

# A finer reparameterisation theorem for MSO and FO queries on strings

Lê Thành Dũng (Tito) Nguyễn

Paweł Parys

## Abstract

We show a theorem on monadic second-order  $k$ -ary queries on finite words. It may be illustrated by the following example: if the number of results of a query on binary strings is  $O(\text{number of 0s} \times \text{number of 1s})$ , then each result can be MSO-definably identified from a 0-position, a 1-position and some finite data.

Our proofs also handle the case of first-order logic / aperiodic monoids. Thus we can state and prove the folklore theorem that dimension minimisation holds for first-order string-to-string interpretations.

For an MSO query given by a formula  $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_k)$  (using first-order free variables  $x_i$ ) on words over a finite alphabet  $\Sigma$ , and  $w \in \Sigma^*$ , we write

$$\#\varphi(w) = \text{Card}(\{\vec{i} \in \{1, \dots, |w|\}^k \mid w \models \varphi(\vec{i})\})$$

Our main result (originally conjectured by Thomas Colcombet in personal communication) is:

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_k)$  and  $\eta_1(x), \dots, \eta_\ell(x)$  be MSO (resp. FO) formulas such that*

$$\#\varphi(w) = O(\#\eta_1(w) \times \dots \times \#\eta_\ell(w))$$

*Then there exists an MSO (resp. FO) formula  $\psi(x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_\ell)$ , which defines for each word  $w$  a total functional relation*

$$\{\vec{i} \mid w \models \varphi(\vec{i})\} \rightarrow \{\vec{j} \mid w \models \eta_1(j_1) \wedge \dots \wedge \eta_\ell(j_\ell)\}$$

*where each  $\vec{j}$  has  $O(1)$  many preimages  $\vec{i}$ .*

**Remark 2** (Colcombet). This does not work for polynomials instead of monomials: over  $\{a, b\}^*$ , consider  $\#(a(x) \wedge b(y)) \leq \#(a(x))^2 + \#(b(y))^2 = \#((a(x) \wedge a(y)) \vee (b(x) \wedge b(y)))$ .

For MSO, the special case  $\eta_1(x) = \dots = \eta_\ell(x) = \text{true}$  was first stated by Bojańczyk in [Boj22, Lemma 6.2], with the proof of a slight variant appearing in [Boj23]. This proof uses Imre Simon’s factorisation forest theorem. Our proof of Theorem 1 is mainly based on ideas from [Boj23], but with choices of exposition heavily inspired from [DT23]. The case where the  $\eta_i$  are trivial has been extended to trees in [GLN25, Theorem 1.3] using arguably simpler tools (combinatorics of weighted automata), but we have not found a way to apply this alternative approach to derive Theorem 1.

For FO, even the “ $\eta_i$  trivial” case has not appeared previously in the literature; it is not just a corollary of the MSO case since we need to ensure that  $\psi$  is in FO. But the proof scheme from [Boj23] still applies, using an aperiodic version of factorisation forests.<sup>1</sup> Our proof of Theorem 1 establishes the MSO and FO cases simultaneously.

The original motivation of [Boj22, Lemma 6.2] was to prove a dimension minimisation theorem for string-to-string MSO interpretations [Boj22, Theorem 6.1] (see also [GLN25, Theorem 1.5] for trees). The reduction to a result on MSO queries performed in [Boj22, GLN25] is an elementary syntactic manipulation that also works for FO. Therefore, thanks to the FO and “ $\eta_i$  trivial” case of Theorem 1, dimension minimisation holds for FO interpretations:

<sup>1</sup>This observation comes from Bojańczyk (personal communication).

**Theorem 3.** *An FO interpretation that defines a string-to-string function  $f$  such that  $|f(w)| = O(|w|^\ell)$  can be effectively translated to an  $\ell$ -dimensional FO interpretation that also defines  $f$ .*

**Recognizing queries.** Consider now a query  $\varphi$  and assume that  $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_k) \Rightarrow x_1 < \dots < x_k$  holds for all words, w.l.o.g. We can then denote  $aaabbabba \models \varphi(3, 5, 9)$  as  $aa\underline{a}bb\underline{a}bba \models \varphi$ .

