

# On repetitiveness measures of Thue-Morse words

Kanaru Kutsukake<sup>1</sup>, Takuya Matsumoto<sup>1</sup>,  
 Yuto Nakashima<sup>1</sup><sup>[0000-0001-6269-9353]</sup>,  
 Shunsuke Inenaga<sup>1,2</sup><sup>[0000-0002-1833-010X]</sup>, Hideo Bannai<sup>3</sup><sup>[0000-0002-6856-5185]</sup>,  
 and Masayuki Takeda<sup>1</sup><sup>[0000-0002-6138-1607]</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Informatics, Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan

<sup>2</sup> PRESTO, Japan Science and Technology Agency, Kawaguchi, Japan

<sup>3</sup> M&D Data Science Center, Tokyo Medical and Dental University, Tokyo, Japan

{kutsukake.kanaru,matsumoto.takuya,yuto.nakashima,  
 inenaga,takeda}@inf.kyushu-u.ac.jp  
 hdbn.dsc@tmd.ac.jp

**Abstract.** We show that the size  $\gamma(t_n)$  of the smallest string attractor of the  $n$ -th Thue-Morse word  $t_n$  is 4 for any  $n \geq 4$ , disproving the conjecture by Mantaci et al. [ICTCS 2019] that it is  $n$ . We also show that  $\delta(t_n) = \frac{10}{3+2^{4-n}}$  for  $n \geq 3$ , where  $\delta(w)$  is the maximum over all  $k = 1, \dots, |w|$ , the number of distinct substrings of length  $k$  in  $w$  divided by  $k$ , which is a measure of repetitiveness recently studied by Kociumaka et al. [LATIN 2020]. Furthermore, we show that the number  $z(t_n)$  of factors in the self-referencing Lempel-Ziv factorization of  $t_n$  is exactly  $2n$ .

**Keywords:** String attractors · Thue-Morse words

## 1 Introduction

Measures which indicate the repetitiveness in a string is a hot and important topic in the field of string compression. For example, given string  $w$ , the size  $g(w)$  of the smallest grammar that derives solely  $w$  [5], the number  $z(w)$  of factors in the Lempel-Ziv factorization [13], the number  $r(w)$  of runs in the Burrows-Wheeler transform [4] (RLBWT), and the size  $b(w)$  of the smallest bidirectional scheme (or macro schemes) [19]. Recently, Kempa and Prezza proposed the notion of *string attractor* [11], and showed that the size  $\gamma(w)$  of the smallest string attractor of  $w$  is a lower bound on the size of the compressed representation for these dictionary compression schemes. While  $z(w)$  and  $r(w)$  are known to be computable in linear time, it is NP-hard to compute  $g(w), b(w), \gamma(w)$  [7,19,11].

To further understand these measures, Mantaci et al. [14] studied the size of the smallest string attractor in several well-known families of strings. In particular, they showed a size-2 string attractor for standard Sturmian words which is the smallest possible. They further showed a string attractor of size  $n$  for the  $n$ -th Thue-Morse word  $t_n$ , and conjectured it to be the smallest.

In this paper, we continue this line of work, and investigate the exact values of various repetitive measures of the  $n$ -th Thue-Morse word  $t_n$ . More specifically,

we show that the size  $\gamma(t_n)$  of the smallest string attractor of  $t_n$  is 4 for  $n \geq 4$ , disproving Mantaci et al.'s conjecture. Furthermore, we give the exact value  $\delta(t_n) = \frac{10}{3+2^{4-n}}$  for  $n \geq 3$ , of the repetitiveness measure recently studied by Kociumaka et al. [12], and the size  $z(t_n) = 2n$  of the self-referencing LZ77 factorization.

We note that for any standard Sturmian word  $s$ ,  $z(s) = \Theta(\log |s|)$  [1], while the size  $r(s)$  of the RLBWT is always constant [15]. On the other hand,  $z(t_n)$  and  $r(t_n)$  are both  $\Theta(n)$ , i.e., logarithmic in the length  $|t_n|$  (the former due to [1] as well as this work, and the latter due to [3]). This shows that Thue-Morse words are an example where the size of smallest string attractor is *not* a tight lower bound on the size of the smallest of the known efficiently computable dictionary compressed representations, namely,  $\min\{z(w), r(w)\}$ . We also conjecture that  $b(t_n) = \Theta(n)$ , which would seem to imply that the size of the smallest string attractor is not a tight lower bound for *all* currently known dictionary compression schemes.

