

Parallel algorithms for power circuits and the word problem of the Baumslag group

Caroline Mattes

Universität Stuttgart, Institut für Formale Methoden der Informatik (FMI), Universitätsstraße 38,
70569 Stuttgart, Germany
caroline.mattes@fmi.uni-stuttgart.de

Armin Weiß 

Universität Stuttgart, Institut für Formale Methoden der Informatik (FMI), Universitätsstraße 38,
70569 Stuttgart, Germany
armin.weiss@fmi.uni-stuttgart.de

Abstract

Power circuits have been introduced in 2012 by Myasnikov, Ushakov and Won as a data structure for non-elementarily compressed integers supporting the arithmetic operations addition and $(x, y) \mapsto x \cdot 2^y$. The same authors applied power circuits to give a polynomial-time solution to the word problem of the Baumslag group, which has a non-elementary Dehn function.

In this work, we examine power circuits and the word problem of the Baumslag group under parallel complexity aspects. In particular, we establish that the word problem of the Baumslag group can be solved in NC – even though one of the essential steps is to compare two integers given by power circuits and this, in general, is shown to be P-complete. The key observation is that the depth of the occurring power circuits is logarithmic and such power circuits can be compared in NC.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Problems, reductions and completeness; Theory of computation → Circuit complexity

Keywords and phrases Word problem, Baumslag group, power circuit, parallel complexity

Related Version conference version [27] at MFCS 2021

Funding *Armin Weiß*: Funded by DFG project DI 435/7-1.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Notation and preliminaries	4
2.1	Complexity	4
2.2	Power circuits	6
3	Compact signed-digit representations	7
4	Operations on power circuits	12
4.1	Basic operations	12
4.2	Relation to arithmetic circuits with + and 2^x gates.	15
4.3	Power circuit reduction	17
4.4	Operations with floating point numbers	25
5	The word problem of the Baumslag group	28
5.1	Conditions for Britton reductions	29
5.2	The algorithm	32
6	Hardness of comparison in power circuits	34
6.1	P-hardness of power circuit comparison	39
7	Conclusion	40

1 Introduction

The *word problem* of a finitely generated group G is as follows: does a given word over the generators of G represent the identity of G ? It was first studied by Dehn as one of the basic algorithmic problems in group theory [10]. Already in the 1950s, Novikov and Boone succeeded to construct finitely presented groups with an undecidable word problem [7, 32]. Nevertheless, many natural classes of groups have an (efficiently) decidable word problem – most prominently the class of linear groups (groups embeddable into a matrix group over some field): their word problem is in LOGSPACE [21, 37] – hence, in particular, in NC, i.e., decidable by Boolean circuits of polynomial size and polylogarithmic depth (or, equivalently decidable in polylogarithmic time using polynomially many processors).

There are various other results on word problems of groups in small parallel complexity classes defined by circuits. For example the word problems of solvable linear groups are even in TC^0 (constant depth with threshold gates) [18] and the word problems of Baumslag-Solitar groups and of right-angled Artin groups are AC^0 -Turing-reducible to the word problem of a non-abelian free group [41, 17]. Moreover, Thompson’s groups are co-context-free [20] and hyperbolic groups have word problem in LOGCFL [22]. All these complexity classes are contained within NC. On the other hand, there are also finitely presented groups with a decidable word problem but with arbitrarily high complexity [35].

A mysterious class of groups under this point of view are one-relator groups, i.e. groups that can be written as a free group modulo a normal subgroup generated by a single element (*relator*). Magnus [25] showed that one-relator groups have a decidable word problem; his algorithm is called the Magnus breakdown procedure (see also [24, 26]). Nevertheless, the complexity remains an open problem – although it is not even clear whether the word problems of one-relator groups are solvable in elementary time, in [5] the question is raised whether they are actually decidable in polynomial time.

In 1969 Gilbert Baumslag defined the group $\mathbf{G}_{1,2} = \langle a, b \mid bab^{-1}a = a^2bab^{-1} \rangle$ as an example of a one-relator group which enjoys certain remarkable properties. It is infinite and non-abelian, but all its finite quotients are cyclic and, thus, it is not residually finite [6]. Moreover, Gersten showed that the Dehn function of $\mathbf{G}_{1,2}$ is non-elementary [14] and Platonov [33] made this more precise by proving that it is (roughly) $\tau(\log n)$ where $\tau(0) = 1$ and $\tau(i + 1) = 2^{\tau(i)}$ for $i \geq 0$ is the tower function (note that he calls the group Baumslag-Gersten group). Since the Dehn function gives an upper bound on the complexity of the word problem, the Baumslag group was a candidate for a group with a very difficult word problem. Indeed, when applying the Magnus breakdown procedure to an input word of length n , one obtains as intermediate results words of the form $v_1^{x_1} \cdots v_m^{x_m}$ where $v_i \in \{a, b, bab^{-1}\}$, $x_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $m \leq n$. The issue is that the x_i might grow up to $\tau(\log n)$; hence, this algorithm has non-elementary running time. However, as foreseen by the above-mentioned conjecture, Myasnikov, Ushakov and Won succeeded to show that the word problem of $\mathbf{G}_{1,2}$ is, indeed, decidable in polynomial time [29]. Their crucial contribution was to introduce so-called *power circuits* in [30] for compressing the x_i in the description above.

Roughly speaking, a *power circuit* is a directed acyclic graph (a dag) where the edges are labelled by ± 1 . One can define an evaluation of a vertex P as two raised to the power of the (signed) sum of the successors of P . Note that this way the value $\tau(n)$ of the tower function can be represented by an $n + 1$ -vertex power circuit – thus, power circuits allow for a non-elementary compression. The crucial feature for the application to the Baumslag group is that power circuits not only efficiently support the operations $+$, $-$, and $(x, y) \mapsto x \cdot 2^y$, but also the test whether $x = y$ or $x < y$ for two integers represented by power circuits can

be done in polynomial time. The main technical part of the comparison algorithm is the so-called reduction process, which computes a certain normal form for power circuits.

Based on these striking results, Diekert, Laun and Ushakov [11] improved the algorithm for power circuit reduction and managed to decrease the running time for the word problem of the Baumslag group from $\mathcal{O}(n^7)$ down to $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$. They also describe a polynomial-time algorithm for the word problem of the famous Higman group H_4 [15]. In [31] these algorithms have been implemented in C++. Subsequently, more applications of power circuits to these groups emerged: in [19] a polynomial time solution to the word problem in generalized Baumslag and Higman groups is given, in [12] the conjugacy problem of the Baumslag group is shown to be strongly generically in P and in [3] the same is done for the conjugacy problem of the Higman group. Here “generically” roughly means that the algorithm works for most inputs (for details on the concept of generic complexity, see [16]).

Other examples where compression techniques lead to efficient algorithms in group theory can be found e.g. in [13] or [23, Theorems 4.6, 4.8 and 4.9]. Finally, notice that in [28] the word search problem for the Baumslag group has been examined using parametrized complexity.

Contribution. The aim of this work is to analyze power circuits and the word problem of the Baumslag group under the view of parallel (circuit) complexity. For doing so, we first examine so-called *compact* representations of integers and show that ordinary binary representations can be converted into compact representations by constant depth circuits (i.e., in AC^0 – see Section 3). We apply this result in the power circuit reduction process, which is the main technical contribution of this paper. While [30, 11] give only polynomial time algorithms, we present a more refined method and analyze it in terms of parametrized circuit complexity. The parameter here is the depth D of the power circuit. More precisely, we present threshold circuits of depth $\mathcal{O}(D)$ for power circuit reduction – implying our first main result:

► **Proposition A.** *The problem of comparing two integers given by power circuits of logarithmic depth is in TC^1 (decidable by logarithmic-depth, polynomial-size threshold circuits).*

We then analyze the word problem of the Baumslag group carefully. A crucial step is to show that all appearing power circuits have logarithmic depth. Using Proposition A we succeed to describe a TC^1 algorithm for computing the Britton reduction of uv given that u and v are already Britton-reduced (Britton reductions are the basic step in the Magnus breakdown procedure – see Section 5 for a definition). This leads to the following result:

► **Theorem B.** *The word problem of the Baumslag group $\mathbf{G}_{1,2}$ is in TC^2 .*

In the final part of the paper we prove lower bounds on comparison in power circuits, and thus, on power circuit reduction. In particular, this emphasizes the relevance of Proposition A and shows that our parametrized analysis of power circuit reduction is essentially the best one can hope for. Moreover, Theorem C highlights the importance of the logarithmic depth bound for the power circuits appearing during the proof of Theorem B.

► **Theorem C.** *The problem of comparing two integers given by power circuits is P-complete.*

Power circuits can be seen in the broader context of arithmetic circuits and arithmetic complexity. Thus, results on power circuits also give further insight into these arithmetic circuits. Notice that the corresponding logic over natural numbers with addition and 2^x has been shown to be decidable by Semënov [36]. In Proposition 30 we show that, indeed,

for every power circuit with a marking M there is an arithmetic circuit of polynomial size with $+$, $-$, and 2^x -gates evaluating to the same number and vice-versa. Moreover, the transformation between these two models can be done efficiently.

This work is the full and extended version of the conference publication [27]. Besides giving full proofs of all results, here we explore the connections between power circuits and arithmetic circuits with $+$, $-$, and 2^x -gates and in Theorem 53 we give a refined variant of Theorem C which also yields hardness results for power circuits of logarithmic depth.

2 Notation and preliminaries

General notions. We use standard \mathcal{O} -notation for functions from \mathbb{N} to non-negative reals $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$, see e.g. [9]. Throughout, the logarithm \log is with respect to base two. The *tower function* $\tau: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is defined by $\tau(0) = 1$ and $\tau(i+1) = 2^{\tau(i)}$ for $i \geq 0$. It is primitive recursive, but $\tau(6)$ written in binary cannot be stored in the memory of any conceivable real-world computer. Moreover, we set $\log^*(n) = \min \{i \mid \tau(i) \geq n\}$.

We denote the support of a function $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $\sigma(f) = \{x \in X \mid f(x) \neq 0\}$. Furthermore, the interval of integers $\{i, \dots, j\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ is denoted by $[i..j]$ and we define $[n] = [0..n-1]$. We write $\mathbb{Z}[1/2] = \{p/2^q \in \mathbb{Q} \mid p, q \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ for the set of dyadic fractions.

Let Σ be a set. The set of all words over Σ is denoted by $\Sigma^* = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Sigma^n$. The length of a word $w \in \Sigma^*$ is denoted by $|w|$. A dag is a directed acyclic graph. For a dag Γ we write $\text{depth}(\Gamma)$ for its depth, which is the length (number of edges) of a longest path in Γ .

2.1 Complexity

We assume the reader to be familiar with the complexity classes LOGSPACE and P (polynomial time); see e.g. [2] for details. Most of the time, however, we use circuit complexity within NC.

Throughout, we assume that languages L (resp. inputs to functions f) are encoded over the binary alphabet $\{0, 1\}$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. A language L (resp. function f) is in AC^k if there is a family of polynomial-size Boolean circuits of depth $\mathcal{O}(\log^k n)$ (where n is the input length) deciding L (resp. computing f). More precisely, a Boolean circuit is a dag (directed acyclic graph) where the vertices are either input gates x_1, \dots, x_n , or NOT, AND, or OR gates. There are one or more designated output gates (for computing functions there is more than one output gate – in this case they are numbered from 1 to m). All gates may have unbounded fan-in (i.e., there is no bound on the number of incoming wires). A language $L \subseteq \{0, 1\}^*$ belongs to AC^k if there exist a family $(C_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of Boolean circuits such that $x \in L \cap \{0, 1\}^n$ if and only if the output gate of C_n evaluates to 1 when assigning $x = x_1 \cdots x_n$ to the input gates. Moreover, C_n may contain at most $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ gates and have depth $\mathcal{O}(\log^k n)$. Here, the depth of a circuit is the length of the longest path from an input gate to an output gate. Likewise AC^k -computable functions are defined.

The class TC^k is defined analogously with the difference that also MAJORITY gates are allowed (a MAJORITY gate outputs 1 if its input contains more 1s than 0s). Moreover, $\text{NC} = \bigcup_{k \geq 0} \text{TC}^k = \bigcup_{k \geq 0} \text{AC}^k$. For more details on circuits we refer to [39]. Our algorithms (or circuits) rely on two basic building blocks which can be done in TC^0 :

► **Example 1.** Iterated addition is the following problem:

Input: n numbers A_1, \dots, A_n each having n bits
 Output: $\sum_{i=1}^n A_i$

This is well-known to be in TC^0 .

► **Example 2.** Let $(k_1, v_1), \dots, (k_n, v_n)$ be a list of n key-value pairs (k_i, v_i) equipped with a total order on the keys k_i such that it can be decided in TC^0 whether $k_i < k_j$. Then the problem of sorting the list according to the keys is in TC^0 : the desired output is a list $(k_{\pi(1)}, v_{\pi(1)}), \dots, (k_{\pi(n)}, v_{\pi(n)})$ for some permutation π such that $k_{\pi(i)} \leq k_{\pi(j)}$ for all $i < j$.

We briefly describe a circuit family to do so: The first layer compares all pairs of keys k_i, k_j in parallel. For all i and j the next layer computes a Boolean value $P(i, j)$ which is true if and only if $|\{\ell \mid k_\ell < k_i\}| = j$. The latter is computed by iterated addition. As a final step the j -th output pair is set to (k_i, v_i) if and only if $P(i, j)$ is true.

► **Remark 3.** The class NC is contained in P if we consider uniform circuits. A family of circuits is called LOGSPACE -uniform (or simply uniform) if the function $1^n \mapsto C_n$ is computable in LOGSPACE (where 1^n is the string consisting of n ones and C_n is given as some reasonable encoding). Be aware that for classes below LOGSPACE usually even stronger uniformity conditions are imposed. In order not to overload the presentation, throughout, we state all our results in the non-uniform case – all uniformity considerations are left to the reader.

Parametrized circuit complexity. In our work we also need some parametrized version of the classes TC^k , which we call *depth-parametrized* TC^k . Let $\text{par}: \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ (called the *parameter*). Consider a family of circuits $(C_{n,D})_{n,D \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $C_{n,D}$ contains at most $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ gates (independently of D)¹ and has depth $\mathcal{O}(D \cdot \log^k n)$. A language L is said to be accepted by this circuit family if for all n and D and all $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ with $\text{par}(x) \leq D$ we have $x \in L$ if and only if $C_{n,D}$ evaluates to 1 on input x . Similarly, $f: \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$ is computed by $(C_{n,D})_{n,D \in \mathbb{N}}$ if for all n and D and all $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ with $\text{par}(x) \leq D$ the circuit $C_{n,D}$ evaluates to $f(x)$ on input x . We define DepParaTC^k as the class of languages (resp. functions) for which there are such parametrizations $\text{par}: \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and families of circuits $(C_{n,D})_{n,D \geq 0}$. Note that this is not a standard definition – but it perfectly fits our purposes.

