

# On the Maximum Number of Distinct Factors of a Binary String

*Jeffrey Shallit* §

*Department of Computer Science*

*University of Waterloo*

*Waterloo, Ontario N2L 3G1*

*Canada*

`shallit@graceland.waterloo.edu`

## *Abstract.*

In this note we prove that a binary string of length  $n$  can have no more than  $2^{k+1} - 1 + \binom{n-k+1}{2}$  distinct factors, where  $k$  is the unique integer such that  $2^k + k - 1 \leq n < 2^{k+1} + k$ . Furthermore, we show that for each  $n$ , this bound is actually achieved. The proof uses properties of the de Bruijn graph.

§ Research supported in part by an NSERC operating grant.

## I. Introduction.

Let  $w$  be a string of 0's and 1's, i.e.  $w \in (0 + 1)^*$ . We say that  $z \in (0 + 1)^*$  is a *factor* of  $w$  if there exist  $x, y \in (0 + 1)^*$  such that

$$w = xzy.$$

In analogy with the function that counts the number of divisors of a positive integer  $n$ , define  $d(w)$  to be the *total number of distinct factors* of the string  $w$ . For example,  $d(101110) = 12$ , as its set of factors is given by

$$\{\epsilon, 0, 1, 01, 10, 11, 011, 101, 110, 0110, 1011, 10110\}.$$

Note that we count  $\epsilon$ , the empty string, as a factor of every string.

In this note we discuss the maximum order of  $d(w)$ .

## II. The Main Results.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $|w| = n$ . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} d(w) &\leq \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} \min(2^i, n - i + 1) \\ &= \binom{n - k + 1}{2} + 2^{k+1} - 1, \end{aligned}$$

where  $k$  is the unique integer such that  $2^k + k - 1 \leq n < 2^{k+1} + k$ .

### Proof.

The first inequality is clear, as there are precisely  $n - i + 1$  possible factors of length  $i$ , of which at most  $2^i$  can be distinct.

To see the second equality, note that if  $2^k + k - 1 \leq n < 2^{k+1} + k$ , then  $2^k \leq n - k + 1$  and  $2^{k+1} > n - k$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} \min(2^i, n - i + 1) &= \sum_{0 \leq i \leq k} 2^i + \sum_{k < i \leq n} (n - i + 1) \\ &= 2^{k+1} - 1 + \binom{n - k + 1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. ■

**Theorem 2.** *The upper bound in Theorem 1 is actually attained for all  $n$ .*

To prove Theorem 2, we use the *de Bruijn graph*  $B_k$ . This graph was apparently first studied by Flye-Sainte Marie in 1894 [FSM]. Good [G] and de Bruijn [B] independently rediscovered the graph in 1946. A more accessible reference is Bondy and Murty [BM, pp.

181-183] or van Lint [L, pp. 82-92]. For a survey of results on this graph until 1982, see Fredricksen [F].

Recall that  $B_k$  is a directed graph with  $2^k$  vertices  $\{0, 1\}^k$ , and  $2^{k+1}$  directed edges with labels  $\{0, 1\}^{k+1}$ . There is a directed edge from the head vertex, labeled  $a_1 a_2 \cdots a_k$ , to the tail vertex, labeled  $b_1 b_2 \cdots b_k$ , iff  $a_2 \cdots a_k = b_1 \cdots b_{k-1}$ . In this case the edge is labeled  $a_1 a_2 \cdots a_k b_k$ .

For example, below is the de Bruijn graph  $B_3$ :

A *chain* is an alternating sequence of distinct edges and possibly non-distinct vertices,  $v_1, e_2, v_2, \dots, e_j, v_j$ , where  $v_i$ ,  $2 \leq i \leq j$ , is the tail of  $e_i$  and  $v_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq j - 1$ , is the head of  $e_{i+1}$ . If  $v_1 = v_j$ , this is a *closed chain*. A closed chain with distinct vertices (other than  $v_1 = v_j$ ) is a *cycle*. The *length* of a chain is the number of edges it contains.

We need the following lemma:

**Lemma 3.**

*For each  $i$  with  $2^k \leq i \leq 2^{k+1}$ , the graph  $B_k$  contains a closed chain of length  $k$  that visits every vertex at least once.*

Note that for  $i = 2^k$ , this is a Hamiltonian cycle, and for  $i = 2^{k+1}$ , this is an Eulerian tour.

**Proof.**

This theorem can be derived from results in a paper of Yoeli [Y], although it is not explicitly stated there.

Yoeli proved the following theorems:

**Theorem A.**

*If  $B_k$  has a cycle of length  $i$ , then it has a closed chain of length  $i + 2^k$ .*

**Theorem B.**

*$B_k$  contains a cycle of length  $i$  for any  $i$ ,  $0 < i \leq 2^k$ .*

Combining these two theorems, we see that  $B_k$  has a closed chain of any length between  $2^k$  and  $2^{k+1}$ . However, it remains to see there exists such a chain that visits every

vertex of  $B_k$ . Yoeli's proof of Theorem A does in fact construct a closed chain that visits every vertex of  $B_k$ . Since this is nowhere stated in his paper, we briefly go through the argument.

Yoeli proves the following three lemmas:

**Lemma 4.**  *$B_k$  is strongly connected.*

Define a  $P$ -set of cycles of  $B_k$  to be a set of vertex-disjoint cycles covering all the vertices. (Each cycle must have at least one edge; thus a  $P$ -set of  $B_k$  has  $2^k$  edges.)

