

Bijjective BWT based Compression Schemes

Golnaz Badkobeh¹[0000-0001-5550-7149], Hideo Bannai²[0000-0002-6856-5185],
and Dominik Köppl³[0000-0002-8721-4444]

¹ City, University of London, London, UK, Golnaz.Badkobeh@city.ac.uk

² Tokyo Medical and Dental University, Tokyo, Japan, hdbn.dsc@tmd.ac.jp

³ Yamanashi University, Kofu, Japan, dkppl@yamanashi.ac.jp

Abstract. We show that for any string w of length n , $r_B = O(z \log^2 n)$, where r_B and z are respectively the number of character runs in the bijective Burrows-Wheeler transform (BBWT), and the number of Lempel-Ziv 77 factors of w . We can further induce a bidirectional macro scheme of size $O(r_B)$ from the BBWT. Finally, there exists a family of strings with $r_B = \Omega(\log n)$ but having only $r = 2$ character runs in the standard Burrows-Wheeler transform (BWT). However, a lower bound for r is the minimal run-length of the BBWTs applied to the cyclic shifts of w , whose time complexity might be $o(n^2)$ in the light that we show how to compute the Lyndon factorization of all cyclic rotations in $O(n)$ time. Considering also the rotation operation performing cyclic shifts, we conjecture that we can transform two strings having the same Parikh vector to each other by BBWT and rotation operations, and prove this conjecture for the case of binary alphabets and permutations.

Keywords: Repetitiveness measure · Burrows-Wheeler Transform

1 Introduction

The Burrows-Wheeler transform (BWT) [11] has seen numerous applications in data compression and text indexing, and is used heavily by various tools in the field of bioinformatics. For any string w , $\text{BWT}(w)$ is defined as the string obtained by concatenating the last characters of all cyclic rotations of w , in the lexicographic order of the cyclic rotations. The BWT can thus be understood as a function that maps a representative (string) of the conjugacy class of all strings being cyclic rotations to each other because two strings are transformed to the same string if and only if they are cyclic rotations of each other. Since BWT preserves the string length, by the pigeonhole principle, BWT is not surjective, meaning there exist strings that are not in the image of BWT.

For a string x , the inverse BWT transform is induced from the LF-mapping function $\psi_x(i)$ which returns the position of the k th $x[i]$ in the sequence obtained by sorting the multiset of all symbols of x in increasing order, where $x[i]$ is the k th $x[i]$ in $x[1..i]$. For a non-primitive string w , the standard BWT always constructs a string $x = \text{BWT}(w)$ such that ψ_x forms a single cycle (i.e., $\forall i, \exists j$ s.t. $\psi_x^j(i) = 1$), and $x[\psi_x^{|w|-1}(i)] \cdots x[\psi_x^0(i)]$ is a cyclic rotation of w . In general, ψ can

form several cycles, and it is more natural to view the inverse BWT transform as a mapping from a string to a multiset of primitive cyclic strings. The bijective BWT (BBWT) [15] exploits this to define an automorphism on strings, i.e., an isomorphism from strings to strings; By selecting the lexicographically smallest string from each cyclic string and concatenating them in non-increasing lexicographic order, this mapping becomes a bijection that maps a string to another string. The forward transform $\text{BBWT}(w)$ can then be defined as a transform that first computes the Lyndon factorization [12] of w , and then taking the last symbol of all cyclic rotations of all the Lyndon factors, sorted in ω -order \prec_ω , which is an order defined as $x \prec_\omega y \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x^\infty \prec y^\infty$, where \prec denotes the standard lexicographic order.

It is known that the BBWT can be computed in linear time [6,8]. It can also be used as an index similar to the BWT [5,6], or as an index for a set of circular strings [10]. While the size r of the run-length compressed BWT (RLBWT) has been a focus of study in various contexts and is known to be small for highly-repetitive texts [19], the size of the run-length compressed BBWT (RLBBWT) has not yet been studied rigorously. Biagi et al. [7] study the sensitivity [1] of RLBBWT with respect to the *reverse* operation, and present an infinite family of strings such that the size of the RLBBWT can change by a factor of $\Omega(\log n)$.

