$, and compute $q := \delta_2(q_1, q_2, f)$. We then add the edge $(v, q) \rightarrow (v_1, q_1)$ of weight $\gamma(v, v_1)$ if $(v, q), (v_1, q_1) \in \text{Conf}^a(T)$ and $(v_2, q_2) \in \text{Conf}^\emptyset(T)$. Similarly, we add the edge $(v, q) \rightarrow (v_2, q_2)$ of weight $\gamma(v, v_2)$ if $(v, q), (v_2, q_2) \in \text{Conf}^a(T)$ and $(v_1, q_1) \in \text{Conf}^\emptyset(T)$. This procedure needs time $\mathcal{O}(|T| \cdot |Q|^2)$. \square

For $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^a(T)$ let

$$\text{succ}^u(v, q) = \{(v', q') \in \text{Conf}^u(T) : (v, q) \xrightarrow{*} (v', q')\}. \quad (1)$$

For $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^u(T)$ with $(v, v_1) \in E_\ell, (v, v_2) \in E_r$ and $\lambda(v) = f$, let

$$\text{succ}^a(v, q) = \{(v_1, q_1, v_2, q_2) : (v_1, q_1), (v_2, q_2) \in \text{Conf}^a(T), \delta_2(q_1, q_2, f) = q\}. \quad (2)$$

Note that the set $\text{succ}^u(u, p)$ contains only useful configurations (and also contains (u, p) in the case that it is useful), while $\text{succ}^a(u, p)$ contains only pairs of active configurations. The following two lemmas are from [2] and form the core of Bagan's enumeration algorithm.

Lemma E.2. *For $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^a(T)$ we have*

$$\mathcal{S}^a(v, q) = \bigcup_{(v', q') \in \text{succ}^u(v, q)} \mathcal{S}^u(v', q'), \quad (3)$$

and the union in (3) goes over pairwise disjoint sets.




Figure 4: A witness tree: automaton states are in green, node names (if written) are in blue.

For disjoint sets A_1, A_2 and $\mathcal{S}_i \subseteq 2^{A_i}$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ we define

$$\mathcal{S}_1 \oplus \mathcal{S}_2 = \{B_1 \cup B_2 : B_1 \in \mathcal{S}_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{S}_2\}.$$

Lemma E.3. *If $(v, v_1) \in E_\ell$, $(v, v_2) \in E_r$ and $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^u(T)$, then*

$$\mathcal{S}^u(v, q) = \bigcup_{(v_1, q_1, v_2, q_2) \in \text{succ}^a(v, q)} \mathcal{S}^a(v_1, q_1) \oplus \mathcal{S}^a(v_2, q_2) \quad (4)$$

and the union in (4) goes over pairwise disjoint sets.

According to Lemma E.2, for every active configuration (u, p) , the set $\mathcal{S}^a(u, p)$ is the disjoint union over all the sets $\mathcal{S}^u(v, q)$, where $(v, q) \in \text{succ}^u(u, p)$, and, according to Lemma E.3, each such $\mathcal{S}^u(v, q)$ is the disjoint union over all $\mathcal{S}^a(v_1, q_1) \oplus \mathcal{S}^a(v_2, q_2)$, where $(v_1, q_1, v_2, q_2) \in \text{succ}^a(v, q)$. Since (v_1, q_1) and (v_2, q_2) are active configurations, this reasoning can be repeated until we reach configurations (w, r) , where w is a leaf. In particular, if we start in some active configuration (u, p) and then carry out this recursion, but always choosing just one element of the succ^a and succ^u sets, then we obtain a tree, which represents one element of $\mathcal{S}^a(u, p)$. Such witness trees will be formally defined in the next subsection.

E.2 Witness trees

Our goal is to enumerate the set $\text{select}(\mathcal{B}, T)$. For this, we produce for every set $S \in \text{select}(\mathcal{B}, T)$ a witness tree for the fact that $(T, S) \in L(\mathcal{B})$. A first choice would be to label every node v with the unique state $q = \mathcal{B}(T_v, S_v)$ at which \mathcal{B} arrives in node v ; in this way, the node v becomes the configuration (v, q) . The problem is that this tree is too big. Our enumeration must work with output-linear delay. Hence, the delay for producing a solution S must be in $\mathcal{O}(|S|)$. Therefore, there is not enough time to produce the above state-annotated version of T , which has size $|T|$. The solution is to prune the tree by keeping only those nodes that are on a path from the root to a leaf from S . This yields a tree with only $|S|$ many leaves. But the resulting tree is still too big because it may contain long paths of unary nodes (nodes with a single child except for the last node on the path). In Figure 4 these are the red paths. The set S consists of u_1, u_2 and u_3 and we labelled every node with that state at which \mathcal{B} arrives at the node. The final idea is to contract the red paths in Figure 4 to single edges; this results in a tree of size $\mathcal{O}(|S|)$, which is called a witness tree W . Note that all nodes of W are from $\text{Conf}^a(T)$ and all binary nodes $((v_2, p_2)$ and (v_3, p_3) in Figure 4) and leaves of W $((u_1, r_1), (u_2, r_2)$ and (u_3, r_3) in Figure 4) are from $\text{Conf}^u(T)$. Moreover, all edges that belong to a red path are from the forest $T \otimes \mathcal{B}$. This motivates the following definition.

Definition E.4. *A witness tree W for a configuration $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^a(T)$ is a tree whose root is (v, q) . It is constructed recursively as follows:*

- If v is a leaf in T then (v, q) is the only node of W .
- Assume that v is not a leaf in T . Then the root (v, q) has a single child $(v', q') \in \text{succ}^u(v, q) \subseteq \text{Conf}^u(T)$ (we may have $(v', q') = (v, q)$ in which case we introduce a copy of the node (v, q)). If v' is a leaf of T , then (v', q') is a leaf of W . Otherwise, (v', q') has a left child $(v_1, q_1) \in \text{Conf}^a(T)$ and a right child $(v_2, q_2) \in \text{Conf}^a(T)$ in W such that $(v_1, q_1, v_2, q_2) \in \text{succ}^a(v', q')$. The construction then continues from (v_1, q_1) and (v_2, q_2) in the same way as for (v, q) .

For a witness tree W , let

$$S(W) = \{v \in \text{leaves}(T) : (v, q) \text{ is a leaf of } W \text{ for some } q \in Q\}.$$

Lemma E.5. *The following holds for every $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^a(T)$:*

- Every witness tree W for (v, q) contains at most $4|S(W)|$ many nodes.
- $\mathcal{S}^a(v, q) = \{S(W) : W \text{ is a witness tree for } (v, q)\}$
- For every $S \in \mathcal{S}^a(v, q)$ there is a unique witness W for (v, q) with $S = S(W)$.