Let  $\ell(w)$  denote the size of the Lyndon factorization [6] of  $w$ . It is known that for any  $w$ ,  $\ell(w) = O(g(w))$  [8] and  $\ell(w) = O(z(w))$  [10,21], although it can be much smaller. Interestingly, it is also known that  $\ell(t_n) = \Theta(n)$  (Theorem 3.1, Remark 3.8 of [9]). Thus, if  $b(t_n) = \Theta(n)$ , then  $\ell(t_n)$  would be an asymptotically tight lower bound for the smallest size of known dictionary compression schemes for  $t_n$ , while  $\gamma(t_n)$  is not.

Table 1 summarizes what we know so far.

**Table 1.** Repetitiveness measures for the  $n$ -th Thue-Morse word  $t_n$ .

measure	description	value	reference
$z(t_n)$	Size of Lempel-Ziv factorization with self-reference	$2n$	[1], this work
$r(t_n)$	Number of same-character runs in BWT	$2n$	[3]
$\ell(t_n)$	Size of Lyndon factorization	$\lfloor \frac{3n-2}{2} \rfloor$	[9]
$b(t_n)$	Size of smallest bidirectional scheme	open	N/A
$\gamma(t_n)$	Size of smallest string attractor	4 ( $n \geq 4$ )	this work
$\delta(t_n)$	maximum of subword complexity divided by subword length	$\frac{10}{3+2^{4-n}}$ ( $n \geq 3$ )	this work

## 2 Preliminaries

Let  $\Sigma$  denote a set of symbols called the alphabet. An element of  $\Sigma^*$  is called a string. For any  $k \geq 0$ , let  $\Sigma^k$  denote the set of strings of length exactly  $k$ . For any string  $w$ , the length of  $w$  is denoted by  $|w|$ . For any  $1 \leq i \leq |w|$ , let  $w[i]$  denote the  $i$ th symbol of  $w$ , and for any  $1 \leq i \leq j \leq |w|$ , let  $w[i..j] = w[i]w[i+1] \cdots w[j]$ .

If  $w = xyz$  for strings  $x, y, z \in \Sigma^*$ , then  $x, y, z$  are respectively called a prefix, substring, suffix of  $w$ . We denote by  $Substr(w)$ , the set of substrings of  $w$ .

In this paper, we will only consider the binary alphabet  $\Sigma = \{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}\}$ . For any string  $w \in \Sigma^*$ , let  $\bar{w}$  denote the string obtained from  $w$  by changing all occurrences of  $\mathbf{a}$  (resp.  $\mathbf{b}$ ) to  $\mathbf{b}$  (resp.  $\mathbf{a}$ ).

**Definition 1 (Thue-Morse Words [17,20,16]).** *The  $n$ -th Thue-Morse word  $t_n$  is a string over a binary alphabet  $\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}\}$  defined recursively as follows:  $t_0 = \mathbf{a}$ , and for any  $n > 0$ ,  $t_n = t_{n-1}\bar{t}_{n-1}$ .*

It is a simple observation that  $|t_n| = 2^n$  for any  $n \geq 0$ .

Below, we define the repetitiveness measures used in this paper:

**String attractors [11]** For any string  $w$ , a set  $\Gamma$  of positions in  $w$  is a string attractor of  $w$ , if, for any substring  $x$  of  $w$ , there is an occurrence of  $x$  in  $w$  that contains a position in  $\Gamma$ . For any string  $w$ , we will denote the size of a smallest string attractor of  $w$  as  $\gamma(w)$ .

**$\delta$  [18,12]**

For any string  $w$ ,

$$\delta(w) = \max_{k=1, \dots, |w|} (|\Sigma^k \cap Substr(w)|/k).$$

**LZ factorization [13]** For any string  $w$ , the LZ factorization of  $w$  is the sequence  $f_1, \dots, f_z$  of non-empty strings such that  $w = f_1 \cdots f_z$ , and for any  $1 \leq i \leq z$ ,  $f_i$  is the longest prefix of  $f_i \cdots f_z$  which has at least two occurrences in  $f_1 \cdots f_i$ , or,  $|f_i| = 1$  otherwise. We denote the size of the LZ factorization of string  $w$  as  $z(w)$ .

