

The structure of polynomial growth for tree automata/transducers and MSO set queries

Paul Gallot

Universität Bremen, Germany

Nathan Lhote ✉

Laboratoire d'Informatique et des Systèmes (LIS), Aix-Marseille University, France

Lê Thành Dũng (Tito) Nguyễn ✉ 🏠 📧

LIS, CNRS & Aix-Marseille University, France

Abstract

The ambiguity of a tree automaton is the number of distinct accepting runs over a given input. We show that, in polynomial time, one can decide whether the ambiguity grows polynomially or exponentially in the input size, and, in the former case, one can compute the exact polynomial degree. Equivalently, this amounts to studying the growth of the number of results of set queries in Monadic Second-Order logic (MSO) over ranked trees; we also prove a reparameterization theorem for such queries in the case of polynomial growth.

This property of MSO set queries leads directly to a generalization of Bojańczyk's dimension minimization theorem for string-to-string polyregular functions. Our generalization applies to MSO set interpretations from trees, which subsume (as we show) tree-walking transducers and invisible pebble tree-to-string transducers. Finally, with a bit more work we obtain the following:

- a new, short and conceptual proof that macro tree transducers of linear growth compute only tree-to-tree MSO transductions (a seminal theorem of Engelfriet and Maneth);
- a procedure to decide polynomial size-to-height increase for macro tree transducers and compute the polynomial degree, which extends the recent decidability result of Gallot, Maneth, Nakano and Peyrat concerning linear size-to-height increase.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Transducers

Keywords and phrases monadic second-order logic, polynomial ambiguity, polyregular functions, macro tree transducers

Acknowledgements This collaboration was initiated thanks to Sylvain Salvati's intermediation and then highly stimulated by the Dagstuhl Seminar on Regular Transformations [1]. Our approach to size-to-height increase was inspired by Thomas Colcombet's advice on handling maxima using nondeterminism and positionality arguments. We would also like to thank Antoine Amarilli, Mikołaj Bojańczyk, Gaëtan Douéneau-Tabot, Denis Kuperberg, Anca Muscholl and Sylvain Schmitz for interesting discussions. L. T. D. Nguyễn is especially grateful to Sandra Kiefer and Cécilia Pradic for their collaboration on the related work [50].

1 Introduction

This paper is concerned with the asymptotics of various quantities, defined by automata or logic, depending on a (finite) input tree over a fixed ranked alphabet. More specifically, for a map f from trees to $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, \dots\}$, we consider the associated *growth rate function*

$$\text{growth}[f]: n \in \mathbb{N} \mapsto \max_{|t| \leq n} f(t)$$

where the size $|t|$ of the tree t is its number of nodes. We shall say that:

- f has *polynomial growth of degree* $k \in \mathbb{N}$ when $\text{growth}[f](n) = \Theta(n^k)$;
- f has *exponential growth* when $\text{growth}[f](n) = 2^{\Theta(n)}$ – in that case we shall say that the degree of growth of f is ∞ .

Ambiguity of tree automata. The ambiguity of a non-deterministic automaton over a given input tree is its number of distinct runs over this input. This notion plays an important role in the theory of automata over words; the definition extends as it is to tree automata, and it has been occasionally studied in this setting, e.g. in [53].

E. Paul has shown [60, Corollary 8.27] that the ambiguity of a tree automaton must have a well-defined degree of growth in $\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, in accordance with our definition above. In particular, following standard terminology, every tree automaton is either *polynomially ambiguous* or *exponentially ambiguous*. We reprove this result and make it effective:

► **Theorem 1.1.** *The degree of growth of the ambiguity of a tree automaton is computable in polynomial time.*

In the special case of strings, there was already a polynomial-time algorithm due to Weber and Seidl [68, Section 4]. But surprisingly, we have not found this theorem explicitly stated for trees in the literature.

MSO set queries. Let $F(X_1, \dots, X_\ell)$ be a formula of *monadic second-order logic* (MSO) over trees. We capitalize the free variables X_1, \dots, X_ℓ to indicate that they are second-order variables – that is, they range over sets of nodes. Such a formula defines an *MSO set query*

$$?F: \text{tree } t \mapsto \left\{ \underbrace{(P_1, \dots, P_\ell)}_{\text{each of these tuples is called a result of the query}} \in \{\text{subsets of nodes of } t\}^\ell \mid t \models F(P_1, \dots, P_\ell) \right\}$$

The enumeration of the results of such queries has been an active topic of research in database theory, see for instance [3, Sections 3.4 & 4.3]. Here, we start with this elementary remark:


▷ **Claim 1.2.** From an MSO set query over trees (given by a formula), one can effectively compute a tree automaton whose ambiguity coincides, over any input tree, with the number of results of the query. Thus, the growth rate of this query enjoys a polynomial/exponential dichotomy and its degree is computable.

We can say more about queries of polynomial growth, thanks to structural properties that arise in our study of polynomially ambiguous tree automata (E. Paul’s aforementioned work also states some related properties [60, Lemmas 8.11 & 8.20]). Let us say that a family of functions is *finite-to-one* if there is some global finite bound on the cardinality of every fiber $f^{-1}(\{x\})$, for f in the family and x in the codomain of f .

► **Theorem 1.3.** *Suppose that $F(X_1, \dots, X_\ell)$ defines an MSO set query over trees that has polynomial growth, with degree $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there exists a finite-to-one and effectively MSO-definable family of functions $?F(t) \rightarrow \{\text{nodes of } t\}^k$, indexed by input trees t .*

We shall make the meaning of “MSO-definable” in this statement precise in Section 3; “effectively” means that the MSO formula defining this family can be computed from F . Morally, the results of the query can be *reparameterized* in MSO by k -tuples of *nodes* instead of ℓ -tuples of *sets*, up to bounded imprecision.

► **Example 1.4.** Let us consider an MSO set query over trees that selects paths from the root — let us say *rooted paths* for short — under a suitable encoding as tuples of sets of nodes. We give such an encoding (for a larger class of graphs) in Example 3.3. The number of rooted paths grows linearly in the size of the tree; Theorem 1.3 then says that they can be sent in a finite-to-one fashion to tree nodes. To do so explicitly, we can send a rooted path to its endpoint — this is in fact one-to-one, as well as MSO-definable (Example 3.10).



■ **Figure 1** A tree-to-graph MSO transduction (left) followed by an unfolding (right). For an input of size n , the output of the composition has size $n(n+3)/2 - 1 = \Theta(n^2)$.

MSO (set) interpretations & tree transducers. The above Theorem 1.3 is very similar to Bojańczyk’s “Seed Lemma”¹ [8, Lemma 6.2]. While our conclusions are slightly weaker, the Seed Lemma as stated in [8] requires much stronger assumptions: it only applies to MSO formulas over strings with first-order free variables. (This is due to Bojańczyk’s use of factorization forests, whereas our proof relies only on elementary pumping arguments.)

The original purpose of the Seed Lemma was to prove a *dimension minimization* property for *MSO interpretations* on strings, a logical formalism for defining functions [8, Theorem 6.1]. Our results on MSO set queries therefore allow us to generalize this property to MSO *set* interpretations (introduced by Colcombet and Löding [23]) on trees.

► **Theorem 1.5.** *The output size of an MSO set interpretation \mathcal{I} from trees to relational structures grows either polynomially or exponentially in the input size, with a computable degree $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$. Furthermore, when $k < \infty$, one can compute a k -dimensional MSO interpretation that defines the same function as \mathcal{I} (up to isomorphism of structures).*

In particular we can decide if the growth rate is linear — this is the case $k \leq 1$ — and if it is, we get an equivalent 1-dimensional interpretation, a.k.a. an MSO transduction.

The aforementioned notion of MSO transduction was introduced in the late 1980s [4, 29, 24] and has gone on to acquire a central importance in automata theory and adjacent fields, such as parts of graph theory, cf. e.g. [25, 9]. In the string-to-string case, MSO transductions capture the important class of *regular functions* (cf. [57]), whereas MSO interpretations characterize the *polyregular functions* [13, Theorem 7]; the latter have been the subject of many works in recent years, see [8, 49] for surveys.²

As for MSO set interpretations, which our new theorem applies to, they subsume some function classes defined by tree *transducers*, i.e. automata with outputs.

► **Example 1.6.** An *MSO transduction with sharing* (MSOTS) consists of a tree-to-graph MSO transduction post-composed with the graph-to-tree *unfolding* operation, as illustrated by Figure 1. They define the same class of functions as some well-established automata models, such as tree-walking transducers with regular look-around [7, Theorem 17].³

By translating MSOTS to MSO set interpretations (Proposition 5.1), we make Theorem 1.5 applicable: there is an algorithm which can detect, e.g., that the MSOTS of Figure 1 has quadratic growth, and then compute an equivalent 2-dimensional MSO interpretation.

¹ The lemma is stated without proof in [8]. All the proof ingredients may be found in [10, Section 2], even though the statements given there are formally slightly different.

² At the time of writing, no such results have been published for string-to-string MSO set interpretations, but they are currently being investigated by M. Bojańczyk, T. Colcombet, E. Filiot, N. Lhote, P. Ohlmann, P.-A. Reynier, . . . For instance, they were the topic of a recent talk at Dagstuhl [1, §3.15].

³ Bloem and Engelfriet [7] state the result for a formalism based on attribute grammars, which is essentially equivalent to tree-walking transducers. We refer to [58, Section 3.2] for further discussion of this point.

In Section 5, we also detail (and discuss the significance of) some slightly less immediate applications of Theorem 1.5 to tree transducers: they do not merely amount to observing that a function class of interest is included in MSO set interpretations. *Inter alia*, we generalize a couple of decidability results — an old one [36] and a new one [39] — on the asymptotics of *macro tree transducers* (MTTs). Furthermore, our proofs are arguably simpler and more conceptual than those of [36, 39] since we avoid combinatorial reasoning on MTTs.

1.1 Some closely related work: ambiguity vs \mathbb{N} -weighted automata

We only discuss a small sample of the related work here, chosen for its relevance to our technical development. The rest is covered partially throughout the paper, and partially in the conclusion (Section 6.1).

It is well known that the ambiguity of a nondeterministic (tree or string) automaton \mathcal{A} is equal, over all inputs, to the value of the $(\mathbb{N}, +, \times)$ -weighted automaton obtained from \mathcal{A} by turning the presence (resp. absence) of a transition into the weight 0 (resp. 1). Conversely, by taking copies of the states of an $(\mathbb{N}, +, \times)$ -weighted automaton \mathcal{B} , one can build a nondeterministic automaton whose ambiguity coincides with the value of \mathcal{B} .

Let us now focus on strings as input. Through the aforementioned correspondence, the structural characterisation of finitely ambiguous automata — i.e. whose growth rate has degree 0 — by Weber and Seidl [68, Theorem 3.1] is very similar (though not identical) to Mandel and Simon’s earlier decision procedure for the boundedness of $(\mathbb{N}, +, \times)$ -weighted automata [54, Corollary 5.2]. As already mentioned, Weber and Seidl also prove⁴ the special case of Theorem 1.1 over strings; using similar ideas, Douéneau-Tabot [27, Section 4.4.2] gives a simple proof of the analogous results⁵ for the growth of an $(\mathbb{N}, +, \times)$ -weighted automaton, which relies on (a rephrasing of) Mandel and Simon’s results. Douéneau-Tabot’s arguments are a key inspiration in our proof of Theorem 1.1.

Finally, extending the ideas of his paper with Weber [68], Seidl showed the decidability (in polynomial time) of finite ambiguity for tree automata [65, Theorem 2.5]. His characterization of finite ambiguity — or rather, a slight variant (Theorem 2.8 here) — plays a crucial role in our proof of Theorem 1.1. Paul’s work on the structure of polynomially ambiguous tree automata [60], which we mentioned at the beginning of the paper, also leverages Seidl’s theorem. Although Paul does not propose a decision procedure, a non-effective version of Theorem 1.3 could almost be derived from his results.

1.2 Conventions on trees

A *ranked alphabet* is a finite set Σ given together with a *rank function* $\text{rank} : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. The set $\mathbb{T}\Sigma$ of *trees* over Σ is freely inductively generated by:

$$\text{empty family when } \text{rank}(a)=0 \\ \text{for } a \in \Sigma \text{ and } \overbrace{t_1, \dots, t_{\text{rank}(a)}} \in \mathbb{T}\Sigma, \quad a(t_1, \dots, t_{\text{rank}(a)}) \in \mathbb{T}\Sigma$$

This inductive definition means that trees are subject to structural equality:

$$a(t_1, \dots, t_k) = b(t'_1, \dots, t'_\ell) \iff a = b \text{ (implying } k = \ell) \text{ and } \forall i, t_i = t'_i$$

⁴ They are not the first to do so, though their algorithm is the first one that runs in polynomial time. See [45, Section 3] for a discussion of earlier work.

⁵ In particular, he shows that the degree of growth can be computed in polynomial time. Formally, this does not directly follow from Weber and Seidl’s result, because the reduction from $(\mathbb{N}, +, \times)$ -weighted automata to nondeterministic automata that we alluded to above is not polynomial (but it is pseudo-polynomial, i.e. polynomial when the weights are written in unary).

A tree $t \in T\Sigma$ has a set of *nodes*, with the usual meaning. We shall use the identification

$$\text{nodes}(a(t_1, \dots, t_k)) = \{\text{root of } t\} \cup \bigcup_{i=0}^k \text{nodes}(t_i), \quad \text{the union being disjoint.}$$

Even though it is formally incompatible with structural equality (in $a(t, t)$, do the two copies of t have the same nodes?), this slight abuse will not cause any issue for us in this paper. (See the “tree structures” of Section 3 for a rigorous treatment.) Each node has a *label* in Σ , and the nodes whose label has rank 0 are the *leaves*. To relate nodes in a tree, we use standard terminology: *parent*, *i*-th *child*, *ancestor/descendant*, etc.