Proof. The first statement holds, since W has exactly $|S(W)|$ many leaves (since there do not exist different leaves of the form (v, q) and (v, q')) and it arises from a binary tree by inserting a unary node above every node (this doubles the number of nodes). The other two statements follow from Lemmas E.2 and E.3. For the last point, the disjointness of the unions in (3) and (4) is important. \square

We can now describe Bagan's enumeration algorithm [2] with the concept of witness trees. Let r be the root of our binary tree T . The goal is to enumerate all sets $S \subseteq \text{leaves}(T)$ such that $\mathcal{B}(T, S) \in Q_f$. After every solution S the algorithm prints the separator symbol $\#$. For every solution S , time $\mathcal{O}(|S|)$ can be spend (since the delay should be output-linear). We identify the leaves of T with its leaf number (a number from the interval $[0, \ell - 1]$, where $\ell = |\text{leaves}(T)|$). We start with checking whether $(r, q_f) \in \text{Conf}^0(T)$ holds for some $q_f \in Q_f$. If this holds, the algorithm prints a $\#$ (for the empty set). Then all non-empty solutions $S \in \bigcup_{q_f \in Q_f} \mathcal{S}^a(r, q_f)$ have to be enumerated. For every $S \in \mathcal{S}^a(r, q_f)$, the algorithm prints a list of all elements of S (viewed as numbers from $[0, \ell - 1]$).

The algorithm runs over all final states $q_f \in Q_f$. Note that for two different final states $q_f, q'_f \in Q_f$ the sets $\mathcal{S}^a(r, q_f)$ and $\mathcal{S}^a(r, q'_f)$ are disjoint. Let us fix a final state $q_f \in Q_f$ for the further consideration. By Lemma E.5, it suffices to enumerate all sets $S(W)$, where W is a witness trees for (r, q_f) . For this, it suffices to enumerate witness trees itself. Thereby, every witness tree W has to be produced in time $\mathcal{O}(|W|)$. To do this, we define a kind of lexicographical order on witness trees. For this, we have to fix some linear orders: For every configuration $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^a(T)$ we fix and precompute an arbitrary linear order on $\text{succ}^u(v, q)$. Moreover, for every configuration $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^u(T)$ we additionally fix and precompute an arbitrary linear order on $\text{succ}^a(v, q)$.

Consider next a witness tree W and a node (v, q) of W . We say that (v, q) is a maximal node if one of the following three cases holds:

- (v, q) is a leaf of W .
- (v, q) is a unary node whose unique child is the largest $(v', q') \in \text{succ}^u(v, q)$.
- (v, q) is a binary node with left (resp., right) child (v_1, q_1) (resp., (v_1, q_2)) and (v_1, q_1, v_2, q_2) is the largest 4-tuple in $\text{succ}^a(v, q)$.

If in the second (resp., third) point we take the smallest $(v', q') \in \text{succ}^u(v, q)$ (resp., the smallest $(v_1, q_1, v_2, q_2) \in \text{succ}^a(v, q)$), then we speak of a minimal node. Leaves of a witness tree are maximal as well as minimal.

We say that the witness tree W is maximal (resp., minimal) if all nodes of W are maximal (resp., minimal). Intuitively, this means that we construct the witness tree according to Definition E.4, but at each extension step (where the children of a node are defined) we take the largest (resp., smallest) available choice. Clearly, there is a unique maximal (resp., minimal) witness tree for every $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^a(T)$.

The enumeration algorithm for $\mathcal{S}^a(r, q_f)$ starts with producing the unique minimal witness tree W_0 for (r, q_f) in time $\mathcal{O}(|W_0|)$. For a single enumeration step, assume that W is the previously produced

witness tree for (r, q_f) . If W is maximal, then the enumeration stops and the algorithm prints EOE. Otherwise, we produce the lexicographically next witness tree W' as follows: Let w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n be the set of nodes of W listed in preorder (left-to-right depth-first order).⁷ We can assume that this list was produced in the previous enumeration phase in time $\mathcal{O}(|W|)$. Let w_i be the last non-maximal node in the list, i.e., w_{i+1}, \dots, w_n are maximal. Also w_i has been computed in the previous enumeration phase in time $\mathcal{O}(|W|)$. We then copy all nodes w_1, \dots, w_{i-1} together with their children to W' . The edges between these copied nodes are also copied from W to W' . In this way, we obtain a partial witness tree for (r, q_f) . Note that the parent node of w_i belongs to $\{w_1, \dots, w_{i-1}\}$. Hence, w_i is also copied to W' . Let $w_i = (v, q)$. Since leaves of W are always maximal, (v, q) is either a unary or a binary node in W . We then extend the partial witness tree at node (v, q) by taking the next largest choice (compared to the choice taken in W). More precisely, if (v, q) is unary and its unique child is (v', q') in W , then we add in W' an edge from (v, q) to the configuration that comes after (v', q') in our fixed linear order on $\text{succ}^u(v, q)$. Now assume that (v, q) is binary and let (v_1, q_1) (resp., (v_2, q_2)) be the left (resp., right) child of (v, q) in W . Let (v_1, q'_1, v_2, q'_2) be the 4-tuple that comes after (v_1, q_1, v_2, q_2) in our fixed order on $\text{succ}^a(v, q)$. Then (v_1, q'_1) becomes the left child and (v_2, q'_2) becomes the right child of (v, q) in W' .

In the last step, it remains to complete the partial witness tree W' constructed so far to a (complete) witness tree by extending W' below leaves (v, q) of W' such that v is *not* a leaf in T . During this extension we follow the recursive definition of witness trees (Definition E.4) but always choose the smallest element from $\text{succ}^u(v, q)$ (resp., $\text{succ}^a(v, q)$) if (v, q) is the leaf where we currently extend the partial witness tree.

Since we spend constant time for each node of the final witness tree W' , it follows that W' can be constructed in time $\mathcal{O}(|W'|)$. Let us also have a look at the preprocessing phase: We already argued that the sets $\text{Conf}^p(T)$, $\text{Conf}^a(T)$, $\text{Conf}^u(T)$, $\text{Conf}^\emptyset(T)$ and the forest $T \otimes \mathcal{B}$ can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(|T| \cdot |Q|^2)$ (see Lemma E.1). The sets $\text{succ}^a(v, q)$ (for $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^u(T)$) are pairwise disjoint and their disjoint union has size $\mathcal{O}(|T| \cdot |Q|^2)$. We can compute in time $\mathcal{O}(|T| \cdot |Q|^2)$ this disjoint union together with a linear order where every set $\text{succ}^a(v, q)$ forms an interval. For the sets $\text{succ}^u(v, q)$ for $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^a(T)$ the situation is not so clear. These sets have size $\mathcal{O}(|T| \cdot |Q|)$ but they are not disjoint. Nevertheless one can compute a global linear order on the set $\text{Conf}^u(T)$ such that every set $\text{succ}^u(v, q)$ is an interval of this global linear order; see [2].⁸ Then, every $\text{succ}^u(v, q)$ can be represented by the smallest and largest configuration of the corresponding interval. This is good enough for the above enumeration algorithm.

Recall that T and $T \otimes \mathcal{B}$ have edge weights defined via the weight function γ . So far, we have ignored these weights. We can assign weights to the edges of a witness tree as follows: Let $((v, q), (v', q'))$ be an edge of a witness tree W . Then, there is a unique path (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k) from $v_1 = v$ to $v_k = v'$ in the tree T and we set $\gamma((v, q), (v', q')) = \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \gamma(v_i, v_{i+1})$. If instead of enumerating all sets $S(W)$ we want to enumerate the sets $\gamma(S(W))$ (see Theorem 4.3), we simply have to compute for each witness tree W the products of the weights along the paths from the root to the leaves of W . To do this, we compute during the construction of a witness tree W for each node w of W the product of the weights from the root to w . In this way, the set $\gamma(S(W))$ can be produced in time $\mathcal{O}(|W|) = \mathcal{O}(|S(W)|)$. This yields Theorem 4.3 for the case that the binary input tree is not compressed by a DAG D .