It is known that  $\delta(w) \leq \gamma(w) \leq z(w), r(w)$  for any  $w$  [7,11].

### 3 Repetitive Measures of Thue-Morse Words

#### 3.1 $\gamma(t_n)$

Mantaci et al. [14] showed the following explicit string attractor of size  $n$  for the  $n$ -th Thue-Morse word.

**Theorem 1 (Theorem 8 of [14]).** *A string attractor of the  $n$ -th Thue Morse word, with  $n \geq 3$  is*

$$\{2^{n-1} + 1\} \cup \{3 \cdot 2^{i-2} \mid i = 2, \dots, n\}.$$


To prove our new upperbound of 4 for the smallest string attractor of  $t_n$  for  $n \geq 4$ , we first show the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.** *Let*

$$N_n = \{t_{n-1}\bar{t}_{n-1}\} \cup \left( \bigcup_{k=0}^{n-2} \{t_k \bar{t}_k, \bar{t}_k t_k\} \right).$$

*Then, for any substring  $w \in Substr(t_n)$  and  $n \geq 2$ , there exists  $s \in N_n$  such that the occurrence of  $w$  in  $s$  contains the center of  $s$  (i.e., position  $|s|/2$ ).*

*Proof.* Consider the recursively defined perfect binary tree with  $t_n$  as the root, with  $t_{n-1}$  and  $\overline{t_{n-1}}$  respectively as its left and right children (See Fig. 1). The leaves consist of either  $t_0$  or  $\overline{t_0}$ , each corresponding to a position of  $t_n$ . If  $|w| = 1$ , then, we can choose  $t_1 = t_0\overline{t_0} = \mathbf{ab}$  for  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $t_2 = t_1\overline{t_1} = \mathbf{abba}$  for  $\mathbf{b}$ . For any substring  $w = t_n[i..j]$  of length at least 2, consider the lowest common ancestor of leaves corresponding to  $t_n[i]$  and  $t_n[j]$ . Each node of the tree is  $t_n = t_{n-1}\overline{t_{n-1}}$  if it is the root, or otherwise, either  $t_{k+1} = t_k\overline{t_k}$  or  $\overline{t_{k+1}} = \overline{t_k}t_k$  for some  $0 \leq k \leq n-2$ . Since  $w$  is a substring that starts in the left child and ends in the right child of the lowest common ancestor, the occurrence of  $w$  must contain the center, and the lemma holds.  $\square$



**Fig. 1.** A representation of  $t_n$  as a perfect binary tree (shown to depth 4) introduced in the proof of Lemma 1. For each level where segments are labeled with  $t_k$ , non-labeled segments represent  $\overline{t_k}$ . The black circles depict the four positions in  $K_n$  defined in Theorem 2, at the node at which the center of the parent coincides with the position.

**Theorem 2.** For any  $n \geq 4$ , the set

$$K_n = \{2^{n-2}, 3 \cdot 2^{n-3}, 2^{n-1}, 3 \cdot 2^{n-2}\}$$

is a string attractor of  $t_n$ .

*Proof.* Let  $w$  be an arbitrary substring of  $t_n$ . From Lemma 1, it suffices to show that any element in  $N_n$  has an occurrence in  $t_n$  whose center coincides with a position in  $K_n$ .  $t_{n-1}\overline{t_{n-1}}$ ,  $t_{n-2}\overline{t_{n-2}}$ ,  $\overline{t_{n-2}}t_{n-2}$ , and  $\overline{t_{n-3}}t_{n-3}$  each have an occurrence whose center coincides respectively with position  $2^{n-1}$ ,  $2^{n-2}$ ,  $3 \cdot 2^{n-2}$ , and  $3 \cdot 2^{n-3}$  which are all elements of  $K_n$  (see Fig. 1). Furthermore, there is an occurrence of  $t_{n-3}\overline{t_{n-3}}$  whose center coincides with that of  $t_{n-1}\overline{t_{n-1}}$ , and thus with an element of  $K_n$ . More generally, for any  $2 \leq k \leq n-2$ , each occurrence of  $t_k\overline{t_k}$  implies an occurrence of  $t_{k-2}\overline{t_{k-2}}$  whose centers coincide. This is because

$$\begin{aligned} t_k\overline{t_k} &= t_{k-1}\overline{t_{k-1}}\overline{t_{k-1}}t_{k-1} \\ &= t_{k-1}\overline{t_{k-2}}t_{k-2}\overline{t_{k-2}}t_{k-2}t_{k-1}. \end{aligned}$$