► **Lemma 4.** Let $C > 0$, $k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\text{par}: \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $\{w \in \{0, 1\}^* \mid \text{par}(w) \leq C \cdot \lfloor \log |w| \rfloor^\ell\} \in \text{TC}^{k+\ell}$ and $L \in \text{DepParaTC}^k$ (parametrized by par). Then $\tilde{L} = \{w \in L \mid \text{par}(w) \leq C \cdot \lfloor \log |w| \rfloor^\ell\}$ is in $\text{TC}^{k+\ell}$.

Proof. Let $w \in \{0, 1\}^n$ be some input. First decide whether $\text{par}(w) \leq \log^\ell n$ (by the hypothesis this is in $\text{TC}^{k+\ell}$). If yes, the circuit $C_{n, C \cdot \lfloor \log n \rfloor^\ell}$ can be used to decide whether $w \in \tilde{L}$. Clearly, the combined circuit has polynomial size. Its depth is $\mathcal{O}(\log^{k+\ell} n)$ plus $\mathcal{O}(C \cdot \lfloor \log n \rfloor^\ell \cdot \log^k n) = \mathcal{O}(\log^{k+\ell} n)$ for $C_{n, C \cdot \lfloor \log n \rfloor^\ell}$. Hence, we have obtained a $\text{TC}^{k+\ell}$ circuit. ◀

We introduce this parametrized TC^k classes because later for computing reduced power circuits we apply a non-constant number of TC^0 computations f one after each other. The number of these computations is the depth of the power circuit. The crucial step is to show that after any number of applications of f , the output is still polynomially bounded. Putting things together, we obtain a DepParaTC^0 computation parametrized by the depth of the power circuit. Let us formalize this idea:

Denote the i -fold composition of f by $f^{(i)}$ (i.e., $f^{(0)}$ is the identity function and $f^{(i)} = f \circ f^{(i-1)}$ for $i \geq 1$).

¹ Here and in most other natural applications the parameter D is bounded by the input size n . In this case, we could let the size of $C_{n,D}$ be a polynomial in both n and D – without changing the actual class.

In order to allow circuits to compute functions having outputs of different lengths for inputs of the same length, we can assume that each output gate also carries an enable bit (or equivalently we can think that there is an additional padding symbol in the output alphabet).

► **Lemma 5.** *Let $f: \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$ be TC^k -computable such that for all $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$ there is some $\omega_x \leq |x|$ with $f^{(\omega_x)}(x) = f^{(\omega_x+1)}(x)$. Further, assume that there is some polynomial p such that for all $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$ and for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $|f^{(i)}(x)| \leq p(|x|)$.*

Then $x \mapsto f^{(\omega_x)}(x)$ is in DepParaTC^k where the parameter $\text{par}: \{0, 1\}^ \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is defined by $x \mapsto \omega_x$.*

Proof. Let $(C_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the family of TC^k circuits computing f . We construct a new family of circuits $(C_{n,\omega})_{n,\omega \in \mathbb{N}}$. Let \tilde{C}_m be a circuit consisting of C_i for all $i \in [0..m]$ in parallel. We can compose $\tilde{C}_{p(n)} \circ C_n$ by feeding the outputs of C_n into the C_i (as part of $\tilde{C}_{p(n)}$) with the appropriate number of input bits. By iterating this, we obtain a circuit $\tilde{C}_{p(n)} \circ \dots \circ \tilde{C}_{p(n)} \circ C_n$ consisting of C_n followed by $\omega - 1$ layers of $\tilde{C}_{p(n)}$. By the hypothesis of the lemma, we can assume $\omega \leq n$, so this circuit contains at most $n \cdot (p(n))^2$ gates. Moreover, the depth of $\tilde{C}_{p(n)}$ is $\mathcal{O}(\log^k p(n)) = \mathcal{O}(\log^k n)$, so the depth of $C_{n,\omega}$ is $\mathcal{O}(\omega \cdot \log^k(n))$. ◀

2.2 Power circuits

Consider a pair (Γ, δ) where Γ is a set of n vertices and δ is a mapping $\delta: \Gamma \times \Gamma \rightarrow \{-1, 0, +1\}$. The support of δ is the subset $\sigma(\delta) \subseteq \Gamma \times \Gamma$ consisting of those (P, Q) with $\delta(P, Q) \neq 0$. Thus, $(\Gamma, \sigma(\delta))$ is a directed graph without multi-edges. Throughout we require that $(\Gamma, \sigma(\delta))$ is acyclic – i.e., it is a dag. In particular, $\delta(P, P) = 0$ for all vertices P . A *marking* is a mapping $M: \Gamma \rightarrow \{-1, 0, +1\}$. Each node $P \in \Gamma$ is associated in a natural way with a marking $\Lambda_P: \Gamma \rightarrow \{-1, 0, +1\}$, $Q \mapsto \delta(P, Q)$ called its successor marking. The support of Λ_P consists of the target nodes of outgoing edges from P . We define the *evaluation* $\varepsilon(P)$ of a node ($\varepsilon(M)$ of a marking resp.) bottom-up in the dag by induction:

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon(\emptyset) &= 0, \\ \varepsilon(P) &= 2^{\varepsilon(\Lambda_P)} && \text{for a node } P, \\ \varepsilon(M) &= \sum_P M(P)\varepsilon(P) && \text{for a marking } M. \end{aligned}$$


We have $\varepsilon(\Lambda_P) = \log_2(\varepsilon(P))$, i.e., the marking Λ_P plays the role of a logarithm. Note that leaves (nodes of out-degree 0) evaluate to 1 and every node evaluates to a positive real number. However, we are only interested in the case that all nodes evaluate to integers:

► **Definition 6.** *A power circuit is a pair (Γ, δ) with $\delta: \Gamma \times \Gamma \rightarrow \{-1, 0, +1\}$ such that $(\Gamma, \sigma(\delta))$ is a dag and all nodes evaluate to some positive natural number in $2^{\mathbb{N}}$.*


The size of a power circuit is the number of nodes $|\Gamma|$. By abuse of language, we also simply call Γ a power circuit and suppress δ whenever it is clear. If M is a marking on Γ and $S \subseteq \Gamma$, we write $M|_S$ for the restriction of M to S . Let (Γ', δ') be a power circuit, $\Gamma \subseteq \Gamma'$, $\delta = \delta'|_{\Gamma \times \Gamma}$, and $\delta'|_{\Gamma \times (\Gamma' \setminus \Gamma)} = 0$. Then (Γ, δ) itself is a power circuit. We call it a *sub-power circuit* and denote this by $(\Gamma, \delta) \leq (\Gamma', \delta')$ or, if δ is clear, by $\Gamma \leq \Gamma'$.

If M is a marking on $S \subseteq \Gamma$, we extend M to Γ by setting $M(P) = 0$ for $P \in \Gamma \setminus S$. With this convention, every marking on Γ also can be seen as a marking on Γ' if $\Gamma \leq \Gamma'$.

► **Example 7.** A power circuit of size $n + 1$ can realize $\tau(n)$ since a directed path of $n + 1$ nodes represents $\tau(n)$ as the evaluation of the last node. The following power circuit realizes $\tau(5)$ using 6 nodes:



► **Example 8.** We can represent every integer in the range $[-2^n - 1, 2^n - 1]$ as the evaluation of some marking in a power circuit with node set $\{P_0, \dots, P_{n-1}\}$ with $\varepsilon(P_i) = 2^i$ for $i \in [n]$. Thus, we can convert the binary notation of an n -bit integer into a power circuit with n vertices, $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ edges (each successor marking requires at most $\lfloor \log n \rfloor + 1$ edges) and depth at most $\log^* n$. For an example of a marking representing the integer 23, see Figure 1.



■ **Figure 1** Each integer $z \in [-63..63]$ can be represented by a marking in the following power circuit. The marking given in blue is representing the number 23.

► **Definition 9.** We call a marking M compact if for all $P, Q \in \sigma(M)$ with $P \neq Q$ we have $|\varepsilon(\Lambda_P) - \varepsilon(\Lambda_Q)| \geq 2$. A reduced power circuit of size n is a power circuit (Γ, δ) with Γ given as a sorted list $\Gamma = (P_0, \dots, P_{n-1})$ such that all successor markings are compact and $\varepsilon(P_i) < \varepsilon(P_j)$ whenever $i < j$. In particular, all nodes have pairwise distinct evaluations.

It turns out to be crucial that the nodes in Γ are sorted by their values. Still, sometimes it is convenient to treat Γ as a set – we write $P \in \Gamma$ or $S \subseteq \Gamma$ with the obvious meaning. Whenever convenient we assume that $\varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_i}) = \infty$ for $i \geq n$.

Notice that in [11] the data structure for a reduced power circuit also contains a bit-vector indicating which nodes have successor markings differing by one – we will compute this information on-the-fly whenever needed. For more details on power circuits see [11, 30].

► **Remark 10.** If (Γ, δ) is a reduced power circuit with $\Gamma = (P_0, \dots, P_{n-1})$, we have $\delta(P_i, P_j) = 0$ for $j \geq i$. Thus, the order on Γ by evaluations is also a topological order on the dag $(\Gamma, \sigma(\delta))$.

3 Compact signed-digit representations

In this section we will show that for every binary number we can efficiently calculate a so-called unique compact representation. This will be crucial tool for the power circuit reduction process.

- **Definition 11.** (i) A sequence $B = (b_0, \dots, b_{m-1})$ with $b_i \in \{-1, 0, +1\}$ for $i \in [m]$ is called a signed-digit representation of $\text{val}(B) = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} b_i \cdot 2^i \in \mathbb{Z}$.
- (ii) The digit-length of $B = (b_0, \dots, b_{m-1})$ is the maximal i with $b_{i-1} \neq 0$.
- (iii) The sequence $B = (b_0, \dots, b_{m-1})$ is called compact if $b_i b_{i-1} = 0$ for all $i \in [1..m-1]$ (i.e., no two successive digits are non-zero).

A non-negative binary number is the special case of a signed-digit representation where all b_i are 0 or 1 (note that, in general, they are not compact). Also negative binary numbers can be seen as special cases of signed-digit representations – though the precise form depends on the representation: A negative number given as two’s complement is a signed-digit representation where the most-significant digit is a -1 and the other non-zero digits are 1s; a negative

signed magnitude representation can be viewed as signed-digit representation where all non-zero digits are -1 s. In particular, every integer k can be represented as a signed-digit representation. However, in general, a signed-digit representation for an integer k is not unique. Still, we will prove in this section that each integer k , indeed, has a unique compact signed-digit representation (see also [30]).

Note that by setting $b_i = 0$ for $i \geq m$, one can extend every signed-digit representation $B = (b_0, \dots, b_{m-1})$ to an arbitrarily long or infinite sequence. By doing so, $\text{val}(B)$ and the digit-length of B do not change.

Computing compact signed-digit representations. In the following we will, amongst other things, show that for every binary number A there exists such a compact signed digit representation B of A and that B is unique with this property. We start with the existence and the complexity of calculating B . While in [30, Section 2.1] a linear-time algorithm for calculating B has been given, we aim for optimizing the parallel complexity.

► **Theorem 12.** *The following is in AC^0 :*

Input: A binary number $A = (a_0, \dots, a_{m-1})$.
Output: A compact signed-digit representation of A .

Notice that Theorem 12 implies that every integer has a compact signed-digit representation. Moreover, be aware that, clearly, the theorem is only true if we choose suitable encodings – in particular, we assume that the three values $-1, 0, 1$ are all encoded using two bits.

Proof. Let $A = (a_0, \dots, a_{m-1})$ be a binary number. For $i \geq m$ we set $a_i = 0$. We view the a_i as Boolean variables and aim for constructing (almost) Boolean formulas for the compact representation. Since the digits of a compact representation are from the set $\{-1, 0, 1\}$, we treat the Boolean values $0, 1$ as a subset of the integers and we will mix Boolean operations (\wedge, \vee, \oplus) with arithmetic operations ($+, \cdot$). Here \oplus denotes the *exclusive or*, which is addition modulo two.

For $i \geq 0$ we define

$$c_i = \bigvee_{1 \leq j \leq i} \left((a_j \wedge a_{j-1}) \wedge \bigwedge_{j < k \leq i} (a_k \vee a_{k-1}) \right),$$

$$b_i = (a_i \oplus c_i) \cdot (-1)^{a_i+1}.$$

Moreover, we set $B = (b_0, \dots, b_{m-1}, b_m)$. Observe that $c_0 = 0$ and, hence, $b_0 = a_0 \cdot (-1)^{a_1}$. Furthermore, $b_m = c_m$ and $b_i = c_i = 0$ for $i \geq m + 1$.

► **Remark 13.** It is clear that the c_i can be computed in AC^0 and so the same holds for the b_i . This implies that on input of $A = (a_0, \dots, a_{m-1})$, one can compute B in AC^0 . By the very definition as a Boolean formula, it is clear, that it is actually in uniform AC^0 (see Remark 3).

Thus, in order to prove Theorem 12, it remains to show that $B = (b_0, \dots, b_m)$ is compact and that $\text{val}(B) = \text{val}(A)$.

▷ **Claim 14.** The c_i satisfy the following recurrence:

- $c_0 = 0$
- $c_i = (a_i \wedge a_{i-1}) \vee (c_{i-1} \wedge (a_i \vee a_{i-1}))$ for $i \geq 1$.

Proof. For $i = 0$, the claim holds because the empty disjunction is equal to 0. Now we assume that $i \geq 1$ and that the recurrence holds for $i - 1$. We set $X_j = a_j \wedge a_{j-1}$ and $Y_j = a_j \vee a_{j-1}$. Then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} c_i &= \bigvee_{1 \leq j \leq i} \left(X_j \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{j < k \leq i} Y_k \right) \right) = X_i \vee \left(\bigvee_{1 \leq j \leq i-1} X_j \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{j < k \leq i} Y_k \right) \right) \\ &= X_i \vee \left(\left(\bigvee_{1 \leq j \leq i-1} X_j \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{j < k \leq i-1} Y_k \right) \right) \wedge Y_i \right) \\ &= X_i \vee (c_{i-1} \wedge Y_i) \end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim. \triangleleft

\triangleright Claim 15. Let a_i, b_i and c_i be as above. Then for all $k \geq 0$ we have

$$a_k + c_k = b_k + 2c_{k+1}.$$

Proof. By Claim 14 we have $c_{k+1} = (a_{k+1} \wedge a_k) \vee (c_k \wedge (a_{k+1} \vee a_k))$. Thus, we can express both b_k and c_{k+1} in terms of a_k, a_{k+1} and c_k . This leads us to the following table:

a_k	a_{k+1}	c_k	b_k	c_{k+1}
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	1	0
0	1	0	0	0
0	1	1	-1	1
1	0	0	1	0
1	0	1	0	1
1	1	0	-1	1
1	1	1	0	1

If we now take the values in the table as integer values and put them into the above equation, we see that the equation holds in all cases. \triangleleft

\triangleright Claim 16. Let a_i, b_i and c_i be as above. Then for all $k \geq 0$ we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^k 2^i a_i = 2^{k+1} c_{k+1} + \sum_{i=0}^k 2^i b_i.$$

Proof. We use induction on k . Since $c_0 = 0$ we have $a_0 = 2 \cdot c_1 + b_0$ by Claim 15. Therefore, the equation holds for $k = 0$.