F Details for Section 6

In Section 6 we explained how to generalize the construction of witness trees to the case where the tree T is given by a binary node-labelled DAG $D = (V, E, \lambda, \gamma, v_0)$, so that $T = \text{unfold}(D)$. In this section we add some details that adapt the description from Section 6 to the more detailed description of Bagan's algorithm from Section E.

As explained in Section 6 we can define (and compute) the sets $\text{Conf}^a(D)$, $\text{Conf}^u(D)$ and $\text{Conf}^\emptyset(D)$ and the DAG $D \otimes \mathcal{B}$ in exactly the same way as we did for a tree T . We then have $\text{unfold}(D \otimes \mathcal{B}) = \text{unfold}(D) \otimes \mathcal{B} = T \otimes \mathcal{B}$.

By Definition E.4 there are two main steps when we construct a witness tree for an active configuration $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^a(T)$, where v is not a leaf of the tree T :

⁷Every order on the nodes of the witness tree would be suitable, as long as (i) one can traverse the nodes in the chosen order in constant time per node and (ii) the parent node of a node w comes before w .

⁸We do not need the argument from [2], since at this step, we anyway need another solution for our extension of Bagan's algorithm to DAGs; see Sections 6 and F.

1. The root (v, q) has a single child $(v', q') \in \text{succ}^u(v, q) \subseteq \text{Conf}^u(T)$, which means that $(v, q) \rightarrow^* (v', q')$ in the forest $T \otimes \mathcal{B}$.
2. If v' is not a leaf of T , then (v', q') has a left child $(v_1, q_1) \in \text{Conf}^a(T)$ and a right child $(v_2, q_2) \in \text{Conf}^a(T)$ in W such that $(v_1, q_1, v_2, q_2) \in \text{succ}^a(v', q')$.

Assume now that $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^a(D)$. We want to construct witness trees for $(\tilde{v}, q) \in \text{Conf}^a(T)$ where \tilde{v} is any tree node that is represented by the DAG node v . Formally, \tilde{v} is a path from the root node v_0 of the DAG to v , but the construction of witness trees does not depend on the concrete path from v_0 to v . As explained in Section 6 we have to adapt the above step (1) in the construction of witness trees: Instead of choosing a configuration of $(v', q') \in \text{Conf}^u(D)$ with $(v, q) \rightarrow^* (v', q')$ in the DAG $D \otimes \mathcal{B}$, we have to choose in $D \otimes \mathcal{B}$ a path from (v, q) to a vertex from $\text{Conf}^u(D)$.

Recall that when the enumeration algorithm for witness trees has to construct from the previously constructed witness tree W the next witness tree W' , we have to find the last non-maximal node $w_i = (v, q)$ in the preorder listing of all nodes from W ; see Section E.2 (in particular, w_i is not a leaf in W). Depending on whether (v, q) is a unary or a binary node the construction of W' behaves differently. If (v, q) is unary then we have started at a previous stage the enumeration of paths from (v, q) to a vertex from $\text{Conf}^u(D)$. This enumeration was frozen and has to be resumed now until the next path from (v, q) to a vertex from $\text{Conf}^u(D)$ is produced. Actually, the enumeration algorithm does not have to print the whole path but only the pair $\langle (v', q'), \gamma \rangle$ consisting of the last vertex $(v', q') \in \text{Conf}^u(D)$ on the enumerated path and the weight γ of this path. Then, (v', q') becomes the unique child of (v, q) in W' and we assign to (v', q') the product of the weight assigned to (v, q) and γ . At this point, the enumeration of paths from (v, q) to $\text{Conf}^u(D)$ in the DAG $D \otimes \mathcal{B}$ must be frozen again and resumed later (in case (v, q) is still not maximal).

If the node $w_i = (v, q)$ is binary, the situation is simpler. In that case we need to define the set of 4-tuples $\text{succ}^a(v, q)$ for the DAG D in the same way as we did for the tree T in (2) (Section E): For $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^u(D)$ with $(v, \ell, v_1), (v, r, v_2) \in E$ and $\lambda(v) = f$, let

$$\text{succ}^a(v, q) = \{(v_1, q_1, v_2, q_2) : (v_1, q_1), (v_2, q_2) \in \text{Conf}^a(D), \\ \delta_2(q_1, q_2, f) = q\}.$$

We can assume that we have precomputed for every configuration $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^u(D)$ a list $L_{q,v}$ of all pairs $(q_1, q_2) \in Q \times Q$ such that $(v_1, q_1, v_2, q_2) \in \text{succ}^a(v, q)$, where $(v, \ell, v_1), (v, r, v_2) \in E$. Note that if $q \neq q'$, then the lists $L_{q,v}$ and $L_{q',v}$ are disjoint. Hence, for every vertex $v \in V$ the sum of the lengths of all lists $L_{q,v}$ is bounded by $|Q|^2$. This implies that all lists $L_{q,v}$ for $(v, q) \in \text{Conf}^u(D)$ can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(|D| \cdot |Q|^2)$.

In the above situation, where $w_i = (v, q)$ is binary, the enumeration of witness trees has started at a previous stage the enumeration of the list $L_{v,q}$ and has stored a pointer to that list. Then, the algorithm has to take the 4-tuple (v_1, q_1, v_2, q_2) referenced by the pointer and move the pointer to the next list entry (if possible). The configurations (v_1, q_1) and (v_2, q_2) become the new children of (v, q) in W .

G Details for Section 7

In this section we prove Theorem 6.2. Recall from Section E.1 that we write the monoid M in multiplicative notation in the appendix.

Let $s \in V$ be the fixed vertex that we get as input according to the statement of Theorem 6.2. We start with some preprocessing. We first remove as long as possible vertices v of outdegree zero that do not belong to V_0 (if s is one of these vertices, we simply output an empty list). We can therefore assume that vertices of outdegree zero belong to V_0 . If there is a vertex $v \in V_0$ of non-zero outdegree, we can add a copy v' together with a new edge (v, i, v') and set the weight of this edge to 1 (the neutral element of M). Moreover, we remove v from V_0 and add v' to V_0 . By this, we can assume that V_0 consists of all vertices of outdegree zero (the leaves of the DAG).