The same argument holds for  $\overline{t_{k-2}t_{k-2}}$  by considering  $\overline{t_k t_k}$ . The theorem follows from a simple induction.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.**  $\gamma(t_n) = 4$  for any  $n \geq 4$ .

*Proof.* Theorem 2 implies  $\gamma(t_n) \leq 4$ . From Theorem 4 shown in the next subsection, we have  $\delta(t_n) > 3$  for  $n \geq 6$ . Since  $\gamma(t_n)$  is an integer which cannot be smaller than  $\delta(t_n)$ , it follows that  $\gamma(t_n) \geq 4$  for  $n \geq 6$ . For  $n = 4, 5$ , it can be shown by exhaustive search that there is no string attractor of size 3.  $\square$

### 3.2 $\delta(t_n)$

Brelek [2] investigated the number of distinct substrings of length  $m$  in  $t_n$ , and gave an exact formula. Below is a summary of his result which will be a key to computing  $\delta(t_n)$ .

**Lemma 2 (Proposition 4.2, Corollary 4.2.1, Proposition 4.4 of [2]).** *The number  $P_n(m)$  of distinct substrings of length  $m \geq 3$  in  $t_n$  ( $n \geq 3$ ) is:*

$$P_n(m) = \begin{cases} 2^n - m + 1 & 2^{n-2} + 1 \leq m \leq 2^n \\ 6 \cdot 2^{q-1} + 4p & 3 \leq m \leq 2^{n-2}, 0 < p \leq 2^{q-1} \\ 8 \cdot 2^{q-1} + 2p & 3 \leq m \leq 2^{n-2}, 2^{q-1} < p \leq 2^q \end{cases}$$

where  $p, q$  are values uniquely determined by  $m = 2^q + p + 1$  and  $0 < p \leq 2^q$ .

**Theorem 4.**

$$\delta(t_n) = \begin{cases} 1 & n = 0 \\ 2 & n = 1, 2 \\ \frac{10}{3+2^{4-n}} & n \geq 3 \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* We only consider  $n \geq 3$  below. The number of distinct substrings of length 1 and 2 in  $t_n$ , are respectively 2 and 4. For  $2^{n-2} + 1 \leq m \leq 2^n$ ,

$$\max_{2^{n-2}+1 \leq m \leq 2^n} \frac{P_n(m)}{m} = \max_{2^{n-2}+1 \leq m \leq 2^n} \left\{ \frac{2^n + 1}{m} - 1 \right\} = \frac{2^n + 1}{2^{n-2} + 1} - 1 = \frac{3}{1 + 2^{2-n}}.$$

For  $3 \leq m \leq 2^{n-2}$  and fixed  $q$ , it is easy to verify that  $P_n(m)/m$  is increasing when  $0 < p \leq 2^{q-1}$ , and non-increasing when  $2^{q-1} < p \leq 2^q$ , because

$$\left( \frac{6 \cdot 2^{q-1} + 4p}{2^q + p + 1} \right)' = \frac{4(2^q + p + 1) - (6 \cdot 2^{q-1} + 4p)}{(2^q + p + 1)^2} = \frac{2^q + 4}{(2^q + p + 1)^2} > 0$$

and

$$\left( \frac{8 \cdot 2^{q-1} + 2p}{2^q + p + 1} \right)' = \frac{2(2^q + p + 1) - (8 \cdot 2^{q-1} + 2p)}{(2^q + p + 1)^2} = \frac{(2 - 4 \cdot 2^{q-1})}{(2^q + p + 1)^2} \leq 0.$$