Now let $k \geq 0$. Then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^{k+1} 2^i a_i &= 2^{k+1} a_{k+1} + \sum_{i=0}^k 2^i a_i \\ &= 2^{k+1} a_{k+1} + 2^{k+1} c_{k+1} + \sum_{i=0}^k 2^i b_i && \text{(by induction)} \\ &= 2^{k+1} (a_{k+1} + c_{k+1}) + \sum_{i=0}^k 2^i b_i \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= 2^{k+1} (b_{k+1} + 2c_{k+2}) + \sum_{i=0}^k 2^i b_i && \text{(by Claim 15)} \\
 &= 2^{k+2} c_{k+2} + \sum_{i=0}^{k+1} 2^i b_i
 \end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim. ◁

▷ **Claim 17.** Let $B = (b_0, \dots, b_{m-1}, b_m)$ be as defined above. Then B is compact.

Proof. We have to make sure that there is no $i \in [m]$ such that $b_i \neq 0$ and $b_{i+1} \neq 0$. In order to do so, we express b_i and b_{i+1} in terms of a_i , a_{i+1} and c_i . Notice that b_{i+1} is not fully determined by a_i , a_{i+1} and c_i . Still these three values tell us whether b_{i+1} is zero or not. This leads us to the following table, which shows that B is, indeed, compact:

a_i	a_{i+1}	c_i	c_{i+1}	b_i	b_{i+1}
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	0	1	0
0	1	0	0	0	± 1
0	1	1	1	-1	0
1	0	0	0	1	0
1	0	1	1	0	± 1
1	1	0	1	-1	0
1	1	1	1	0	0

◁

Now we are ready to finish the proof of Theorem 12. Let $A = (a_0, \dots, a_{m-1})$ and $B = (b_0, \dots, b_{m-1}, b_m)$ as above. By Claim 17, B is compact. Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{val}(B) &= \sum_{i=0}^m 2^i b_i = 2^m c_m + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} 2^i b_i && \text{(since } c_m = b_m) \\
 &= \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} 2^i a_i = \text{val}(A). && \text{(by Claim 16)}
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, B is a compact signed-digit representation for A as claimed in Theorem 12. By Remark 13, it can be computed in AC^0 . ◀

Uniqueness of compact signed-digit representations. The following lemmas are crucial tools both for proving uniqueness of compact representations and for the power circuit reduction process, which we describe later. In [30, Section 2.1] similar statements can be found.

► **Lemma 18.** *Let A be a compact signed-digit representation and let $B = (b_0, \dots, b_{n-1})$ be a compact signed-digit representation of digit-length n such that $b_i = n - i \pmod 2$ (i.e., $b_{n-1} = 1$ and then B alternates between 0 and 1). Then we have*

- (i) $\text{val}(B) = \left\lfloor \frac{2^{n+1}}{3} \right\rfloor$,
- (ii) $\text{val}(A) \leq \text{val}(B)$ if and only if $\text{val}(A) \leq 0$ or the digit-length of A is at most n .

Proof. First, we want to calculate $\text{val}(B)$. If n is even, then

$$\text{val}(B) = \sum_{i=0}^{\frac{n}{2}-1} 2^{2i+1} = 2 \sum_{i=0}^{\frac{n}{2}-1} 4^i = 2 \cdot \frac{1-4^{\frac{n}{2}}}{1-4} = \frac{2}{3} \cdot (2^n - 1).$$

If n is odd, then

$$\text{val}(B) = \sum_{i=0}^{\frac{n-1}{2}} 2^{2i} = \sum_{i=0}^{\frac{n-1}{2}} 4^i = \frac{1-4^{\frac{n-1}{2}+1}}{1-4} = \frac{2^{n+1}-1}{3}$$

showing that in any case $\text{val}(B) = \lfloor \frac{2^{n+1}}{3} \rfloor$.

In order to see (ii), we denote $A = (a_0, \dots, a_{n-1})$. If $\text{val}(A) \leq 0$, then clearly $\text{val}(A) \leq \text{val}(B)$. Hence, assume that the digit-length of A is at most n and consider the following operations:

1. If $a_i = -1$, then set $a_i = 0$.
2. If $a_{n-1} = 0$, then set $a_{n-1} = 1$ and set $a_{n-2} = 0$.
3. If $a_i = a_{i+1} = 0$ with $i \in [1 .. n-2]$, then set $a_i = 1$ and $a_{i-1} = 0$ (technically, this rule subsumes the previous rule).
4. If $a_0 = a_1 = 0$, set $a_0 = 1$.

Let A' be the number we obtained after applying at least one of the above operations to A (if this is possible). Then A' is also a compact signed-digit representation, the digit-length of A' is at most n , and $\text{val}(A) < \text{val}(A')$. Moreover, if $A \neq B$, then we always can apply one of these rules. This shows that $\text{val}(A) \leq \text{val}(B)$.

On the other hand, assume that the digit-length of A is m with $m \geq n+1$. First, assume that $a_{m-1} = 1$ and set $A' = (a_0, \dots, a_{m-3})$. Then, since A is compact, we have $a_{m-2} = 0$ and, hence, $\text{val}(A) = 2^{m-1} + \text{val}(A')$. By the previous implication and part (i), we know that $|\text{val}(A')| \leq \lfloor \frac{2^{m-1}}{3} \rfloor$. Therefore, $\text{val}(A) \geq 2^{m-1} - |\text{val}(A')| \geq 2^{m-1} - \lfloor \frac{2^{m-1}}{3} \rfloor > \lfloor \frac{2^m}{3} \rfloor \geq \lfloor \frac{2^{n+1}}{3} \rfloor = \text{val}(B)$. If $a_{m-1} = -1$, we obtain $\text{val}(A) < 0$ with the same argument. ◀

► **Lemma 19** ([30, Lemma 4]). *Let $A = (a_0, \dots, a_{m-1})$, $B = (b_0, \dots, b_{m-1})$ be compact signed-digit representations. Then:*

- (i) $\text{val}(A) = \text{val}(B)$ if and only if $a_i = b_i$ for all $i \in [m]$.
- (ii) Assume there is some i with $a_i \neq b_i$ and let $i_0 = \max \{i \in [m] \mid a_i \neq b_i\}$. Then $\text{val}(A) < \text{val}(B)$ if and only if $a_{i_0} < b_{i_0}$.

Proof. Notice that (i) is an immediate consequence of (ii). In order to see (ii), observe that it suffices to show only one implication. Let $A' = (a_0, \dots, a_{i_0})$ and $B' = (b_0, \dots, b_{i_0})$ and assume that $0 = a_{i_0} < b_{i_0} = 1$ (the cases involving the value -1 follow with the same argument). Now, A' and B' are compact signed-digit representations, so by Lemma 18, $\text{val}(A') \leq \lfloor \frac{2^{i_0+1}}{3} \rfloor$ and $\text{val}(B') > \lfloor \frac{2^{i_0+1}}{3} \rfloor$. Hence, $\text{val}(A) < \text{val}(B)$. ◀

From this lemma together with Theorem 12 it follows that each $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ can be uniquely represented by a compact signed digit representation $\text{CR}(k)$. Likewise for a signed digit representation A , we write $\text{CR}(A)$ for its compact signed digit representation.

► **Corollary 20.** *The following problems are in AC^0 :*

- (i) **Input:** A signed-digit representation A .
Output: $\text{CR}(A)$.

- (ii) Input: Signed-digit representations A and B .
Output: The compact signed-digit representation of $\text{val}(A) + \text{val}(B)$.
- (iii) Input: Signed-digit representations A and B .
Question: Is $\text{val}(A) < \text{val}(B)$?

Proof. Given a signed-digit representation $A = (a_0, \dots, a_{m-1})$, we can split it into two non-negative binary numbers B, C such that $\text{val}(A) = \text{val}(B) - \text{val}(C)$ (i.e., $b_i = \max\{0, a_i\}$ and $c_i = -\min\{0, a_i\}$). From these binary numbers we can compute the difference in AC^0 and then make the result compact using Theorem 12. To see (ii), we proceed exactly the same way. For comparing two signed-digit representations, we compute their compact representations using part (i) and then compare them in AC^0 by evaluating the condition in Lemma 19. ◀

4 Operations on power circuits

4.1 Basic operations


Before we consider the computation of reduced power circuits, which is our main result in this section, let us introduce some more notation on power circuits and recall the basic operations from [30, 11] under circuit complexity aspects.

Markings and chains.

► **Definition 21.** Let (Γ, δ) be a reduced power circuit with Γ given as the sorted list $\Gamma = (P_0, \dots, P_{n-1})$.

- (i) A chain C of length $|C| = \ell$ in Γ starting at $P_i = \text{start}(C)$ is a sequence $(P_i, \dots, P_{i+\ell-1})$ such that $\varepsilon(P_{i+j+1}) = 2 \cdot \varepsilon(P_{i+j})$ for all $j \in [\ell - 1]$.
In particular, $\varepsilon(P_{i+j}) = 2^j \cdot \varepsilon(P_i)$ for all $j \in [\ell]$. As we do for Γ , we treat a chain both as a sorted list and as a set.
- (ii) We call a chain C maximal if it cannot be extended in either direction. We denote the set of all maximal chains by \mathcal{C}_Γ .
As a set, a reduced power circuit is the disjoint union of its maximal chains.
- (iii) Let M be a marking in the reduced power circuit (Γ, δ) and let $C = (P_i, \dots, P_{i+\ell-1}) \in \mathcal{C}_\Gamma$ and define $a_j = M(P_{i+j})$ for $i \in [\ell]$. Then we write $\text{digit}_C(M) = (a_0, \dots, a_{\ell-1})$.
- (iv) There is a unique maximal chain C_0 containing the node P_0 of value 1. We call C_0 the initial maximal chain of Γ and denote it by $C_0 = C_0(\Gamma)$.

For an example of a power circuit with three maximal chains, see Figure 2.



■ **Figure 2** This power circuit is an example for a reduced power circuit with three maximal chains: The first one consists of the nodes of values 1, 2, 4, 8, the next one is formed by the nodes of values 2^8 and 2^9 and the node of value 2^{2^9} is a maximal chain of length 1.

We will show how to computationally find the maximal chains in Corollary 27. The following facts are clear from the definition of maximal chains:

▷ **Fact 22.** Let (Γ, δ) be a reduced power circuit and let M be a marking on Γ . Then the following holds:

- (i) $\varepsilon(M|_C) = \varepsilon(\text{start}(C)) \cdot \text{val}(\text{digit}_C(M))$ for every chain C in Γ (even if C is not maximal).
- (ii) $\varepsilon(M) = \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}_\Gamma} \varepsilon(\text{start}(C)) \cdot \text{val}(\text{digit}_C(M))$.
- (iii) The marking M is compact if and only if $\text{digit}_C(M)$ is compact for all $C \in \mathcal{C}_\Gamma$.

► **Lemma 23.** Let (Γ, δ) be a reduced power circuit. Let L and M be compact markings in Γ such that $\varepsilon(L) > \varepsilon(M)$ and let $0 \leq k \leq \lfloor \frac{2^{|C_0|+1}}{3} \rfloor$. Then $\varepsilon(L) \leq \varepsilon(M) + k$ if and only if the following holds:

- $\varepsilon(M|_{\Gamma \setminus C_0}) = \varepsilon(L|_{\Gamma \setminus C_0})$ and
- $\varepsilon(L|_{C_0}) \leq \varepsilon(M|_{C_0}) + k$.

Proof. We first assume that $\varepsilon(M|_{\Gamma \setminus C_0}) \neq \varepsilon(L|_{\Gamma \setminus C_0})$ and aim for showing that $\varepsilon(L) > \varepsilon(M) + k$: By Lemma 18, we have $|\varepsilon(L|_{C_0})|, |\varepsilon(M|_{C_0})| \leq \lfloor \frac{2^{|C_0|+1}}{3} \rfloor$. Hence,

$$|\varepsilon(M|_{C_0}) + k - \varepsilon(L|_{C_0})| \leq |\varepsilon(M|_{C_0})| + k + |\varepsilon(L|_{C_0})| \leq 3 \left\lfloor \frac{2^{|C_0|+1}}{3} \right\rfloor \leq 2^{|C_0|+1} - 1.$$

Furthermore, $\varepsilon(L|_{\Gamma \setminus C_0}) - \varepsilon(M|_{\Gamma \setminus C_0})$ is a multiple of $2^{|C_0|+1}$. Therefore, by the assumption $\varepsilon(L) > \varepsilon(M)$ and Lemma 19, we obtain $\varepsilon(L|_{\Gamma \setminus C_0}) - \varepsilon(M|_{\Gamma \setminus C_0}) \geq 2^{|C_0|+1}$. It follows that

$$\varepsilon(L|_{\Gamma \setminus C_0}) - \varepsilon(M|_{\Gamma \setminus C_0}) + \varepsilon(L|_{C_0}) - \varepsilon(M|_{C_0}) - k \geq 1$$

and so $\varepsilon(L) > \varepsilon(M) + k$.

Now assume that $\varepsilon(M|_{\Gamma \setminus C_0}) = \varepsilon(L|_{\Gamma \setminus C_0})$. It remains to show that under this assumption we have $\varepsilon(L) \leq \varepsilon(M) + k$ if and only if $\varepsilon(L|_{C_0}) \leq \varepsilon(M|_{C_0}) + k$. However, this follows immediately from the fact that

$$\varepsilon(L) = \varepsilon(L|_{\Gamma \setminus C_0}) + \varepsilon(L|_{C_0}) \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon(M) + k = \varepsilon(M|_{\Gamma \setminus C_0}) + \varepsilon(M|_{C_0}) + k.$$

This finishes the proof of the lemma. ◀

Comparison of markings.

► **Lemma 24.** Given a reduced power circuit (Γ, δ) and a node $P \in \Gamma$ one can decide in AC^0 whether $P \in C_0$.

► **Remark 25.** Since membership in AC^0 often highly depends on the encoding of the input, in the following we always assume that power circuits are given in a suitable way. In particular, we may assume that an n -node power circuit is given by the $n \times n$ matrix representing δ where each entry from $\{0, \pm 1\}$ is encoded using two bits. Moreover, in order to represent power circuits with fewer nodes within the same data structure, we can allow one *deleted* bit for every row and column of the matrix. Markings can be encoded the same way by a sequence of n symbols from $\{0, \pm 1\}$. Moreover, if the power circuit is reduced, we also assume that the matrix representing δ is already in the sorted order (in particular, the ordering is not given by some separate data structure).