In this paper, we shed light on the size r_B of the RLBBWT of a string w . In detail, we show that $r_B = O(z \log^2 n)$ for z being the number of Lempel-Ziv 77 (LZ77) factors of w (Thm. 1). We can further induce a bidirectional macro scheme (BMS) of size $O(r_B)$ from the BBWT (Lemma 1). Finally, there exists a family of strings with $r_B = \Omega(\log n)$ having an RLBWT of length 2 (Thm. 2).

Alas, a lower bound for the RLBWT length is the shortest RLBBWT among all cyclic shifts of w , whose time might be subquadratic provided that we can compute the Lyndon factorizations of all rotations of w in linear time (Thm. 3).

Finally, adding rotations, we conjecture that two strings having the same Parikh vector can be transformed to each other by BBWT and rotation operations (Conjecture 1); we prove this conjecture for special cases (Thm. 4).

2 Preliminaries

Let Σ be a set of symbols referred to as the *alphabet*, and Σ^* the set of strings over Σ . For any integer $n \geq 1$, Σ^n is the set of strings of length n . For any string $x \in \Sigma^*$, $|x|$ denotes x 's length. The empty string (the string of length 0) is denoted by ε . For any integer $i \in [1, n]$, $x[i]$ is the i th symbol of x , and for any integer $j \in [i, n]$, $x[i..j] = x[i] \cdots x[j]$. For convenience, let $x[i..j] = \varepsilon$ if $i > j$. Let $\text{rot}(x, i) = x[i+1..n]x[1..i]$ for $i \geq 0$, and $\text{rot}(x, i) = x[n+i+1..n]x[1..n+i]$ for $i \leq 0$. For any string x , a string y is a *cyclic rotation* of x if there exist i such that $y = \text{rot}(x, i)$. Let $x = x^1$, and for any integer $k \geq 2$, $x^k = xx^{k-1}$. A string is *primitive*, if it cannot be represented as x^k for some string x and integer $k \geq 2$.

Given a total order \prec on Σ , the lexicographic order (also denoted by \prec) induced by \prec is a total order on Σ^* such that $x \prec y$ iff x is a prefix of y , or, $x[i] \prec y[i]$ where $i = \min\{k \geq 1 \mid x[k] \neq y[k]\}$. A string w is a *Lyndon*

word, if it is lexicographically smaller than any of its proper suffixes [16]. Lyndon words are primitive. Also, any string w can be partitioned into a unique sequence of lexicographically non-decreasing Lyndon words, called the *Lyndon factorization* [12] of w , i.e., $w = f_1^{k_1} \dots f_{\ell(w)}^{k_{\ell(w)}}$ where each f_i ($1 \leq i \leq \ell(w)$) is a Lyndon word, and $f_i \succ f_{i+1}$ for all $1 \leq i < \ell(w)$. We call $f_i^{k_i}$ the i -th *Lyndon necklace* of w . The ω -order \prec_ω is a total order over primitive strings, defined as: $x \prec_\omega y \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x^\infty \prec y^\infty$.

Given a string w , the Burrows–Wheeler transform $\text{BWT}(w)$ is a string obtained by concatenating the last symbol of all cyclic rotations of w , in lexicographic order. The bijective BWT $\text{BBWT}(w)$ is a string obtained by concatenating the last symbol of all cyclic rotations of all Lyndon factors in the Lyndon factorization of w , in ω -order. The number of same-character runs in $\text{BWT}(w)$ and $\text{BBWT}(w)$ will be denoted by $r(w)$, and $r_B(w)$ respectively. Although $r(w)$, $r_B(w)$ and $\ell(w)$ are functions on strings to non-negative integers, we will omit writing the considered string and just write r, r_B, ℓ , if the context is clear.

3 Properties of r_B

We here introduce r_B as a repetitiveness measure for a string w . For that, we confirm that r_B corresponds to the size of a *bidirectional macro scheme (BMS)*, and is a repetitiveness measure for a form of dictionary compression, as is RLBWT. A BMS [21], the most expressive form of dictionary compression, partitions w into phrases, such that each phrase of length at least 2 can be represented as a reference to another substring of w . The referencing of the phrases induces a referencing forest over the positions: any position in a phrase of length at least 2 references another position in w , such that adjacent positions in the same phrase point to adjacent positions, and there are no cycles.