We say that a monoid morphism  $\mu: \Sigma^* \rightarrow M$  recognizes  $\varphi$  when the images of the maximal infixes without distinguished position – in the above example,  $\mu(aa)$ ,  $\mu(b)$ ,  $\mu(abb)$  and  $\mu(\varepsilon)$  – together with the values of the distinguished letters ( $a, b, a$  above) suffice to determine whether  $\varphi$  is satisfied. A query is recognizable by a morphism to a finite (resp. finite and aperiodic) monoid if and only if it is MSO-definable (resp. FO-definable).

**Factorization forests.** Let  $\mu: \Sigma^* \rightarrow M$  be a morphism to a finite monoid. We define a  $\mu$ -forest for  $w \in \Sigma^+$  by induction as:

- either the leaf  $w$  when  $w \in \Sigma$
- or the node  $\langle f_1 \rangle \dots \langle f_n \rangle$  whose children  $f_1, \dots, f_n$  are forests for  $w_1, \dots, w_n$  such that  $w = w_1 \cdot \dots \cdot w_n$  with  $n \geq 2$ , and with the condition that if  $n \geq 3$  then:
  - $\mu(w_1) = \dots = \mu(w_n)$ ;
  - $\mu(w_1)^{|M|} = \mu(w_1)^{|M|+1}$  — beware, this final condition is a bit idiosyncratic, and meant to unify the MSO and FO cases.

The *height* is the maximum nesting of  $\langle - \rangle$ .

**Theorem 4.** *There exists a rational function  $\Sigma^* \rightarrow (\Sigma \cup \{\langle, \rangle\})^*$  that produces for each input word (the string representation of) some  $\mu$ -forest for that word of bounded height, with the expected origin semantics. Furthermore, when  $M$  is aperiodic, this function can be taken to be FO-rational.*

*Proof.* In the non-aperiodic case, the Factorisation Forest Theorem states the existence of a  $\mu$ -forest of bounded height with the last item replaced by the stronger property that  $\mu(w_1)$  is *idempotent*, and a well-known refinement (see e.g. [DT23, Theorem 2.21]) gives us a rational function that computes it.

In the aperiodic case, an FO-rational function can produce forests without this idempotence property according to [Boj18, Lemma 6.5]<sup>2</sup> and then  $\mu(w_1)^{|M|} = \mu(w_1)^{|M|+1}$  follows from the definition of the aperiodicity of  $M$ .  $\square$

**Navigating in forests.** Changing the definitions of [DT23, Section 2.3] slightly to fit our notion of  $\mu$ -forest, we say that a node  $\mathbf{m}$  in a forest *observes* a node  $\mathbf{n}$  when  $\mathbf{n}$  is a sibling at distance at most  $|M|$  (when ordering the siblings from left to right) of an ancestor of  $\mathbf{m}$ . (Here, any node is its own sibling at distance 0, and it is also its own ancestor.) A node is *iterable* when it has at least  $|M|$  left siblings and at least  $|M|$  right siblings (not including itself).

Original terminology: the *anchor* of a leaf is either its lowest iterable ancestor, if it has any, or the root otherwise. (This is related to the “frontiers” in [DT23, §2.3].) When the anchor of a leaf  $i$  observes the anchor of a leaf  $j$ , we say that  $i$  *points to*  $j$ .

Fix a  $k$ -ary MSO (resp. FO) query  $\varphi$  and unary queries  $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell$ , a morphism  $\mu: \Sigma^* \rightarrow M$  recognizing all those queries, and a rational (resp. FO-rational) function computing factorization forests of bounded height for  $\mu$ . For  $w \in \Sigma^*$ , we speak of *the forest of  $w$*  to refer to the one returned by the aforementioned function.

Let  $(w, i_1, \dots, i_k)$  such that  $w \models \varphi(i_1, \dots, i_k)$ . Let us consider the following graph: the vertices are  $\{1, \dots, k\}$  and there is an edge from  $p$  to  $q$  when  $i_p$  points to  $i_q$ .

