# Lexicographic Listing and Ranking of t-ary Trees

M. C. ER\*

Department of Computer Science, University of Western Australia, Nedlands, WA 6009, Australia

This paper presents three simple and efficient algorithms for generating, ranking and unranking t-ary trees in a lexicographic order. The simplest idea of encoding a t-ary tree with n nodes as a bit-string of length t\*n is exploited to its full advantages. It is proved that the lexicographic order in the set of t-ary trees with n nodes is preserved in the set of bit-strings of length t\*n, using the above encoding scheme. Thus by generating all bit-strings in the lexicographic order, a simple decoding algorithm can convert them to t-ary trees in the same order. Finally, the theoretical basis for ranking a lexicographic listing of bit-strings is discussed, and the ranking and the unranking algorithms are derived.

Received December 1985, revised September 1986

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years the interest in the lexicographic generation of regular trees has been shifted from binary trees to t-ary trees. Ruskey1 presented one of the earliest algorithms for generating t-ary trees in a lexicographic order. He encoded a t-ary tree as a string of digits, each digit representing the level of a leaf. Thus by manipulating a string of leaf levels, all t-ary trees could be generated. Trojanowski<sup>2</sup> established a one-to-one mapping between a set of t-ary trees and a set of stack-generatable permutations. Thus by enumerating a set of stackgeneratable permutations, all t-ary trees could also be generated. Liu<sup>3</sup> used a permutation of the multiset  $\{1, 2, ..., n\}^{t-1}$  to encode a t-ary tree with n nodes. Thus the problem of generating all t-ary trees is reduced to the problem of generating all permutations of the multiset subject to certain constraints. It is well known that a representation has tremendous influence on the complexity and the efficiency of an algorithm that manipulates it. Due to the utilisation of these complex encoding schemes for representing t-ary trees, their algorithms for generating t-ary trees are unnecessarily complex; so are their ranking and unranking algorithms.

In a recent paper, Er<sup>4</sup> proposed a method for encoding a binary tree as a binary string, and demonstrated that simple and efficient algorithms for generating, ranking and unranking binary trees could be constructed. In this paper we extend the results to t-ary trees. More specifically, we shall show that a t-ary tree can be encoded as a binary string, and that simple and efficient algorithms for generating, ranking and unranking t-ary trees can be constructed.

# 2. DEFINITIONS AND NOTATIONS

Throughout this paper, we consider only the class of rooted, ordered and regular t-ary trees. A tree is said to be rooted if it has a single root; it is said to be regular if every internal node has t children; and ordered if the subtrees of each internal node can be identified. When we say a t-ary tree, we mean a rooted, ordered and regular t-ary tree.

Let T(t, n) be a set of t-ary trees with n nodes. Further, let  $T_i$  denote the *i*th subtree of  $T \in T(t, n)$ . To generate members of T(t,n) systematically, first of all it is necessary to specify the lexicographic order.

\* Now at: Dept. of Maths. and Computing Sciences, St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, Nova Scotia, Canada B2G 1CO.

Definition of lexicographic order

Given two t-ary trees, T and T', we say that T < T' if (a) T is empty and T is not empty, or

- (b) both T and T are not empty, and for some  $1 \le i \le t$ :
  - (i)  $T_j = T'_j$ , for j = 1, 2, ..., i-1, and (ii)  $T_i < T'_i$ .

Let |T(t,n)| denote the number of distinct t-ary trees with n nodes. Further, let  $C_{t,n}$  be the generalized Catalan number.<sup>5</sup> Then the following lemma is immediate.

Lemma 1

$$|T(t,n)| = C_{t,n} = \frac{1}{(t-1)n+1} {tn \choose n}$$

for  $t \ge 2$  and  $n \ge 0$ .

A t-ary tree T with n nodes can be converted to an extended t-ary tree  $\overline{T}$  with n internal nodes (see Ref. 6 for an extended binary tree), which is also a full t-ary tree, by replacing all empty nodes of T by n(t-1)+1 leaves. Let  $\overline{T}(t, n)$  be a set of extended t-ary trees with n internal nodes. It is obvious that T(t,n) and  $\overline{T}(t,n)$  are in one-to-one correspondence.

An extended t-ary tree  $\overline{T}$  can be encoded as a binary bit-string as follows. An internal node and a leaf are represented as a one and a zero, respectively, by the pre-order traversal of  $\overline{T}$ . The resulting bit-string comprises (tn+1) bits. Because of the nature of pre-order traversal, the last bit of such a bit-string is always a zero. It can therefore be ignored without affecting the representation. The reason for deleting the last zero is to facilitate the following definitions.