A (*one-hole*) *context* over Σ is a tree over $\Sigma \cup \{\square \text{ (rank 0)}\}$ with exactly one leaf, the *hole*, labeled by \square . A context C can be applied to a tree by “plugging the root of t into the hole of C ”, producing a tree $C[t]$; for example, $a(b(\square), c)[a(c, c)] = a(b(a(c, c)), c)$. Contexts can be composed so that $(C \circ C')[t] = C[C'[t]]$.

2 Ambiguity of nondeterministic tree automata

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.1.

Let us fix a ranked alphabet Σ . As usual, a *tree automaton* over Σ consists of:

- a finite set of *states*, with a subset of *accepting states*;
- a set of *transitions* — each transition is a tuple $(q_1, \dots, q_{\text{rank}(a)}, a, q)$ where $a \in \Sigma$ and $q_1, \dots, q_{\text{rank}(a)}, q$ are states.

A *run* of the automaton over an input tree is a map from its nodes to states where for each node labeled by $a \in \Sigma$, its state and its children’s states are allowed to be q and $q_1, \dots, q_{\text{rank}(a)}$ respectively only if $(q_1, \dots, q_{\text{rank}(a)}, a, q)$ belongs to the set of transitions — we then call it the *transition taken at this node*. A run is *accepting* if the state at the root is an accepting state. On a given input, the *ambiguity* of a tree automaton is the number of accepting runs.

We have already mentioned the notions of finite/polynomial/exponential ambiguity. More generally a tree automaton is called *ambiguous* if its ambiguity is at least two on some input, and it is *unambiguous* otherwise.

► **Remark 2.1.** The way we write the transitions suggests a bottom-up point of view on tree automata; the top-down version would be (q, a, q_1, \dots, q_m) . However, we insist that for nondeterministic tree automata, this is only a matter of perspective: the bottom-up and top-down versions are syntactically isomorphic. Therefore, we can freely apply results stated for top-down automata, such as those of [65] (where accepting states are called “initial states”).

A run of a tree automaton over a context C is like a run over an input tree, except that the hole \square may be assigned any state.

► **Definition 2.2.** For q, q' two states and C a one-hole context, we denote by $q \rightarrow_C q'$ the existence of a run on C with q at the hole and q' at the root. When we drop the subscript, $q \rightarrow q'$ means that there exists a context C such that $q \rightarrow_C q'$.

(This definition implicitly depends on a tree automaton.)

A state q is *accessible* if there exists a tree t and a run on t with q at the root. We say that q is *co-accessible* if $q \rightarrow q_a$ where q_a is an accepting state. A tree automaton is *trim* if all its states are accessible and co-accessible. Tree automata can be trimmed in polynomial time [65, Proposition 1.1] — the trimmed automaton is obtained by removing states and transitions, and for any input tree, its set of accepting runs is the same as in the original automaton, so in particular the ambiguity is preserved.

Hence, for the rest of this Section 2, we assume our tree automata to be trim.

2.1 Deciding exponential vs polynomial growth

► **Definition 2.3.** For q, q' two states and C a one-hole context, we denote by $q \twoheadrightarrow_C q'$ the existence of two different runs on C with q at the hole and q' at the root. As in Definition 2.2, we drop the subscript to existentially quantify on C .

A heavy cycle consists of a state q and a context C such that $q \twoheadrightarrow_C q$.

► **Theorem 2.4.** If a trim tree automaton admits a heavy cycle, then it is exponentially ambiguous; otherwise, its ambiguity is bounded by a polynomial.⁶ This condition can be tested in polynomial time.

This subsection is dedicated to proving the above theorem. As before, we fix a trim tree automaton \mathcal{A} over a ranked alphabet Σ .

Polynomial-time detection of heavy cycles. Given \mathcal{A} and a state q , one can compute in polynomial time another automaton $\mathcal{A}_{q,q}$ over $\Sigma \cup \{q \text{ (rank 0)}\}$ whose runs over input trees correspond to the runs of \mathcal{A} over one-hole contexts with q at the hole and at the root. Then \mathcal{A} has no heavy cycle if and only if $\mathcal{A}_{q,q}$ is unambiguous for every state q , which can be tested in polynomial time [65, Proposition 1.2].

Heavy cycle \Rightarrow exponential ambiguity. The trivial upper bound (number of states) ^{n} is exponential. The lower bound is established by a simple pumping argument, that already appears in [65, proof of Proposition 2.1]. Let $q \twoheadrightarrow_C q$; let $q \rightarrow_{C'} q_a$ where q_a is accepting (by trimness, q is co-accessible) and t be a tree that admits a run where the root has state q (states are accessible). Then $t_n = C'[C^n[t]]$ has size $O(n)$ and admits at least 2^n runs:

$$q \twoheadrightarrow_C \cdots \twoheadrightarrow_C q \rightarrow_{C'} q_a$$

No heavy cycle \Rightarrow polynomial bound. Our argument is heavily inspired by [60, §8].

Suppose also, without loss of generality, that the tree automaton \mathcal{A} is ambiguous (otherwise the result is trivial) and has a single accepting state q_a .⁷ Let us say that a state is *ambiguous* if some input has at least two runs with this state at the root, otherwise the state is called unambiguous.

▷ **Claim 2.5.** The states q such that $q_a \rightarrow q$ are ambiguous. Moreover, in any run, the set of nodes labeled by such states is closed under taking ancestors.

Proof. The first half of the claim follows from the assumption that \mathcal{A} is ambiguous, which means that q_a is ambiguous. Moreover we observe that if $q_1 \rightarrow q_2$ and q_1 is ambiguous then so is q_2 . This is because if t has two distinct runs with q_1 at the root and $q_1 \rightarrow_C q_2$, then $C[t]$ has two distinct runs with q_2 at the root.

Let us fix an input tree and a run. Consider a node in the above-defined set, with state q , and one of its ancestors with state q' . They can be described as the respective roots of t

⁶ We do not yet say “polynomially ambiguous” because at this point, we have not proved that the growth rate of the ambiguity is $\Theta(n^k)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. This is a known result [60, Corollary 8.27], but we want to reprove it on the way to making it effective.

⁷ The ambiguity of an automaton with n accepting states is the sum of the ambiguities of n copies of this automaton, each with one accepting state. Finite sums of polynomials are also polynomials.

and $C[t]$ for some decomposition of the input as $C'[C[t]]$. We then have $q \rightarrow_C q'$ as part of our fixed run. From the assumption that $q_a \rightarrow q$, we then get $q_a \rightarrow q'$. \triangleleft

Call a transition (q_1, \dots, q_m, a, q) a *final bridge* when $q_a \rightarrow q$ but $q_a \not\rightarrow q_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$. Note that the second half of the definition is vacuously true for $m = 0$.

▷ **Claim 2.6.** Each accepting run contains exactly one occurrence of a final bridge.

Proof. Let us fix an input tree and an accepting run on that input. Let S be the set of nodes considered in Claim 2.5. The final bridges are exactly the transitions for the maximal nodes in S (for the descendant ordering). Since $S \neq \emptyset$ (it contains the root), it suffices to show that it has only one maximal element.

Suppose for the sake of contradiction that S has at least two distinct maximal nodes. They are descendants of the i -th and j -th children, respectively, of their lowest common ancestor, for some $i \neq j$. Let (q_1, \dots, q_m, a, q) be the transition taken at this common ancestor; then q , q_i and q_j are states labeling nodes in S . By Claim 2.5 again, q_j is ambiguous: it is reached (meaning, at the root) by two different runs on a common tree t . Then $q_i \rightarrow_C q$ where $C = a(t_1, \dots, t_{i-1}, \square, t_{i+1}, \dots, t_m)$, t_ℓ reaches q_ℓ for each ℓ and $t_j = t$. Furthermore, $q_a \rightarrow q_i$ by definition of S , and since the automaton is trim, $q \rightarrow q_a$. Thus, we get a heavy cycle $q \rightarrow_{C' \circ C} q$. \triangleleft

A run of our automaton \mathcal{A} over an input tree of size n is determined by:

- The final bridge (q_1, \dots, q_m, a, q) of this run — there are a finite number of choices.
- The node where it is taken — each of the $\leq n$ choices corresponds to a decomposition of the input tree as $C[a(t_1, \dots, t_k)]$ where the final bridge is taken at the a -labeled node.
- The run $q \rightarrow_C q_a$ “above” the final bridge. Since $q_a \rightarrow q$, there is only a single choice once C is fixed; otherwise, $q \rightarrow_C q_a$ would imply $q \rightarrow q$, a heavy cycle.
- For each $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, the run over the subtree t_i . It can be seen as an accepting run over t_i of the tree automaton \mathcal{A}_{q_i} obtained by setting q_i to be the new unique accepting state, then trimming. This last step removes at least the state q_a , because $q_a \not\rightarrow q_i$. Furthermore, \mathcal{A}_{q_i} still does not have heavy cycles. Thus, by reasoning by induction on the number of states, we may assume that the ambiguity of \mathcal{A}_{q_i} is polynomially bounded: it has $n^{O(1)}$ possible runs over t_i .

By multiplying these bounds together, we see that the ambiguity of \mathcal{A} is $n^{O(1)}$.

2.2 A known characterization of finite ambiguity

Our next goal is to study the polynomial degree of growth. To do so, we first need to recall the degree 0 case. (The terms “heavy cycle” and “barbell” are taken from [27, Section 4.4.2].)

► **Definition 2.7.** When $q_1 \neq q_2$ and $q_1 \rightarrow_C q_1$ and $q_1 \rightarrow_C q_2$ and $q_2 \rightarrow_C q_2$ — we stress that the three latter conditions must hold for the same context C — we write $q_1 \rightleftharpoons_C q_2$ and we call this configuration a *barbell*.

► **Theorem 2.8** (variation on [65, §2]). *A trim tree automaton is finitely ambiguous if and only if it does not contain any heavy cycle, nor any barbell.*

Let us discuss the relationship with Seidl’s results from [65]. For trim tree automata, he shows that unbounded ambiguity is equivalent to the disjunction of two conditions (T1) and (T2). While these conditions are stated in a local fashion using a “branch automaton”, in order to make algorithmic testing convenient, the proofs in [65, Section 2] make it clear that:

- (T1) corresponds to a special case of heavy cycles (cf. [65, Fig. 2]);



■ **Figure 2** A heavy cycle (left) and a barbell (right), with the assumption that the C -runs are distinct on the left and $q_1 \neq q_2$ on the right.

■ (T2) corresponds precisely to barbells (cf. [65, Fig. 3]).

To bridge the gap with Theorem 2.8, it suffices to check that general heavy cycles also lead to unbounded ambiguity. This has been done in the previous subsection (it is the “easy” part of Theorem 2.4).

2.3 Computing the polynomial degree of growth

In this section, we consider the polynomially bounded case. In other words, **we assume that our trim tree automaton \mathcal{A} has no heavy cycle.**

However, it may have barbells. Those play an important role in determining the degree of growth, but the situation is a bit subtle (at least more so over trees than over strings).

► **Example 2.9.** Consider, for $N \in \mathbb{N}$, the tree automaton whose transitions are:

$$\{(c, q'), (q', b, q'), (q', b, q_N), (q_N, b, q_N), (q_N, q_N, a, q_{N-1}), \dots, (q_1, q_1, a, q_0)\}$$

(where $\text{rank}(a) = 2$, $\text{rank}(b) = 1$ and $\text{rank}(c) = 0$), with accepting state q_0 .

It has a single pair of states forming a barbell, namely $q' \rightleftharpoons q_N$ (this can be witnessed by the context $b(\square)$, or by $b(b(\square))$, etc.). At the same time, the degree of growth of its ambiguity is 2^N .

We now introduce patterns involving barbells that witness lower bounds for the degree of growth. They are finite ranked trees over an infinite alphabet that consists of the original ranked alphabet Σ plus, for each one-hole context C , a rank 1 node $\langle C \rangle$.

► **Definition 2.10.** We define inductively the pumping patterns for each state of \mathcal{A} :

- if \mathcal{A} contains a transition (q_1, \dots, q_k, a, q) and Π_i is a pumping pattern for q_i , for each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, then $a(\Pi_1, \dots, \Pi_k)$ is a pumping pattern for q ;
 - if $q' \rightleftharpoons_C q$ and Π' is a pumping pattern for q' then $\langle C \rangle(\Pi')$ is a pumping pattern for q .
- The degree $\text{deg}(\Pi)$ of a pattern Π is its number of $\langle - \rangle$ nodes. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, by structural induction on a pumping pattern, we set:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pump}(n, a(\Pi_1, \dots, \Pi_k)) &= a(\text{pump}(n, \Pi_1), \dots, \text{pump}(n, \Pi_k)) \\ \text{pump}(n, \langle C \rangle(\Pi)) &= C^n[\text{pump}(n, \Pi)] \end{aligned}$$

► **Remark 2.11.** If $t \in \mathbb{T}\Sigma$ admits a run ending in state q at the root, then t can be seen as a pumping pattern of degree 0 for q . In particular, since the tree automaton \mathcal{A} is assumed to be trim, for any state there is at least one pumping pattern.

As a non-degenerate example, the automaton of Ex. 2.9 (parameterized by $N \in \mathbb{N}$) admits a pumping pattern Π_N of degree 2^N , defined by $\Pi_0 = \langle b(\square) \rangle(c)$ and $\Pi_{i+1} = a(\Pi_i, \Pi_i)$, for $i \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$.

▷ **Claim 2.12.** Let Π be a pumping pattern for a state q and $q \rightarrow_C q_a$ where q_a is accepting. Then $|C[\text{pump}(n, \Pi)]| = O(n)$ while the ambiguity over $C[\text{pump}(n, \Pi)]$ is at least $n^{\text{deg}(\Pi)}$.