<sup>2</sup>For a proof, see [BKL19, Appendix B].

**Claim 5.** Let  $S$  be a strongly connected component of this graph. Then all the nodes in the set  $\text{anchors}(S) = \{\text{anchor}(i_p) \mid p \in S\}$  are siblings in the forest of  $w$ , and any two consecutive members of that set are at distance at most  $|M|$ . (This includes the case where it is the singleton containing the root.)

*Proof.* If  $i_p$  points to  $i_q$  then  $\text{height}(\text{anchor}(i_p)) \leq \text{height}(\text{anchor}(i_q))$ . Thus, we first deduce that all anchors have the same height. Thus, in this case,  $i_p$  can only point to  $i_q$  if  $\text{anchor}(i_p)$  is a (not necessarily proper) sibling of  $\text{anchor}(i_q)$ . We conclude by again using connectedness.  $\square$

This claim allows us to define  $\overline{\text{anchors}}(S)$  as the set consisting of the nodes from  $\text{anchors}(S)$  and the siblings between them in the left-to-right order — note that all these siblings are iterable, unless  $S$  is the singleton containing the root.

Let us call  $\mathcal{M}$  the set of strongly connected components that are minimal, i.e. that have no incoming edge. For each  $S \in \mathcal{M}$ , we consider the infix block( $S$ ) of  $w$  obtained by taking the leaves that descend from the nodes in  $\text{anchors}(S)$ .

**Claim 6.** The infixes block( $S$ ) for  $S \in \mathcal{M}$  are non-overlapping in  $w$ .

*Proof.* If they were overlapping, then there would be some leaf that is a common descendant of some two nodes  $\alpha_1 \in \overline{\text{anchors}}(S_1)$  and  $\alpha_2 \in \overline{\text{anchors}}(S_2)$  for  $S_1 \neq S_2$  and  $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{M}$ . This would mean that one of  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  is an ancestor of the other.

- Suppose first that they are equal. Then  $\overline{\text{anchors}}(S_1) \cap \overline{\text{anchors}}(S_2) \neq \emptyset$ . This can only happen if some node in  $\text{anchors}(S_1)$  and some other node in  $\text{anchors}(S_2)$  are at distance at most  $|M|$ , contradicting the fact that  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  are distinct strongly connected components.
- We may now assume w.l.o.g. that  $\alpha_1$  is a strict ancestor of  $\alpha_2$  — and therefore of all its siblings, in particular of some  $\beta_2 \in \text{anchors}(S_2)$ . There also exists  $\beta_1 \in \text{anchors}(S_1)$  that is a sibling at distance at most  $|M|$  of  $\alpha_1$ . By definition,  $\beta_2$  observes  $\beta_1$ , contradicting the minimality of the component  $S_1$ .  $\square$

Let  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$  be any non-empty subset. We define  $w_n^{\mathcal{S}}$  as the word obtained from  $w$  by pumping  $n$  times all the infixes block( $S$ ) for  $S \in \mathcal{S}$ . Clearly,  $|w_n^{\mathcal{S}}| = O(n)$ .

**Claim 7.**  $\#\varphi(w_n^{\mathcal{S}}) \geq n^{|\mathcal{S}|}$ .

*Proof.* For each pumped block, let us choose one of its copies in  $w_n^{\mathcal{S}}$ ; there are  $n^{|\mathcal{S}|}$  possible choices. Let  $j_1, \dots, j_k$  be positions in  $w_n^{\mathcal{S}}$ :

- that correspond to  $i_1, \dots, i_k$  in  $w$ , according to the intuitive origin semantics of pumping;
- such that if  $i_x$  is in a pumped block, then  $j_x$  is in its chosen copy.