In the following, we do not further consider these encoding issues. Moreover, as soon as we are dealing with TC^0 circuits, there is a lot of freedom how to encode inputs.

Proof of Lemma 24. Let $\Gamma = (P_0, \dots, P_{n-1})$. For each i we define a signed-digit representation $A_i = (a_{i,0}, \dots, a_{i,n-1})$ by $a_{i,j} = \Lambda_{P_i}(P_j)$. These signed-digit representations might not

be compact, but, if $P_i \in C_0$, then A_i is compact (this is because, by Remark 10, P_i has only successors in C_0). Using Corollary 20, we can compute the maximal i_{max} such that $A_{i_{max}}$ is compact and for all $i < i_{max}$ also A_i is compact and $\text{val}(A_{i+1}) = \text{val}(A_i) + 1 = i + 1$ (checking whether A_i is compact, clearly, can be done in AC^0). By a straightforward induction, we obtain that for all $i \leq i_{max}$ we have $\text{val}(A_i) = \varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_i})$ and $P_i \in C_0$. On the other hand, clearly, $P_{i_{max}+1} \notin C_0$. Hence, we have computed C_0 . ◀

► **Proposition 26.** *Let $\Delta \in \{=, \neq, <, \leq, >, \geq\}$. The following problems are in AC^0 :*

- (a) **Input:** A reduced power circuit (Γ, δ) and compact markings L and M on Γ .
Question: Is $\varepsilon(L) \Delta \varepsilon(M)$?
- (b) **Input:** A reduced power circuit (Γ, δ) with compact markings L, M and $k \in [0.. \lfloor \frac{2^{|C_0|+1}}{3} \rfloor]$ given in binary.
Question: Is $\varepsilon(L) \Delta \varepsilon(M) + k$?

Proof. Let us choose \leq as Δ (the other cases follow from this case in a straightforward way).

Let $\Gamma = (P_0, \dots, P_{n-1})$. By Lemma 19 (a) we can check in AC^0 if $\varepsilon(L) = \varepsilon(M)$. If this is not the case, then by Lemma 19 (ii) we have $\varepsilon(M) < \varepsilon(L)$ if and only if $M(P_{i_0}) < L(P_{i_0})$ for $i_0 = \max \{i \in [n] \mid M(P_i) \neq L(P_i)\}$. Now, i_0 can be found in AC^0 and, hence, the whole check is in AC^0 . This proves part (a).

For part (b) we first check whether $\varepsilon(L) \leq \varepsilon(M)$. If yes, then $\varepsilon(L) \leq \varepsilon(M) + k$. According to part (a), this check is possible in AC^0 . Now assume that $\varepsilon(L) > \varepsilon(M)$. By Lemma 24, we can compute C_0 in AC^0 . By Lemma 23 we know that $\varepsilon(L) \leq \varepsilon(M) + k$ if and only if $\varepsilon(M|_{\Gamma \setminus C_0}) = \varepsilon(L|_{\Gamma \setminus C_0})$ and $\varepsilon(L|_{C_0}) \leq \varepsilon(M|_{C_0}) + k$. The markings $M|_{\Gamma \setminus C_0}$ and $L|_{\Gamma \setminus C_0}$ are still compact markings in a reduced power circuit, and so we are able to decide in AC^0 if that equality holds by part (a). So it remains to check if $\varepsilon(L|_{C_0}) \leq \varepsilon(M|_{C_0}) + k$. This amounts to an addition and a comparison of signed-digit representations of digit-length at most $|C_0| + 1$ (according to Lemma 18), which both can be done in AC^0 (see Corollary 20). Thus, $\varepsilon(L) \Delta \varepsilon(M) + k$ can be checked in AC^0 . ◀

► **Corollary 27.** *We can decide in AC^0 , given a reduced power circuit (Γ, δ) and nodes $P, Q \in \Gamma$, whether P and Q belong to the same maximal chain of Γ .*

Proof. Let $P = P_i$ and $Q = P_j$ with $i < j$. Then P and Q belong to the same maximal chain if and only if $\varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_{\ell+1}}) = \varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_\ell}) + 1$ for all $\ell \in [i..j-1]$. The latter can be checked in AC^0 using Proposition 26. ◀

Calculations with markings.

► **Lemma 28.** *The following problems are all in TC^0 :*

- (a) **Input:** A power circuit (Π, δ_Π) together with markings K and L .
Output: A power circuit $(\Pi', \delta_{\Pi'})$ with a marking M such that $\varepsilon(M) = \varepsilon(K) + \varepsilon(L)$ and $(\Pi, \delta_\Pi) \leq (\Pi', \delta_{\Pi'})$, $|\Pi'| \leq 2 \cdot |\Pi|$ and $\text{depth}(\Pi') = \text{depth}(\Pi)$.
- (b) **Input:** A power circuit (Π, δ_Π) together with a marking L .
Output: A marking M in the power circuit (Π, δ_Π) such that $\varepsilon(M) = -\varepsilon(L)$.
- (c) **Input:** A power circuit (Π, δ_Π) together with markings K and L such that $\varepsilon(L) \geq 0$.
Output: A power circuit $(\Pi', \delta_{\Pi'})$ with a marking M such that $\varepsilon(M) = \varepsilon(K) \cdot 2^{\varepsilon(L)}$ and $(\Pi, \delta_\Pi) \leq (\Pi', \delta_{\Pi'})$, $|\Pi'| \leq 3 \cdot |\Pi|$ and $\text{depth}(\Pi') \leq \text{depth}(\Pi) + 1$.

The proof of this lemma uses the following construction (see also [11]):

- **Definition 29.** *Let (Π, δ) be a power circuit and let M be a marking on Π .*
- (a) *Let $P \in \Pi$. We define a new power circuit $\Pi \cup \{\text{CLONE}(P)\}$ where $\text{CLONE}(P)$ is a new node with $\Lambda_{\text{CLONE}(P)} = \Lambda_P$.*
 - (b) *We define a marking $\text{CLONE}(M)$ as follows: First we clone all the nodes in $\sigma(M)$. Then we set $\text{CLONE}(M)(\text{CLONE}(P)) = M(P)$ for $P \in \sigma(M)$ and $\text{CLONE}(M)(P) = 0$ otherwise.*

It is clear that the problem, given a power circuit (Π, δ) and a marking M , compute a new power circuit (Π', δ') containing $\text{CLONE}(M)$ is in TC^0 – and even in AC^0 when defining the underlying data structure properly. Notice that $|\Pi'| \leq 2 \cdot |\Pi|$ and $\text{depth}(\Pi') = \text{depth}(\Pi)$.

Proof. We apply the constructions described in [30, Section 7] and [11, Section 2].

Part (a): First, we clone the marking K leading to a power circuit $(\Pi', \delta_{\Pi'})$ of size at most $2 \cdot |\Pi|$. Now $\text{CLONE}(K)$ and L certainly have disjoint supports. Then we define

$$M(P) = \begin{cases} \text{CLONE}(K)(P), & P \in \sigma(\text{CLONE}(K)), \\ L(P), & P \in \sigma(L), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Clearly, $\varepsilon(M) = \varepsilon(K) + \varepsilon(L)$, and M can be output in TC^0 . To show (b), we set

$$M(P) = \begin{cases} -L(P), & P \in \sigma(L), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

As for (a), to define $M(P)$ we only have to look up $L(P)$ and change the sign and we do not have to create any new nodes or edges – so this can be done even in AC^0 .

To (c): To obtain M , we follow a similar approach as described in [11, Section 2]. We first clone the markings K and L and so obtain markings $\text{CLONE}(K)$ and $\text{CLONE}(L)$. At this point, the size of Π increased by a factor of at most three.

Next we create new edges from every node $P \in \sigma(\text{CLONE}(K))$ to every node $Q \in \sigma(\text{CLONE}(L))$ such that $\delta(P, Q) = \text{CLONE}(L)(Q)$. This operation does not change the size of the power circuit, but it increases the depth by at most 1 since there are no incoming edges to nodes in $\sigma(\text{CLONE}(K))$. Then the marking $\text{CLONE}(K)$ is the marking we search for. ◀

Notice that the construction in (c) also yields $\varepsilon(M) = \varepsilon(K) \cdot 2^{\varepsilon(L)}$ in the case that $\varepsilon(L) < 0$. However, then the resulting graph might not be a power circuit anymore since it might have nodes of non-integral evaluation. Note that [11] is not very precise here: it is actually not sufficient that $\varepsilon(K) \cdot 2^{\varepsilon(L)} \in \mathbb{Z}$ in order to assure that there are no nodes of non-integral evaluation.

4.2 Relation to arithmetic circuits with $+$ and 2^x gates.

Before we proceed to the power circuit reduction, our main result on power circuits, let us elaborate on the relation of power circuits to more general arithmetic circuits. A (constant) $(0, +, -, 2^x)$ -circuit is a dag where each node is either a 0- (i.e., a constant-), $+$ -, $-$ - or a 2^x -gate. 0-gates have zero inputs, $+$ -gates two and $-$ - and 2^x -gates have one input. There is one designated output gate. The evaluation $\text{eval}(\mathcal{C})$ of such a circuit \mathcal{C} is defined in a straightforward way (as a real number – in general, it might not be an integer). The 2^x -depth of a circuit \mathcal{C} denoted by $\text{depth}_{2^x}(\mathcal{C})$ is the maximal number of 2^x -gates on any path in the circuit.

► **Proposition 30.** *For every power circuit (Π, δ) with a marking M , there is a $(0, +, -, 2^x)$ -circuit \mathcal{C} with $\text{eval}(\mathcal{C}) = \varepsilon(M)$ such that*

- $|\mathcal{C}| \leq 2|\sigma(\delta)| + 3|\Pi| + 1$,
- $\text{depth}(\mathcal{C}) \leq (\text{depth}(\Pi) + 2) \cdot (\lceil \log(|\Pi|) \rceil + 2)$ and
- $\text{depth}_{2^x}(\mathcal{C}) = \text{depth}(\Pi) + 1$.

Moreover, \mathcal{C} can be computed in TC^0 .

Conversely, for every $(0, +, -, 2^x)$ -circuit \mathcal{C} there is a power circuit² (Π, δ) with a marking M such that $\text{eval}(\mathcal{C}) = \varepsilon(M)$ and

- $\text{depth}(\Pi) \leq \text{depth}_{2^x}(\mathcal{C})$ and
- $|\Pi| \leq |\mathcal{C}|^2 + |\mathcal{C}|$.

Moreover, (Π, δ) and M can be computed in NC^2 .

If the input of every 2^x -gate of \mathcal{C} is non-negative, then (Π, δ) is, indeed, a power circuit – i.e., all nodes evaluate to positive integers.

Proof. In order to transform (Π, δ) with a marking M into a $(0, +, -, 2^x)$ -circuit \mathcal{C} , we proceed as follows: we create one 0-gate; for every leaf (node of out-degree zero) of Π we create a 2^x -gate with input coming from the 0-gate, for every other node of Π , we create a 2^x -gate whose input we describe next. For every marking (both M and the successor markings Λ_P) we create a tree of +-gates (possibly with some --gates) of logarithmic depth where the leaves correspond to some of the (already created) 2^x - or 0-gates and the last +-gate (i.e., the root) evaluates to $\varepsilon(M)$ (resp. $\varepsilon(\Lambda_P)$). Now, the 2^x -gate corresponding to a node $P \in \Pi$ receives its input from the +-gate corresponding to Λ_P . It is straightforward that this construction can be done in TC^0 .

Clearly, this process introduces at most one +-gate and one --gate for every pair in the support of δ and every node in the support of M . So we have at most $2|\sigma(\delta)| + 2|\Pi|$ many + and --gates. Since there is one 0-gate and $|\Pi|$ many 2^x -gates, the total number of gates is at most $2|\sigma(\delta)| + 3|\Pi| + 1$. It is clear that $\text{depth}_{2^x}(\mathcal{C}) = \text{depth}(\Pi) + 1$ (note that the depth increases by one because leaves of Π are replaced by 2^x -gates with input from the 0-gate). Moreover, the depth of each +-tree is bounded by $\lceil \log(|\Pi|) \rceil$; introducing the --gates and connecting to the 2^x -gates increases the depth further by 2 (note that for the 2^x -gates with single input from a 0-gate this is a huge over-estimate). Since $\text{depth}_{2^x}(\mathcal{C}) = \text{depth}(\Pi) + 1$ and we have one additional +-tree for the marking M , the total depth is at most $(\text{depth}(\Pi) + 2) \cdot (\lceil \log(|\Pi|) \rceil + 2)$.

Now consider a $(0, +, -, 2^x)$ -circuit \mathcal{C} with n gates. Let h_1, \dots, h_k be the 2^x -gates of \mathcal{C} . As a first step, we replace each 2^x -gate h_i by an “input” gate X_i and cut its incoming wire. Thus, we obtain an arithmetic circuit over \mathbb{Z} with +- and --gates. Each +- or --gate g computes a linear combination $\sum_{i=1}^k a_{g,i} X_i$ with $a_{g,i} \in \mathbb{Z}$. By [38, Theorem 21], the $a_{g,i}$ can be computed in GapL , and hence, in NC^2 ([1, Theorem 4.1]). Notice that $|a_{g,i}| < 2^n$ for all g and i .

Now, to construct the power circuit (Π, δ) , we proceed as follows: we start with n singleton nodes. For each 2^x -gate h_j in \mathcal{C} we construct nodes $Q_{j,0}, \dots, Q_{j,n-1}$. The aim is to define $\Lambda_{Q_{j,\ell}}$ such that $\varepsilon(Q_{j,\ell}) = \text{eval}(h_j) \cdot 2^\ell$; in particular, $\varepsilon(Q_{j,0}) = \text{eval}(h_j)$ and $C_j = (Q_{j,0}, \dots, Q_{j,n-1})$ is a chain (by a slight abuse of the notation of Definition 21 since now the power circuit is not reduced).

² Note that technically speaking it is not a power circuit as defined in Definition 6 since it might have nodes not evaluating to integers. Since we have not introduced a terminology for power circuits without this integrality condition, we use the term “power circuit” here.

Let h_j be some 2^x -gate and g the gate from where h_j receives its input. If g is a 0-gate, we define $a_{j,i} = 0$ for all $i \in [1..k]$; if g is a 2^x -gate h_m , we set $a_{j,m} = 1$ and $a_{j,i} = 0$ for all $i \neq m$. Otherwise, g is a + or -gate. In this case we define $a_{j,i} = a_{g,i}$ where $a_{g,i} \in \mathbb{Z}$ is as above. Then for all $\ell \in [n]$ we define $\Lambda_{Q_{j,\ell}}$ on each chain C_i such that $\text{digit}_{C_i}(\Lambda_{Q_{j,\ell}})$ is the binary representation of $a_{j,i}$ (notice that $a_{j,i}$ requires only n bits and all the chains C_i for different i are disjoint, so this is well-defined). Moreover, we add a + edge from $Q_{j,\ell}$ to ℓ many of the singleton nodes. We do this for all 2^x -gates in parallel. By induction we see that, indeed, $\varepsilon(Q_{j,\ell}) = \text{eval}(h_j) \cdot 2^\ell$.