We next eliminate vertices of outdegree one. In time $\mathcal{O}(|D|)$ we first determine the set V_1 of vertices of outdegree one. For every vertex $u \in V_1$ we then compute the unique vertex $f(u)$ such that the outdegree of $f(u)$ is not 1 and $f(u)$ is reached from u by a (unique) path consisting of edges $(v_1, i, v_2) \in E$ with $v_1 \in V_1$. We also compute the weight $\zeta(u)$ of this path. This can be done in time $\mathcal{O}(|D|)$. We then

Algorithm 2: path.enumeration(s)

```
variables:  $v \in V$ ,  $\gamma \in M$ , stack  $\in (V_2 \times M \times \{\ell, r\}^*)^*$ , flag  $\in \{0, 1\}$ ,  $\pi \in \{\ell, r\}^*$ 
1  $v := s$ ;  $\gamma := 1$ ; stack :=  $\varepsilon$ ; flag := 1;  $\pi := \varepsilon$ ;
2 while true do
3   if flag = 1 then
4     print  $\langle \omega_r[v], \gamma \cdot \gamma_r[v] \rangle$ 
5   end if
6   flag := 1;
7   if  $v \in V_2$  then
8     if  $v[r] \in V_2$  then
9       stack.push( $v[r], \gamma \cdot \gamma(v, r, v[r]), \pi r$ )
10    end if
11     $v := v[\ell]$ ;  $\gamma := \gamma \cdot \gamma(v, \ell, v[\ell])$ ;  $\pi := \pi \ell$ 
12  else if stack  $\neq \varepsilon$  then
13     $\langle v, \gamma, \pi \rangle :=$  stack.pop;
14    flag := 0
15  else
16    print EOE ;
17    stop
18  end if
19 end while
```

replace every edge $(v, i, u) \in E$ with $u \in V_1$ by $(v, i, f(u))$ and set $\gamma(v, i, f(u)) = \gamma(v, i, u) \cdot \zeta(u)$. After this step, there is no edge that ends in a vertex of outdegree one. In particular, if a vertex has outdegree one, its indegree is zero. We can then remove all vertices of outdegree one and their outgoing edges from D and store them together with their weights in a separate table. If the start vertex s in Theorem 6.2 has outdegree one and (s, i, v) is its unique outgoing edge, we run the enumeration algorithm for v instead of s and add $\gamma(s, i, v)$ to every weight that is printed in the enumeration for v . We can now assume that all vertices of the DAG D have outdegree zero or at least two. The set V_0 still consists of all vertices of outdegree zero.

We next transform D into a binary DAG $D_b = (V_b, E_b, \gamma_b)$ (without node labels), where $V \subseteq V_b$ and every vertex v has either outdegree zero or two. For this, take a vertex $u_1 \in V$ with outdegree at least two. Let $(u_1, i_1, v_1), \dots, (u_1, i_d, v_d)$ all outgoing edges of u_1 ($d \geq 2$). We then add new vertices u_2, \dots, u_{d-1} to V_b and add the following edges to E_b :

- all left edges (u_k, ℓ, u_{k+1}) for $1 \leq k \leq d-2$,
- all right edges (u_k, r, v_k) for $1 \leq k \leq d-2$,
- (u_{d-1}, ℓ, v_{d-1}) and (u_{d-1}, ℓ, v_d) .

The weights of these edges are defined as follows:

- $\gamma_b(u_k, \ell, u_{k+1}) = 1$ for $1 \leq k \leq d-2$,
- $\gamma_b(u_k, r, v_k) = \gamma(u_1, i_k, v_k)$ for $1 \leq k \leq d-2$,
- $\gamma_b(u_{d-1}, \ell, v_{d-1}) = \gamma(u_1, i_{d-1}, v_{d-1})$ and
- $\gamma_b(u_{d-1}, r, v_d) = \gamma(u_1, i_d, v_d)$.

The binary DAG $D_b = (V_b, E_b, \gamma_b)$ can be easily computed in time $\mathcal{O}(|D|)$. In the following we omit the subscript b , i.e., we write D, V, E and γ instead of D_b, V_b, E_b and γ_b . The set of leaves of D is V_0 . Let $V_2 = V \setminus V_0$ be the set of internal vertices.

For a vertex $v \in V_2$ we write $v[\ell]$ (resp., $v[r]$) for the left (resp., right) child of v . In other words: $(v, \ell, v[\ell]), (v, r, v[r]) \in E$. For a vertex v we denote with $\omega_r[v] \in V_0$ the unique leaf vertex that is reached from v by following right edges: $\omega_r[v] = v$ if $v \in V_0$ and $\omega_r[v] = \omega_r[v[r]]$ if $v \in V_2$. Moreover, we

Algorithm 3: lexicographic_traversal(s)

```
variables:  $v \in V$ ,  $\gamma \in M$ , stack  $\in (V_2 \times M)^*$ ,  $\pi \in \{\ell, r\}^*$ 
1  $v := s$ ;  $\gamma := 1$ ; stack  $:= \varepsilon$ ;  $\pi := \varepsilon$ ;
2 while true do
3   if  $v \in V_2$  then
4     stack.push( $\langle v[r], \gamma \cdot \gamma(v, r, v[r]), \pi r \rangle$ );
5      $v := v[\ell]$ ;  $\gamma := \gamma \cdot \gamma(v, \ell, v[\ell])$ ;  $\pi := \pi \ell$ 
6   else
7     print  $\langle v, \gamma \rangle$ ;
8     if stack  $\neq \varepsilon$  then
9        $\langle v, \gamma, \pi \rangle :=$  stack.pop
10    else
11      print EOE;
12      stop
13    end if
14  end if
15 end while
```

define $\gamma_r[v]$ as the weight of the unique path of right edges from v to $\omega_r[v]$: $\gamma_r[v] = 1$ if $v \in V_0$ and $\gamma_r[v] = \gamma(v, r, v[r]) \cdot \gamma_r[v[r]]$ if $v \in V_2$. These data can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(|D|)$ by a bottom-up computation on the DAG D .

Recall that s is our start vertex of D in Theorem 6.2. For a word $\pi \in \{\ell, r\}^*$ we define the vertex $s[\pi]$ and the weight $\gamma[s, \pi]$ inductively as follows: We start with $s[\varepsilon] = s$ and $\gamma[s, \varepsilon] = 1$. Let us now assume that $s[\pi]$ and $\gamma[s, \pi]$ are already defined. If the vertex $s[\pi]$ has outdegree zero then for $d \in \{\ell, r\}$, $s[\pi d]$ and $\gamma[s, \pi d]$ are not defined. Otherwise we define $s[\pi d] = (s[\pi])[d]$ and $\gamma[s, \pi d] = \gamma[s, \pi] \cdot \gamma(s[\pi], d, s[\pi d])$. Finally, let $L_s \subseteq \{\ell, r\}^*$ be the set of all words $\pi \in \{\ell, r\}^*$ such that $s[\pi]$ is defined and $s[\pi] \in V_0$. The set L_s is in a 1-1-correspondence with the paths from s to V_0 , and we will speak of paths for elements of L_s in the following.

The goal of the enumeration algorithm can therefore be formulated as follows: enumerate the pairs $\langle s[\pi], \gamma[s, \pi] \rangle$, where π ranges over all words from L_s . As explained before, some pairs may occur more than once in this enumeration. In the following, we will explain a version of the path enumeration algorithm that explicitly stores the path π (Algorithm 2). This is only done in order to explain the algorithm in a better way. At the end, we can remove in Algorithm 2 all code in red (the code that deals with the variable π).