We claim that  $w_n^{\mathcal{S}} \models \varphi(j_1, \dots, j_k)$ . Idea: use the fact that the nodes in  $\overline{\text{anchors}}(S)$  for  $S \in \mathcal{S}$  are iterable, plus the standard argument that one can reconstruct the value  $\mu(w[j_x + 1 \dots j_{x+1} - 1])$  from the nodes observed by  $j_x$  and  $j_{x+1}$  in a forest for  $w_n^{\mathcal{S}}$  deduced by pumping.  $\square$

Furthermore, for each query  $\eta_p$  ( $1 \leq p \leq \ell$ ), since  $\mu$  recognizes it, it can also be evaluated using the  $\mu$ -forest, so we have in the above pumping construction:

$$(\text{no positions in the pumped infixes block}(S) \text{ satisfy } \eta_p) \implies \#\eta_p(w_n^{\mathcal{S}}) = O(1)$$

Let  $P(\mathcal{S}) = \{p \in \{1, \dots, \ell\} \mid \exists S \in \mathcal{S} : \text{some position in block}(S) \text{ satisfies } \eta_p\}$ . We then have

$$\#\eta_1(w_n^{\mathcal{S}}) \times \dots \times \#\eta_\ell(w_n^{\mathcal{S}}) = O(n^{|P(\mathcal{S})|}) \quad \text{therefore} \quad |\mathcal{S}| \leq |P(\mathcal{S})|$$

Since this holds for all non-empty  $S \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ , by Hall's marriage theorem, there exists an injection  $\mathcal{M} \hookrightarrow \{1, \dots, \ell\}$  that maps each  $S \in \mathcal{M}$  to a  $p_S$  such that the infix  $\text{block}(S)$  in  $w$  contains some position  $j$  such that  $w \models \eta_{p_S}(j)$ . We can fix a choice of injection  $S \mapsto p_S$ , e.g. the lexicographically smallest one. Let us define, for  $p \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ ,

$$j_p = \begin{cases} \text{the leftmost position of } w \text{ inside } \text{block}(S) \text{ satisfying } \eta_p, & \text{when } p = p_S \\ 1 & \text{when there is no such } S \end{cases}$$

**Claim 8.** The functional relation that maps  $(w, i_1, \dots, i_k)$  to  $(j_1, \dots, j_\ell)$ , according to the above recipe, can be uniformly defined over all words by some MSO formula  $\psi(x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_\ell)$ . If  $M$  is aperiodic then we can have  $\psi$  in FO.

*Proof.* The formula  $\psi$  has to compute  $\mathcal{M}$ , which is doable by an FO query on the forest. We combine this with the fact that FO queries on the output of a rational (resp. FO-rational) function can be pulled back to MSO (resp. FO) queries on the input.  $\square$

We now show that the number of preimages by this function is bounded. For each  $S$ , the anchor of  $j_{p_S}$  must be equal to or below the anchor of some  $i_q$  where  $q \in S$ ; therefore,  $j_{p_S}$  points to  $i_q$ . Since  $\mathcal{M}$  consists of all minimal strongly connected components, each  $i_r$  for  $r \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$  is reachable by a path of length at most  $k$  in the graph for the “points to” relation whose vertices are  $\{1, \dots, |w|\}$  (note that the graph that we considered before can be seen as an induced subgraph), by some  $j_{p_S}$  where  $S \in \mathcal{M}$ . To conclude, recall that:

**Claim 9.** Over forests of bounded height, a leaf points to a bounded number of other leaves.

*Proof.* All the arguments (but not the exact statement) may be found in [DT23, Section 2.3].  $\square$

## References

- [BKL19] 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. Technical report with appendix: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1905.13190>. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.ICALP.2019.106.
- [Boj18] Mikołaj Bojańczyk. Polyregular functions, 2018. [arXiv:1810.08760](https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.08760).
- [Boj22] Mikołaj Bojańczyk. Transducers of polynomial growth (invited talk). 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.
- [Boj23] Mikołaj Bojańczyk. On the growth rates of polyregular functions. In *38th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*, 2023. doi:10.1109/LICS56636.2023.10175808.
- [DT23] Gaëtan Douéneau-Tabot. *Optimization of string transducers*. PhD thesis, Université Paris Cité, November 2023. URL: <https://theses.hal.science/tel-04690881>.
- [GLN25] Paul Gallot, Nathan Lhote, and Lê Thành Dũng Nguyễn. The structure of polynomial growth for tree automata/transducers and mso set queries, 2025. [arXiv:2501.10270](https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.10270).