If the output gate of \mathcal{C} is a 2^x -gate h_j , we obtain a marking evaluating to the same value by simply marking $Q_{j,0}$ with one; if the output gate is a +- or --gate, we obtain a corresponding marking in the same fashion as for the $\Lambda_{Q_{j,0}}$ described above.

Clearly, the whole computation also can be done in NC^2 . The bound $|\Pi| \leq n^2 + n$ is straightforward: we introduced at most n singleton nodes and then for every of the at most n 2^x -gates we introduced n additional nodes. The bound on the depth is because we can have an edge from $Q_{j,\ell}$ to $Q_{j',\ell'}$ only if there is a path from h_j to $h_{j'}$ in \mathcal{C} . Adding the edges from $Q_{j,\ell}$ to the singleton nodes only increases its depth if the depth without these edges was zero, i.e., if h_j is a 2^x -gate whose input is a sum of 0-gates. However, we counted the depth of such 2^x -gates already as one – so also in this case the depth does not increase. ◀

4.3 Power circuit reduction

While compact markings on a reduced power circuit yield unique representations of integers, in an arbitrary power circuit (Π, δ_Π) we can have two markings L and M such that $L \neq M$ but $\varepsilon(L) = \varepsilon(M)$. Therefore, given an arbitrary power circuit, we wish to produce a reduced power circuit for comparing markings. This is done by the following theorem, which is our main technical result on power circuits.

► **Theorem 31.** *The following is in DepParaTC^0 parametrized by $\text{depth}(\Pi)$:*

- Input:** A power circuit (Π, δ_Π) together with a marking M on Π .
Output: A reduced power circuit (Γ, δ) together with a compact marking \tilde{M} on Γ such that $\varepsilon(\tilde{M}) = \varepsilon(M)$.

For a power circuit (Π, δ_Π) with a marking M we call the power circuit (Γ, δ) together with the marking \tilde{M} obtained by Theorem 31 the *reduced form* of Π .

The proof of Theorem 31 consists of several steps, which we introduce on the next pages. The high-level idea is as follows: Like in [30, 11], we keep the invariant that there is an already reduced part and a non-reduced part (initially the non-reduced part is Π). The main difference is that in one iteration we insert *all* the nodes of the non-reduced part that have only successors in the reduced part into the reduced part. Each iteration can be done in TC^0 ; after $\text{depth}(\Pi) + 1$ iterations we obtain a reduced power circuit.

Insertion of new nodes. The following procedure, called **INSERTNODES**, is a basic tool for the reduction process. Let (Γ, δ) be a reduced power circuit and I be a set of nodes with $\Gamma \cap I = \emptyset$. Assume that for every $P \in I$ there exists a marking $\Lambda_P: \Gamma \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$ satisfying:

- $\varepsilon(\Lambda_P) \geq 0$ for all $P \in I$,
- Λ_P is compact for all $P \in I$, and
- $\varepsilon(\Lambda_P) \neq \varepsilon(\Lambda_Q)$ for all $P, Q \in I \cup \Gamma$, $P \neq Q$.

We wish to add I to the reduced power circuit (Γ, δ) . For this, we set $\Gamma' = \Gamma \cup I$ and define $\delta': \Gamma' \times \Gamma' \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$ in the obvious way: $\delta'|_{\Gamma \times \Gamma} = \delta$, $\delta'|_{\Gamma' \times I} = 0$ and $\delta'(P, Q) = \Lambda_P(Q)$

for $(P, Q) \in I \times \Gamma$. Now, (Γ', δ') is a power circuit with $(\Gamma, \delta) \leq (\Gamma', \delta')$ and for every $P \in I$ the map Λ_P is the successor marking of P . Moreover, each node of Γ' has a unique value. In order to obtain a reduced power circuit, we need to sort the nodes in Γ' according to their values: Since for every node $P \in \Gamma'$ the marking Λ_P is a compact marking on the reduced power circuit Γ , by Proposition 26, for $P, Q \in \Gamma'$ we are able to decide in AC^0 whether $\varepsilon(\Lambda_Q) \leq \varepsilon(\Lambda_P)$. Therefore, by Example 2 we can sort Γ' according to the values of the nodes in TC^0 and, hence, assume that $\Gamma' = (P_0, \dots, P_{|\Gamma'|-1})$ is in increasing order.

Observe that $|\Gamma'| = |\Gamma \cup I| = |\Gamma| + |I|$. In addition, inserting a new node either extends an already existing maximal chain, joins two existing maximal chains, or increases the number of maximal chains by one. Therefore, $|\mathcal{C}_{\Gamma'}| \leq |\mathcal{C}_{\Gamma}| + |I|$. So we have proven the following:

► **Lemma 32** (INSERTNODES). *The following problem is in TC^0 :*

- Input:** A power circuit (Γ, δ) and a set I with the properties described above.
Output: A reduced power circuit (Γ', δ') such that $(\Gamma, \delta) \leq (\Gamma', \delta')$ and such that for every $P \in I$ there is a node Q in Γ' with $\Lambda_Q = \Lambda_P$. In addition,
- $|\Gamma'| = |\Gamma| + |I|$, and
 - $|\mathcal{C}_{\Gamma'}| \leq |\mathcal{C}_{\Gamma}| + |I|$.

The three steps of the reduction process. The reduction process for a power circuit (Π, δ_{Π}) with a marking M consists of several iterations. Each iteration starts with a power circuit $(\Gamma_i \cup \Xi_i, \delta_i)$ such that Γ_i is a reduced sub-power circuit and a marking M_i with $\varepsilon(M_i) = \varepsilon(M)$. The aim of one iteration is to integrate the vertices $\text{Min}(\Xi_i) \subseteq \Xi_i$ into Γ_i where $\text{Min}(\Xi_i)$ is defined by

$$\text{Min}(\Xi_i) = \{P \in \Xi_i \mid \sigma(\Lambda_P) \subseteq \Gamma_i\}$$

and to update the marking M_i accordingly. Each iteration consists of the three steps UPDATENODES, EXTENDCHAINS, and UPDATEMARKINGS, which can be done in TC^0 . We have $\Xi_{i+1} = \Xi_i \setminus \text{Min}(\Xi_i)$. Thus, the full reduction process consists of $\text{depth}(\Pi) + 1$ many TC^0 computations.

Let us now describe these three steps in detail and also show that they can be done in TC^0 . After that we present the full algorithm for power circuit reduction.

We write $(\Gamma \cup \Xi, \delta) = (\Gamma_i \cup \Xi_i, \delta_i)$ for the power circuit at the start of one iteration (for simplicity we do not write the indices). Let us fix its precise properties: $\Gamma \cap \Xi = \emptyset$, $(\Gamma, \delta|_{\Gamma \times \Gamma}) \leq (\Gamma \cup \Xi, \delta)$ is a reduced power circuit and $\Lambda_P|_{\Gamma}$ is a compact marking for every $P \in \Xi$. Moreover, we assume that $|\mathcal{C}_0(\Gamma)| \geq \lceil \log(|\Xi|) \rceil + 1$.

► **Lemma 33** (UPDATENODES). *The following problem is in TC^0 :*

- Input:** A power circuit $(\Gamma \cup \Xi, \delta)$ as above.
Output: A reduced power circuit (Γ', δ') such that
- $(\Gamma, \delta|_{\Gamma \times \Gamma}) \leq (\Gamma', \delta')$,
 - for every node $Q \in \text{Min}(\Xi)$ there exists a node $P \in \Gamma'$ with $\varepsilon(P) = \varepsilon(Q)$,
 - $|\Gamma'| \leq |\Gamma| + |\text{Min}(\Xi)|$, and
 - $|\mathcal{C}_{\Gamma'}| \leq |\mathcal{C}_{\Gamma}| + |\text{Min}(\Xi)|$.

For the proof, we define the following equivalence relation \sim_{ε} on $\Gamma \cup \text{Min}(\Xi)$:

$$P \sim_{\varepsilon} Q \text{ if and only if } \varepsilon(P) = \varepsilon(Q).$$

For $P \in \Gamma \cup \text{Min}(\Xi)$ we write $[P]_{\varepsilon}$ for the equivalence class containing P .

Proof. Consider the equivalence relation \sim_ε as defined above on $\Gamma \cup \text{Min}(\Xi)$. Define a set $I \subseteq \text{Min}(\Xi)$ by taking one representative of each \sim_ε -class not containing a node of Γ . Such a set I can be computed in TC^0 : Clearly, $\text{Min}(\Xi)$ can be computed in TC^0 . The \sim_ε -classes can be computed in AC^0 by Proposition 26. Finally, for defining I one has to pick representatives. For example, for every \sim_ε -class which does not contain a node of Γ one can pick the first node in the input which belongs to this class. These representatives also can be found in TC^0 . Now, we can apply Lemma 32 to insert I into Γ in TC^0 . This yields our power circuit (Γ', δ') . The size bounds follow now immediately from those in Lemma 32 (notice that $|I| \leq |\text{Min}(\Xi)|$). \blacktriangleleft

► **Lemma 34** (**EXTENDCHAINS**). *The following problem is in TC^0 :*

- Input:** A reduced power circuit (Γ', δ') and $\mu \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mu \leq \left\lfloor \frac{2^{|C_0|+1}}{3} \right\rfloor$ (where, as before, $C_0 = C_0(\Gamma')$ is the initial maximal chain of Γ')
- Output:** A reduced power circuit (Γ'', δ'') such that
- $(\Gamma', \delta') \leq (\Gamma'', \delta'')$,
 - for each $P \in \Gamma'$ and each $i \in [0.. \mu]$ there is a node $Q \in \Gamma''$ with $\varepsilon(\Lambda_Q) = \varepsilon(\Lambda_P) + i$,
 - $|\Gamma''| \leq |\Gamma'| + |\mathcal{C}_{\Gamma'}| \cdot \mu$, and
 - $|\mathcal{C}_{\Gamma''}| \leq |\mathcal{C}_{\Gamma'}|$.

Proof. First assume that $|C_0| = 1$. Then $|\Gamma'| = 1$ and $\mu \leq 1$. If $\mu = 1$, then just one node has to be created, namely the one of value 2 and we are done. Thus, in the following we can assume that $|C_0| \geq 2$. Now, the proof of Lemma 34 consists of two steps: first, we extend only the chain C_0 to some longer (and long enough) chain in order to make sure that the values of the (compact) successor markings of the nodes we wish to introduce can be represented within the power circuit; only afterwards we add the new nodes as described in the lemma.

Step 1: We first want to extend the chain C_0 to the chain \tilde{C}_0 of minimal length such that \tilde{C}_0 is a maximal chain, $C_0 \subseteq \tilde{C}_0$, and the last node of \tilde{C}_0 is not already present in Γ' . The resulting power circuit will be denoted by $\tilde{\Gamma}$. We define

$$i_0 = \min \{i \in [|\Gamma'|] \mid \varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_{i+1}}) - \varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_i}) > 2\}.$$

Here, we use the convention that $P_{|\Gamma'|}$ has value infinity, so i_0 indeed exists. Furthermore, we define

$$I = \{i \in [0.. i_0] \mid \varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_{i+1}}) - \varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_i}) \geq 2\}.$$

Thus, in order to obtain $\tilde{\Gamma}$, we need to insert a new node between P_i and P_{i+1} into Γ' for each $i \in I$ (resp. one node above P_{i_0}). Since the successor markings of these new nodes might point to some of the other new nodes, we cannot apply Lemma 32 as a black-box. Instead, we need to take some more care: the rough idea is that, first, we compute all positions I where new nodes need to be introduced (I is as defined above), then we compute compact signed-digit representations for the respective successor markings, and, finally, we introduce these new nodes all at once knowing that all nodes where the successor markings point to are also introduced at the same time. In order to map the positions of nodes in Γ' to positions of nodes in $\tilde{\Gamma}$, we introduce a function $\lambda: [|\Gamma'|] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with

$$\lambda(i) = i + |I \cap [0.. i - 1]|.$$

Observe that $\lambda(i) = i$ for $i \in [|C_0|]$, and $\lambda(i+1) = \lambda(i) + 2$ for $i \in I$, and $\lambda(j) = j + |I|$ for $j \geq i_0 + 1$.

For each $i \in I$ we introduce a node Q_i whose successor marking we will specify later such that $\varepsilon(Q_i) = 2\varepsilon(P_i)$. We define the new power circuit $\tilde{\Gamma} = (\tilde{P}_0, \dots, \tilde{P}_{|\Gamma'|+|I|-1})$ by

$$\tilde{P}_j = \begin{cases} P_i & \text{if } j = \lambda(i) \\ Q_i & \text{if } j = \lambda(i) + 1 \text{ and } i \in I. \end{cases}$$

Notice that, if $j = \lambda(i) + 1$ for some $i \in I$, then $j \neq \lambda(i)$ for any i – hence, \tilde{P}_j is well-defined in any case.

The nodes $\tilde{P}_0, \dots, \tilde{P}_{\lambda(i_0)+1}$ will form the chain \tilde{C}_0 as claimed above. Moreover, we have $\Gamma' \subseteq \tilde{\Gamma}$ and $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is sorted increasingly. The successor markings of nodes from Γ' remain unchanged (i.e., $\Lambda_{\tilde{P}_{\lambda(i)}}(\tilde{P}_{\lambda(j)}) = \Lambda_{P_i}(P_j)$ for $i, j \in [|\Gamma'|]$ and $\Lambda_{\tilde{P}_{\lambda(i)}}(Q_j) = 0$ for $j \in I$).

For every $i \in I$ we define the successor marking of the node Q_i by

$$\text{digit}_{\tilde{C}_0}(\Lambda_{Q_i}) = \text{CR}(\varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_i}) + 1) \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda_{Q_i}|_{\tilde{\Gamma} \setminus \tilde{C}_0} = 0.$$

Be aware that, since $Q_i \in \tilde{C}_0$, also the successor marking of Q_i (of value $\varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_i}) + 1$) can be represented using only the nodes from \tilde{C}_0 (see Remark 10), so this is, indeed, a meaningful definition (be aware that to represent $\varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_i}) + 1$, we might need some of the additional nodes Q_i , but never a node that is not part of the chain \tilde{C}_0). Clearly, this yields $\varepsilon(\Lambda_{Q_i}) = \varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_i}) + 1$ as desired.

We obtain a reduced power circuit $(\tilde{\Gamma}, \tilde{\delta})$ with $(\Gamma', \delta') \leq (\tilde{\Gamma}, \tilde{\delta})$ where the map $\tilde{\delta}: \tilde{\Gamma} \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$ is defined by the successor markings. Moreover, $\tilde{C}_0 \subseteq \tilde{\Gamma}$ has the required properties.