Let  $B = (b_1 b_2 b_3 \dots b_{tn})$  be a bit-string. B is said to have the t-dominating property if the number of zeros is always less than or equal to t times the number of ones while scanning from  $b_1$  to  $b_{tn}$ . Furthermore, B is said to be t-feasible if the number of zeros is equal to t times the number of ones, and B satisfies the t-dominating property. Finally, let B(t,n) be a set of bit-strings of length tn, such that they are all t-feasible.

# 3. ENCODING AND DECODING **ALGORITHMS**

Since an extended t-ary tree can be encoded as a bit-string,  $\overline{T}(t, n)$  and B(t, n) are related in some ways. Furthermore, T(t,n) and  $\overline{T}(t,n)$  are in one-to-one correspondence; hence T(t, n) and B(t, n) are also related. Thus if a node of  $T \in T(t, n)$  is encoded as a one and an empty subtree of T is encoded as a zero, then T can be encoded as a bit-string directly. The details are presented in the following encoding algorithm.

```
procedure Encode(T: treeptr);
var j: integer;
begin
    i: = i + 1;
    if T = nil then
        B[i]: = '0'
    else begin
        B[i]: = '1';
        for j: = 1 to t do
            Encode(T^ . son[j]);
        end
end {Encode};
```

Note that i is initialised to zero to start with. The zero in B[t\*n+1] may be omitted.

The above algorithm clearly suggests the following theorem.

#### Theorem 1

The encoding of  $T \in T(t, n)$  as a bit-string always yields a *t*-feasible bit-string  $B \in B(t, n)$ .

# Proof

The encoded bit-string of T is a trace of the pre-order traversal of T. As a node is always visited first before its children, which may or may not be empty, the resulting bit-string B satisfies the t-dominating property and is always t-feasible if the last empty subtree visited is omitted.

Conversely, a t-ary tree T can be constructed from a bit-string B directly. The detailed decoding algorithm is given below.

```
function Decode: treeptr;
var j: integer;
    T: treeptr;
begin
    i:= i+1;
    if (B[i] = '0') or (i > t*n) then
        Decode:= nil
    else begin
        new(T);
    for j:= 1 to t do
        T^ .son[j]:= Decode;
    Decode:= T;
    end;
end {Decode};
```

Again, i is initialised to zero.

The above encoding and decoding algorithms clearly demonstrate the deep connection between T(t, n) and B(t, n). The relationship between them can be formalized in the following theorem.

# Theorem 2

The mapping between T(t, n) and B(t, n) is one to one.

### Proof

The one-to-one correspondence is implied by the algorithms for encoding a  $T \in T(t, n)$  and for decoding a  $B \in B(t, n)$ . Let  $B, B' \in B(t, n)$  be the encoded  $T, T' \in T(t, n)$ , respectively. As the pre-order traversal of a t-ary tree is deterministic, each node is visited in a predetermined manner. Hence, if B = B', then T = T'. The converse is also true.

Notice that the encoding and the decoding algorithms described above visit/construct each node of  $T \in T(t, n)$  once and only once, therefore the running times of both algorithms are O(n).

#### 4. LISTING ALGORITHM

In the previous section, the one-to-one correspondence between T(t,n) and B(t,n) is established. Thus, instead of generating all members of T(t,n) in the lexicographic order, we may simply enumerate all members of B(t,n) in the same order. A question that naturally arises is whether or not the same lexicographic order can be preserved in T(t,n) and B(t,n), when the one-to-one correspondence between them is established. The result is summarised in the following important theorem.

#### Theorem 3

Let  $T, T' \in T(t, n)$  and  $B, B' \in B(t, n)$ . Suppose B and B' are the encoded bit-strings of T and T', respectively. Then B < B' if and only if T < T'.

#### Proof

We prove this theorem in two steps.

```
(i) T < T' implies B < B'.
```

T < T' implies that, by the pre-order traversal, the *i*th (say) node of T is empty and the *i*th node of T' is not empty, while nodes 1 to (i-1) are the same. By the encoding algorithm, the first (i-1) bits of B and B' are the same. As  $b_i$  of B is 0 and  $b'_i$  of B' is 1, thus B < B'.

```
(ii) B < B' implies T < T'.
```

The converse can also be proved readily. B < B' implies that there exists a j,  $1 \le j \le tn$ , such that  $b_j < b'_j$  and  $b_i = b'_i$  for  $1 \le i \le j-1$ . As B and B' are binary bit-strings, it follows that  $b_j = 0$  and  $b'_j = 1$ . By the decoding algorithm, the jth nodes of T and T' are empty and non-empty, respectively, while nodes 1 to (j-1) are the same. Therefore, T < T'.