Lemma 1. *There exists a BMS of size $O(r_B(w))$ that represents the string w .*

Proof. We follow the existence proof for a BMS of size $O(r(w))$ by Gagie et al. [13, Section 10.1]. We consider a BMS such that each text position that does not correspond to a beginning of a same-character run in $\text{BBWT}(w)$ will reference the text position corresponding to the preceding character in the $\text{BBWT}(w)$. It is clear that there are no cycles in such a referencing, and we claim that this allows the string to be partitioned into $O(r_B)$ phrases, such that references of adjacent positions in a given phrase of length at least two point to adjacent positions.

Focus on the i -th Lyndon necklace $f_i^{k_i}$ of w . For any cyclic rotation of f_i , its k_i copies occur adjacently when writing all cyclic conjugates of all Lyndon factors in the ω -order, and thus correspond to adjacent characters in a run in $\text{BBWT}(w)$. It follows that for any position in the last $k - 1$ copies of f_i , the reference points to the corresponding position in the preceding copy. Thus, adjacent positions reference adjacent positions, and can be contained in the same phrase.

Next, consider a position in the first copy of f_i that does not correspond to a beginning of a same-character run in $\text{BBWT}(w)$. Then, since the character at this

position and the preceding (in ω -order) cyclic string is the same, their preceding positions must also correspond to adjacent positions in $\text{BBWT}(w)$ as well. This implies that, as long as the corresponding position is again not a beginning of a same-character run, adjacent positions will refer to adjacent positions, albeit, in the cyclic sense. Being the beginning of a same-character run in $\text{BBWT}(w)$ can happen at most r_B times. Being adjacent in the cyclic sense, but not being adjacent in text-order can happen at most once per Lyndon necklace. Thus, the number of times adjacent text positions can be in a different phrase is bounded by $O(r_B + \ell(w))$. Since $\ell(w) \leq r_B$ is known [9], this concludes the proof. \square

Theorem 1. *For any string, $r_B = O(z \log^2 n)$.*

Proof. (Sketch) We follow the proof of $r = O(z \log^2 n)$ by Kempa and Kociumaka [14]. The LCP array of a string w is an array of integers such that its i -th entry is the length of the longest common prefix (*lcp*) between the lexicographically $(i - 1)$ -th and i -th cyclic rotation of w . An *irreducible LCP position* is a position i such that $i = 1$ or $\text{BWT}(w)[i - 1] \neq \text{BWT}(w)[i]$, and thus the number r of BWT runs is the number of irreducible LCP positions. For a multiset of primitive cyclic strings, we analogously define the ω -LCP array such that its i -th entry is the *lcp* between x^∞ and y^∞ , where x and y are respectively the $(i - 1)$ -th and i -th string, in ω -order, among all cyclic rotations of all Lyndon factors of the Lyndon factorization of w . By construction, the number r_B of BBWT runs is the number of irreducible ω -LCP positions, i.e., $i = 1$ or $\text{BBWT}(w)[i - 1] \neq \text{BBWT}(w)[i]$. Note that ω -LCP values can be infinite when there are Lyndon necklaces in the Lyndon factorization with exponent at least 2, but they can be safely disregarded since they are not irreducible. The theorem follows if we can show that for any value k , the number of irreducible ω -LCP values in $[k, 2k)$ is $O(z \log n)$ and considering $k = 2^i$ for $i = 0, \dots, \lfloor \log n \rfloor$.

The arguments in the proof in [14] proceed by first asserting that for any integer k , a string contains at most $3kz$ distinct strings of length $3k$. Then, each irreducible LCP value in $[k, 2k)$ is associated with a cost of k , which are charged to positions in the at most $3kz$ strings that have an occurrence crossing the corresponding suffix array position, and it is shown that each substring can be charged at most $2 \log n$ times. The total cost is thus at most $6kz \log n$ and thus the number of irreducible LCP values is $O(z \log n)$.