It remains to show that $\tilde{\Gamma}$ can be computed in TC^0 : As $|C_0| \geq 2$, according to Proposition 26, we are able to decide in AC^0 whether the markings Λ_{P_i} and $\Lambda_{P_{i+1}}$ differ by 1, 2, or more than 2 – for all $i \in [|\Gamma'|]$ in parallel. Now, i_0 can be determined in TC^0 via its definition as above. Likewise I and the function λ can be computed in TC^0 . By Corollary 20, $\text{CR}(\varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_i}) + 1)$ for $i \in I$ can be computed in AC^0 (since $|\tilde{C}_0| \leq 2 \cdot |\Gamma'|$) showing that altogether $\tilde{\Gamma}$ can be computed in TC^0 .

Step 2: The second step is to add nodes above each chain of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ as required in the Lemma. The outcome will be denoted by (Γ'', δ'') . We start by defining

$$\begin{aligned} d_i &= \min\{\varepsilon(\Lambda_{\tilde{P}_{i+1}}) - \varepsilon(\Lambda_{\tilde{P}_i}) - 1, \mu\} && \text{for } i \in [|\tilde{\Gamma}|] \setminus \{|\tilde{C}_0| - 1\} \quad \text{and} \\ d_i &= \min\{\varepsilon(\Lambda_{\tilde{P}_{i+1}}) - \varepsilon(\Lambda_{\tilde{P}_i}) - 1, \mu - 1\} && \text{for } i = |\tilde{C}_0| - 1. \end{aligned}$$

In order to obtain (Γ'', δ'') from $(\tilde{\Gamma}, \tilde{\delta})$, for every $i \in [|\tilde{\Gamma}|]$ and every $h \in [1..d_i]$ we have to insert a node $R^{(i,h)}$ such that

$$\varepsilon(\Lambda_{R^{(i,h)}}) = \varepsilon(\Lambda_{\tilde{P}_i}) + h.$$

Observe that the numbers d_i can be computed in TC^0 : since

$$\mu + 1 \leq \left\lfloor \frac{2^{|C_0|+1}}{3} \right\rfloor + 1 \leq \left\lfloor \frac{2^{|\tilde{C}_0|}}{3} \right\rfloor + 1 \leq \left\lfloor \frac{2^{|\tilde{C}_0|+1}}{3} \right\rfloor,$$

by Proposition 26, we can check in AC^0 whether $\varepsilon(\Lambda_{\tilde{P}_{i+1}}) \leq \varepsilon(\Lambda_{\tilde{P}_i}) + k$ with $k \leq \mu + 1$. If $i = |\tilde{C}_0| - 1$ we choose $k = \mu$, otherwise $k = \mu + 1$. If the respective inequality holds, we obtain by Lemma 23 that $\varepsilon(\Lambda_{\tilde{P}_{i+1}}) - \varepsilon(\Lambda_{\tilde{P}_i}) - 1 = \varepsilon(\Lambda_{\tilde{P}_{i+1}}|_{\tilde{C}_0}) - \varepsilon(\Lambda_{\tilde{P}_i}|_{\tilde{C}_0}) - 1$. For the latter

we have signed-digit representations of digit-length at most $|\tilde{C}_0|$. Hence, this difference can be computed in TC^0 .

Since $\tilde{P}_{|\tilde{C}_0|-1} \notin \Gamma'$ and in Step 1 we have not introduced any vertex above $\tilde{P}_{|\tilde{C}_0|-1}$, we know that $\tilde{P}_{|\tilde{C}_0|-1}$ is not marked by $\Lambda_{\tilde{P}}$ for any $\tilde{P} \in \tilde{\Gamma}$. Therefore, for all $i \in [|\tilde{\Gamma}|]$ we have $\varepsilon(\Lambda_{\tilde{P}_i} |_{\tilde{C}_0}) + \mu \leq \lfloor \frac{2^{|\tilde{C}_0|}}{3} \rfloor + \lfloor \frac{2^{|\tilde{C}_0|+1}}{3} \rfloor \leq 2 \lfloor \frac{2^{|\tilde{C}_0|}}{3} \rfloor$ and, hence, by Lemma 18, $\varepsilon(\Lambda_{\tilde{P}_i} |_{\tilde{C}_0}) + h$ can be represented as a compact marking using only nodes from \tilde{C}_0 for every $h \in [1 .. d_i]$. Thus, for every $d_i \neq 0$ and every $h \in [1 .. d_i]$ we define a successor marking of $R^{(i,h)}$ by

$$\text{digit}_{\tilde{C}_0}(\Lambda_{R^{(i,h)}}) = \text{CR}(\varepsilon(\Lambda_{\tilde{P}_i} |_{\tilde{C}_0}) + h) \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda_{R^{(i,h)}} |_{\tilde{\Gamma} \setminus \tilde{C}_0} = \Lambda_{\tilde{P}_i} |_{\tilde{\Gamma} \setminus \tilde{C}_0}.$$

Again, we know that $|\tilde{C}_0| \leq 2|\Gamma'|$. So according to Corollary 20 we are able to calculate $\text{CR}(\varepsilon(\Lambda_{\tilde{P}_i} |_{\tilde{C}_0}) + h)$ in AC^0 .

Now we set $I = \{R^{(i,h)} \mid d_i \neq 0, h \in [1 .. d_i]\}$. According to Lemma 32 we are able to construct in TC^0 a reduced power circuit (Γ'', δ'') such that $(\tilde{\Gamma}, \tilde{\delta}) \leq (\Gamma'', \delta'')$ and such that for each $R \in I$ there exists a node $Q \in \Gamma''$ with $\varepsilon(Q) = \varepsilon(R)$.

Considering the size of Γ'' , observe that during the whole construction, for every node $P_i \in \Gamma'$ we create at most μ new nodes between P_i and P_{i+1} .

Moreover, we only create new nodes between P_i and P_{i+1} if P_i is the last node of a maximal chain of Γ' . Furthermore, notice that the only node of Γ' above which we have introduced new nodes in both Step 1 and Step 2 is the second largest node of \tilde{C}_0 : in Step 1 we have created one new node and in Step 2 we have created at most $\mu - 1$ new nodes above it. Thus, for every chain of Γ' we have introduced at most μ new nodes. Thus, $|\Gamma''| \leq |\Gamma'| + |\mathcal{C}_{\Gamma'}| \cdot \mu$. Finally, the new nodes we create only prolongate the already existing chains, so we do not create any new chains. This finishes the proof of the lemma. \blacktriangleleft

In the following, (Γ', δ') denotes the power circuit obtained by `UPDATENODES` when starting with $(\Gamma \cup \Xi, \delta)$, and (Γ'', δ'') denotes the power circuit obtained by `EXTENDCHAINS` with $\mu = \lceil \log(|\text{Min}(\Xi)|) \rceil + 1$ on input of the power circuit (Γ', δ') (observe that, by the assumption $|\mathcal{C}_0(\Gamma)| \geq \lceil \log(|\Xi|) \rceil + 1$, the condition on μ in Lemma 34 is satisfied). The value of μ is chosen to make sure that in the following lemma one can make the markings compact. Indeed, if $\text{Min}(\Xi) = \{P_1, \dots, P_k\}$ and all P_i have the same evaluation and are marked with 1 by M , then we might need a node of value $2^\mu \cdot \varepsilon(P_1)$ in order to make M compact.

► **Lemma 35** (`UPDATEMARKINGS`). *The following problem is in TC^0 :*

- Input:** *The power circuit (Γ'', δ'') as a result of `EXTENDCHAINS` with $\mu = \lceil \log(|\text{Min}(\Xi)|) \rceil + 1$ and a marking M on $\Gamma \cup \Xi$.*
- Output:** *A marking \tilde{M} on $\Gamma'' \cup (\Xi \setminus \text{Min}(\Xi))$ such that $\varepsilon(\tilde{M}) = \varepsilon(M)$ and $\tilde{M}|_{\Gamma''}$ is compact.*

Proof. Consider again the equivalence relation \sim_ε as defined above on $\Gamma'' \cup \text{Min}(\Xi)$. For the equivalence class of a node $P \in \Gamma'' \cup \text{Min}(\Xi)$ we write $[P]_\varepsilon$. We will define the marking \tilde{M} on Γ'' by defining it on each maximal chain. Recall that we can view M as a marking on $\Gamma'' \cup \Xi$ by defining $M(P) = 0$ if $P \notin \Gamma \cup \Xi$.

Let $C = (P_i, \dots, P_{i+h-1}) \in \mathcal{C}_{\Gamma''}$ be a maximal chain of length h and let

$$S = \bigcup_{P \in C} [P]_\varepsilon = \bigcup_{P \in C} \{Q \in \Gamma'' \cup \text{Min}(\Xi) \mid \varepsilon(Q) = \varepsilon(P)\} \subseteq \Gamma'' \cup \text{Min}(\Xi).$$

We wish to find a compact marking \tilde{M}_C with support contained in $C \subseteq \Gamma''$ and evaluation $\varepsilon(\tilde{M}_C) = \varepsilon(M|_S)$. First define the integer

$$Z_{M,C} = \sum_{r=0}^{h-1} \left(\sum_{Q \in [P_{i+r}]_\varepsilon} M(Q) \right) 2^r.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{M,C} \cdot \varepsilon(\text{start}(C)) &= \sum_{r=0}^{h-1} \sum_{Q \in [P_{i+r}]_\varepsilon} M(Q) 2^r \cdot \varepsilon(\text{start}(C)) \\ &= \sum_{Q \in S} M(Q) \varepsilon(Q) \\ &= \varepsilon(M|_S). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, defining \tilde{M}_C by $\text{digit}_C(\tilde{M}_C) = \text{CR}(Z_{M,C})$ gives our desired marking.

However, be aware that, for this, we have to show that the digit-length of $\text{CR}(Z_{M,C})$ is at most $|C| = h$. Let k be maximal such that $P_{i+k} \in \Gamma'$. Then, in particular, no node in S with higher evaluation than P_{i+k} is marked by M . Moreover, by the properties of $\text{EXTENDCHAINS}(\lceil \log(|\text{Min}(\Xi)|) \rceil + 1)$, we have $h - 1 - k \geq \lceil \log(|\text{Min}(\Xi)|) \rceil + 1$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{M,C} &\leq \text{val}(\text{digit}_C(M)) + |\text{Min}(\Xi)| \cdot 2^k \\ &\leq \frac{1}{3} \cdot 2^{k+2} + 2^{k+\log(|\text{Min}(\Xi)|)} && \text{(by Lemma 18)} \\ &\leq \frac{4}{3} \cdot \left(2^k + 2^{k+\log(|\text{Min}(\Xi)|)} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{2}{3} \cdot 2^{k+\lceil \log(|\text{Min}(\Xi)|) \rceil + 2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Lemma 18, the digit-length of $\text{CR}(Z_{M,C})$ is at most $k + \lceil \log(|\text{Min}(\Xi)|) \rceil + 2 \leq h$.

By Corollary 27, the maximal chains can be determined in TC^0 . Now, for every maximal chain C the (binary) number $Z_{M,C}$ can be computed in TC^0 using iterated addition and made be compact in AC^0 using Theorem 12. Thus, the marking \tilde{M}_C can be computed in TC^0 . The marking \tilde{M} as desired in the lemma is simply defined by $\tilde{M}|_{\Xi \setminus \text{Min}(\Xi)} = M|_{\Xi \setminus \text{Min}(\Xi)}$ and $\tilde{M}|_C = \tilde{M}_C|_C$ for $C \in \mathcal{C}_{\Gamma''}$ – all the markings \tilde{M}_C can be computed in parallel. \blacktriangleleft

Proof of Theorem 31. Now we are ready to describe the full reduction process based on the three steps described above. We aim for a DepParaTC^0 circuit where the input is parametrized by the depth of the power circuit. The input is some arbitrary power circuit (Π, δ_Π) together with a marking M on Π . We start with some initial reduced power circuit (Γ_0, δ_0) and some non-reduced part $\Xi_0 = \Pi$ and successively apply the three steps to obtain power circuits $(\Gamma_i \cup \Xi_i, \delta_i)$ and markings M_i for $i = 0, 1, \dots$ while keeping the following invariants:

- $(\Gamma_i, \delta_i|_{\Gamma_i \times \Gamma_i}) \leq (\Gamma_i \cup \Xi_i, \delta_i)$ (i.e., there are no edges from Γ_i to Ξ_i),
- Γ_i is reduced,
- $\Gamma_{i-1} \leq \Gamma_i$ and $\Xi_i \subseteq \Xi_{i-1}$,
- $\varepsilon(M_i) = \varepsilon(M)$.

Moreover, as long as $\Xi_{i-1} \neq \emptyset$ we assure that $\text{depth}(\Xi_i) < \text{depth}(\Xi_{i-1})$.

We first construct the initial reduced power circuit $(\Gamma_0, \tilde{\delta}_0)$ which consists exactly of a chain of length $\ell = \lceil \log(|\Pi|) \rceil + 1$. This can be done as follows: Let $\Gamma_0 = (P_0, \dots, P_{\ell-1}) = C_0$ and define successor markings by $\text{digit}_{C_0}(\Lambda_{P_i}) = \text{CR}(i)$ for $i \in [\ell]$. This defines $\tilde{\delta}_0$. Now

we set $\Xi_0 = \Pi$ and we define $\delta_0: (\Gamma_0 \cup \Xi_0) \times (\Gamma_0 \cup \Xi_0) \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$ by $\delta_0|_{\Gamma_0 \times \Gamma_0} = \tilde{\delta}_0$, $\delta_0|_{\Xi_0 \times \Xi_0} = \delta_\Pi$ and $\delta = 0$ otherwise. We extend the marking M to Γ_0 by setting $M(P) = 0$ for all $P \in \Gamma_0$. So we obtain a power circuit of the form $(\Gamma_0 \cup \Xi_0, \delta_0)$ with the properties described above.