Proof. We only detail the proof for the lower bound on the ambiguity. It suffices to show that there are at least $n^{\deg(\Pi)}$ runs on $\text{pump}(n, \Pi)$ with q at the root. By structural induction:

case $\Pi = a(\Pi_1, \dots, \Pi_k)$: by definition, there is a transition (q_1, \dots, q_k, a, q) such that each Π_i is a pumping pattern for q_i . By induction hypothesis, there are at least $n^{\deg(\Pi_i)}$ runs on $\text{pump}(n, \Pi_i)$ with q_i at the root. These runs plus the aforementioned transition can be assembled to yield $n^{\deg(\Pi_1)} \times \dots \times n^{\deg(\Pi_k)} = n^{\deg(\Pi)}$ distinct runs on $\text{pump}(n, \Pi)$.

case $\Pi = \langle C \rangle(\Pi')$: by definition, Π' is a pumping pattern for some state q' such that $q' \Rightarrow_C q$. The key observation (from [65, proof of Proposition 2.2]) is that there are at least n runs over the context C^n with q' at the hole and q at the root, namely:

$$\underbrace{q' \rightarrow_C \dots \rightarrow_C q'}_{m-1 \text{ times } C} \rightarrow_C \underbrace{q \rightarrow_C \dots \rightarrow_C q}_{n-m \text{ times } C}$$

These runs over C^m can be plugged with the $n^{\deg(\Pi')}$ runs over $\text{pump}(n, \Pi')$ with q' at the root to give $n \times n^{\deg(\Pi')} = n^{\deg(\Pi)}$ runs on $\text{pump}(n, \Pi)$. \triangleleft

Recall that we assume that the ambiguity is polynomially bounded. Therefore, there must be a global bound on the degrees of pumping patterns. This ensures that the degree of a state, introduced below, is a well-defined natural number.

► **Definition 2.13.** *The degree $\deg(q)$ is the maximum degree of a pumping pattern for q .*

It can be more abstractly characterized, which somehow provides a way to compute it:

- **Lemma 2.14.** *The degree is the smallest function $f: \{\text{states}\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that:*
- *if \mathcal{A} contains a transition (q_1, \dots, q_k, a, q) then $f(q_1) + \dots + f(q_k) \leq f(q)$ – in particular, \deg is monotone with respect to \rightarrow ;*
 - *if $q' \Rightarrow q$ then $f(q') + 1 \leq f(q)$.*

Furthermore, the degrees of the states are computable in polynomial time.

Proof sketch. Let $S(q) = \{\deg(\Pi) \mid \Pi \text{ is a pumping pattern for } q\}$. From Definition 2.10 we can extract a direct inductive definition of S , that can be expressed by general considerations as a least fixed point in a lattice of set-valued functions. Furthermore, $S(q) = \{0, \dots, \deg(q)\}$ (indeed, it is downwards-closed because $\langle C \rangle(\Pi)$ can be replaced by $C[\Pi]$ to decrement the degree of a pattern). The degree function is thus the least fixed point of the following operator:

$$f \mapsto \left[q \mapsto \max \left(\{f(q)\} \cup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k f(q_i) \mid (q_1, \dots, q_k, a, q) \text{ trans.} \right\} \cup \{f(q') + 1 \mid q' \Rightarrow q\} \right) \right]$$

To compute the degree map, we can iterate the operator (starting from $q \mapsto 0$) until we reach a fixed point. This naive algorithm terminates because it builds a bounded increasing sequence of \mathbb{N} -valued functions with finite domain: such a sequence must be finite.

To obtain the complexity bound, we have two things left to prove: firstly that each iteration can be performed in polynomial time, and secondly that the fixed point is reached in a polynomial (in fact linear) number of steps.

For the first point, we need to detect barbells in polynomial time. Seidl gives a cubic algorithm [65, proof of Prop. 2.2]; the idea is that in the three-fold product of \mathcal{A} with itself, $(q, q, q') \rightarrow_C (q, q', q')$ is equivalent to $q \Rightarrow_C q'$ in \mathcal{A} .

Let us show that the fixed point is reached after a linear number of steps. We denote by f_τ the map from states to \mathbb{N} obtained after τ iterations of the aforementioned operator, and by $Q(\tau)$ the set of states that are mapped to the correct value after τ iterations: $Q(\tau) = \{q \mid f_\tau(q) = \deg(q)\}$. We call a set of states S a *trigger* for a state q if:

- either $S = \{q'\}$ and $q' \Rightarrow q$ and $\deg(q) = \deg(q') + 1$,
- or $S = \{q_1, \dots, q_k\}$ and $\deg(q) = \sum_{i=1}^k \deg(q_i)$.

▷ **Claim 2.15.** $Q(\tau + 1) = Q(\tau) \cup \{q \mid q \text{ has a trigger included in } Q(\tau)\}$.

Proof. If a state q has a trigger included in $Q(\tau)$, then this trigger witnesses that

$$\deg(q) \in \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k f_\tau(q_i) \mid (q_1, \dots, q_k, a, q) \text{ trans.} \right\} \cup \{f_\tau(q') + 1 \mid q' \Rightarrow q\}$$

Actually, this is an equivalence. Indeed, let's say that $\deg(q) = f_\tau(q') + 1$ for some $q' \Rightarrow q$ (the other case is similar). Because of the barbell, $\deg(q') + 1 \leq \deg(q)$, so we have $f_\tau(q') \geq \deg(q')$. But the converse inequality is an invariant of the algorithm, so $f_\tau(q') = \deg(q')$, i.e. the trigger $\{q'\}$ is included in $Q(\tau)$.

The result follows by comparing this equivalence with the definition of $f_{\tau+1}$ from f_τ . ◀

▷ **Claim 2.16.** If $Q(\tau + 1) = Q(\tau)$ then a fixed point is reached in at most τ iterations.

Proof. As a consequence of the previous claim, whenever $Q(\tau + 1) = Q(\tau)$, for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $Q(\tau) = Q(\tau + N)$. This means that the fixed point has been reached: indeed, by definition, the algorithm halts at the first time τ' when $Q(\tau')$ is the full set of states. ◀

Thus, $Q(\tau)$ has to be strictly increasing before it stabilizes. Therefore, the number of iterations is bounded by the number of states. ◀

Claim 2.12 entails that the degrees of the states are lower bounds on the polynomial degree of growth of the ambiguity. Next, we prove a matching upper bound. To do so, we start by distinguishing some transitions.

► **Definition 2.17.** A transition (q_1, \dots, q_m, a, q) is critical when

$$\deg(q) > \deg(q_1) + \dots + \deg(q_m) \quad [= 0 \text{ when } m = 0].$$

A critical node for a run over some tree is a node where the transition taken is critical.

We may draw an analogy with flows in directed graphs: non-critical nodes satisfy the “conservation of flow” equation $\deg(q) = \deg(q_1) + \dots + \deg(q_m)$ while critical nodes serve as “sources” for the flow of degrees. Since the root is the only “sink”, we have:

▷ **Claim 2.18.** The number of critical nodes in a (not necessarily accepting) run is bounded by the degree of the state at the root.

Proof idea. The degree at the root is the sum, for each node, of the “entering flow” at that node, i.e. $\deg(q) - \deg(q_1) - \dots - \deg(q_m)$ if the transition taken is (q_1, \dots, q_m, a, q) . Each critical node contributes ≥ 1 to that sum, while the other nodes contribute 0. ◀

Furthermore, the set of critical nodes of an accepting run almost determines this run:

► **Lemma 2.19.** The number of accepting runs over any given input tree whose set of critical nodes equals any prescribed value is bounded by a computable function of the automaton \mathcal{A} .

Proof. We build a new tree automaton \mathcal{B} with the same states as \mathcal{A} , but with input alphabet $\Sigma \times \{0, 1\}$ (where the left component determines the rank). For each critical (resp. non-critical) transition (q_1, \dots, q_m, a, q) in \mathcal{A} , we add a transition $(q_1, \dots, q_m, (a, [1 \text{ (resp. } 0)]), q)$ to \mathcal{B} . This way, the runs in \mathcal{A} over an input $t \in \mathbb{T}\Sigma$ whose set of critical nodes is $S \subseteq \text{nodes}(t)$ correspond precisely to the runs in \mathcal{B} over the tree t_S obtained by replacing the label a of each node ν by $(a, 1)$ if $\nu \in S$ or by $(a, 0)$ if $\nu \notin S$.

Therefore, it suffices to show that our new automaton is finitely ambiguous. To do so, we apply Theorem 2.8. Let us check its assumptions:

- \mathcal{A} is trim and has no heavy cycles (by assumption), therefore \mathcal{B} too.
- Suppose for the sake of contradiction that $q_1 \Rightarrow_C q_2$ in \mathcal{B} . Then in \mathcal{A} , $q_1 \Rightarrow q_2$ is witnessed by the context obtained from C by projecting on the first component; thus, $\text{deg}(q_1) < \text{deg}(q_2)$ (we only speak of degrees in \mathcal{A}). Furthermore, by definition of \Rightarrow , we have $q_1 \rightarrow_C q_1$ and $q_1 \rightarrow_C q_2$ in \mathcal{B} . These are jointly impossible because, by a “conservation of flow” argument (cf. above), if $q' \rightarrow_C q''$, then $\text{deg}(q') < \text{deg}(q'')$ if and only if C contains a node with label in $\Sigma \times \{1\}$.

Finally, we note that the finite ambiguity of our new tree automaton is bounded by a computable function of its number of states and of $r = \max(\text{rank}(\Sigma))$: cf. [65, Theorem 3.1] when $r > 1$ and [68, Theorem 2.1] in the degenerate case $r \leq 1$ (which corresponds to taking strings as inputs). ◀

We are now in a position to bound the ambiguity over an input tree of size n by

$$\sum_S |\text{runs whose set of critical nodes is } S| \leq \underbrace{O(n^{\max(\text{deg}(\text{states}))})}_{\text{Claim 2.18}} \times \underbrace{O(1)}_{\text{Lemma 2.19}}$$

Combined with the matching lower bound obtained earlier, we see that

$$\text{growth}[\text{ambiguity of } \mathcal{A}] = \Theta(n^{\max(\text{deg}(\text{states}))})$$

Together with the complexity result of Lemma 2.14, this concludes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

3 Growth and reparameterization of MSO queries

Let us now deduce Theorem 1.3 (stated in more detail as Theorem 3.9) from the properties of critical transitions that we just saw above.

We use the standard definition of monadic second-order (MSO) logic and its semantics over relational structures; see for instance [25, Chapter 5]. As usual, uppercase letters X, Y, \dots denote second-order variables (ranging over subsets of the domain) whereas lowercase letters x, y, \dots denote first-order variables (ranging over elements of the domain). A formula is closed when it has no free variables.

Trees and DAGs as relational structures. To a ranked alphabet Σ , we associate a relational signature that consists of:

- for each $a \in \Sigma$, a unary symbol a ;
- for each $i \in \{1, \dots, \max(\text{rank}(\Sigma))\}$, a binary symbol child_i ;
- a binary symbol \leq .

► **Definition 3.1.** We define a rooted DAG (directed acyclic graph) over Σ to be a finite structure \mathfrak{G} over the above signature, such that the following hold:

- \mathfrak{G} interprets the formula $\text{child}_1(x_1, x_2) \vee \dots \vee \text{child}_{\max(\text{rank}(\Sigma))}(x_1, x_2)$ as an irreflexive and acyclic binary relation over its domain, whose reflexive transitive closure is equal to \leq ;

- the partial order \leq has a unique minimum element, called the root;
- for each vertex (i.e. domain element) $u \in \text{dom}(\mathfrak{G})$:
 - there is a unique $a \in \Sigma$ such that $G \models a(u)$;
 - for $i \in \{1, \dots, \text{rank}(a)\}$, there is a unique $v \in \text{dom}(\mathfrak{G})$ such that $\mathfrak{G} \models \text{child}_i(u, v)$;
 - for $i > \text{rank}(a)$, there is no $v \in \text{dom}(\mathfrak{G})$ such that $\mathfrak{G} \models \text{child}_i(u, v)$.

When $\mathfrak{G} \models u \leq v$, we say that u is an ancestor of v and that v is a descendant of u .

► **Remark 3.2.** All these axioms are definable in MSO.

Let us illustrate the power of MSO for querying DAGs encoded as relational structures.

► **Example 3.3.** A *rooted path* in \mathfrak{G} is a finite sequence $(u_0, i_1, u_1, \dots, i_n, u_n)$ such that u_0 is the root and $\mathfrak{G} \models \text{child}_{i_k}(u_{k-1}, u_k)$ for $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

We may encode such a path as a tuple (P_1, \dots, P_r) for $r = \max(\text{rank}(\Sigma))$ by taking $P_i = \{u_{k-1} \mid k \in \{1, \dots, n\}, i_k = i\}$ (in particular, the path with only the root ($k = 0$) is encoded as $(\emptyset, \dots, \emptyset)$). Then $\vec{P} \in \mathcal{P}(\text{dom}(\mathfrak{G}))^r$ is an encoding of a rooted path if and only if $\mathfrak{G} \models F_{\text{path}}(\vec{P})$ for some MSO formula $F_{\text{path}}(X_1, \dots, X_r)$. We can then say that this formula defines an MSO set query whose results are the rooted paths.

Explicitly, F_{path} may be defined as the conjunction of:

- $\forall x. X_i(x) \Rightarrow \bigvee_{a \in \Sigma, i \leq \text{rank}(a)} a(x)$ (take one such subformula for each $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$);
- $\forall x. \bigvee_{1 \leq i \leq r} X_i(x) \Rightarrow \left((\forall y. x \leq y) \vee \bigvee_{1 \leq j \leq r} \exists y. X_j(y) \wedge \text{child}_j(y, x) \right)$;
- the predicates X_i define disjoint subsets (this can be expressed in MSO).

► **Remark 3.4.** We work with structures whose interpretation of \leq is fully determined by their interpretation of the other symbols. But from the point of view of expressive power, it is well known that having direct access to the descendent order makes a difference in first-order logic (see e.g. the introduction to [5]) — this is important for the decomposition of Lemma 5.9. It also matters for the structures outputted by MSO interpretations (§4), as explained in [13, §2.2].