**Lemma 5.**

*Let  $C$  be a cycle of  $B_k$ . Then there exists a  $P$ -set of cycles of  $B_k$  including no edge of  $C$ .*

**Lemma 6.**

*Let  $C'$  and  $C''$  be vertex-disjoint cycles of  $B_k$  and let  $e = (u, v)$  be an edge with  $u$  in  $C'$  and  $v$  in  $C''$ . Then there is an edge  $e'$  from  $v$ 's predecessor in  $C''$  to  $u$ 's predecessor in  $C'$ , and a cycle on the vertex set of  $C' \cup C''$  can be formed using edges of  $C' \cup C''$  together with  $e$  and  $e'$ .*

Now we can complete the proof of Lemma 3, following the proof Yoeli gave for his Theorem A.

Let  $C$  be a cycle in  $B_k$  of length  $i$ . By Lemma 5 there exists a  $P$ -set of cycles  $P_1$  of  $B_k$  including no edge of  $C$ . Let  $H_1$  be the subgraph of  $B_k$  formed by the edges of  $P_1$  and  $C$ . If the underlying undirected graph of  $H_1$  consists of more than one connected component, then by Lemma 4 there must be an edge  $e$  in  $B_k$  joining two components of  $H_1$ . Edge  $e$  must join two vertex disjoint cycles  $D'$  and  $D''$  in  $P_1$ , where no edge of  $H_1$  goes between  $D'$  and  $D''$ . Applying Lemma 6 to combine  $D'$  and  $D''$ , we obtain a  $P$ -set of cycles  $P_2$  including no edge of  $C$ , and such that  $H_2 = C \cup P_2$  has one fewer connected component. Continuing in this fashion leads to a connected subgraph  $H_r$ , consisting of  $C \cup P_r$ , where  $P_r$  is a  $P$ -set. Since  $H_r$  is connected, with each vertex's in-degree equal to its out-degree,  $H_r$  has an Eulerian tour. This provides a closed chain of length  $2^k + i$  visiting all vertices. ■

Using Yoeli's result we can construct a string that achieves the upper bound:

**Proof of Theorem 2.**

Let  $n$  be given, and let  $k$  be the unique integer such that  $2^k + k - 1 \leq n < 2^{k+1} + k$ . Consider the de Bruijn graph  $B_k$ . By Lemma 3 there exists a closed chain  $C$  of length  $n - (k - 1)$  traversing each vertex in  $B_k$  and repeating no edges. Take the string formed by the  $k$  letters of the vertex label of the first vertex in  $C$ , followed by the last letter in the labels of all subsequent edges in  $C$ . The result is a string of length  $n$ , and we claim it is the desired one.

Now this closed chain visits every vertex of  $B_k$ ; hence  $w$  contains all factors of length  $k$ , and hence all factors of lengths  $0, 1, 2, \dots, k - 1$ .

On the other hand, the chain  $C$  does not repeat any edge, so all the factors of length  $k + 1$  are distinct. Hence so are all the factors of lengths  $k + 2, k + 3, \dots, n$ , since any two factors of the same length must differ in the first  $k + 1$  positions.

Thus we see

$$d(w) = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq k} 2^i + \sum_{k < i \leq n} n - i + 1,$$

and so the upper bound is achieved. ■

### An Example.

Let  $n = 14$ . Then  $k = 3$  and  $n - (k - 1) = 12$ . Looking at  $B_3$ , we see there is a closed chain of length 12, as follows (listing only the vertices):

$$\begin{aligned} 000 \rightarrow 001 \rightarrow 010 \rightarrow 100 \rightarrow 001 \rightarrow 011 \rightarrow 110 \rightarrow \\ 101 \rightarrow 011 \rightarrow 111 \rightarrow 110 \rightarrow 100 \rightarrow 000. \end{aligned}$$

This corresponds to the string 000100110111000 of length 14. It has  $15 + 66 = 81$  distinct factors, which is the maximum possible for any binary string of length 14.

### III. Acknowledgments.

I am most grateful to M. Mendès France for having suggested the problem.

I would like to thank A. Rosenberg for suggesting the article of Yoeli, and T. Leighton for suggesting I speak to A. Rosenberg.

Finally, I would like to express many thanks to A. Lubiw, who provided the proof of Lemma 3.

### References

- [B] N. G. de Bruijn, A combinatorial problem, *Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Proc.* **49** (1946), 758–764.
- [BM] J. A. Bondy and U. S. R. Murty, *Graph Theory with Applications*, Macmillan, 1976.
- [F] H. Fredricksen, A survey of full length nonlinear shift register cycle algorithms, *SIAM Review* **24** (1982), 195–221.
- [FSM] C. Flye-Sainte Marie, Solution to problem number 58, *L'Intermédiaire des Mathématiciens* **1** (1894), 107–110.
- [G] I. J. Good, Normally recurring decimals, *J. London Math. Soc.* **21** (1946), 167–169.
- [L] J. H. van Lint, Combinatorial Theory Seminar, Eindhoven University of Technology, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics # 382*, Springer-Verlag, 1974.
- [Y] M. Yoeli, Binary ring sequences, *Amer. Math. Monthly* **69** (1962), 852–855.