Now let the power circuit $(\Gamma_i \cup \Xi_i, \delta_i)$ together with the marking M_i be the input for the $i + 1$ -th iteration meeting the above described invariants. We write $\tilde{\delta}_i = \delta_i|_{\Gamma_i \times \Gamma_i}$. Now we apply the three steps from above:

1. Using UPDATENODES (Lemma 33) we compute a reduced power circuit (Γ'_i, δ'_i) with $(\Gamma_i, \tilde{\delta}_i) \leq (\Gamma'_i, \delta'_i)$ such that for every $P \in \text{Min}(\Xi_i)$ there is some $Q \in \Gamma'_i$ with $\varepsilon(Q) = \varepsilon(P)$.
2. Using EXTENDCHAINS (Lemma 34) with $\mu = \lceil \log(|\text{Min}(\Xi_i)|) \rceil + 1$ we extend each maximal chain in (Γ'_i, δ'_i) by at most $\lceil \log(|\text{Min}(\Xi_i)|) \rceil + 1$ nodes. Notice that $\lceil \log(|\text{Min}(\Xi_i)|) \rceil + 1 \leq \lceil \log(|\Pi|) \rceil + 1$ and so, as $\Gamma_0 \leq \Gamma'_i$, the condition $\mu \leq \left\lfloor \frac{2^{\lceil C_0(\Gamma'_i) \rceil + 1}}{3} \right\rfloor$ in Lemma 34 is satisfied. The result of this step is denoted by (Γ''_i, δ''_i) .
3. We apply UPDATEMARKINGS (Lemma 35) to obtain markings \tilde{M}_i and $\tilde{\Lambda}_P$ for $P \in \Xi_i \setminus \text{Min}(\Xi_i)$ on $\Gamma''_i \cup (\Xi_i \setminus \text{Min}(\Xi_i))$ such that $\varepsilon(\tilde{M}_i) = \varepsilon(M_i)$ and $\varepsilon(\tilde{\Lambda}_P) = \varepsilon(\Lambda_P)$. Observe that these markings restricted to Γ''_i are compact.
4. Each iteration ends by setting $\Gamma_{i+1} = \Gamma''_i$ and $\Xi_{i+1} = \Xi_i \setminus \text{Min}(\Xi_i)$ and $M_{i+1} = \tilde{M}_i$. Finally, δ_{i+1} is defined as δ''_i on Γ_{i+1} and via the successor markings $\tilde{\Lambda}_P$ for $P \in \Xi_{i+1}$.

After exactly $\text{depth}(\Pi) + 1$ iterations we reach $\Xi_{d+1} = \Xi_d \setminus \text{Min}(\Xi_d) = \emptyset$ where $d = \text{depth}(\Pi)$. In this case we do not change the resulting power circuit any further. It is clear from Lemma 33, Lemma 34 and Lemma 35 that throughout the above-mentioned invariants are maintained. Thus, $(\Gamma, \delta) = (\Gamma_{d+1}, \delta_{d+1})$ is a reduced power circuit and for every node $P \in \Pi$ there exists a node $Q \in \Gamma_{d+1}$ such that $\varepsilon(Q) = \varepsilon(P)$ and M_{d+1} is a compact marking on Γ_{d+1} with $\varepsilon(M_{d+1}) = \varepsilon(M)$.

▷ **Claim 36.** Let $d = \text{depth}(\Pi)$ and $\Gamma_0, \dots, \Gamma_{d+1}$ be as constructed above. Then for all i we have

- $|\mathcal{C}_{\Gamma_i}| \leq |\Pi| + 1$,
- $|\Gamma_i| \leq (|\Pi| + 1)^2 \cdot (\log(|\Pi|) + 2)$.

Proof. According to Lemma 33 and Lemma 34 we have $|\mathcal{C}_{\Gamma_{i+1}}| \leq |\mathcal{C}_{\Gamma_i}| + |\text{Min}(\Xi_i)|$. Further observe that Π is the disjoint union of the $\text{Min}(\Xi_j)$ for $j \in [0..d]$. Since $|\mathcal{C}_{\Gamma_0}| = 1$, we obtain for all $i \in [0..d]$ that

$$|\mathcal{C}_{\Gamma_{i+1}}| \leq |\mathcal{C}_{\Gamma_i}| + |\text{Min}(\Xi_i)| \leq 1 + \sum_{0 \leq j \leq i} |\text{Min}(\Xi_j)| \leq |\Pi| + 1. \quad (1)$$

Again by Lemma 33 and Lemma 34 we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Gamma_{i+1}| &\leq |\Gamma'_i| + |\mathcal{C}_{\Gamma'_i}| \cdot (\lceil \log(|\text{Min}(\Xi_i)|) \rceil + 1) && \text{(by Lemma 34)} \\ &\leq |\Gamma_i| + |\text{Min}(\Xi_i)| + (|\mathcal{C}_{\Gamma_i}| + |\text{Min}(\Xi_i)|) \cdot (\lceil \log(|\text{Min}(\Xi_i)|) \rceil + 1) && \text{(by Lemma 33)} \\ &\leq |\Gamma_i| + |\text{Min}(\Xi_i)| + (|\Pi| + 1) \cdot (\lceil \log(|\Pi|) \rceil + 1). && \text{(by (1))} \end{aligned}$$

Since $|\Gamma_0| = \lceil \log(|\Pi|) \rceil + 1$, we obtain by induction that

$$\begin{aligned} |\Gamma_i| &\leq |\Gamma_0| + \sum_{0 \leq j \leq i-1} |\text{Min}(\Xi_j)| + i \cdot (|\Pi| + 1) \cdot (\log(|\Pi|) + 2) \\ &\leq (\lceil \log(|\Pi|) \rceil + 1) + |\Pi| + i \cdot (|\Pi| + 1) \cdot (\log(|\Pi|) + 2) \\ &\leq (i + 1) \cdot (|\Pi| + 1) \cdot (\log(|\Pi|) + 2) \end{aligned}$$

for all $i \in [1..d+1]$. The last inequality is due to the fact that $|\Pi|+1 \geq 2$ and $\log(|\Pi|)+2 \geq 2$. Since $d+1 \leq |\Pi|$, we obtain $|\Gamma_i| \leq (|\Pi|+1)^2 \cdot (\log(|\Pi|)+2)$. \triangleleft

Let $D \in \mathbb{N}$ and assume that $\text{depth}(\Pi) \leq D$. By Lemma 33, Lemma 34 and Lemma 35 each iteration of the three steps above can be done in TC^0 . Notice here that the construction of the markings \tilde{M}_i and $\tilde{\Lambda}_P$ during UPDATEMARKINGS can be done in parallel – so it is in TC^0 , although Lemma 35 is stated only for a single marking. Now, the crucial observation is that, due to Claim 36, the input size for each iteration is polynomial in the original input size of (Π, δ_Π) . Therefore, we can compose the individual iterations and obtain a circuit of polynomial size and depth bounded by $\mathcal{O}(D)$ as described in Lemma 5. Thus, we have described a DepParaTC^0 circuit (parametrized by $\text{depth}(\Pi)$) for the problem of computing a reduced form for (Π, δ_Π) . This completes the proof of Theorem 31. \blacktriangleleft

- **Remark 37. (1)** While Theorem 31 is only stated for one input marking, the construction works within the same complexity bounds for any number of markings on (Π, δ_Π) since during UPDATEMARKINGS these all can be updated in parallel.
- (2) Moreover, note that for every maximal chain $C \in \mathcal{C}_\Gamma$ there exists a node $Q \in \Pi$ (i.e., in the original power circuit) such that $\varepsilon(Q) = \varepsilon(\text{start}(C))$. This is because new chains are only created during UPDATENODES , the other steps only extend already existing chains.
- (3) Further observe that $|\sigma(\tilde{M})| \leq |\sigma(M)|$. Looking at the construction of \tilde{M} we see that we first make sure that M does not mark two nodes of the same value, then we make the marking compact. Both operations do not increase the number of nodes in the support of the marking.

► **Example 38.** In Figure 3 we illustrate what happens in the steps UPDATENODES , EXTENDCHAINS and UPDATEMARKINGS during the reduction process. Picture a) shows our starting situation. In b) we already inserted the nodes of value 2^3 and 2^{32} into the reduced part. Now the reduced part consists of three chains: one starting at the node of value 1 and the nodes 2^5 and 2^{32} as chains of length 1. Because $|\text{Min}(\Xi)| = 3$, we have to extend each chain by three nodes or until two chains merge. So in c) we obtain two chains, one from 1 to 2^8 and the one from 2^{32} to 2^{35} . In d) we then updated the markings and discarded the nodes from $\text{Min}(\Xi)$.


► **Example 39.** In Figure 4 we give an example of the complete power circuit reduction process by showing the result after each iteration. We start with a non-reduced power circuit of depth 2 in a). This power circuit has size 5, so we first construct the starting chain of length 4 in b). Part c) and d) show the result after inserting layer 0 and layer 1, respectively. In e) we finally inserted all layers and thus have constructed the reduced power circuit.

For comparing two markings L and M on an arbitrary power circuit, we can proceed as follows: first compute the difference (Lemma 28), then reduce the power circuit (Theorem 31) and, finally, compare the resulting compact marking with zero (Proposition 26). This shows:

► **Corollary 40.** *Let $\Delta \in \{=, \neq, <, \leq, >, \geq\}$. The following is in DepParaTC^0 parametrized by $\text{depth}(\Pi)$:*

- Input:** A power circuit (Π, δ_Π) together with markings L, M on Π .
Question: Is $\varepsilon(L) \Delta \varepsilon(M)$?

Proof of Proposition A. When assuming $\text{depth}(\Pi) \leq C \cdot \log |\Pi|$, by Lemma 4, we obtain Proposition A as an immediate consequence of Corollary 40. \blacktriangleleft



■ **Figure 3** The three steps of power circuit reduction. The already reduced part consist of **blue nodes** and $\text{Min}(\Xi_i)$ is colored in **cyan**. The **red signs** indicate a marking. Three dots \dots in between two nodes mean that we omitted some nodes. A dashed edge $--$ means that we actually omitted the outgoing edges of the right node.

► **Remark 41.** By Corollary 40 comparing two numbers m_1 and m_2 represented by a $(0, +, -, 2^x)$ -circuit \mathcal{C} can be done in DepParaTC^0 parametrized by $\text{depth}_{2^x}(\mathcal{C}) + \log^2 |\mathcal{C}|$ if the input of every 2^x -gate of \mathcal{C} is non-negative: by Proposition 30 we can find a power circuit (Π, δ) with $\text{depth}(\Pi) \leq \text{depth}_{2^x}(\mathcal{C})$ and markings M_1 and M_2 evaluating to m_1 and m_2 in $\text{NC}^2 \subseteq \text{TC}^2$. It remains to compare $\varepsilon(M_1)$ and $\varepsilon(M_2)$.

4.4 Operations with floating point numbers

In the following, we want to represent a number $r \in \mathbb{Z}[1/2]$ using markings in a power circuit. For this, we use a floating point representation. Observe that for each such $r \in \mathbb{Z}[1/2] \setminus \{0\}$ there exist unique $u, e \in \mathbb{Z}$ with u odd such that $r = u \cdot 2^e$.

► **Lemma 42.** *The following problem is in DepParaTC^0 parametrized by $\text{depth}(\Pi)$:*


Input: A power circuit (Π, δ_Π) with a marking M on Π .

Output: A power circuit $(\tilde{\Pi}, \delta_{\tilde{\Pi}})$ with markings E, U on $\tilde{\Pi}$ such that $\varepsilon(M) = \varepsilon(U) \cdot 2^{\varepsilon(E)}$ with $\varepsilon(U)$ odd.

In addition, $(\Pi, \delta_\Pi) \leq (\tilde{\Pi}, \delta_{\tilde{\Pi}})$, $\text{depth}(\tilde{\Pi}) \leq \max(\text{depth}(\Pi), 2)$ and $|\tilde{\Pi}| \in \mathcal{O}(|\Pi|)$.

Proof. First note that we are searching for a marking representing the maximal $e \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $2^e \mid \varepsilon(M)$. For finding e , we need the compact representation of M . Therefore, we construct the reduced form (Γ, δ) of Π and a compact marking \tilde{M} on Γ such that $\varepsilon(\tilde{M}) = \varepsilon(M)$. According to Theorem 31 this is possible in DepParaTC^0 . Now we have $\varepsilon(M) = \sum_{i=1}^k \tilde{M}(Q_i) \cdot 2^{\varepsilon(\Lambda_{Q_i})}$ where $\sigma(\tilde{M}) = \{Q_1, \dots, Q_k\} \subseteq \Gamma$. We assume that the Q_i are ordered according to their value, i.e., $\varepsilon(Q_i) < \varepsilon(Q_j)$ for $i < j$. Hence, $e = \varepsilon(\Lambda_{Q_1})$.

Before we can define the markings U and E , we have to introduce some new nodes. First we add $\lceil \log(|\Gamma|) \rceil$ new nodes to Π each of value 1 (i.e., with empty successor marking). Then for each $j \in [0 .. \lceil \log(|\Gamma|) \rceil]$ we create a node of value 2^j and depth 1 in the following way:



■ **Figure 4** The complete process of power circuit reduction – inserting layer after layer. For an explanation of the colors, see Figure 3.

the successor marking of such a node marks exactly j nodes of value 1 with $+1$ and all the other nodes with 0.

In order to define U , we aim for adding a node S_i to Π with $\varepsilon(\Lambda_{S_i}) = \varepsilon(\Lambda_{Q_i}) - e$ for each $i \in [1..k]$. We proceed as follows: For each $i \in [1..k]$, let $C_i \in \mathcal{C}_\Gamma$ denote the maximal chain to which Q_i belongs. Note that for different i these chains could be equal. By Remark 37, we know that there exist nodes $R_1, \dots, R_k \in \Pi$ such that $\varepsilon(R_i) = \varepsilon(\text{start}(C_i))$ for $i \in [1..k]$. To find the nodes R_i , we can for example remember the equivalence classes we obtain during the reduction process. Now there exist $m_i \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m_i \in [0..|\Gamma|]$ such that $\varepsilon(\Lambda_{Q_i}) = \varepsilon(\Lambda_{R_i}) + m_i$. We can find m_i as the difference of the indices of Q_i and $\text{start}(C_i)$ in the sorted order of Γ , and so we can find all the m_i in AC^0 . Note that the binary representation of m_i uses at most $\lceil \log(|\Gamma|) \rceil + 1$ bits. We define markings M_i on the newly defined nodes of depth 1 using the binary representation of m_i such that $\varepsilon(M_i) = m_i$ for $i \in [1..k]$. Now we are ready to define the marking E by $E = \Lambda_{R_1} + M_1$.

We now want to define a marking U , with $\varepsilon(U) = \varepsilon(M) \cdot 2^{-\varepsilon(E)}$. For every $i \in [1..k]$ we create a node S_i with $\Lambda_{S_i} = \Lambda_{R_i} + M_i - E$, so in particular, $\varepsilon(S_i) = \varepsilon(Q_i) \cdot 2^{-\varepsilon(E)}$ (notice that $\varepsilon(S_1) = 1$). Because E and M_i could have supports with non-trivial intersection (as well as E and Λ_{R_i}), we have to clone the nodes in $\sigma(E)$ for the addition. Then the marking U with $U(S_i) = M(Q_i)$ for $i \in [1..k]$ is the marking U we searched for.

Regarding the size of $\tilde{\Pi}$, observe that to define the markings M_i , we insert $2 \cdot \lceil \log(|\Gamma|) \rceil + 1$ nodes. By cloning the nodes in $\sigma(E)$, we add at most $\lceil \log(|\Gamma|) \rceil + 1 + |\Pi|$ additional nodes. By Remark 37 (3), we know that $|\sigma(\tilde{M})| \leq |\sigma(M)| \leq |\Pi|$, so we insert at most $|\Pi|$ nodes when inserting the nodes S_i . According to Claim 36, we have $\log(|\Gamma|) \in \mathcal{O}(\log(|\Pi|))$. Hence, $|\tilde{\Pi}| \in \mathcal{O}(|\Pi|)$.