This theorem explicitly states that the one-to-one mapping between T(t,n) and B(t,n) preserves the lexicographic order of T(t,n) in B(t,n). Therefore we need only to generate B(t,n) in the lexicographic order; the conversion from bit-strings to t-ary trees can be trivially carried out by the decoding algorithm. The details of the generating algorithm for listing B(t,n) in the lexicographic order are given below.

```
procedure Listing(a, z: integer);

var i: integer;

begin

if (a = 0) and (z = 0) then PrintBitString

else begin

i := t*(n-a)-z+1;

if z <> 0 then begin

B[i] := '0';
```

```
Listing(a, z-1);
       end;
    if a < > 0 then begin
       B[i] := '1';
       Listing(a-1, z+t-1);
    end
end {Listing};
```

If the above algorithm is activated as Listing (n, 0), then B(t, n) will be generated. This generating algorithm can be proved correct as follows. (i) We show that exactly n ones and n(t-1) zeros are generated per bit-string. Note that a is decremented by 1 when a one is generated. It follows that n ones will be generated per bit-string. Furthermore, the value of z is incremented by (t-1) when a one is subtracted from a. As z is decremented by one when a zero is generated, exactly n(t-1) zeros will be generated per bit-string – since the initial value of z is zero. (ii) We show that the bit-strings so generated are t-feasible. It is important to note that (t-1) zeros cannot be generated before a one is generated. More generally, additional (t-1) zeros cannot be generated before an additional one is generated. Consequently, the bit-strings so generated are t-feasible, as the initial values of a and z are n and 0, respectively. (iii) We show that the successive bit-strings so generated are in the lexicographic order. It is apparent from the algorithm that for any i,  $1 \le i \le tn$ ,  $b_i$  is assigned a zero before a one whenever possible. Thus the successive bit-strings generated are in the lexicographic order. Hence the correctness of the algorithm is established.

#### 5. RANKING ALGORITHM

A bit-string  $B \in B(t, n)$  is a string of binary digits; it can also be interpreted as a binary number. This makes the association between a t-ary tree and a number obvious. However, using this method the set of numbers that B(t,n) maps to is not consecutive. It is desirable to map B(t, n) to a set of consecutive natural numbers so that a list of t-ary trees with n nodes in the lexicographic order can be ranked accordingly.

Let R be a ranking function which maps B(t, n) to  $\mathbf{Z} = \{1, 2, ..., C_{t, n}\}$ , such that B < B' if and only if R(B) < R(B'), where  $B, B' \in B(t, n)$ . By Theorem 3, T(t, n)is also ranked in the same order. So the remaining problem is to derive R.

First of all, we derive some auxiliary functions to assist the final derivation R. Let f(i) be the number of ones in between  $b_i$  and  $b_{in}$  of B inclusively. Further, let V(i) be the number of bit-strings that are t-feasible, such that they all have the same prefix  $b_1 b_2 \dots b_{i-1}$  as B has, with  $b_i = 0$ . Then V(i) is given by the following important theorem.

Theorem 4

$$V(i) = {tn-i \choose f(i)} - {tn-i \choose f(i)-1} (t-1).$$

Proof

V(i) is equal to the number of permutations of f(i) ones and (tn-i-f(i)) zeros in between  $b_{i+1}$  and  $b_{in}$  inclusively, such that the resulting bit-strings are t-feasible. The number of all possible permutations of f(i) ones and (tn-i-f(i)) zeros is

$$\binom{tn-i}{f(i)}$$

However, the above number of permutations also includes bit-strings that do not satisfy the t-dominating property. By the reflection principle,7 the number of such bit-strings is

$$\binom{tn-i}{f(i)-1}(t-1).$$

Hence the theorem is correct.