Any tree over Σ can be turned into a rooted DAG whose domain is the set of nodes of the tree, with the intuitive interpretations of the relation symbols. This defines an injection from trees to DAGs, whose range can be characterized up to isomorphism of structures:

► **Definition 3.5.** *If every vertex of a rooted DAG \mathfrak{G} has its set of ancestors totally ordered by the descendant order \leq , then \mathfrak{G} is called a tree structure.*

For $t \in \mathbb{T}\Sigma$ and F a formula, we abbreviate “[the tree structure for t] $\models F$ ” as $t \models F$. This abuse of notation extends to formulas with first-order (resp. second-order) variables instantiated by nodes (resp. subsets of nodes) of t — as used, for instance, in the introduction when defining the set query $?F$ specified by an MSO formula $F(X_1, \dots, X_\ell)$.

Logic-automata correspondence. The fundamental theorem of MSO on trees is that the sets of trees defined by closed MSO formulas are precisely the regular tree languages: those recognized by nondeterministic tree automata or equivalently by deterministic bottom-up tree automata; cf. e.g. [52, Theorem 2.7]. (The language recognized by an automaton is the set of inputs with an accepting run.) Furthermore, these equivalences are effective, i.e. witnessed by computable translations. In fact, the correspondence between MSO and tree

automata works not just for closed formulas defining languages, but also for formulas with free variables defining queries, as follows:⁸

► **Theorem 3.6.** *Let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and, for each $t \in \mathsf{T}\Sigma$, let $\Xi_t \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathsf{nodes}(t))^\ell$. The following are equivalent, with effective conversions:*

- *there is an MSO formula $F(X_1, \dots, X_\ell)$ such that $\Xi_t = ?F(t)$ for all $t \in \mathsf{T}\Sigma$;*
- *the “language of marked trees” $\{\mathsf{marked}(t, \vec{P}) \mid t \in \mathsf{T}\Sigma, \vec{P} \in \Xi_t\} \subseteq \mathsf{T}(\Sigma \times \{0, 1\}^\ell)$ is regular, where $\mathsf{marked}(t, P_1, \dots, P_\ell)$ is the tree such that*
 - *by projecting all labels to their first coordinate, one recovers the tree t (for this to make sense, we define the ranks on $\Sigma \times \{0, 1\}^\ell$ to be inherited from the ranks on Σ);*
 - *the $(i + 1)$ -th coordinate of the label of a node is 1 if and only if the corresponding node in t belongs to P_i .*

Number of query results vs ambiguity. Let $F(X_1, \dots, X_\ell)$ be an MSO formula on trees over the ranked alphabet Σ . Let \mathcal{A}_F be an *unambiguous* tree automaton over $\Sigma \times \{0, 1\}^\ell$ — e.g. a deterministic bottom-up tree automaton — that recognizes the corresponding language of marked trees, according to Theorem 3.6. We build another automaton \mathcal{B}_F as follows:

- its states are of the form (q, a, \vec{b}) where q is a state of \mathcal{A}_F and $(a, \vec{b}) \in \Sigma \times \{0, 1\}^\ell$;
- the accepting states in \mathcal{B}_F are those whose first component is accepting in \mathcal{A}_F ;
- its transitions are $((q_1, a_1, \vec{b}_1), \dots, (q_m, a_m, \vec{b}_m), a, (q, a, \vec{b}))$ for each $\vec{b}_1, \dots, \vec{b}_m, \vec{b} \in \{0, 1\}^\ell$ and $a \in \Sigma$ such that \mathcal{A}_F contains the transition $(q_1, \dots, q_m, (a, \vec{b}), q)$.

▷ **Claim 3.7 (Explicit version of Claim 1.2).** The results of the query $?F$ are in canonical bijection with the set of accepting runs of \mathcal{B}_F over every input tree in $\mathsf{T}\Sigma$.

Proof. By construction, the accepting runs of \mathcal{B}_F over an input $t \in \mathsf{T}\Sigma$ are in bijection with

$$\{(t', \underbrace{\text{some accepting run of } \mathcal{A}_F \text{ over } t'}_{\text{unique because } \mathcal{A}_F \text{ is unambiguous}}) \mid t' \in (\text{project node labels on } \Sigma)^{-1}(\{t\})\}$$

By definition of the language of marked trees recognized by \mathcal{A}_F , the trees t' appearing in the above set are precisely those of the form $\mathsf{marked}(t, \vec{P})$ for $\vec{P} \in ?F(t)$. ◁

As stated in the introduction, the properties that we have established concerning the ambiguity of tree automata can therefore be transferred to MSO set queries. Since the correspondence in Theorem 3.6 is effective, what we get is:

► **Corollary 3.8.** *The number of results of an MSO set query grows either polynomially or exponentially in the input size, with a computable degree in $\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$.*

The reparameterization theorem. In the case of polynomial growth, we have:

► **Theorem 3.9** (precise statement of Theorem 1.3). *Given an MSO formula $F(X_1, \dots, X_\ell)$ over trees on Σ whose number of results has a growth rate of degree $k < \infty$, one can compute an MSO formula $G(X_1, \dots, X_\ell, z_1, \dots, z_k)$ and $B \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for every $t \in \mathsf{T}\Sigma$:*

- *$?G(t) \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathsf{nodes}(t))^\ell \times \mathsf{nodes}(t)^k$ is the graph of some map $g_t: ?F(t) \rightarrow \mathsf{nodes}(t)^k$;*

⁸ Indeed, one classical proof — which is the one given in [52, proof of Theorem 2.7] — of this correspondence translates MSO to tree automata by induction over the syntax; the induction hypothesis needs to apply to subformulas with free variables, so it ends up being the statement of Theorem 3.6 that is proved. Alternatively, Theorem 3.6 can be quickly reduced to the case of closed formulas.

■ *this map satisfies $|g_t^{-1}(\{u\})| \leq B$ for every $u \in \text{nodes}(t)$.*

Thus, $(g_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}\Sigma}$ is a finite-to-one family of functions with computable bound.

► **Example 3.10.** Consider the MSO formula $F_{\text{path}}(X_1, \dots, X_r)$ where $r = \max(\text{rank}(\Sigma))$ from Example 3.3, which selects the encodings of rooted paths in a DAG over Σ . As announced in the introduction (Example 1.4), over *trees*, the query $?F_{\text{path}}$ has linear growth, and there is an explicit reparameterization: map each rooted path to its endpoint (i.e. the last vertex in the path), which determines the path uniquely ($B = 1$):

$$G_{\text{path}}(\vec{X}, z) = F_{\text{path}}(\vec{X}) \wedge \forall z'. z \leq z' \Leftrightarrow \overbrace{\bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq r} \forall x. \forall y. X_i(x) \wedge \text{child}_i(x, y) \Rightarrow y \leq z'}^{\text{"}z' \text{ is an upper bound of all vertices in the path"}}$$

This MSO formula selects the endpoint of a rooted path in any rooted DAG — a level of generality that will be convenient for later reuse. (Though this is not finite-to-one over DAGs; in fact, there can be up to exponentially many rooted paths to a given endpoint.)

Proof of Theorem 3.9. Let \mathcal{B}'_F be obtained by trimming the tree automaton \mathcal{B}_F defined earlier; they have the same accepting runs. By the assumption $k < \infty$ and Claim 3.7, \mathcal{B}'_F is polynomially ambiguous: it satisfies the assumptions of Section 2.3. This allows us to speak of the critical nodes for the runs of \mathcal{B}'_F (Definition 2.17). Using the bijective correspondence of Claim 3.7, we can define a family of functions indexed by $t \in \mathbb{T}\Sigma$ as follows:

$$\vec{P} \in ?F(t) \mapsto \{\text{critical nodes for the accepting run of } \mathcal{B}'_F \text{ over } t \text{ corresponding to } \vec{P}\}$$

By Lemma 2.19, this family is finite-to-one with computable bound. Furthermore, it can be defined in MSO by some formula $H(X_1, \dots, X_\ell, Y)$ using standard techniques for representing runs of tree automata in MSO. Note also that the range of any function in this family only contains sets of nodes of cardinality at most k , according to Claim 2.18.

The next step is to devise an MSO formula $J(Y, z_1, \dots, z_k)$ that defines a finite-to-one family of functions $\{\text{subsets of } \text{nodes}(t) \text{ of size } \leq k\} \rightarrow \text{nodes}(t)^k$ for $t \in \mathbb{T}\Sigma$. One possible solution is to use a prefix of the output tuple to list the elements of the input set, in a fixed MSO-definable order, and pad the remaining output coordinates with the root node.

Finally, we take $G(\vec{X}, \vec{z}) = \exists Y. H(\vec{X}, Y) \wedge J(Y, \vec{z})$. This works because the composition of two finite-to-one families of functions is itself finite-to-one. ◀

4 Dimension minimization for MSO set interpretations

We now turn to the proof of Theorem 1.5 using Theorem 3.9.

Let us start by recalling Colcombet and Löding's notion of MSO set interpretation, slightly generalized (strictly speaking, their definition [23, Section 2.3] corresponds to the case $\ell = 1$ below).

► **Definition 4.1.** *An MSO set interpretation \mathcal{I} from a family of finite relational structures (over a fixed signature) to another consists of $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and*

- *an MSO formula $\mathcal{I}_{\text{dom}}(X_1, \dots, X_\ell)$ with second-order free variables X_i ;*
- *an MSO formula $\mathcal{I}_R(X_{1,1}, \dots, X_{1,\ell}, X_{2,1}, \dots, X_{m,\ell})$ for each m -ary relation symbol R in the output signature.*

It maps an input structure S to the output structure:

- *with domain $? \mathcal{I}_{\text{dom}}(S) = \{\langle P_1, \dots, P_\ell \rangle \in \mathcal{P}(\text{dom}(S))^\ell \mid S \models \mathcal{I}_{\text{dom}}(P_1, \dots, P_\ell)\}$;*
- *where $R(\langle P_{1,1}, \dots, P_{1,\ell} \rangle, \dots, \langle P_{m,1}, \dots, P_{m,\ell} \rangle)$ if and only if $S \models \mathcal{I}_R(P_{1,1}, \dots, P_{m,\ell})$.*

An MSO set interpretation maps isomorphic inputs to isomorphic outputs. We may therefore identify structures up to isomorphism; this allows us to treat tree structures (handled by MSO set interpretations) and trees (processed by automata and transducers) interchangeably without losing relevant information.

► **Example 4.2.** We define the *unfolding* $\text{unfold}(\mathfrak{G})$ of a rooted DAG \mathfrak{G} as a tree structure (over the same ranked alphabet Σ):

- the domain elements (nodes) are the rooted paths in \mathfrak{G} , cf. Example 3.3;
- each path $\pi \in \text{dom}(\text{unfold}(\mathfrak{G}))$ inherits the label of its endpoint: $\text{unfold}(\mathfrak{G}) \models a(\pi)$ if and only if $\pi = (\dots, u)$ with $\mathfrak{G} \models a(u)$;
- the descendent order \leq is the prefix ordering on paths;
- $\text{unfold}(\mathfrak{G}) \models \text{child}_i(\pi, \pi')$ for $\pi, \pi' \in \text{dom}(\text{unfold}(\mathfrak{G}))$ if and only if π extended by going to the i -th child of its endpoint equals π' — in other words, the two paths are of the form $(u_0, i_1, u_1, \dots, u_n)$ and $(u_0, i_1, u_1, \dots, u_n, i, u_{n+1})$ respectively.

An example of unfolding is given in the right-hand side of Figure 1 (in the introduction).

We can define unfold (up to isomorphism) as an MSO set interpretation, by working over the encodings of rooted paths introduced in Example 3.3:

- $\mathcal{I}_{\text{dom}}(X_1, \dots, X_\ell) = F_{\text{path}}(X_1, \dots, X_\ell)$ with $\ell = \max(\text{rank}(\Sigma))$;
- $\mathcal{I}_a(\vec{X}) = \exists z. G_{\text{path}}(\vec{X}, z) \wedge a(z)$ for $a \in \Sigma$, using the formula G_{path} from Example 3.10 which selects the endpoint of a rooted path;
- $\mathcal{I}_{\leq}(X_1, \dots, X_\ell, Y_1, \dots, Y_\ell) = X_1 \subseteq Y_1 \wedge \dots \wedge X_\ell \subseteq Y_\ell$;
- $\mathcal{I}_{\text{child}_i}(\vec{X}, \vec{Y}) = \bigwedge_{j \neq i} X_j = Y_j \wedge \exists z. G_{\text{path}}(\vec{X}, z) \wedge \underbrace{(\forall z'. Y_i(z') \Leftrightarrow X_i(z') \vee z' = z)}_{Y_i = X_i \cup \{z\}}$.

An *MSO interpretation* is mostly like an MSO set interpretation, except with first-order variables x_i rather than second-order variables X_i . Another difference, in the definition that we take, is to allow a bounded amount of “copying” thanks to a finite set of *components*. This copying is standard in the 1-dimensional case of *MSO transductions* (cf. e.g. [25, Chapter 7]). MSO string-to-string interpretations of arbitrary dimension are defined with components in [8, 10], but without them in the earlier paper [13]; the reason is that [8, 10] deal with dimension minimization, as we do, and the copying feature is important for this purpose.

► **Definition 4.3.** For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, a k -dimensional MSO interpretation \mathcal{I} from a family of finite relational structures to another consists of

- a finite set of components $\mathcal{I}_{\text{comp}}$;
- for each $\alpha \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{comp}}$, an MSO formula $\mathcal{I}_{\text{dom}}^\alpha(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ with first-order free variables x_i ;
- for each m -ary relation symbol R in the output signature and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{comp}}$, an MSO formula $\mathcal{I}_R^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m}(x_{1,1}, \dots, x_{1,k}, x_{2,1}, \dots, x_{m,k})$.