For ω -LCP, the corresponding length $3k$ substring associated with the suffix array position may not occur in the original string but instead will correspond to a substring of some Lyndon necklace of the Lyndon factorization. Note that there are at most $3k$ distinct substrings of length $3k$ that are not substrings of the original string but a substring of a given Lyndon necklace. Since $\ell(w) < 4z$ [22], we have that the total number of such distinct substrings of length $3k$ that occur in this context is still bounded by $O(kz)$, and that the arguments still hold. \square

Despite sharing common traits, r and r_B can be asymptotically different:

Theorem 2. *There exists a family of strings with $r_B = \Omega(\log n)$ and $r = 2$.*

Proof. Define the Fibonacci words as follows: $F_0 = \mathbf{b}, F_1 = \mathbf{a}, F_i = F_{i-1}F_{i-2}$. The infinite Fibonacci word is $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} F_k$. Melançon [18] showed that the k -th factor (the first factor being the 0-th) of the Lyndon factorization of the infinite Fibonacci word, has length f_{2k+2} , where $f_i = |F_i|$. Now, $\sum_{k=0}^i f_{2k+2} = -f_1 + (\dots(((f_1 + f_2) + f_4) + f_6) + \dots) + f_{2i+2} = f_{2i+3} - 1$. Therefore, the word obtained by deleting the last symbol of F_{2i+3} has $i + 1$ distinct Lyndon factors. Noticing that the last symbol of F_{2i+3} must be ‘a’ and will form a distinct Lyndon factor, we have that the size of the Lyndon factorization of F_{2i+3} is $i + 2$. Since $\ell(w) \leq r_B$ [9], the BBWT of the k -th Fibonacci word F_k for odd k has $\Omega(k)$ runs, while the BWT of any Fibonacci word has $r(F_k) = 2$ runs [17]. \square

We have not yet been able to find a family of strings where $r_B = o(r)$.

4 RLBBWT and Rotation

The results of the previous section give the impression that r seems superior to r_B . However, if we are to incorporate a rotation operation, which can be encoded as a single $\log n$ -bit integer, r becomes an upper bound. That is because we have $r(x) = r_B(x)$ for the Lyndon rotation x of any primitive word. The Lyndon rotation of a primitive word can be computed in linear time [20].

For any string w , let $\hat{w} = \arg \min_{uv=w} \{r_B(vu)\}$ be the *optimal* rotation w.r.t. r_B . We observe that \hat{w} is not always the Lyndon rotation of w . For example, for the Lyndon word $w = \mathbf{aaabaabaaabaabb}$, we have that $\text{BWT}(w) = \text{BBWT}(w) = \mathbf{bbbaabaaaaabaaaa}$, thus $r_B(w) = 6$. However, we have that $\hat{w} = \text{rot}(w, -1) = \mathbf{baaabaabaaabaab}$ and $\text{BBWT}(\hat{w}) = \mathbf{bbbbaaaaaaaaab}$, thus $r_B(\hat{w}) = 3$.

Since $\text{BBWT}(w)$ (and hence $r_B(w)$) can be computed in $O(n)$ time, it is straightforward to compute \hat{w} (and hence $r_B(\hat{w})$) in $O(n^2)$ time. A subquadratic time algorithm for this problem would be very interesting. (For LZ77, it was recently shown that indeed subquadratic time computation is possible [3].) While we have not yet been able to achieve this, we give a partial result:

Theorem 3. *We can compute the sizes of the Lyndon factorizations of all cyclic rotations of w in time linear in the length of w .*

Proof. (Sketch) Assume that w is Lyndon, consider the string $W = ww$, and view the cyclic rotations of w as substrings of length $|w|$ of W . Any Lyndon factorization of such a substring consists of the Lyndon factorization of a suffix of w and a prefix of w , since any $x = uv$ such that u is a suffix of w and v is a prefix of w cannot be Lyndon: it would imply $uv \prec v \prec w \prec u$, a contradiction.

We observe that the factors of the Lyndon factorization for any suffix of w , are the sequence of maximal right sub-trees of the standard (right) Lyndon tree [4] of w that are contained in the suffix. Similarly, for any prefix of w , they are the maximal left sub-trees of the left Lyndon tree [2] of w that are contained in the prefix. Both trees can be computed in linear time. It is not difficult to see that the changes in the sequences, and thus the sizes of the Lyndon factorizations can be computed in total linear time for each of the suffixes and prefixes, by a left-to-right traversal on the trees. \square

5 BBWT Reachability

Further developing the idea of combining rotation and BBWT in order to obtain a smaller representation of a string, we give the following conjecture.

Conjecture 1. Given two words with the same Parikh vector, we can transform one to the other by using only rotation and BBWT operations.