Also note that  $6 \cdot 2^{q-1} + 4p = 8 \cdot 2^{q-1} + 2p$  when  $p = 2^{q-1}$ . Therefore, for a fixed  $q$ , the maximum value of  $\frac{P_n(m)}{m}$  is obtained when  $p = 2^{q-1}$ , i.e.,  $\frac{6 \cdot 2^{q-1} + 4 \cdot 2^{q-1}}{2^q + 2^{q-1} + 1} =$

$\frac{10 \cdot 2^{q-1}}{3 \cdot 2^{q-1} + 1} = \frac{10}{3 + 2^{1-q}}$ . Since this is increasing in  $q$ , we have that  $\max_{3 \leq m \leq 2^{n-2}} \frac{P_n(m)}{m}$  is obtained by choosing the largest possible  $q = n - 3$  (where  $p = 2^{q-1} = 2^{n-4}$ , and thus  $m = 2^{n-3} + 2^{n-4} + 1 = 3 \cdot 2^{n-4} + 1 \leq 2^{n-2}$ ), which gives us the final result  $\delta(t_n) = \max\{\frac{2}{1}, \frac{4}{2}, \frac{10}{3+2^{4-n}}, \frac{3}{1+2^{2-n}}\} = \frac{10}{3+2^{4-n}}$ .  $\square$

### 3.3 LZ77

We consider the size  $z(t_n)$  of the LZ factorization. Although Berstel and Savelli [1] have given a complete characterization of the LZ factorization for the infinite Thue-Morse word, we show an alternate proof in terms of the  $n$ -th Thue-Morse word. Below is an important lemma, again by Brlek, we will use.

**Lemma 3 (Corollary 4.1.1 of [2]).** *The word  $t_n$  has one and only one occurrence of every factor  $w$  such that  $|w| \geq 2^{n-2} + 1$ .*

**Theorem 5.** *For any  $n \geq 1$ ,  $z(t_n) = 2n$ .*

*Proof.* Clearly,  $z(t_1) = 2$ . Since  $t_k = t_{k-1}\overline{t_{k-1}} = t_{k-2}\overline{t_{k-2}t_{k-2}}t_{k-2}$ , it is easy to see that  $z(t_k) \leq z(t_{k-1}) + 2$ , because  $t_{k-2}$  and  $t_{k-2}$  respectively have earlier occurrences in  $t_k$ . Thus,  $z(t_n) \leq 2n$ . On the other hand, Lemma 3 implies that the substring  $t_k[2^{k-1}..3 \cdot 2^{k-2}]$  of length  $2^{k-2} + 1$  cannot be a single LZ factor, implying that position  $2^{k-1}(= |t_{k-1}|)$  and position  $3 \cdot 2^{k-2}(> |t_{k-1}|)$  belong to different factors. Similarly, the substring  $t[3 \cdot 2^{k-2}..2^k]$  of length  $2^{k-2} + 1$  cannot be a single LZ factor, implying that position  $3 \cdot 2^{k-2}$  and position  $2^k$  belong to different factors. Thus,  $z(t_k) \geq z(t_{k-1}) + 2$ , implying  $z(t_n) \geq 2n$ .  $\square$

### Acknowledgments

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP18K18002 (YN), JP17H01697 (SI), JP16H02783, JP20H04141 (HB), JP18H04098 (MT), and JST PRESTO Grant Number JPMJPR1922 (SI).