It defines the function that maps an input structure S to the output structure:

- with domain $\{\langle \alpha, u_1, \dots, u_k \rangle \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{comp}} \times \text{dom}(S)^k \mid S \models \mathcal{I}_{\text{dom}}^\alpha(u_1, \dots, u_k)\}$;
- where $R(\langle \alpha_1, u_{1,1}, \dots, u_{1,k} \rangle, \dots, \langle \alpha_m, u_{m,1}, \dots, u_{m,k} \rangle)$ iff $S \models \mathcal{I}_R^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m}(u_{1,1}, \dots, u_{m,k})$.

In the case $k = 1$, a 1-dimensional MSO interpretation is also called an MSO transduction.

► **Example 4.4.** The following MSO transduction \mathcal{T} defines a function from trees over the alphabet $\{S$ (rank 1), 0 (rank 0) $\}$ to rooted DAGs over $\{a$ (rank 2), b (rank 1), c (rank 0) $\}$, illustrated by the left-hand side of Figure 1 (in the introduction):

- $\mathcal{T}_{\text{comp}} = \{\alpha, \beta\}$ (the names of the components are just formal symbols);
- $\mathcal{T}_{\text{dom}}^\alpha(x) = S(x)$, $\mathcal{T}_{\text{dom}}^\beta(x) = \text{true}$;
- $\mathcal{T}_a^\alpha(x) = \mathcal{T}_b^\beta(x) = S(x)$, $\mathcal{T}_c^\beta(x) = 0(x)$;
- $\mathcal{T}_{\leq}^{\alpha, \alpha}(x, y) = \mathcal{T}_{\leq}^{\alpha, \beta}(x, y) = \mathcal{T}_{\leq}^{\beta, \beta}(x, y) = (x \leq y)$;

- $\mathcal{T}_{\text{child}_1}^{\alpha,\beta}(x,y) = (x=y)$, $\mathcal{T}_{\text{child}_2}^{\alpha,\alpha}(x,y) = \mathcal{T}_{\text{child}_1}^{\beta,\beta}(x,y) = \text{child}_1(x,y)$,
 $\mathcal{T}_{\text{child}_2}^{\alpha,\beta}(x,y) = 0(y) \wedge \text{child}_1(x,y)$;
- every formula in \mathcal{T} that has not been defined above is set to **false**.

► **Proposition 4.5.** *Any function defined by an MSO interpretation can also be defined by an MSO set interpretation (up to isomorphism of output structures).*

Proof. The basic idea is to replace each first-order free variable x_i by a second-order variable X_i with the constraint $X_i = \{x_i\}$ (definable by $\forall y. X_i(y) \Leftrightarrow y = x_i$). We also take care of the components by using extra second-order variables, whose values are restricted to be either the full set or the empty set, as binary “flags”; this works because our input structures are nonempty (they contain at least the root). Thus, we translate a k -dimensional MSO interpretation \mathcal{I} whose components are $\{1, \dots, N\}$ (without loss of generality) to an MSO set interpretation \mathcal{J} with a domain formula $\mathcal{J}_{\text{dom}}(X_1, \dots, X_{k+N})$ defined as follows:

$$\exists x_1 \dots x_k. \bigwedge_{i=1}^k X_i = \{x_i\} \wedge \bigvee_{\alpha=1}^N \mathcal{I}_{\text{dom}}^\alpha(x_1, \dots, x_k) \wedge \overbrace{\forall y. X_{k+\alpha}(y) \wedge \bigwedge_{\beta \neq \alpha} \neg X_{k+\beta}(y)}^{\text{morally detects that we are in the component } \alpha}$$

The definition of the formulas in \mathcal{J} for the output relations follows a similar scheme. ◀

Let us now discuss the growth rate of MSO (set) interpretations. It follows directly from the definitions that if a function f is defined by a k -dimensional MSO interpretation, then $|f(\mathfrak{G})| = O(|\mathfrak{G}|^k)$, where the size $|\mathfrak{G}|$ of the structure \mathfrak{G} is the cardinality of its domain (thus, for trees, it coincides with the number of nodes). The dimension minimization property announced in the introduction (Theorem 1.5) is a sort of converse.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. By a direct adaptation of [8, proof of Theorem 6.1]. Let \mathcal{I} be an MSO set interpretation with trees as inputs.

First, by definition, $\text{dom}(\mathcal{I}(t)) = ?\mathcal{I}_{\text{dom}}(t)$ for every input tree t . Thus, the output size is the number of results of an MSO set query. By Corollary 3.8, its degree of growth $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ is well-defined and can be computed from \mathcal{I}_{dom} .

Suppose now that $k < \infty$. By Theorem 3.9, one can compute $B \in \mathbb{N}$ and an MSO formula $G(\vec{X}, z_1, \dots, z_k)$ that defines a family of functions $\text{dom}(\mathcal{I}(t)) \rightarrow \text{nodes}(t)^k$, indexed by input trees t , which is finite-to-one with bound B . For $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, B\}$, there is an MSO formula $H_\alpha(\vec{X}, \vec{z})$ whose meaning is: there are at least α tuples \vec{Y} such that $G(\vec{Y}, \vec{z})$, and \vec{X} is the α -th such tuple for some fixed total order, e.g. lexicographic with respect to some tree traversal. The following k -dimensional interpretation \mathcal{J} then defines the same function as \mathcal{I} :

- $\mathcal{J}_{\text{comp}} = \{1, \dots, B\}$
- $\mathcal{J}_{\text{dom}}^\alpha(z_1, \dots, z_k) = \exists \vec{X}. H_\alpha(\vec{X}, z_1, \dots, z_k)$ (this implies $\mathcal{I}_{\text{dom}}(\vec{X})$)
- $\mathcal{J}_R^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m}(\vec{z}_1, \dots, \vec{z}_m) = \exists \vec{X}_1. \dots \exists \vec{X}_m. \bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq m} H_{\alpha_i}(\vec{X}_i, \vec{z}_i) \wedge \mathcal{I}_R(\vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_m)$ ◀

5 Applications to tree transducers

We now demonstrate how the level of generality of MSO set interpretations makes Theorem 1.5 widely applicable, by quickly deriving a few results on the function classes defined by various tree transducer models. (We only consider deterministic transducers here; this is implicitly assumed in our theorem statements.)

Let us start with the MSO transductions with sharing (MSOTS) defined in the introduction (Example 1.6), where it is illustrated in Figure 1. A short syntactic manipulation (explained in Section 5.1 below) shows that:

► **Proposition 5.1.** *Every MSOTS can be effectively translated to a tree-to-tree MSO set interpretation that computes the same function.*

► **Corollary 5.2.** *Theorem 1.5 applies to MSO transductions with sharing.*

An important special case — we discuss why in the conclusion (§6.1) — is that one can decide whether an MSOTS has *linear* growth, and if it does, then it computes an MSO transduction. Until now, to our knowledge, the only available proof of this result on linear growth was by Engelfriet and Maneth, who established it for the larger class of functions computed by *macro tree transducers* (MTTs) [36, Theorem 7.1]. Their proof involves intricate pumping arguments over MTTs, while our approach to Corollary 5.2 is more conceptual: the tricky part is isolated in the study of ambiguity in (ordinary) tree automata.

Actually, it is known (cf. e.g. [58, §3.3]) that $\text{MSOTS} \subset \text{MTT} \subset \text{MSOTS}^2$ (with effective translations), where MSOTS^2 denotes the compositions of two MSOTS. Engelfriet and Maneth’s theorem on macro tree transducers therefore follows from our next results:

► **Proposition 5.3.** $\text{MSOTS}^2 \subset \text{unfold} \circ [\text{tree-to-graph MSO set interpretation}]$, effectively.

► **Corollary 5.4** (of Theorem 1.5). *Given a tree-to-graph function f defined by an MSO set interpretation, it is decidable whether $\text{unfold} \circ f$ has linear growth. Furthermore, if it does, then it is effectively equivalent to a tree-to-tree MSO transduction.*

Proof. We apply Theorem 1.5 to f to decide whether its growth rate is at most linear.

- If it is, then one can compute an MSO transduction that defines f . By definition, this gives us an MSOTS defining $\text{unfold} \circ f$. Corollary 5.2 then finishes the job.
- Otherwise, $\text{unfold} \circ f$ also grows faster than linearly, because $|\text{unfold}(\mathfrak{G})| \geq |\mathfrak{G}|$ for any \mathfrak{G} (each vertex of the graph \mathfrak{G} has at least one “copy” in $\text{unfold}(\mathfrak{G})$). ◀

In Section 5.1, we present a very short proof of Proposition 5.3; but it depends indirectly on a deep result on semigroup theory due to Colcombet [17]. A more pedestrian approach would be to translate *invisible pebble tree transducers*, which characterize MSOTS^2 [31, Theorem 53]. Speaking of which, since unfold is the identity in the case of strings (seen as unary trees):

► **Corollary 5.5** (of Proposition 5.3). *Theorem 1.5 applies to invisible pebble tree-to-string transducers (which includes the case of tree-to-string MTTs).*

In particular, any polynomially growing function computed by an invisible pebble string-to-string transducer is polyregular. This constitutes some modest progress towards a conjecture about these string transducers by Douéneau-Tabot [27, Conjecture 4.56 (in §4.5)].

Our final result is about studying the asymptotics of the output *height* of a tree transducer, rather than the output size. Actually, we reduce one to the other in the case of MTTs:

► **Proposition 5.6** (proved in §5.2). *From a macro tree transducer realizing a tree-to-tree function f , one can compute another MTT realizing a tree-to-string function g such that*

$$\forall n \geq 1, \quad \text{growth}[\text{height} \circ f](n) + 1 = \text{growth}[|g|](n)$$

► **Corollary 5.7** (of Cor. 5.5). *The output height of an MTT grows either polynomially or exponentially in the input size, with a computable degree $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$.*

By testing whether $k \leq 1$, we recover a recent result of Gallot, Maneth, Nakano and Peyrat [39, Theorem 17(1)]: linear size-to-height increase is decidable for MTTs.

5.1 Some compositional tricks: proof of Propositions 5.1 and 5.3

First, we recall the cases in which MSO (set) interpretations can be composed by naive syntactic substitution (replacing relation symbols by formulas defining them); the issues that arise in other cases are discussed in [13, Sections 1 and 2.1]. An MSO interpretation defined using formulas in *first-order logic*, i.e. without using the second-order quantifiers $\exists X/\forall X$, is called an *FO interpretation*. For instance, the MSO transduction of Example 4.4 is actually a *1-dimensional FO interpretation*, also known as an *FO transduction*.

► **Lemma 5.8** ([23, Proposition 2.4]). *A composition of functions of the form*

$$[FO\ interpretation] \circ [MSO\ set\ interpretation] \circ [MSO\ transduction]$$

can be (effectively) defined by a single MSO set interpretation.

Proposition 5.1 follows from this lemma, because by definition, every MSO transduction with sharing (MSOTS) can be written as

$$\text{id} \circ [\text{unfold, defined by an MSO set interpretation (Ex. 4.2)}] \circ [\text{MSO transduction}]$$

To prove Proposition 5.3, we take advantage of some results on two restricted classes of MSO transductions: the aforementioned FO transductions, and MSO relabelings. The latter are tree-to-tree transductions that change only the labels of the nodes.

► **Lemma 5.9.** *MSO transduction from trees = FO transduction \circ MSO relabeling.*

Proof. As explained by Bojańczyk and Doumane [12, proof of Theorem 7.1], this is a direct consequence of the fact that any MSO query on trees can be decomposed as an MSO relabeling followed by a first-order query [17, Corollary 1] — which, as mentioned earlier, is due to deep semigroup-theoretic reasons. ◀

► **Lemma 5.10.** *The class of MSOTS is closed under post-composition by MSO relabelings.*

Proof. It suffices to have the above statement for post-composition by deterministic top-down tree transducers with regular lookahead — no need to know what this means here! — since they can compute all MSO relabelings of trees (concerning this easy inclusion, see the discussion in [32, Section 4]).

The result is then stated by Engelfriet, Inaba and Maneth [32, Theorem 18] using the characterisation of MSOTS by tree-walking tree transducers. Alternatively, Colcombet and Löding’s earlier [22, Theorem 1] (whose proof may be found in [16, §3.4.4]) says that for not necessarily acyclic graphs, whose unfoldings are possibly infinite trees,

$$[\text{top-down transducer with lookahead}] \circ \text{unfold} \subseteq \text{unfold} \circ [\text{MSO transduction}]$$

and by precomposing with MSO transductions, which are closed under composition (for the same reason as Lemma 5.8, cf. e.g. [25, Theorem 7.14]), we get the desired result. ◀

Proof of Proposition 5.3. By the following reasoning, postcomposed by *unfold*:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MSOT} \circ \text{MSOTS} &= \text{FOT} \circ \text{MSO relabeling} \circ \text{MSOTS} && \text{(by Lemma 5.9)} \\ &= \text{FOT} \circ \text{MSOTS} && \text{(by Lemma 5.10)} \\ &\subseteq \text{FOT} \circ \text{MSO set interpretation} && \text{(by Proposition 5.1)} \\ &= \text{MSO set interpretation} && \text{(by Lemma 5.8)} \quad \blacktriangleleft \end{aligned}$$

► **Remark 5.11.** While we only use FO transductions as a convenient tool, they have been intensively studied for their own sake in the string-to-string case, see e.g. [57, p. 2:9–2:11]. They have also been investigated in the tree-to-tree case [12]. In higher dimensions, FO interpretations of strings correspond to a well-behaved subclass of polyregular functions [13]. Finally, let us remark that FO transductions and interpretations of graphs play a key role in recent progress in algorithmic model theory, cf. e.g. [66].

5.2 Output height of macro tree transducers: proof of Proposition 5.6

To define MTTs, we fix two disjoint sets of “input variables” $\{x_1, x_2, \dots\}$ and of “parameters” $\{y_1, y_2, \dots\}$. (MSO logic does not appear in this subsection, avoiding a clash of notations.)