The simplest way to achieve the above goal would be to run in lexicographic order over all words $\pi \in L_s$; see Algorithm 3. It preserves the invariant that $v = s[\pi]$ and $\gamma = \gamma[s, \pi]$ for the three variables v, γ , and π in Algorithm 3. In each iteration of the while loop, if the current vertex is not a leaf (Line 3), the data for the path πr is pushed on the stack (Line 4), and the algorithm proceeds with the path $\pi \ell$ (Line 5). If the current vertex is a leaf then it prints $\langle s[\pi], \gamma[s, \pi] \rangle$ in Line 7. Then it checks whether the stack is empty. If not, it pops the topmost triple from the stack and sets v, γ, π to the corresponding values from the popped triple (Line 9). Otherwise the enumeration terminates (Line 11 and 12).

The problem with Algorithm 3 is that it has non-constant delay (the delay is proportional to the depth of the DAG D). To solve this problem we modify the algorithm such that in each iteration of the while loop it behaves as follows:

- If the current path π ends with ℓ or is empty, then we print the triple $\langle \omega_r[v], \gamma \cdot \gamma_r[v] \rangle$. In other words: we extend the current path π maximally to the right until we reach a leaf; then we print the pair corresponding to this path.
- If the current path π ends with r then we print nothing.

This behavior is achieved with the flag in Algorithm 2 (in the following, all line numbers refer to Algorithm 2). Note that the current path π ends with r if and only if we pop from the stack, i.e., Line 13 is executed. We then set the flag to zero in Line 14. Moreover, when we start a new iteration of the while loop we only print the pair $\langle \omega_r[v], \gamma \cdot \gamma_r[v] \rangle$ if the flag is 1 (Lines 3 and 4). Line 6, where the flag is set to 1 is explained in a moment.

This modified algorithm with the flag is still correct, i.e., it enumerates the pairs $\langle s[\pi], \gamma[s, \pi] \rangle$ for $\pi \in L_s$, but the algorithm still has non-constant delay. The problem arises from paths of the form $\pi = \tau r$ that end in a leaf. Consider for instance the case, where $L_s = \{\ell^i : 0 \leq i \leq n\} \cup \{\ell^i r : 0 \leq i \leq n-1\}$. In the first n iterations, the algorithm will produce the pairs $\langle s[\ell^i r], \gamma[s, \ell^i r] \rangle$ ($0 \leq i \leq n-1$) followed by $\langle s[\ell^n], \gamma[s, \ell^n] \rangle$. Moreover, it pushes the triples $\langle s[\ell^i r], \gamma[s, \ell^i r], \ell^i r \rangle$ for $0 \leq i \leq n-1$ on the stack. These triples will then be popped again from the stack in n iterations but nothing is printed in these iterations. Hence, the delay is not constant.

The solution for this problem is simple. We only push a triple $\langle v[r], \gamma \cdot \gamma(v, r, v[r]), \pi r \rangle$ on the stack if $v[r]$ is not a leaf of the DAG (Lines 8 and 9). This does not harm the correctness of the algorithm: Assume that $v[r]$ is a leaf so that Line 9 is not executed. The pair $\langle v[r], \gamma \cdot \gamma(v, r, v[r]) \rangle$ has been printed in a previous iteration of the while loop. To see this, write $\pi = \tau r^k$, where τ does not end with r . Then, in a previous iteration, the path variable π had the value τ , and in this iteration the pair $\langle v[r], \gamma \cdot \gamma(v, r, v[r]) \rangle$ was printed. Moreover, since $v[r]$ is a leaf, there is no reason to return later to the vertex $v[r]$. Hence, it is not necessary to push $\langle v[r], \gamma \cdot \gamma(v, r, v[r]), \pi r \rangle$ on the stack.

Therefore, whenever the new path π is popped from the stack (Line 13), the flag is set to zero, π is of the form $\pi = \tau r$, and moreover, $\pi \ell \in L_s$. In the next iteration of the while loop, nothing is printed (due to Line 3). Moreover, we have $v \in V_2$ and therefore π will be set to $\pi \ell$ in Line 11. Therefore, we can safely reset the flag to 1 in Line 6 (the new π does not end with r). Moreover, in the next iteration of the while loop a pair will be printed in Line 4. Hence, there cannot be two consecutive iterations of the while loop, where no pair is printed. This shows that Algorithm 2 works with constant delay.

Finally notice that we can omit the red code dealing with the variable π in Algorithm 2. It does not influence the control flow of the algorithm.

H Computing preorder numbers

In this section, we explain how to obtain the following variant of Theorem 4.1, where all nodes of $\llbracket D \rrbracket$ are represented by their preorder numbers. One may argue that the representation of nodes of $\llbracket D \rrbracket$ by their preorder number is more natural than the representation by D -numbers. The later depend on the FSLP D , whereas the preorder numbers do not depend on the FSLP D for the forest.

Theorem H.1. *From an n STA \mathcal{A} with m states and an FSLP D one can compute in preprocessing time $\mathcal{O}(|D|) \cdot 2^{\mathcal{O}(m^4)}$ a data structure that allows to enumerate the set $\text{select}(\mathcal{A}, F)$ with output-linear delay. In the enumeration, every node of $\llbracket D \rrbracket$ is represented by its preorder number.*

The proof of Theorem H.1 is exactly the same as the proof of Theorem 4.1, we only have to replace the monoid $M = (\mathbb{N}, +)$ of edge weights in Sections 5–7 by another slightly more complicated monoid of certain affine mappings. In the following, we define this monoid.

We start with some definitions. For a forest algebra expression T_e we define the type $\tau(T_e) \in \{0, 1\}$ as follows:

$$\tau(T_e) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \llbracket T_e \rrbracket \in \mathcal{F}(\Sigma) \\ 1 & \text{if } \llbracket T_e \rrbracket \in \mathcal{F}_*(\Sigma) \end{cases}$$

Note that the occurrences of the symbols from Σ in a forest $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Sigma)$ (viewed as a string over the alphabet $\Sigma \cup \{(,)\}$) correspond to the nodes of the forest. The i^{th} occurrence of a symbol from Σ in $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Sigma)$ corresponds to the i^{th} node of F in (depth-first left-to-right) *preorder*. We refer to a node of F by its preorder number from $[0, |F| - 1]$, where we start with zero for convenience.

Example H.2. *Let $F = a(bcb(aa(b(aa))cb)a)ab(a(c))$. The preorder numbers are*

$$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccc} a & (& b & c & b & (& a & a & (& b & (& a & a &) &) & c & b &) & a &) & a & b & (& a & (& c &) &) \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 & 11 & 12 & 13 & 14 & 15 \end{array}$$

For the further consideration we fix a $T_e \in \mathcal{E}(\Sigma)$ with $\tau(T_e) = 0$. Recall that there is a 1-to-1 correspondence between the nodes of the forest $\llbracket T_e \rrbracket$ and the leaves of T_e . Let us denote with χ the function that maps a leaf v of T_e to the preorder number of the corresponding node of $\llbracket T_e \rrbracket$. When moving from the root r of T_e down to the leaf v we can compute the preorder number $\chi(v)$. To see this, consider the path from the root r of the expression tree T_e to the leaf v and let u be the current node. Let $T_{e,u}$ be the subexpression rooted in u . In the following, we write $\llbracket u \rrbracket \in \mathcal{F}(\Sigma) \cup \mathcal{F}_*(\Sigma)$ for $\llbracket T_{e,u} \rrbracket$ and

$\tau(u) \in \{0, 1\}$ for $\tau(T_{e,u})$. In order to compute $\chi(v)$ we have to compute for every u on the path from r to v the so-called *preorder data* $\mathbf{pre}(u)$. It is a single natural number in case $\tau(u) = 0$ and it is a pair of natural numbers in case $\tau(u) = 1$. The meaning of these numbers is the following, where we identify $\llbracket u \rrbracket$ with the set of nodes of $\llbracket T_e \rrbracket$ that belong to the subforest (context) $\llbracket u \rrbracket$. If $\mathbf{pre}(u) = x \in \mathbb{N}$ (resp., $\mathbf{pre}(u) = (x, y) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$) then

- x is the smallest preorder number of the nodes in $\llbracket u \rrbracket$ and
- y (which only exists if $\tau(u) = 1$) is the size of the subforest of $\llbracket T_e \rrbracket$ that replaces the hole $*$ in the subcontext $\llbracket u \rrbracket$.