If true, this would suggest that it is possible, for example, to represent a string w based on w 's Parikh vector, and a sequence of integers where each integer alternately represents the offset of the rotation or the number of times BBWT is applied, to reach w from the lexicographically smallest string with the same Parikh vector.

We have computationally confirmed the conjecture for ternary strings of up to length 17, with code available at <https://github.com/koepl/bbwtreachability>, and have proved it for the specific cases where the alphabet is binary, or, when all symbols are distinct. We first give the following lemma.

Lemma 2. *Let x be a word of length n whose smallest rotation is itself, over the alphabet $\{c_1, \dots, c_\sigma\}$ where $c_1 \prec \dots \prec c_\sigma$, and let (e_1, \dots, e_σ) be the Parikh vector of x . Let $y = c_1^{e_1} \dots c_\sigma^{e_\sigma}$, i.e., the lexicographically smallest string with the same Parikh vector as x , and $i = lcp(x, y)$. Then, if $x \neq y$ and $x[i] \neq x[n]$, $\min\{vu \mid uv = \text{BBWT}^{-1}(x[n]x[1..n-1])\} \prec x$.*

Proof. Let $x[1..i] = c_1^{e_1} \dots c_k^{e'_k}$, where $e'_k \leq e_k$. This implies that symbols smaller than c_k are all used up in $x[1..i] = y[1..i]$, and cannot occur in $x[i+1..n]$ nor $y[i+1..n]$. Thus, it holds that $x[j] \succeq x[i] = c_k$ for $j \in [i+1, n]$, in particular, $x[n] \succ x[i] \succeq x[j]$ for all $j \in [1, i]$ since $x[i] \neq x[n]$ is assumed.

Next, consider traversing the symbols of $\hat{x} = x[n]x[1..n-1]$ using the LF mapping $\psi_{\hat{x}}$ starting from position i' such that $\psi_{\hat{x}}(i') = i+1$ to recover one of the strings that composes $\text{BBWT}^{-1}(\hat{x})$. Thus, we start from the symbol $\hat{x}[i'] = y[i+1]$. Since $\hat{x}[1] = x[n] \neq x[j] = y[j]$ for any $j \in [1..i]$ and $\hat{x}[2..i+1] = x[1..i] = y[1..i]$, it follows that $\psi_{\hat{x}}(j) = j-1$ for any $j \in [2..i+1]$. Therefore, we have that $y[i+1]$ is prefixed by $x[1..i]$, i.e., $\text{BBWT}^{-1}(\hat{x})$ consists of a string with $x[1..i]y[i+1] \prec x[1..i+1]$ as a substring, where the inequality follows from the definition of y and i . Thus, the lemma holds. \square

Theorem 4. *Given two words of the same length with the same Parikh vector, it is possible to transform one to the other by using only rotation and BBWT transformations if all symbols are distinct, or if the alphabet is binary.*

Proof. Given any word, consider its smallest rotation x , and let y be the smallest word with the same Parikh vector. Since BBWT and rotations are automorphisms (note that for any x , there exists k such that $\text{BBWT}^k(x) = \text{BBWT}^{-1}(x)$), it suffices to show that we can reach y from x . If $y \prec x$, using Lemma 2, we can always obtain a strictly lexicographically smaller string using rotations and BBWT^{-1} and thus eventually reach y : when all symbols are distinct, it is easy to see that the condition of Lemma 2 holds. If the alphabet is binary, i.e., $\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}\}$, we have that $x[n] = \mathbf{b}$ since x is a smallest rotation. Furthermore, if $i = lcp(x, y)$, then, since $x[i] = \mathbf{b}$ would imply $x = y$, we have $x[i] = \mathbf{a} \neq \mathbf{b} = x[n]$. \square