► **Definition 5.12.** *The data of a (deterministic) macro tree transducer \mathcal{T} from an input alphabet Σ to an output alphabet Γ (both ranked) consists of:*

- a finite ranked set Q of states, with a root state q_0 ;
- for each state $q \in Q$ and each input letter $a \in \Sigma$, a tree

$$\text{RHS}_{\mathcal{T}}(q, a) \in \text{T}(\Gamma \cup \underbrace{(Q \times \{x_1, \dots, x_{\text{rank}(a)}\})}_{\text{we write } q\langle x_i \rangle \text{ for } (q, x_i) \text{ and its rank is } \text{rank}(q)} \cup \underbrace{\{y_1, \dots, y_{\text{rank}(q)}\}}_{\text{all with rank 0}})$$

which should be understood as the right-hand-side of a “rule”

$$q\langle a(x_1, \dots, x_{\text{rank}(a)}) \rangle(y_1, \dots, y_{\text{rank}(q)}) := \text{RHS}_{\mathcal{T}}(q, a)$$

Morally, these rules are mutually recursive definitions of procedures, whose names are the states. The root state determines the function computed by the MTT. For a more formal account of the semantics of MTTs, see for example [36, Section 3], where this recursive computation is expressed as a rewriting system (thus, the symbol \rightarrow is used instead of $:=$).

► **Example 5.13.** The value on the input $S(S(0))$ of the MTT defined by

$$\begin{aligned} q_0\langle 0 \rangle &:= b(c) & q_1\langle 0 \rangle(y_1) &:= a(y_1, b(y_1)) \\ q_0\langle S(x_1) \rangle &:= q_1\langle x_1 \rangle(c) & q_1\langle S(x_1) \rangle(y_1) &:= q_1\langle x_1 \rangle(q_1\langle x_1 \rangle(y_1)) \end{aligned}$$

is $q_0\langle S(S(0)) \rangle = q_1\langle S(0) \rangle(c) = q_1\langle 0 \rangle(q_1\langle 0 \rangle(c)) = q_1\langle 0 \rangle(a(c, b(c))) = a(a(\dots), b(a(\dots)))$.

The key to reducing the asymptotic growth of the output height of MTTs — in the above example, it is exponential — to the analogous question for the output size of tree-to-string MTTs is that the height of a tree is the maximum length of a rooted path. We encode rooted paths as strings, seen as unary trees.

Let us fix an MTT \mathcal{T} , with the notations from Definition 5.12. For each output letter $a \in \Gamma$ of nonzero rank, we introduce a fresh letter \hat{a} of rank 1, and we collect them into a set $\hat{\Gamma}$. We also write $\Gamma_0 = \{a \in \Gamma \mid \text{rank}(a) = 0\}$. For each state $q \in Q$, we introduce a new symbol q^\bullet of rank 0 and, when $\text{rank}(q) \geq 1$, new symbols $q^{y_1}, \dots, q^{y_{\text{rank}(q)}}$ of rank 1, and we collect these symbols into a set Q' . Finally, we introduce yet another rank 0 symbol \boxtimes .

► **Definition 5.14.** *By structural induction:*

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket a(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_k) \rrbracket &= \{\boxtimes\} \cup \{\hat{a}(\mathbf{b}) \mid \mathbf{b} \in \llbracket \tau_1 \rrbracket \cup \dots \cup \llbracket \tau_k \rrbracket\} \quad \text{for } a \in \Gamma \setminus \Gamma_0, k = \text{rank}(a) \\ \llbracket c \rrbracket &= \{\boxtimes, c\} \quad \text{for } c \in \Gamma_0 \\ \llbracket y_i \rrbracket &= \{\boxtimes, y_i\} \\ \llbracket q\langle x_i \rangle(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_k) \rrbracket &= \{\boxtimes, q^\bullet\langle x_i \rangle\} \cup \{q^{y_j}\langle x_i \rangle(\mathbf{b}) \mid j \in \{1, \dots, k\}, \mathbf{b} \in \llbracket \tau_j \rrbracket\} \end{aligned}$$

For a tree $t \in \mathbb{T}(\Gamma \cup \{y_1, \dots\})$ — that is, without labels of the form $q\langle x_i \rangle$ — the unary trees in $\llbracket t \rrbracket \subset \mathbb{T}(\widehat{\Gamma} \cup \Gamma_0 \cup \{y_1, \dots\})$ are encodings of the rooted paths of t . The unary trees of $\llbracket t \rrbracket$ whose leaf is labeled by \blackboxtimes correspond to rooted paths whose endpoint is not a leaf.

In general, we call *branches* the elements of $\llbracket \tau \rrbracket \subset \mathbb{T}(\widehat{\Gamma} \cup \Gamma_0 \cup Q' \times \{x_1, \dots\} \cup \{y_1, \dots\})$, even when τ contains nodes labeled by $q\langle x_i \rangle$. We speak of y_i -branches (resp. \blackboxtimes -branches) for those whose endpoint is labeled by y_i (resp. by \blackboxtimes). The remaining branches — i.e. those whose leaf label is some letter in Γ_0 or some $q^\bullet\langle x_i \rangle$ — are called \bullet -branches.

At this point, one can observe that:

▷ **Claim 5.15.** The branches of $q\langle a(t_1, \dots, t_k) \rangle$ are exactly the unary trees that are obtained from the branches of $\text{RHS}_{\mathcal{T}}(q, a)$ by substituting:

- each leaf labeled by $q^\bullet\langle x_j \rangle$ by some \bullet -branch or \blackboxtimes -branch of $q'\langle t_j \rangle$ (distinct leaves with the same label may be substituted by different branches),
- each unary node labeled by $q^{y_\ell}\langle x_j \rangle$ by some y_ℓ -branch or \blackboxtimes -branch of $q'\langle t_j \rangle$ — where, for a node b in a tree $C[b(t)]$ (where C is a one-hole context), we define the result of substituting this node by $C'[y_\ell]$ (resp. $C'[\blackboxtimes]$) as $C[C'[t]]$ (resp. $C[C'[\blackboxtimes]]$).

Furthermore, the “types” of the branches that we get can be determined as follows:

- if at least one of the substitutions involves a \blackboxtimes -branch, the result is also a \blackboxtimes -branch;
- otherwise, for $\alpha \in \{\blackboxtimes, \bullet\} \cup \{y_1, y_2, \dots\}$, if we start from an α -branch of $\text{RHS}_{\mathcal{T}}(q, a)$, the result is an α -branch.

Proof. By mechanical inspection of the semantics of MTTs. ◁

We now build a new MTT $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}$ as follows.

- The finite input alphabet consists of the pairs (a, ρ) , abbreviated as a^ρ , such that $a \in \Sigma$ — we set $\text{rank}(a^\rho) = \text{rank}(a)$ — and ρ is a family whose components are:

$$\rho_{q,\alpha} \text{ is either an } \alpha\text{-branch of } \llbracket \text{RHS}_{\mathcal{T}}(q, a) \rrbracket \text{ or } \blackboxtimes \text{ for } q \in Q, \alpha \in \{\bullet\} \cup \{y_1, \dots, y_{\text{rank}(q)}\}$$

- The output alphabet is $\widehat{\Gamma} \cup \Gamma_0 \cup \{\blackboxtimes\}$.
- The ranked set of states is Q' , and the root state is q_0^\bullet (where q_0 is the root state of \mathcal{T}).
- The rules are

$$\begin{aligned} q^\bullet\langle a^\rho(x_1, \dots, x_k) \rangle &:= \rho_{q,\bullet} \\ q^{y_i}\langle a^\rho(x_1, \dots, x_k) \rangle(y_1) &:= \rho_{q,y_i} \text{ with } y_i \text{ replaced by } y_1 \text{ if it occurs (i.e. if } \rho_{q,y_i} \neq \blackboxtimes). \end{aligned}$$

Let us write π for the “projection” function that strips the exponents from the labels in an input tree for $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}$, that is:

$$\pi(a^\rho(t_1, \dots, t_k)) = a(\pi(t_1), \dots, \pi(t_k)) \in \mathbb{T}\Gamma$$

The fact that the tree-to-string MTT $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}$ satisfies the statement of Proposition 5.6 with respect to \mathcal{T} is a direct consequence of the following, applied to $q = q_0$ and $\alpha = \bullet$.

▷ **Claim 5.16.** For each state q of \mathcal{T} , each input tree t for $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}$ and $\alpha \in \{\bullet\} \cup \{y_1, y_2, \dots\}$, the unary tree $q^\alpha\langle t \rangle$ is either an α -branch or a \blackboxtimes -branch of $q\langle \pi(t) \rangle$.

Conversely, for each $t' \in \mathbb{T}\Gamma$, there exists \underline{t}' such that $\pi(\underline{t}') = t'$ and, for every $q \in Q$ and $\alpha \neq \blackboxtimes$, if $q\langle t' \rangle$ has a α -branch, then $q^\alpha\langle \underline{t}' \rangle$ is a α -branch of $q\langle \underline{t}' \rangle$ of *maximum length*.

Proof. By induction over the structure of t and t' , using Claim 5.15. We only detail the argument for the second part. Let $t' = a(t_1, \dots, t_k)$, and assume by induction that $\underline{t}_1, \dots, \underline{t}_k$ have been built satisfying the above property.

If $q\langle t' \rangle$ has a α -branch, then we can choose one of maximum length and call it $\mathfrak{b}_1(q, \alpha)$. By Claim 5.15, $\mathfrak{b}_1(q, \alpha)$ can be obtained from some $\rho_{q, \alpha} \in \llbracket \text{RHS}_{\mathcal{T}}(q, a) \rrbracket$ by performing some substitutions: for all q', α' , each node labeled by $q'^{\alpha'}\langle x_i \rangle$ is substituted by a α' -branch of $q'\langle t_i \rangle$. By the induction hypothesis, this α' -branch is at most as long as $q'^{\alpha'}\langle \underline{t}_i \rangle$. This means that if we instead substitute each node labeled by $q'^{\alpha'}\langle x_i \rangle$ in $\rho_{q, \alpha}$ by the branch $q'^{\alpha'}\langle \underline{t}_i \rangle$ then we get another α -branch $\mathfrak{b}_2(q, \alpha) \in \llbracket q\langle t' \rangle \rrbracket$ that is at least as long as $\mathfrak{b}_1(q, \alpha)$. Therefore, $\mathfrak{b}_2(q, \alpha)$ is also of maximum length.

Thus, to conclude, it suffices to define \underline{t}' in such a way that $\pi(\underline{t}') = t'$ and $q^\alpha\langle \underline{t}' \rangle = \mathfrak{b}_2(q, \alpha)$ when $q\langle t' \rangle$ has a α -branch. To do so, we take $\underline{t}' = a^\rho(t_1, \dots, t_k)$, where ρ is a family whose components have been partially defined in the previous paragraph; to complete this family, when $q\langle t' \rangle$ has no α -branch, we set $\rho_{q, \alpha} = \mathfrak{X}$. Note that ρ does not just depend on q and a , but on the whole tree t' . The desired equality follows from comparing the substitution that defines $\mathfrak{b}_2(q, \alpha)$ with the semantics of the MTT $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$. ◀

► **Remark 5.17.** Given an input tree in $\mathbb{T}\Sigma$, one may first *choose nondeterministically* an annotation ρ at each node, then execute $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ on the resulting annotated tree (with labels a^ρ). This defines a *relation* between each tree $t \in \mathbb{T}\Sigma$ and some branches of $\mathcal{T}(t)$, including at least one of maximum length.

It seems tempting to think that some nondeterministic device should be able to define this relation directly; but formally, for which machine model? Somehow, in a given run, we want every sub-computation that visits a node to make the same choice, corresponding to the exponent ρ at that node in some choice of annotated tree. Usual nondeterministic MTTs cannot enforce this “common guess” property (using the terminology of [11, Section 6] for string transducers), but it could plausibly be emulated in Inaba and Hosoya’s *multi-return macro tree transducers* [48, 47].

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we started by following a direct thread:

- from polynomial ambiguity of tree automata,
- to reparameterization of MSO set queries of polynomial growth,
- and then to dimension minimization for MSO set interpretations.

To demonstrate the usefulness of our theorem on interpretations, we then applied it to derive various results on the asymptotics of tree transducers. These applications sometimes required a bit of work, but no new difficult combinatorics; the only place where pumping arguments occur is Section 2.

One limitation of our work is that it investigates the growth of some output parameter depending on the *size* of an input tree. It would also make sense to study the dependency on the input *height*: the suitable definition of growth rate would then be

$$h \in \mathbb{N} \mapsto \max\{f(t) \mid \text{height}(t) \leq h\} \quad \text{for } f: \mathbb{T}\Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{N}.$$

For example, Maletti, Nasz, Stier and Ulbricht [53] study tree automata that are “polynomially ambiguous in height”, by which they mean the existence of a polynomial upper bound. It is natural to ask: is this property decidable, and does it entail that the growth rate of the ambiguity is $\Theta(h^k)$ for some computable $k \in \mathbb{N}$?

A positive answer would also allow us to compute the polynomial degree of height increase (meaning “height-to-height”) of a macro tree transducer. This would complete the generalization of Gallot et al.’s [39, Theorem 17], whose two items are:

1. decidability of linear size-to-height increase, already subsumed by Corollary 5.7;
2. decidability of linear height increase.

6.1 Further related work

Tree transducers. The theorem stated below is one of the most powerful available results concerning the growth rate of transducers (on strings or trees). It concerns linear growth, and we consider that extending it to polynomial growth is a major open problem.

► **Theorem 6.1** ([55, 32]). *It is decidable whether the composition of a sequence of functions, each defined by a macro tree transducer, has linear growth; and if it does, then it is effectively equivalent to a tree-to-tree MSO transduction.*

This was originally stated and proved by Maneth [55, Theorems 1 and 2], by induction over the length of the composition. The case of a single MTT, established earlier by Engelfriet and Maneth [36] (as mentioned in Section 5), plays a key role in the inductive step — not just in the base case. Engelfriet, Inaba and Maneth [32] later reproved Theorem 6.1 by a similar induction based on MSOTS instead of MTT, using the fact that

$$\text{MSOTS}^k \subset \text{MTT}^k \subset \text{MSOTS}^{k+1} \quad [32, \text{Corollary 25}].$$

Their inductive step thus depends on the case of a single MSOTS. By deducing this case from Corollary 5.2 (again, cf. §5), we simplify part of the proof of Theorem 6.1.