For a leaf v of T_e of type 0 we have $\mathbf{pre}(v) = \chi(v)$ and for a leaf v of type 1 the first component of $\mathbf{pre}(v)$ is $\chi(v)$.

We will compute the preorder data top down for every node of T_e . To do this, we first have to compute the leaf size $s(u)$ and the left size $\ell(u)$ for every node of T_e :

- $s(u)$ is the number of leafs in the subexpression below of u , which is the same as the number of nodes of $\llbracket u \rrbracket$,
- $\ell(u)$ is only defined if $\tau(u) = 1$ and is the number of nodes of $\llbracket u \rrbracket$ that are in preorder smaller than the unique occurrence of the hole $*$ in $\llbracket u \rrbracket$.

The leaf sizes are computed bottom-up as follows: if u is a leaf of T_e then $s(u) = 1$ and if u has the left (resp., right) child v_1 (resp., v_2) then $s(u) = s(v_1) + s(v_2)$.

The left size for a leaf u with $\tau(u) = 1$ (i.e., u is labelled with a symbol a_*) is $\ell(u) = 1$. Now assume that u has the left (resp., right) child v_1 (resp., v_2) and that u is labelled with the operator $\circ \in \{\ominus, \oplus\}$:

- Case $\circ = \ominus$, $\tau(v_1) = 0$, and $\tau(v_2) = 1$: $\ell(u) = s(v_1) + \ell(v_2)$
- Case $\circ = \ominus$, $\tau(v_1) = 1$, and $\tau(v_2) = 0$: $\ell(u) = \ell(v_1)$
- Case $\circ = \oplus$, and $\tau(v_1) = \tau(v_2) = 1$: $\ell(u) = \ell(v_1) + \ell(v_2)$

Finally, the preorder data are computed top-down as follows: For the root node r we set $\mathbf{pre}(r) = 0$ (recall that $\tau(T_e) = 0$). Now assume that u is an internal node of T_e with left (resp., right) child v_1 (resp., v_2). Moreover, let u be labelled with the operator $\circ \in \{\ominus, \oplus\}$ and let $\mathbf{pre}(u) = x$ in case $\tau(u) = 0$ and $\mathbf{pre}(u) = (x, y)$ in case $\tau(u) = 1$:

- Case $\circ = \ominus$, and $\tau(v_1) = \tau(v_2) = 0$:

$$\mathbf{pre}(v_1) = x \text{ and } \mathbf{pre}(v_2) = x + s(v_1)$$

- Case $\circ = \ominus$, $\tau(v_1) = 0$, and $\tau(v_2) = 1$:

$$\mathbf{pre}(v_1) = x \text{ and } \mathbf{pre}(v_2) = (x + s(v_1), y)$$

- Case $\circ = \ominus$, $\tau(v_1) = 1$, and $\tau(v_2) = 0$:

$$\mathbf{pre}(v_1) = (x, y) \text{ and } \mathbf{pre}(v_2) = x + s(v_1) + y$$

- Case $\circ = \oplus$, $\tau(v_1) = 1$, and $\tau(v_2) = 0$:

$$\mathbf{pre}(v_1) = (x, s(v_2)) \text{ and } \mathbf{pre}(v_2) = x + \ell(v_1)$$

- Case $\circ = \oplus$ and $\tau(v_1) = \tau(v_2) = 1$.

$$\mathbf{pre}(v_1) = (x, y + s(v_2)) \text{ and } \mathbf{pre}(v_2) = (x + \ell(v_1), y)$$

Example H.3. As an example, consider the forest algebra expression T_e from Figure 5. Green (resp., red) nodes have type 0 (resp., 1). Every node is labelled with its preorder data (in blue), the leaf size (in magenta), and the left size (in green). The forest $\llbracket T_e \rrbracket$ is shown in Figure 6.




Figure 5: A forest algebra expression. Green (resp., red) nodes have type 0 (resp., 1). Every node is in addition labelled with its preorder data (in blue), its leaf size (in magenta on the left of the node), and its left size (in green on the right of the node, if the node has type 1).




Figure 6: The forest $\llbracket T_e \rrbracket$ produced by the forest algebra expression from Figure 5. Every node is additionally labelled with its preorder number.

Every edge (u, v) in the expression tree T_e can be labelled with the function $f_{u,v}$ that represents the effect on the preorder data. We call this function the *preorder effect* of the edge (u, v) . It depends on the operator computed in node u , on the types $\tau(u)$, $\tau(v)$, the values $s(v)$, $\ell(v)$, $s(v')$ and $\ell(v')$ (where v' is the second child of u), and whether v is the left or right child of u . If $\tau(u) = i$ and $\tau(v) = j$ for $i, j \in \{0, 1\}$ then $f_{u,v} : \mathbb{N}^{i+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^{j+1}$. The functions $f_{u,v}$ are defined in Figure 7.

If we take the closure of the functions $f_{u,v}$ under composition, we obtain a monoid M_{pre} of transformations of the following types, where $c, d \in \mathbb{N}$ are constants and $x, y \in \mathbb{N}$ are the arguments.

- $x \mapsto x + c$
- $x \mapsto (x + c, d)$
- $(x, y) \mapsto x + c$
- $(x, y) \mapsto x + y + c$
- $(x, y) \mapsto (x + c, y + d)$
- $(x, y) \mapsto (x + y + c, d)$

Every such function can be represented by at most two natural numbers (the constants c and d). Clearly, given two functions of the above form, we can compute the composition of the functions with a constant number of additions. Hence, the monoid M_{pre} satisfies the requirements from the last paragraph in Section 2.4.

Note that the definition of the type $\tau(v)$, the leaf size $s(v)$, and left size $\ell(v)$ for a node v make also sense for a vertex v of an FSLP D (since these values are computed bottom-up). More precisely, if D is an FSLP and v is a vertex of D then we can define the forest algebra expression $T_{e,v} = \text{unfold}_D(v)$ rooted in v . If r is the root of $T_{e,v}$ then $\tau(v) = \tau(r)$, $s(v) = s(r)$, and $\ell(v) = \ell(r)$. Moreover, for an edge (u, i, v) of D , we can define the function $f_{u,i,v}$ in the same way as the function $f_{u,v}$ for an edge (u, v) of a forest algebra expression. The reason is that this function only depends on the types $\tau(u)$, $\tau(v)$, the values $s(v)$, $\ell(v)$, $s(v')$ and $\ell(v')$ (where v' is the second child of u), and whether v is the left or right child of u . We then obtain Theorem H.1 by taking the monoid M_{pre} for the monoid M of edge weights in Sections 5–7.