Theorem 5

$$R(B) = 1 + \sum_{b,-1} \left( \binom{tn-i}{f(i)} - \binom{tn-i}{f(i)-1} (t-1) \right).$$

Proof

For each  $b_i$  of B, such that  $b_i = 1$ , B is preceded by other bit-strings having the prefix  $b_1 b_2 \dots b_{i-1} 0$ , where  $b_1 b_2 \dots b_{i-1}$  are identical with the first (i-1) bits of B. By Theorem 4, the total number of bit-strings preceding B

$$\sum_{b_{i-1}} \left( \binom{tn-i}{f(i)} - \binom{tn-i}{f(i)-1} (t-1) \right).$$

Hence the position index R(B) of B in the lexicographic listing of B(t, n) is

$$1 + \sum_{b_i=1} \left( \binom{tn-i}{f(i)} - \binom{tn-i}{f(i)-1} (t-1) \right). \qquad \Box$$

Corollary 1

$$V(1) = 0.$$

Proof

As f(1) = n, therefore

$$V(1) = {tn-1 \choose n} - {tn-1 \choose n-1} (t-1)$$
$$= 0.$$

Equipped with Theorem 5, the ranking algorithm can be implemented easily, and is detailed below.

```
function Rank(B: bitstring): integer;
var i, j, index: integer;
begin
  j := n-1;
  i := 2;
  index := 1;
  while j > 0 do begin
     if B[i] = 1 then begin
       B[i] = 1 then beginding index: = index + C(t*n-i, j-1) *(t*(n-j)-i+1) div j;
       j := j-1;
       end;
     i := i + 1;
     end;
  Rank := index;
end {Rank};
```

Note that the equation of Theorem 4 can be simplified as follows:

$$\binom{tn-i}{f(i)} - \binom{tn-i}{f(i)-1}(t-1) = \frac{t(n-f(i))-i+1}{f(i)} \binom{tn-i}{f(i)-1}.$$

Indeed, this simplified form is used in the ranking algorithm. Note that in the ranking algorithm,

$$C(t*n-i,j-1) = \binom{tn-i}{j-1},$$

and the initial values of i, j and index are based on Theorem 5 and Corollary 1.

# 6. UNRANKING ALGORITHM

Let  $R^{-1}$  be the unranking function which maps  $\mathbf{Z} = \{1, 2, ..., C_{t, n}\}$  to B(t, n). Clearly  $R^{-1}$  is the inverse of R. So, given a position index, we want to compute its corresponding bit-string in the lexicographic listing of B(t, n). The following implementation does just that.

```
procedure Unrank(index: integer);
var i, j, x: integer;
begin
  j:=n;
  i := 1;
  while j > 0 do begin
     x := C(t*n-i, j-1)*(t*(n-j)-i+1) \operatorname{div} j;
     if index > x then begin
       B[i] := '1';
       j := j-1;
```

# REFERENCES

- 1. F. Ruskey, Generating t-ary trees lexicographically. SIAM Journal on Computing 7, 424-439 (1978).
- 2. A. E. Trojanowski, Ranking and listing algorithms for k-ary trees. SIAM Journal on Computing 7, 492-509 (1978).
- 3. C. L. Liu, Generation of k-ary trees. Proc. 5th Colloque de Lille-Les Arbres en Algèbre et en Programmation (1980).
- 4. M. C. Er, Enumerating ordered trees lexicographically. The Computer Journal 28 (5), 538-542 (1985).

```
index := index - x;
     else B[i] := '0';
    i := i + 1;
     end:
  for i := i to t*n do B[i] := `0`:
end {Unrank};
```

The correctness of the unranking algorithm may be proved as follows. First of all, it compares the position index with V(i). If index > V(i),  $b_i$  should be assigned a one in order that the given position index will fall within the range covered by the subset of B(t, n) having the same prefix  $b_1 b_2 \dots b_{i-1}$  in the lexicographic listing. The total number of ones to be assigned to B is reduced by 1, and the value of the position index is reduced by V(i). Conversely, if index  $\leq V(i)$ ,  $b_i$  should be assigned a zero, as V(i) indicates the number of t-feasible bit-strings having the prefix  $b_1 b_2 \dots b_{i-1} 0$  By induction, the unranking algorithm is correct.

# 7. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Representation plays an important role in complex problem solving, as well as in designing efficient algorithms. Some representations lend a hand to simple and transparent solutions, but some do not. This paper shows that the simplest idea of representing a binary tree as a bit-string4 can be extended to a t-ary tree. The resulting generating, ranking and unranking algorithms for t-ary trees are also very simple and efficient.

- 5. A. D. Sands, On generalised Catalan numbers. Discrete Mathematics 21, 219-221 (1978).
- 6. D. E. Knuth, The Art of Computer Programming, vol. 1. Addison-Wesley, Reading, Massachusetts (1973).
- 7. W. Feller, An Introduction to Probability Theory and its Applications, vol. 1, third edition. Wiley, New York 1968.