Why does this simplification succeed? One major reason is that we work as little as possible with machine models for tree-to-tree functions, and focus on logical interpretations. The proof of dimension minimization (Theorem 1.5) leverages the flexibility of the syntax of MSO (set) interpretations to reduce the problem to reparameterizing the domain query: we do not have to worry about how the order is defined on the output structure. Meanwhile, combinatorial arguments on macro tree transducers — or on the characterization of MSOTS by tree-walking transducers, used by Engelfriet et al. [32] to prove Theorem 6.1 — do not decouple the size of the output from its shape. In this vein, it seems likely that the “pruning” arguments in [32] can also be simplified by working with the logical definition of MSOTS.

String transducers. String-to-string macro tree transducers are essentially the same thing as (right-to-left) *copyful streaming string transducers* [38]⁹ (cf. [58, §2.5] for the equivalence, and [37] for other characterizations). Filot and Reynier [38, Theorem 5.2] give a polynomial-time decision procedure for linear growth of copyful SSTs and show — independently of Engelfriet and Maneth’s result on MTTs [36] — that copyful SSTs of linear growth recognize string-to-string MSO transductions. Douéneau-Tabot later showed that the polynomial degree of growth of a copyful SSTs is also computable in polynomial time, with a structure theorem [27, Theorem 4.41], by reduction to his work on $(\mathbb{N}, +, \times)$ -weighted automata described in Section 1.1.

In particular, Douéneau-Tabot’s result implies that every function computed by a copyful SST of polynomial growth is polyregular (the inclusion is strict, cf. e.g. [59, Theorem 8.1]). There have been several works on the degree of growth of polyregular functions, such as Bojańczyk’s dimension minimization theorem for string-to-string MSO interpretations mentioned in the introduction (which Theorem 1.5 generalizes).

⁹ The *copyless* version was introduced earlier [2] and characterises MSO transductions; see also [57].

Among the many equivalent formalisms that define polyregular functions (cf. [8]), the earliest one is the *pebble transducer*, originating in the early 2000s [56, 34]: a machine that manipulates a bounded stack of “pebbles” (pointers to input positions) whose height trivially bounds the degree of growth. Analogously to the case of MSO interpretations, one can ask the converse question: is a polyregular function f of growth $O(n^k)$ always computable by some k -pebble transducer? Douéneau-Tabot [27, Chapter 3] showed¹⁰ that for a few restricted classes of pebble transducers, given a device in this class that computes f , one can compute an equivalent k -pebble transducer in the same class. However, this “pebble minimization” fails in the general case: Bojańczyk proved that there is no bounded number of pebbles that suffices to compute all polyregular functions of quadratic growth [10, Theorem 3.3]. Note that since 1-pebble (a.k.a. two-way) transducers are equivalent to MSO transductions [30], pebble minimization holds for linear growth as a consequence of (Bojańczyk’s special case of) Theorem 1.5, cf. [10, §1].

This linear growth case can also be derived from Theorem 6.1 because compositions of ℓ macro tree transducers can simulate ℓ -pebble¹¹ transducers [35]. This connection with the MTT composition hierarchy has also been used by Kiefer, Nguyễn and Pradic [50] to give an alternative refutation of pebble minimization. They show a strengthening of Bojańczyk’s result: there is no ℓ such that compositions of ℓ macro tree transducers include all polyregular functions of quadratic growth. The proof is a direct application of Engelfriet and Maneth’s “bridge theorem” on the output languages of compositions of MTTs [33].

The philosophy of this work by Kiefer et al. [50] is somehow dual to ours here: they give a short reduction from a problem on polyregular functions to older results on macro tree transducers, whereas we take inspiration from recent work on polyregular functions to simplify proofs concerning tree transducers such as MTTs.

Language growth. Given a language $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$, let $f_L : n \in \mathbb{N} \mapsto \text{card}(L \cap \Sigma^n)$.

When L is regular, one can easily build an automaton over $\{a\}^*$ whose ambiguity on a^n is equal to $f_L(n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ [46, Lemma 3.2]. Therefore, Theorem 1.1 can be applied to the study of “the growth of L ”, that is, of f_L . The results thus obtained for regular languages are true more generally for *context-free* languages:

- They have either polynomial or exponential growth. Furthermore, a context-free language has polynomial growth if and only if — this “has been independently discovered at least six times” [41, §1] — it is a *bounded language*, that is:¹²

$$L \subseteq w_1^* \dots w_k^* \quad \text{for some } k \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } w_1, \dots, w_k \in \Sigma^*.$$

- Ginsburg and Spanier showed in the 1960s that the boundedness of a context-free language is decidable [43, Theorem 5.2] (see also [42, Chapter 5]); a decision procedure in polynomial time was found by Gawrychowski, Krieger, Rampersad and Shallit [41, Theorem 19] more recently. In the bounded case, they also give a polynomial-time algorithm that computes the degree of growth [41, Theorem 25].

Although this does not seem to have been explicitly noted, these decidability and complexity results transfer to regular tree languages:

¹⁰ One of Douéneau-Tabot’s results [27, Theorem 3.12] is an effective version of an earlier theorem of Nguyễn, Noûs and Pradic [59, Theorem 7.1].

¹¹ Note that the numbering of the pebble transducer hierarchy is off-by-one in [35] compared to more recent papers such as [8]. We use the latter convention here.

¹² Beware: this notion of boundedness is very different from bounded ambiguity (a.k.a. finite ambiguity) or the boundedness of a function $\Sigma^* \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ recognized by a weighted automaton.

► **Theorem 6.2.** *Any regular tree language has a well-defined degree of growth in $\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, that can be computed in polynomial time.*

Proof idea. From a tree automaton, one can compute in polynomial time a context-free grammar that generates the encodings in (e.g.) reverse Polish notation of the trees accepted by the automaton. The encoding is injective and size-preserving. ◀

However, over trees, the above theorem cannot be deduced from our results on the ambiguity of tree automata. The difference with the case of strings is that the size of a tree does not uniquely determine its shape (the information kept after forgetting the node labels).

Infinite trees & automatic structures. Rabinovich and Tiferet [63, Theorem 1] have shown that via a characterisation using “heavy cycles” (cf. Section 2), one can decide in polynomial time whether the ambiguity of a Büchi automaton over infinite trees is at most countable (see also [62] for partial results on parity automata). In this setting, uncountable necessarily means of cardinality 2^{\aleph_0} [15, Theorem 1.2]; this sort of “continuum hypothesis” can be seen as the infinite counterpart to the polynomial/exponential dichotomy in our growth rates, since $(\aleph_0)^k = \aleph_0$.

Colcombet and Rabinovich (personal communication) have been working on a version of Theorem 1.5 for MSO finite set interpretations from the infinite binary tree. These interpretations describe tree-automatic structures [23, Proposition 3.1] — which was actually the original motivation for introducing MSO set interpretations. The aforementioned characterisation of regular string languages of polynomial growth as “bounded” regular languages has also been used by Bárány to study a subclass of automatic structures [14, Section 3.3.2], which led to further works [40, 69]. For a survey on (tree-)automatic structures, see [44].

More weighted automata & regular cost functions. A precursor from the 1960s to the works mentioned in Section 1.1 is Schützenberger’s characterization of the polynomially growing functions, with given degree, recognized by $(\mathbb{Z}, +, \times)$ -weighted automata on strings [64] — cf. the modern rephrasing in [6, Chapter 9]. An effective version has been proved recently by Colcombet, Douéneau-Tabot and Lopez [21] (see also [27, Chapter 5]) whose motivations came from polyregular functions. In both cases, the proofs are significantly more difficult than for $(\mathbb{N}, +, \times)$ -weighted automata.

One can also study the growth rate of functions recognized by weighted automata over semirings with other operations. For instance, Simon showed [67, Theorem 13] that for an alphabet Σ with at least two letters, the function classes

$$\{f: \Sigma^* \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \mid f \text{ recognized by some } (\mathbb{N}, \min, +)\text{-automaton, } \text{growth}[f](n) = \Omega(\sqrt[k]{n})\}$$

form a strict hierarchy for $k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, and every $(\mathbb{N}, \min, +)$ -automaton either lies somewhere in this hierarchy or takes bounded values.

As another example, Colcombet, Daviaud and Zuleger proved that $(\mathbb{N}, \max, +)$ -automata exhibit an asymptotic behavior with fractional degree [20, 26], namely: if such a weighted automaton recognizes a function $f: \Sigma^* \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, then

$$\min_{|w| \geq n} f(w) = \Theta(n^\alpha) \text{ for some } \alpha \in (\mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]) \cup \{-\infty\} \text{ computable from the automaton.}$$

See [26, Ex. 4.1.1 and 4.1.2] for concrete examples of max-plus automata that realize the degrees $\alpha = 1/2$ and $\alpha = 2/3$ respectively.

In Colcombet’s theory of regular cost functions [18], min-plus automata and max-plus automata are both generalized by “B-automata” (which are no longer weighted automata). Cost functions are the equivalence classes of functions $\Sigma^* \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{+\infty\}$ for a suitable equivalence relation, and those that have a representative computed by some B-automaton are said to be regular. The point of this theory is that many “quantitative” computational problems on formal languages and automata can be solved by deciding the boundedness of regular cost functions; cf. the survey [19]. While the present paper also attempts to take a unified look at several quantitative questions (of asymptotic growth), there is no clear relationship at the moment between our work and regular cost functions.

Finally, let us mention that weighted automata with restricted ambiguity (e.g. finite or polynomial) are a common topic of study. The purpose of this restriction can be to control their expressive power (e.g. [60, 28, 53]) or to make decision problems easier (e.g. [51, 61]).

References

- 1 Rajeev Alur, Mikołaj Bojańczyk, Emmanuel Filiot, Anca Muscholl, and Sarah Winter. Regular Transformations (Dagstuhl Seminar 23202). *Dagstuhl Reports*, 13(5):96–113, 2023. doi:10.4230/DagRep.13.5.96.
- 2 Rajeev Alur and Pavol Černý. Expressiveness of streaming string transducers. In Kamal Lodaya and Meena Mahajan, editors, *IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science, FSTTCS 2010, December 15-18, 2010, Chennai, India*, volume 8 of *LIPICs*, pages 1–12. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2010. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.FSTTCS.2010.1.
- 3 Antoine Amarilli. *Query Evaluation: Enumeration, Maintenance, Reliability*. Habilitation à diriger des recherches, Institut Polytechnique de Paris, April 2023. URL: <https://theses.hal.science/tel-04065298>.
- 4 Stefan Arnborg, Jens Lagergren, and Detlef Seese. Problems easy for tree-decomposable graphs (extended abstract). In Timo Lepistö and Arto Salomaa, editors, *Automata, Languages and Programming, 15th International Colloquium, ICALP88, Tampere, Finland, July 11-15, 1988, Proceedings*, volume 317 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 38–51. Springer, 1988. doi:10.1007/3-540-19488-6_105.
- 5 Michael Benedikt and Luc Segoufin. Regular tree languages definable in FO and in FO_{mod}. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic*, 11(1):4:1–4:32, 2009. doi:10.1145/1614431.1614435.
- 6 Jean Berstel and Christophe Reutenauer. *Noncommutative Rational Series with Applications*, volume 137 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, October 2010. doi:10.1017/CB09780511760860.
- 7 Roderick Bloem and Joost Engelfriet. A Comparison of Tree Transductions Defined by Monadic Second Order Logic and by Attribute Grammars. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 61(1):1–50, August 2000. doi:10.1006/jcss.1999.1684.
- 8 Mikołaj Bojańczyk. Transducers of polynomial growth. In Christel Baier and Dana Fisman, editors, *LICS ’22: 37th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, Haifa, Israel, August 2 - 5, 2022*, pages 1:1–1:27. ACM, 2022. doi:10.1145/3531130.3533326.
- 9 Mikołaj Bojańczyk. The category of mso transductions, 2023. arXiv:2305.18039.
- 10 Mikołaj Bojańczyk. On the growth rates of polyregular functions. In *38th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*. IEEE, June 2023. doi:10.1109/LICS56636.2023.10175808.
- 11 Mikołaj Bojańczyk, Laure Daviaud, Bruno Guillon, and Vincent Penelle. Which classes of origin graphs are generated by transducers. In Ioannis Chatzigiannakis, Piotr Indyk, Fabian Kuhn, and Anca Muscholl, editors, *44th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2017, July 10-14, 2017, Warsaw, Poland*, volume 80 of *LIPICs*, pages 114:1–114:13. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2017. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ICALP.2017.114.