Figure 7: The effect of edges on the preorder data. Green (resp., red) nodes have type 0 (resp., 1).

In Section I on updates, we will need the following lemma.

Lemma H.4. *Assume that we are given an FSLP $D = (V, E, \lambda, v_0)$ and the preorder number k of a node v in $\llbracket D \rrbracket$. Moreover, assume that for every vertex u of D the values $\tau(u)$, $s(u)$ and $\ell(u)$ have been computed. Then, one can compute in time $\mathcal{O}(\text{depth}(D))$ the root-leaf-path π in the DAG D that corresponds to the node v .*

Proof. The algorithm walks from v_0 down in the DAG D and thereby stores a pair $(u, m) \in V \times \mathbb{N}$ if $\tau(u) = 0$ and a triple $(u, m, p) \in V \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ if $\tau(u) = 1$. The pair (u, m) means that the current goal is to descend from u along the path that corresponds to the node with preorder number m in the forest produced from vertex u in D . A triple (u, m, p) means that the current goal is to descend from u along the path that corresponds to the node with preorder number m in the forest context produced from vertex u under the additional assumption that the unique occurrence of $*$ in this forest context is replaced by a forest of size p . It is always ensured by the algorithm that m belongs to the range of preorder numbers of nodes belonging to the forest (resp., forest context) produced from vertex u .

We start with the pair $(u, m) := (v_0, k)$. Assume now that (u, ℓ, u_1) and (u, r, u_2) are the two outgoing edges of vertex u in the DAG D . First assume that $\tau(u) = 0$. Hence, $\lambda(u) = \ominus$ implies $\tau(u_1) = \tau(u_2) = 0$ and $\lambda(u) = \oplus$ implies $\tau(u_1) = 1$ and $\tau(u_2) = 0$. The algorithm currently stores a pair (u, m) and updates the data as follows (recall that the preorder numbers start with 0):

Case $\lambda(u) = \ominus$ and $m < s(u_1)$: (u, m) is replaced by (u_1, m) .

Case $\lambda(u) = \ominus$ and $s(u_1) \leq m$: (u, m) is replaced by $(u_2, m - s(u_1))$.

Case $\lambda(u) = \oplus$ and $(m < \ell(u_1) \text{ or } \ell(u_1) + s(u_2) \leq m)$: (u, m) is replaced by $(u_1, m, s(u_2))$.

Case $\lambda(u) = \oplus$ and $\ell(u_1) \leq m < \ell(u_1) + s(u_2)$: (u, m) is replaced by $(u_2, m - \ell(u_1))$.

Now assume that $\tau(u) = 1$. Hence, if $\lambda(u) = \oplus$ then $\tau(u_1) = \tau(u_2) = 1$ and if $\lambda(u) = \ominus$ then either $\tau(u_1) = 1$ and $\tau(u_2) = 0$ or $\tau(u_1) = 0$ and $\tau(u_2) = 1$. The algorithm currently stores a triple (u, m, p) and updates the data as follows:




Figure 8: An update in the FSLP D from Figure 2. For better readability we removed the zero weights of left edges. The node identified by the red path on left (with D -number 14) is relabelled with the symbol d . Note that we do not have to copy the first three vertices of the red path since these vertices are not duplicated when unfolding the DAG.

Case $\lambda(u) = \ominus$, $\tau(u_1) = 0$, $\tau(u_2) = 1$, and $m < s(u_1)$: (u, m, p) is replaced by (u_1, m) .

Case $\lambda(u) = \ominus$, $\tau(u_1) = 0$, $\tau(u_2) = 1$, and $s(u_1) \leq m$: (u, m, p) is replaced by $(u_2, m - s(u_1), p)$.

Case $\lambda(u) = \ominus$, $\tau(u_1) = 1$, $\tau(u_2) = 0$, and $m < s(u_1) + p$: (u, m, p) is replaced by (u_1, m, p) .

Case $\lambda(u) = \ominus$, $\tau(u_1) = 1$, $\tau(u_2) = 0$, and $s(u_1) + p \leq m$: (u, m, p) is replaced by $(u_2, m - s(u_1) - p)$.

Case $\lambda(u) = \oplus$ and $(m < \ell(u_1)$ or $\ell(u_1) + s(u_2) + p \leq m)$: (u, m, p) is replaced by $(u_1, m, s(u_2) + p)$.

Case $\lambda(u) = \oplus$ and $\ell(u_1) \leq m < \ell(u_1) + s(u_2) + p$: (u, m, p) is replaced by $(u_2, m - \ell(u_1), p)$.

The algorithm terminates when the first component of the current pair (resp., triple) is a leaf of the DAG D . The first components of the pairs (resp., triples) that are produced by the algorithm form exactly the path that corresponds to the node with the initial preorder number k . \square

I Details for Section 8

In this section, we argue that our enumeration algorithm can be easily extended with relabeling updates in time $\mathcal{O}(\log |F|)$ where $F = \llbracket D \rrbracket$. In a relabeling update $\text{relabel}(v, a)$, v is a node in the current forest F (e.g. specified by its preorder number) and a symbol $a \in \Sigma$. The forest is then changed by labelling node v with the symbol $a \in \Sigma$. We write $\text{relabel}(v, a)[F]$ for the resulting forest. We argue that such updates can be performed in time $\mathcal{O}(\log |F|)$ in our setting, where F is represented by an FSLP D .⁹ After an update, the enumeration of the query results can start without the need of doing the whole preprocessing from scratch. This is beneficial, since $|D|$ is lower bounded by $\Omega(\log |F|)$.

For doing relabeling updates in logarithmic time on FSLP-compressed forests, we need a result from [20]. The depth of an FSLP $D = (V, E, \lambda, v_0)$, $\text{depth}(D)$ for short, is defined as the length of a longest path starting in v_0 .

Theorem I.1 (c.f. [20, Corollary 3.28]). *Given an FSLP D defining the forest $F = \llbracket D \rrbracket$, one can compute in time $\mathcal{O}(|D|)$ an FSLP D' such that $\llbracket D' \rrbracket = F$, $|D'| = \Theta(|D|)$ and $\text{depth}(D') = \Theta(\log |F|)$.*

By Theorem I.1 we can assume that our FSLP D has depth $\Theta(\log |F|)$. Assume that we want to change the label of node v to $a \in \Sigma$, where v is given by its preorder number in F . By Lemma H.4, we can compute from the preorder number of v the corresponding root-leaf-path π in D in time $\mathcal{O}(\log |F|)$. To update the node label of v , we have to add to D a copy π' of the path π ; see Figure 8 for an example. For every node on the path π' we have to update our additional data structures (D refers to the updated FSLP, π' is identified with the set of new nodes and Q is the set of states of our dBUTA):

⁹In the time bound $\mathcal{O}(\log |F|)$ we ignore the size of automaton defining the query, i.e., we refer to data complexity.