## References

1. Berstel, J., Savelli, A.: Crochemore factorization of Sturmian and other infinite words. In: Proc. 31st International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (MFCS 2006). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 4162, pp. 157–166. Springer (2006), [https://doi.org/10.1007/11821069\\_14](https://doi.org/10.1007/11821069_14)
2. Brlek, S.: Enumeration of factors in the Thue-Morse word. Discrete Applied Mathematics **24**(1), 83 – 96 (1989), [https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-218X\(92\)90274-E](https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-218X(92)90274-E)
3. Brlek, S., Frosini, A., Mancini, I., Pergola, E., Rinaldi, S.: Burrows-Wheeler transform of words defined by morphisms. In: Proc. 30th International Workshop on Combinatorial Algorithms (IWOC 2019). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 11638, pp. 393–404. Springer (2019), [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-25005-8\\_32](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-25005-8_32)
4. Burrows, M., Wheeler, D.J.: A block-sorting lossless data compression algorithm. SRC Research Report **124** (1994)
5. Charikar, M., Lehman, E., Liu, D., Panigrahy, R., Prabhakaran, M., Sahai, A., Shelat, A.: The smallest grammar problem. IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **51**(7), 2554–2576 (2005), <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2005.850116>
6. Chen, K.T., Fox, R.H., Lyndon, R.C.: Free differential calculus, IV. the quotient groups of the lower central series. Annals of Mathematics **68**(1), 81–95 (1958), <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1970044>
7. Christiansen, A.R., Ettienne, M.B., Kociumaka, T., Navarro, G., Prezza, N.: Optimal-time dictionary-compressed indexes (2019), <http://arxiv.org/abs/1811.12779v6>
8. I, T., Nakashima, Y., Inenaga, S., Bannai, H., Takeda, M.: Faster Lyndon factorization algorithms for SLP and LZ78 compressed text. In: Proc. 20th International Symposium on String Processing and Information Retrieval (SPIRE 2013). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 8214, pp. 174–185. Springer (2013), [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02432-5\\_21](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02432-5_21)
9. Ido, A., Melançon, G.: Lyndon factorization of the Thue-Morse word and its relatives. Discret. Math. Theor. Comput. Sci. **1**(1), 43–52 (1997), <http://dmcs.episciences.org/233>
10. Kärkkäinen, J., Kempa, D., Nakashima, Y., Puglisi, S.J., Shur, A.M.: On the size of lempel-ziv and lyndon factorizations. In: Vollmer, H., Vallée, B. (eds.) 34th Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science, STACS 2017, March 8–11, 2017, Hannover, Germany. LIPIcs, vol. 66, pp. 45:1–45:13. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2017), <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.STACS.2017.45>
11. Kempa, D., Prezza, N.: At the roots of dictionary compression: string attractors. In: Diakonikolas, I., Kempe, D., Henzinger, M. (eds.) Proc. 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC 2018). pp. 827–840. ACM (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1145/3188745.3188814>
12. Kociumaka, T., Navarro, G., Prezza, N.: Towards a definitive measure of repetitiveness. In: Proc. 14th Latin American Symposium on Theoretical Informatics (LATIN) (2020), <https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.02151>, to appear
13. Lempel, A., Ziv, J.: On the complexity of finite sequences. IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **22**(1), 75–81 (1976), <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.1976.1055501>
14. Mantaci, S., Restivo, A., Romana, G., Rosone, G., Sciortino, M.: String attractors and combinatorics on words. In: Proc. 20th Italian Conference on Theoretical Computer Science (ICTCS 2019). pp. 57–71 (2019), <http://ceur-ws.org/Vol-2504/paper8.pdf>

15. Mantaci, S., Restivo, A., Sciortino, M.: Burrows-Wheeler transform and Sturmian words. *Inf. Process. Lett.* **86**(5), 241–246 (2003), [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-0190\(02\)00512-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-0190(02)00512-4)
16. Morse, M.: Recurrent geodesics on a surface of negative curvature. *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* **22**, 84100 (1921)
17. Prouhet, E.: Mémoire sur quelques relations entre les puissances des nombres. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér.* **133**, 225 (1851)
18. Raskhodnikova, S., Ron, D., Rubinfeld, R., Smith, A.D.: Sublinear algorithms for approximating string compressibility. *Algorithmica* **65**(3), 685–709 (2013), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00453-012-9618-6>
19. Storer, J.A., Szymanski, T.G.: Data compression via textual substitution. *J. ACM* **29**(4), 928–951 (1982), <https://doi.org/10.1145/322344.322346>
20. Thue, A.: Über unendliche zeichenreihen. *Norske vid. Selsk. Skr. Mat. Nat. Kl.* **7**, 1–22 (1906)
21. Urabe, Y., Nakashima, Y., Inenaga, S., Bannai, H., Takeda, M.: On the size of overlapping Lempel-Ziv and Lyndon factorizations. In: 30th Annual Symposium on Combinatorial Pattern Matching (CPM 2019). pp. 29:1–29:11 (2019), <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CPM.2019.29>