- 12 Mikołaj Bojańczyk and Amina Doumane. First-order tree-to-tree functions, 2020. Corrected version with erratum of a LICS 2020 paper. [arXiv:2002.09307v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.09307v2).
- 13 Mikołaj Bojańczyk, Sandra Kiefer, and Nathan Lhote. String-to-string interpretations with polynomial-size output. In *46th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2019, July 9-12, 2019, Patras, Greece*, pages 106:1–106:14, 2019. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.ICALP.2019.106.
- 14 Vince Bárány. *Automatic presentations of infinite structures*. PhD thesis, RWTH Aachen University, Germany, 2007. URL: <http://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:hbz:82-opus-20193>.
- 15 Vince Bárány, Lukasz Kaiser, and Alexander Rabinovich. Expressing cardinality quantifiers in monadic second-order logic over trees. *Fundamenta Informaticae*, 100:1–17, 2010. doi:10.3233/FI-2010-260.
- 16 Thomas Colcombet. *Représentations et propriétés de structures infinies*. PhD thesis, Université de Rennes 1, France, 2004. URL: <https://theses.hal.science/04504198-tel>.
- 17 Thomas Colcombet. A combinatorial theorem for trees. In Lars Arge, Christian Cachin, Tomasz Jurdziński, and Andrzej Tarlecki, editors, *Automata, Languages and Programming, 34th International Colloquium, ICALP 2007, Wrocław, Poland, July 9-13, 2007, Proceedings*, volume 4596 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 901–912. Springer, 2007. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-73420-8_77.
- 18 Thomas Colcombet. Regular cost functions, part I: logic and algebra over words. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 9(3), 2013. doi:10.2168/LMCS-9(3:3)2013.
- 19 Thomas Colcombet. Logic and regular cost functions. In *32nd Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2017, Reykjavik, Iceland, June 20-23, 2017*, pages 1–4. IEEE Computer Society, 2017. doi:10.1109/LICS.2017.8005061.
- 20 Thomas Colcombet, Laure Daviaud, and Florian Zuleger. Size-change abstraction and max-plus automata. In Erzsébet Csuhaj-Varjú, Martin Dietzfelbinger, and Zoltán Ésik, editors, *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science 2014 - 39th International Symposium, MFCS 2014, Budapest, Hungary, August 25-29, 2014. Proceedings, Part I*, volume 8634 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 208–219. Springer, 2014. doi:10.1007/978-3-662-44522-8_18.
- 21 Thomas Colcombet, Gaëtan Douéneau-Tabot, and Aliaume Lopez. \mathbb{Z} -polyregular functions. In *38th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*. IEEE, June 2023. doi:10.1109/lics56636.2023.10175685.
- 22 Thomas Colcombet and Christof Löding. On the expressiveness of deterministic transducers over infinite trees. In Volker Diekert and Michel Habib, editors, *STACS 2004, 21st Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science, Montpellier, France, March 25-27, 2004, Proceedings*, volume 2996 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 428–439. Springer, 2004. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-24749-4_38.
- 23 Thomas Colcombet and Christof Löding. Transforming structures by set interpretations. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 3(2), 2007. doi:10.2168/LMCS-3(2:4)2007.
- 24 Bruno Courcelle. The monadic second-order logic of graphs V: on closing the gap between definability and recognizability. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 80(2):153–202, 1991. doi:10.1016/0304-3975(91)90387-H.
- 25 Bruno Courcelle and Joost Engelfriet. *Graph structure and monadic second-order logic. A language-theoretic approach*. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its applications, Vol. 138. Cambridge University Press, June 2012. doi:10.1017/CB09780511977619.
- 26 Laure Daviaud. *Comportements asymptotiques des automates Max-plus et Min-plus*. PhD thesis, Université Paris 7, 2014. URL: <https://www.mimuw.edu.pl/~ldaviaud/thesemanuscrit.pdf>.
- 27 Gaëtan Douéneau-Tabot. *Optimization of string transducers*. PhD thesis, Université Paris Cité, November 2023. URL: <https://theses.hal.science/tel-04690881>.
- 28 Manfred Droste and Paul Gastin. Aperiodic weighted automata and weighted first-order logic. In Peter Rossmanith, Pinar Heggernes, and Joost-Pieter Katoen, editors, *44th International*

- Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science, MFCS 2019, August 26-30, 2019, Aachen, Germany*, volume 138 of *LIPICs*, pages 76:1–76:15. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2019. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.MFCS.2019.76.
- 29 Joost Engelfriet. A characterization of context-free NCE graph languages by monadic second-order logic on trees. In Hartmut Ehrig, Hans-Jörg Kreowski, and Grzegorz Rozenberg, editors, *Graph-Grammars and Their Application to Computer Science, 4th International Workshop, Bremen, Germany, March 5-9, 1990, Proceedings*, volume 532 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 311–327. Springer, 1990. doi:10.1007/BFB0017397.
 - 30 Joost Engelfriet and Hendrik Jan Hoogeboom. MSO definable string transductions and two-way finite-state transducers. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic*, 2(2):216–254, April 2001. doi:10.1145/371316.371512.
 - 31 Joost Engelfriet, Hendrik Jan Hoogeboom, and Bart Samwel. XML navigation and transformation by tree-walking automata and transducers with visible and invisible pebbles. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 850:40–97, January 2021. doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2020.10.030.
 - 32 Joost Engelfriet, Kazuhiro Inaba, and Sebastian Maneth. Linear-bounded composition of tree-walking tree transducers: linear size increase and complexity. *Acta Informatica*, 58(1-2):95–152, 2021. doi:10.1007/s00236-019-00360-8.
 - 33 Joost Engelfriet and Sebastian Maneth. Output string languages of compositions of deterministic macro tree transducers. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 64(2):350–395, 2002. doi:10.1006/jcss.2001.1816.
 - 34 Joost Engelfriet and Sebastian Maneth. Two-way finite state transducers with nested pebbles. In Krzysztof Diks and Wojciech Rytter, editors, *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science 2002, 27th International Symposium, MFCS 2002, Warsaw, Poland, August 26-30, 2002, Proceedings*, volume 2420 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 234–244. Springer, 2002. doi:10.1007/3-540-45687-2_19.
 - 35 Joost Engelfriet and Sebastian Maneth. A comparison of pebble tree transducers with macro tree transducers. *Acta Informatica*, 39(9):613–698, 2003. doi:10.1007/s00236-003-0120-0.
 - 36 Joost Engelfriet and Sebastian Maneth. Macro tree translations of linear size increase are MSO definable. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 32(4):950–1006, 2003. doi:10.1137/S0097539701394511.
 - 37 Julien Ferté, Nathalie Marin, and Géraud Sénizergues. Word-Mappings of Level 2. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 54(1):111–148, January 2014. doi:10.1007/s00224-013-9489-5.
 - 38 Emmanuel Filiot and Pierre-Alain Reynier. Copyful streaming string transducers. *Fundamenta Informaticae*, 178(1-2):59–76, January 2021. doi:10.3233/FI-2021-1998.
 - 39 Paul Gallot, Sebastian Maneth, Keisuke Nakano, and Charles Peyrat. Deciding Linear Height and Linear Size-To-Height Increase of Macro Tree Transducers. In Karl Bringmann, Martin Grohe, Gabriele Puppis, and Ola Svensson, editors, *51st International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2024)*, volume 297 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 138:1–138:20, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2024. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ICALP.2024.138.
 - 40 Moses Ganardi and Bakhadyr Khoussainov. Automatic Equivalence Structures of Polynomial Growth. In Maribel Fernández and Anca Muscholl, editors, *28th EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic (CSL 2020)*, volume 152 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 21:1–21:16, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2020. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.CSL.2020.21.
 - 41 Pawel Gawrychowski, Dalia Krieger, Narad Rampersad, and Jeffrey O. Shallit. Finding the growth rate of a regular or context-free language in polynomial time. *International Journal of Foundations of Computer Science*, 21(4):597–618, 2010. doi:10.1142/S0129054110007441.
 - 42 Seymour Ginsburg. *The Mathematical Theory of Context-Free Languages*. McGraw-Hill, Inc., USA, 1966.

- 43 Seymour Ginsburg and Edwin H. Spanier. Bounded ALGOL-like languages. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 113(2):333–368, 1964. doi:10.1090/s0002-9947-1964-0181500-1.
- 44 Erich Grädel. Automatic structures: Twenty years later. In Holger Hermanns, Lijun Zhang, Naoki Kobayashi, and Dale Miller, editors, *LICS '20: 35th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, Saarbrücken, Germany, July 8-11, 2020*, pages 21–34. ACM, 2020. doi:10.1145/3373718.3394734.
- 45 Yo-Sub Han, Arto Salomaa, and Kai Salomaa. Ambiguity, nondeterminism and state complexity of finite automata. *Acta Cybernetica*, 23(1):141–157, 2017. doi:10.14232/actacyb.23.1.2017.9.
- 46 Oscar H. Ibarra and Bala Ravikumar. On sparseness, ambiguity and other decision problems for acceptors and transducers. In Burkhard Monien and Guy Vidal-Naquet, editors, *STACS 86, 3rd Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science, Orsay, France, January 16-18, 1986, Proceedings*, volume 210 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 171–179. Springer, 1986. doi:10.1007/3-540-16078-7_74.
- 47 Kazuhiro Inaba. *Complexity and Expressiveness of Models of XML Translations*. PhD thesis, University of Tokyo, 2009. URL: <http://www.kmonos.net/pub/files/phd.pdf>.
- 48 Kazuhiro Inaba and Haruo Hosoya. Multi-return macro tree transducers. In *PLAN-X 2008, Programming Language Technologies for XML, An ACM SIGPLAN Workshop colocated with POPL 2008, San Francisco, California, USA, January 9, 2008*, 2008. URL: <http://www.kmonos.net/pub/files/mrmtt08.pdf>.
- 49 Sandra Kiefer. Polyregular functions – characterisations and refutations. In Joel D. Day and Florin Manea, editors, *Developments in Language Theory - 28th International Conference, DLT 2024, Göttingen, Germany, August 12-16, 2024, Proceedings*, volume 14791 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 13–21. Springer, 2024. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-66159-4_2.
- 50 Sandra Kiefer, Lê Thành Dũng Nguyễn, and Cécilia Pradic. Refutations of pebble minimization via output languages, 2023. arXiv:2301.09234.
- 51 Daniel Kirsten and Sylvain Lombardy. Deciding Unambiguity and Sequentiality of Polynomially Ambiguous Min-Plus Automata. In Susanne Albers and Jean-Yves Marion, editors, *26th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science*, volume 3 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 589–600, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2009. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.STACS.2009.1850.
- 52 Christof Löding and Wolfgang Thomas. Automata on finite trees. In Jean-Éric Pin, editor, *Handbook of Automata Theory*, volume I (Theoretical Foundations), chapter 7, pages 235–264. EMS Press, September 2021. doi:10.4171/automata-1/7.
- 53 Andreas Maletti, Teodora Nasz, Kevin Stier, and Markus Ulbricht. Ambiguity hierarchies for weighted tree automata. *International Journal of Foundations of Computer Science*, 34(8):903–921, 2023. doi:10.1142/S0129054123430013.
- 54 Arnaldo Mandel and Imre Simon. On finite semigroups of matrices. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 5(2):101–111, 1977. doi:10.1016/0304-3975(77)90001-9.
- 55 Sebastian Maneth. The macro tree transducer hierarchy collapses for functions of linear size increase. In Paritosh K. Pandya and Jaikumar Radhakrishnan, editors, *FST TCS 2003: Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science, 23rd Conference, Mumbai, India, December 15-17, 2003, Proceedings*, volume 2914 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 326–337. Springer, 2003. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-24597-1_28.
- 56 Tova Milo, Dan Suciu, and Victor Vianu. Typechecking for XML transformers. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 66(1):66–97, 2003. Journal version of a PODS 2000 paper. doi:10.1016/S0022-0000(02)00030-2.
- 57 Anca Muscholl and Gabriele Puppis. The Many Facets of String Transducers. In Rolf Niedermeier and Christophe Paul, editors, *36th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS 2019)*, volume 126 of *Leibniz International Proceedings*

- in *Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 2:1–2:21. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2019. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.STACS.2019.2.
- 58 Lê Thành Dũng Nguyễn. Two or three things i know about tree transducers, 2024. arXiv: 2409.03169.
- 59 Lê Thành Dũng Nguyễn, Camille Noûs, and Cécilia Pradic. Comparison-Free Polyregular Functions. In Nikhil Bansal, Emanuela Merelli, and James Worrell, editors, *48th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2021)*, volume 198 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 139:1–139:20. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.ICALP.2021.139.
- 60 Erik Paul. *Weighted tree automata and quantitative logics with a focus on ambiguity*. Master’s thesis (Diplomarbeit), Universität Leipzig, April 2015. URL: <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:bsz:15-qucosa2-164548>.
- 61 Erik Paul. Finite sequentiality of finitely ambiguous max-plus tree automata. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 68(4):615–661, October 2021. doi:10.1007/s00224-021-10049-6.
- 62 Alexander Rabinovich and Doron Tiferet. Degrees of ambiguity for parity tree automata. In Christel Baier and Jean Goubault-Larrecq, editors, *29th EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic, CSL 2021, January 25-28, 2021, Ljubljana, Slovenia (Virtual Conference)*, volume 183 of *LIPIcs*, pages 36:1–36:20. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.CSL.2021.36.
- 63 Alexander Rabinovich and Doron Tiferet. On degrees of ambiguity for Büchi tree automata. *Information and Computation*, 281, 2021. doi:10.1016/j.ic.2021.104750.
- 64 Marcel-Paul Schützenberger. Finite counting automata. *Information and Control*, 5(2):91–107, June 1962. doi:10.1016/s0019-9958(62)90244-9.
- 65 Helmut Seidl. On the finite degree of ambiguity of finite tree automata. *Acta Informatica*, 26(6):527–542, 1989. doi:10.1007/BF00263578.
- 66 Sebastian Siebertz and Alexandre Vigny. Advances in Algorithmic Meta Theorems. In Siddharth Barman and Slawomir Lasota, editors, *44th IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science (FSTTCS 2024)*, volume 323 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 2:1–2:29, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2024. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.FSTTCS.2024.2.
- 67 Imre Simon. The nondeterministic complexity of a finite automaton. In M. Lothaire, editor, *Mots : Mélanges offerts à M.-P. Schützenberger*, pages 384–400. Hermès, 1990. URL: <http://igm.univ-mlv.fr/~berstel/Schutzenberger/Souvenirs/Hommages/mots.pdf>.
- 68 Andreas Weber and Helmut Seidl. On the degree of ambiguity of finite automata. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 88(2):325–349, 1991. Journal version of a MFCS’86 paper. doi:10.1016/0304-3975(91)90381-B.
- 69 Matěj Záček. *Automatic Structures of Polynomial Growth*. Master’s thesis, Masaryk University, December 2023. URL: <https://www.fi.muni.cz/~blumens/Publications/Master-Thesis-Matej-Zacek.pdf>.