References

1. Akagi, T., Funakoshi, M., Inenaga, S.: Sensitivity of string compressors and repetitiveness measures. *Inf. Comput.* **291**, 104999 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IC.2022.104999>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2022.104999>
2. Badkobeh, G., Crochemore, M.: Linear construction of a left Lyndon tree. *Inf. Comput.* **285**(Part), 104884 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IC.2022.104884>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2022.104884>
3. Bannai, H., Charalampopoulos, P., Radoszewski, J.: Maintaining the size of LZ77 on semi-dynamic strings (2024), to appear at CPM '24
4. Bannai, H., I, T., Inenaga, S., Nakashima, Y., Takeda, M., Tsuruta, K.: The “runs” theorem. *SIAM J. Comput.* **46**(5), 1501–1514 (2017)
5. Bannai, H., Kärkkäinen, J., Köppl, D., Piatkowski, M.: Indexing the bijective BWT. In: *Proc. CPM. LIPIcs*, vol. 128, pp. 17:1–17:14 (2019)
6. Bannai, H., Kärkkäinen, J., Köppl, D., Piatkowski, M.: Constructing and indexing the bijective and extended Burrows–Wheeler transform. *Information and Computation* **297**, 105153 (2024). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2024.105153>, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S089054012400018X>
7. Biagi, E., Cenzato, D., Lipták, Z., Romana, G.: On the number of equal-letter runs of the bijective Burrows–Wheeler transform. In: Castiglione, G., Sciortino, M. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 24th Italian Conference on Theoretical Computer Science*, Palermo, Italy, September 13–15, 2023. *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, vol. 3587, pp. 129–142. *CEUR-WS.org* (2023), <https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-3587/4564.pdf>
8. Boucher, C., Cenzato, D., Lipták, Z., Rossi, M., Sciortino, M.: Computing the original eBWT faster, simpler, and with less memory. In: Lecroq, T., Touzet, H. (eds.) *String Processing and Information Retrieval - 28th International Symposium, SPIRE 2021, Lille, France, October 4–6, 2021, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 12944, pp. 129–142. Springer (2021). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-86692-1_11, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-86692-1_11
9. Boucher, C., Cenzato, D., Lipták, Z., Rossi, M., Sciortino, M.: r-indexing the eBWT. In: *Proc. SPIRE. LNCS*, vol. 12944, pp. 3–12 (2021)
10. Boucher, C., Cenzato, D., Lipták, Z., Rossi, M., Sciortino, M.: r-indexing the eBWT. *Information and Computation* **298**, 105155 (2024). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2024.105155>, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0890540124000208>
11. Burrows, M., Wheeler, D.J.: A block sorting lossless data compression algorithm. *Tech. Rep. 124*, Digital Equipment Corporation, Palo Alto, California (1994)
12. Chen, K.T., Fox, R.H., Lyndon, R.C.: Free differential calculus, IV. The quotient groups of the lower central series. *Annals of Mathematics* **68**(1), 81–95 (1958)
13. Gagie, T., Navarro, G., Prezza, N.: Optimal-time text indexing in BWT-runs bounded space (May 2017), <http://arxiv.org/abs/1705.10382v4>
14. Kempa, D., Kociumaka, T.: Resolution of the Burrows–Wheeler transform conjecture. *Commun. ACM* **65**(6), 91–98 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3531445>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3531445>
15. Kufleitner, M.: On bijective variants of the Burrows–Wheeler transform. In: *Proc. PSC*. pp. 65–79 (2009)
16. Lyndon, R.C.: On Burnside’s problem. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **77**(2), 202–215 (1954)
17. Mantaci, S., Restivo, A., Sciortino, M.: Burrows–Wheeler transform and Sturmian words. *Inf. Process. Lett.* **86**(5), 241–246 (2003)

18. Melançon, G.: Lyndon words and singular factors of Sturmian words. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **218**(1), 41–59 (1999)
19. Navarro, G.: Indexing highly repetitive string collections, part I: repetitiveness measures. *ACM Comput. Surv.* **54**(2), 29:1–29:31 (2021)
20. Shiloach, Y.: Fast canonization of circular strings. *J. Algorithms* **2**(2), 107–121 (1981)
21. Storer, J.A., Szymanski, T.G.: Data compression via textual substitution. *J. ACM* **29**(4), 928–951 (1982). <https://doi.org/10.1145/322344.322346>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/322344.322346>
22. Urabe, Y., Nakashima, Y., Inenaga, S., Bannai, H., Takeda, M.: On the size of overlapping lempel-ziv and lyndon factorizations. In: Pisanti, N., Pissis, S.P. (eds.) 30th Annual Symposium on Combinatorial Pattern Matching, CPM 2019, June 18–20, 2019, Pisa, Italy. *LIPICs*, vol. 128, pp. 29:1–29:11. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2019). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.CPM.2019.29>, <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.CPM.2019.29>