- Update the preorder data : First, we compute the leaf size and left size for every node $v' \in \pi'$ bottom-up. Then we compute the preorder data for every node $v' \in \pi'$ top-down.
- For every configuration $(v', q) \in \pi' \times Q$, determine bottom-up whether (v', q) belongs to the sets $\text{Conf}^x(D)$ for all $x \in \{p, a, u, \emptyset\}$.
- Compute the children of every new configuration from $(\pi' \times Q) \cap \text{Conf}^a(D)$ in the DAG $D \otimes \mathcal{B}$.
- For every new configuration $(v', q) \in (\pi' \times Q) \cap \text{Conf}^u(D)$ we have to compute a linear order on the set $\text{succ}^a(v', q)$.
- Update the data structures from Section 7. First we have to keep the DAG binary. For this it is important that the number of successors of a new vertex x in the DAG $D \otimes \mathcal{B}$ is bounded by $2|Q|$. This ensures that for every new vertex x only a constant number of new vertices and edges have to be added to the binary DAG. Thereby we can also compute the vertex $\omega_r[x]$ and the weight $\gamma_r[x]$ for every new vertex x of the DAG.

In the above computations we only have to spend constant time for each new node on π' . Therefore, the whole computation takes time $\Theta(\log |F|)$.

Note that a relabeling update adds at most $\text{depth}(D) = \Theta(\log |F|)$ many nodes to the FSLP. We can prove that even for string SLPs this is up to a log-log-factor optimal. For a word w let $g(w)$ be the size of a smallest SLP for w .

Theorem I.2. *There is a family of words $(w_k)_{k \geq 1}$ over the alphabet $\{a, b\}$ of strictly increasing length and for every $k \geq 1$ there is an update $U_k = \text{relabel}(p_k, a)$ such that*

$$g(w_k) - g(U_k[w_k]) \geq \Omega(\log |w_k| / \log \log |w_k|).$$

Proof. We start with a word $u_k \in \{0, 1\}^*$ of length k^2 having Kolmogorov complexity k^2 . It is well-known that such a word exists; see e.g. [27]. Let us write $u_k = u_{k,1}u_{k,2} \cdots u_{k,k}$ with $|w_{k,i}| = k$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. Let $\mu_k : \{0, 1\}^k \rightarrow [1, 2^k]$ be the function such that every word $s \in \{0, 1\}^k$ is the $\mu_k(s)^{\text{th}}$ word in the lexicographic enumeration of all words from $\{0, 1\}^k$. Let $m_{k,i} = \mu_k(u_{k,i}) \leq 2^k$. Consider now the following two words:

$$\begin{aligned} v_k &= a^{2^k + m_{k,1} + \cdots + m_{k,k} + k}, \\ v'_k &= a^{2^k} b a^{m_{k,1}} b a^{m_{k,2}} b \cdots a^{m_{k,k-1}} b a^{m_{k,k}}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $2^k + k \leq |v_k| = |v'_k| \leq k + (k+1)2^k$. Since v_k is a unary string, we have $g(v_k) = \Theta(\log |v_k|) = \Theta(k)$.

Let us estimate $n_k := g(v'_k)$. Since v'_k has an SLP of size n_k , one can encode v'_k by a bit string of length $\mathcal{O}(n_k \cdot \log n_k)$; see e.g. [39]. Since v'_k encodes the word w_k of Kolmogorov complexity k^2 , we must have $k^2 \leq \mathcal{O}(n_k \cdot \log n_k)$, i.e., $n_k \cdot \log n_k \geq \Omega(k^2)$. In addition, we can easily construct an SLP for v'_k of size $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$ (a^{2^k} and all $a^{m_{k,i}}$ have SLPs of size $\mathcal{O}(k)$). Hence, $n_k \leq \mathcal{O}(k^2)$. We thus obtain

$$g(v'_k) = n_k \geq \Omega(k^2 / \log n_k) \geq \Omega(k^2 / \log k).$$

Notice that v'_k is obtained from v_k by k relabelling updates that add the occurrences of b . We can conclude that at least one of those k relabelling updates must increase the minimal SLP size by at least

$$\Omega\left(\frac{k^2 / \log k - k}{k}\right) = \Omega\left(\frac{k}{\log k}\right) = \Omega\left(\frac{\log |v_k|}{\log \log |v_k|}\right).$$

We define w_k as the word right before this relabelling update (it has the same length as v_k). □

I.1 Complex editing updates on SLP-compressed strings

In the context of query enumeration on SLP-compressed strings, the rather general framework of complex document editing updates (CDE-updates) is considered in [34, 38]. There, a collection of strings w_1, \dots, w_n is represented by a single SLP D that contains for every w_i a nonterminal A_i that produces w_i . CDE-updates allow to construct from w_1, \dots, w_n new strings using the operations of string concatenation and cutting out a factor between two positions in an existing string w_i . These basic operations are combined to CDE-expressions with a suitable syntax.

To do these updates on SLP-compressed strings in time $\mathcal{O}(\log N)$, where N is the maximal length of one of the strings w_i , the authors of [34, 38] transform the input SLP D into a so-called strongly balanced SLP, where it is required that for every node in the syntax tree of D , the height difference between the left and right subtree is either -1 , 0 , or 1 . Strongly balanced SLPs were first introduced in [36], where it was shown that every SLP of size m can be transformed into an equivalent strongly balanced SLP of size $\mathcal{O}(m \cdot \log m)$ using AVL-tree rotations. It was shown in [17] that the multiplicative size increase of $\mathcal{O}(\log m)$ is unavoidable. To update a strongly balanced SLP one has to modify the SLP only on a path from a root to a leaf. To maintain strong balance, $\mathcal{O}(\log N)$ many AVL-rotations are performed bottom-up on this path.

I.2 Insertion and deletion updates in trees

Let us briefly discuss more complex tree updates that were considered in [26] in the context of query enumeration on uncompressed trees. In this paper, the authors consider in addition to relabeling updates also certain insertion and deletion updates, where nodes are inserted (resp., deleted) at certain specified positions in the current tree. The authors in [26] achieve time $\mathcal{O}(\log |T|)$ for these updates. For this, they represent the input tree T by a forest algebra expression T_e of height $\mathcal{O}(\log |T|)$.

It is tempting to extend the approach from [26] to an FSLP D , i.e., to a forest algebra expression T_e that is represented by a DAG. We conjecture that this is indeed possible, but the technical difficulties are considerable. In [26] the authors maintain a certain balancing property for the forest algebra expression T_e that is motivated from strongly balanced SLPs but is much more technical. The problem is that the AVL-rotations that are used to construct strongly balanced SLPs require associativity for all combinations of the underlying algebra operations. For SLPs, there is only one operation, namely string concatenation, which is of course associative. For the two binary forest algebra operations, associativity no longer holds: $F_1 \oplus (F_2 \ominus F_3)$ is in general not the same as $(F_1 \oplus F_2) \ominus F_3$. In [26] the authors found a quite technical workaround for this problem in the uncompressed setting. It is not obvious that the same workaround can be also used in the situation, where the forest algebra expression is represented by a DAG.

For string SLPs (which are a special case of FSLPs) all these problems do not arise. Therefore, our approach can be used to recover the main result of [34], which is an enumeration algorithm for MSO-queries on SLP-compressed strings with the following characteristics: (i) linear preprocessing, (ii) output-linear delay, and (iii) CDE-updates in time $\mathcal{O}(\log N)$.