A BMS from BBWT

For the string $w = abbabbabab$, we give below an example for the BMS computed from its BBWT. The Lyndon factorization of w is abb, abb, ab, ab, ab .

i	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
$w[i]$	a	b	b	b	a	b	b	a	b	a	b	a	b
BBWT[i]	b	b	b	b	b	a	a	a	b	b	a	b	a
CSA[i]	8	10	12	5	1	9	11	13	7	4	6	3	2
CSA[i] - 1	9	11	13	7	4	8	10	12	6	3	5	2	1
ref?		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓			

The number of runs r_B is 6. BBWT positions belonging to a referencing phrase are marked with ✓ in the last row. We therefore have 6 non-referencing phrases.

The referencing phrases are computed as follows: In the table, CSA is the circular suffix array whose entry CSA[i] denotes the text position after the one from which we took BBWT[i] (or the first text position if BBWT[i] belongs to the last character of a Lyndon factor). The row CSA[i] - 1 denotes the text position corresponding to BBWT[i]. By construction of our BMS, the CSA entry positions 2-5, 7-8, and 10 correspond to referencing phrases, i.e., the text positions after 10, 12, 5, 1, 11, 13, 4 (applying CSA on these entry positions), i.e., the text positions 11, 13, 7, 4, 10, 12, 3. These positions refer to 9, 11, 13, 7, 8, 10, 6, respectively. If we combine neighboring positions with neighboring references, we obtain the following 9 phrases.



B Lyndon Factorization of all Rotations

The right Lyndon tree of a Lyndon word w is a binary tree defined as follows: if w is a single letter, it is a leaf, otherwise, the left and right child are respectively the Lyndon trees of u, v where $w = uv$ and v is the longest proper suffix of w that is a Lyndon word. (Note that it can be shown that this choice of v implies that u is a Lyndon word.) The left Lyndon tree is defined analogously, but u is the longest proper prefix of w that is a Lyndon word. (Similarly, it can be shown that this choice of u implies that v is a Lyndon word)

By definition of the Lyndon trees, and the property of the Lyndon factorization which states that the first (resp. last) factor is the longest prefix (resp. suffix) that is a Lyndon word, it is a simple observation that the Lyndon factorization of a suffix of w is exactly the sequence of maximal right nodes of the right Lyndon tree that are contained in the suffix, and the Lyndon factorization of a prefix of w is exactly the sequence of maximal left nodes of the left Lyndon tree that are contained in the prefix. See Fig 1.




Fig. 1. The left and right Lyndon trees of the string $w = aaabaaabababaabb$. The Lyndon factorization of cyclic rotations of w are shown below, where factors are delimited by vertical bars. Right-nodes of the right Lyndon tree, and left-nodes of the left Lyndon tree are marked in red.

C Example for Lemma 2

The idea of Lemma 2 can be described by the following algorithm:

1. take an input string w of length n
2. let x be w 's smallest rotation
3. let $p = \text{BBWT}^{-1}(x[n] \cdot x[1..n-1])$
4. return the smallest rotation of p

Our claim in Lemma 2 is that this computation gives a string that is lexicographically smaller than x having the same Parikh vector, if the conditions stated in the lemma are satisfied.

Example 1. Take $x = \text{aacb}$. Then $p = \text{BBWT}^{-1}(x[n] \cdot x[1..n-1]) = \text{BBWT}^{-1}(\text{baac}) = \text{caab}$. The smallest rotation of p is aabc , which is lexicographically smaller than x .

In Example 1, p coincides here with the string y in the proof of Lemma 2. A schematic sketch of this proof is given in Fig. 2.




Fig. 2. Schematic sketch of the proof of Lemma 2. Here, $\alpha = y[i+1]$ and $\beta = x[i+1]$ with $c_k \leq y[i+1] = \alpha < x[i+1] = \beta$. Repeating the LF mapping produces a string that contains $x[1..i]y[i+1]$.

D Open Problems

We pose the following questions:

1. Is it possible to compute the BBWT of all cyclic rotations in linear time?
2. Given a string of length n , is there an upper bound on the cycle length when applying BBWT iteratively? We would like to find the smallest k for which the iterative application of BBWT on a string w gives w .
3. Can we define a family of strings with $r_B = o(r)$?
4. Does Conjecture 1 hold for general alphabets?