Considering the depth, when inserting the new nodes of depth 1, the depth only increases if $\text{depth}(\Pi) = 0$. When inserting a node S_i the depth increases only if $\text{depth}(\Pi) \leq 1$. ◀

► **Definition 43.** A power circuit representation of $r \in \mathbb{Z}[1/2]$ consists of a power circuit (Π, δ_Π) together with a pair of markings (U, E) on Π such that $\varepsilon(U)$ is either zero or odd and $r = \varepsilon(U) \cdot 2^{\varepsilon(E)}$.

► **Lemma 44.** (a) *The following problems are in TC^0 :*

Input: A power circuit representation for $r \in \mathbb{Z}[1/2]$ over a power circuit (Π, δ_Π) and a marking M on Π .

Output: A power circuit representation of $r \cdot 2^{\varepsilon(M)}$ over a power circuit $(\tilde{\Pi}, \delta_{\tilde{\Pi}})$.

Input: A power circuit representation for $r \in \mathbb{Z}[1/2]$ over a power circuit (Π, δ_Π) .

Output: A power circuit representation of $-r$ over (Π, δ_Π) .

Input: Power circuit representations for $r, s \in \mathbb{Z}[1/2]$ over a power circuit (Π, δ_Π) such that $\frac{r}{s}$ is a power of two.

Output: A marking L in a power circuit $(\tilde{\Pi}, \delta_{\tilde{\Pi}})$ such that $\varepsilon(L) = \log(\frac{r}{s})$.

(b) *The following problems are in DepParaTC^0 parametrized by $\text{depth}(\Pi)$:*

Input: A power circuit (Π, δ_Π) and a marking M on Π .

Output: A power circuit representation of $\varepsilon(M) \in \mathbb{Z}[1/2]$ over a power circuit $(\tilde{\Pi}, \delta_{\tilde{\Pi}})$.

Input: $r, s \in \mathbb{Z}[1/2]$ given as power circuit representations over a power circuit (Π, δ_Π) .

Output: A power circuit representation of $r + s$ over a power circuit $(\tilde{\Pi}, \delta_{\tilde{\Pi}})$.

Input: A power circuit representation for $r \in \mathbb{Z}[1/2]$ over a power circuit (Π, δ_Π)

Question: Is $r \triangle 0$ for $\triangle \in \{=, \neq, <, \leq, >, \geq\}$?

Input: A power circuit representation for $r \in \mathbb{Z}[1/2]$ over a power circuit (Π, δ_Π) .

Output: Is $r \in \mathbb{Z}$? If yes, a marking M in a power circuit $(\tilde{\Pi}, \delta_{\tilde{\Pi}})$ such that $\varepsilon(M) = r$.

In all cases we have $(\Pi, \delta_\Pi) \leq (\tilde{\Pi}, \delta_{\tilde{\Pi}})$, $|\tilde{\Pi}| \in \mathcal{O}(|\Pi|)$, and $\text{depth}(\tilde{\Pi}) = \text{depth}(\Pi) + \mathcal{O}(1)$.

Proof. During the whole proof, let U, V, E, F be markings in Π such that $\varepsilon(U)$, $\varepsilon(V)$ are odd, $r = \varepsilon(U) \cdot 2^{\varepsilon(E)}$ and $s = \varepsilon(V) \cdot 2^{\varepsilon(F)}$.

Part (a): We have $r \cdot 2^{\varepsilon(M)} = \varepsilon(U) \cdot 2^{\varepsilon(E) + \varepsilon(M)}$. According to Lemma 28 point (a), the marking $E + M$ can be obtained in TC^0 as marking in a power circuit $(\tilde{\Pi}, \delta_{\tilde{\Pi}})$ that satisfies all the required properties. The computation of $-r$ is clear by Lemma 28.

If $\frac{r}{s}$ is a power of two, we know that $\varepsilon(U) = \varepsilon(V)$, and so $\frac{r}{s} = 2^{\varepsilon(E) - \varepsilon(F)}$. Now again Lemma 28 finishes the proof of part (a).

Part (b): The first point is due to Lemma 42. For the addition, first observe that

$$r + s = \varepsilon(U) \cdot 2^{\varepsilon(E)} + \varepsilon(V) \cdot 2^{\varepsilon(F)} = 2^{\varepsilon(E)} \cdot (\varepsilon(U) + \varepsilon(V) \cdot 2^{\varepsilon(F) - \varepsilon(E)})$$

We can decide in DepParaTC^0 whether $\varepsilon(E) \leq \varepsilon(F)$ using Corollary 40. W.l.o.g. let $\varepsilon(E) \leq \varepsilon(F)$ (otherwise we switch the roles of r and s). Next, we construct a marking K in a power circuit $(\Pi', \delta_{\Pi'})$ such that $\varepsilon(K) = \varepsilon(U) + \varepsilon(V) \cdot 2^{\varepsilon(F) - \varepsilon(E)}$. According to Lemma 28 and because $\varepsilon(F) - \varepsilon(E) \geq 0$, this is possible in TC^0 and such that $|\Pi'| \in \mathcal{O}(|\Pi|)$ and $\text{depth}(\Pi') \leq \text{depth}(\Pi) + 1$. Now, according to Lemma 42 we can construct markings W and G in a power circuit $(\Pi'', \delta_{\Pi''})$ such that $\varepsilon(W)$ is odd and $\varepsilon(K) = \varepsilon(W) \cdot 2^{\varepsilon(G)}$ in DepParaTC^0 . In addition, $|\Pi''| \in \mathcal{O}(|\Pi'|)$ and $\text{depth}(\Pi'') \leq \max(\text{depth}(\Pi'), 2)$. Now according to Lemma 28 the marking $E + G$ can be obtained as marking in a power circuit $(\tilde{\Pi}, \delta_{\tilde{\Pi}})$ with $|\tilde{\Pi}| \in \mathcal{O}(|\Pi|)$ and $\text{depth}(\tilde{\Pi}) = \text{depth}(\Pi) + \mathcal{O}(1)$. Then the power circuit $(\tilde{\Pi}, \delta_{\tilde{\Pi}})$ together with the markings W and $E + G$ is the power circuit representation for $r + s$, satisfying the required properties.

To decide if $r \triangle 0$, we just have to check if $\varepsilon(U) \triangle 0$. According to Corollary 40 this is possible in DepParaTC^0 . To decide if $r \in \mathbb{Z}$, since $\varepsilon(U)$ is odd, we just need to decide if $\varepsilon(E) \geq 0$. Again, this can be done using Corollary 40. In the affirmative case, we just have to apply Lemma 28 point (c) to produce the desired output. ◀

5 The word problem of the Baumslag group

Before we start solving the word problem of the Baumslag group, let us fix our notation from group theory.

Group presentations. A group G is *finitely generated* if there is some finite set Σ and a surjective monoid homomorphism $\eta: \Sigma^* \rightarrow G$ (called a presentation). Usually, we do not write the homomorphism η and treat words over Σ both as words and as their images under η . We write $v =_G w$ with the meaning that $\eta(v) = \eta(w)$. If $\Sigma = S \cup S^{-1}$ where S^{-1} is some disjoint set of formal inverses and $R \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \Sigma^*$ is some set of relations, we write $\langle \Sigma \mid R \rangle$ for the group $\Sigma^*/C(R)$ where $C(R)$ is the congruence generated by R together with the relations $aa^{-1} = a^{-1}a = 1$ for $a \in \Sigma$. If R is finite, G is called *finitely presented*.

The word problem for a fixed group G with presentation $\eta: \Sigma^* \rightarrow G$ is as follows:

Input: A word $w \in \Sigma^*$
 Question: Is $w =_G 1$?

For further background on group theory, we refer to [24].

The Baumslag-Solitar group. The Baumslag-Solitar group is defined by

$$\mathbf{BS}_{1,2} = \langle a, t \mid tat^{-1} = a^2 \rangle.$$

We have $\mathbf{BS}_{1,2} \cong \mathbb{Z}[1/2] \rtimes \mathbb{Z}$ via the isomorphism $a \mapsto (1, 0)$ and $t \mapsto (0, 1)$. Recall that $\mathbb{Z}[1/2] = \{p/2^q \in \mathbb{Q} \mid p, q \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is the set of dyadic fractions with addition as group operation. The multiplication in $\mathbb{Z}[1/2] \rtimes \mathbb{Z}$ is defined by $(r, m) \cdot (s, n) = (r + 2^m s, m + n)$. Inverses can be computed by the formula $(r, m)^{-1} = (-r \cdot 2^{-m}, -m)$. In the following we use $\mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$ and $\mathbb{Z}[1/2] \rtimes \mathbb{Z}$ as synonyms.

The Baumslag group. A convenient way to understand the Baumslag group $\mathbf{G}_{1,2}$ is as an HNN extension³ of the Baumslag-Solitar group:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{G}_{1,2} &= \langle \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}, b \mid bab^{-1} = t \rangle \\ &= \langle a, t, b \mid tat^{-1} = a^2, bab^{-1} = t \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, due to $bab^{-1} = t$, we can remove t and we obtain exactly the presentation $\langle a, b \mid bab^{-1}a = a^2bab^{-1} \rangle$. Moreover, $\mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$ is a subgroup of $\mathbf{G}_{1,2}$ via the canonical embedding and we have $b(q, 0)b^{-1} = (0, q)$, so a conjugation by b “flips” the two components of the semi-direct product if possible. Henceforth, we will use the alphabet $\Sigma = \{1, a, a^{-1}, t, t^{-1}, b, b^{-1}\}$ to represent elements of $\mathbf{G}_{1,2}$ (the letter 1 represents the group identity; it is there for padding reasons).

Britton reductions. Britton reductions are a standard way to solve the word problem in HNN extensions. Here we define them for the special case of $\mathbf{G}_{1,2}$. Let

$$\Delta = \mathbf{BS}_{1,2} \cup \{b, b^{-1}\}$$

³ Named after Graham Higman, Bernhard H. Neumann and Hanna Neumann. For a precise definition, we refer to [24]. This is also the way how the Magnus breakdown procedure works.

be an infinite alphabet (note that $\Sigma \subseteq \Delta$). A word $w \in \Delta^*$ is called *Britton-reduced* if it is of the form

$$w = (s_0, n_0)\beta_1(s_1, n_1) \cdots \beta_\ell(s_\ell, n_\ell)$$

with $\beta_i \in \{b, b^{-1}\}$ and $(s_i, n_i) \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$ for all i (i.e., w does not have two successive letters from $\mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$) and there is no factor of the form $b(q, 0)b^{-1}$ or $b^{-1}(0, k)b$ with $q, k \in \mathbb{Z}$. If w is not Britton-reduced, one can apply one of the rules

$$\begin{aligned} (r, m)(s, n) &\rightarrow (r + 2^m s, m + n) \\ b(q, 0)b^{-1} &\rightarrow (0, q) \\ b^{-1}(0, k)b &\rightarrow (k, 0) \end{aligned}$$

in order to obtain a shorter word representing the same group element. The following lemma is well-known (see also [24, Section IV.2]).

► **Lemma 45** (Britton's Lemma for $\mathbf{G}_{1,2}$ [8]). *Let $w \in \Delta^*$ be Britton-reduced. Then $w \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$ as a group element if and only if w does not contain any letter b or b^{-1} . In particular, $w =_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} 1$ if and only if $w = (0, 0)$ or $w = 1$ as a word.*

► **Example 46.** Define words $w_0 = t$ and $w_{n+1} = b w_n a w_n^{-1} b^{-1}$ for $n \geq 0$. Then we have $|w_n| = 2^{n+2} - 3$ but $w_n =_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} t^{\tau(n)}$. While the length of the word w_n is only exponential in n , the length of its Britton-reduced form is $\tau(n)$.

5.1 Conditions for Britton reductions

The idea to obtain a parallel algorithm for the word problem is to compute a Britton reduction of uv given that both u and v are Britton-reduced. For this, we have to find a maximal suffix of u which cancels with a prefix of v . The following lemma is our main tool for finding the longest canceling suffix. It is important to note that for all suffixes the conditions can be checked in parallel.

► **Lemma 47.** *Let $w = \beta_1(r, m)\beta_2 x \beta_2^{-1}(s, n)\beta_1^{-1} \in \Delta^*$ with $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in \{b, b^{-1}\}$ such that $\beta_1(r, m)\beta_2$ and $\beta_2^{-1}(s, n)\beta_1^{-1}$ both are Britton-reduced and $\beta_2 x \beta_2^{-1} =_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} (q, k) \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$ (in particular, $k = 0$ and $q \in \mathbb{Z}$, or $q = 0$).*

Then $w \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$ if and only if the respective condition in the following table is satisfied. Moreover, if $w \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$, then $w =_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} \hat{w}$ according to the last column of the table.

β_1	β_2	Condition	\hat{w}
b	b	$r + 2^{m+k} s \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad m + n + k = 0$	$(0, r + 2^{-n} s)$
b	b^{-1}	$r + 2^m(q + s) \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad m + n = 0$	$(0, r + 2^m(q + s))$
b^{-1}	b	$r + 2^{m+k} s = 0$	$(n + \log(\frac{-r}{s}), 0)$
b^{-1}	b^{-1}	$r + 2^m(q + s) = 0$	$(m + n, 0)$

Notice that in the case $\beta_1 = b^{-1}$ and $\beta_2 = b$, we have $r \neq 0$ and $s \neq 0$.

► **Example 48.** Let us illustrate with two examples how to read Lemma 47. For this, let $w = \beta_1(r_1, m_1)\beta_2 x \beta_2^{-1}(s_1, n_1)\beta_1^{-1} \in \Delta^*$ with the same properties as in Lemma 47, in particular, $\beta_2 x \beta_2^{-1} =_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} (q, k) \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$.

We first consider the case that $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = b$. To check if $w \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$ we have to check if $m_1 + n_1 + k = 0$ and if $r_1 + 2^{m_1+k} \cdot s_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ according to Lemma 47. In order to obtain a formula for k , we apply Lemma 47 to $\beta_2 x \beta_2^{-1}$ using the rightmost column. We write

$$(q, k) =_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} \beta_2 x \beta_2^{-1} = \beta_2(r_2, m_2) \beta_3 x' \beta_3^{-1}(s_2, n_2) \beta_2^{-1}. \quad (2)$$

For our example let us assume that $\beta_3 = b$. Then according to Lemma 47, $(q, k) = (0, r_2 + 2^{-n_2} \cdot s_2)$. Hence, $w \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$ if and only if $m_1 + n_1 + (r_2 + 2^{-n_2} \cdot s_2) = 0$ and $r_1 + 2^{m_1+r_2+2^{-n_2} \cdot s_2} \cdot s_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$. If both conditions are satisfied, we know that $w =_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} (0, r_1 + 2^{-n_1} s_1)$.

Now let us consider a more difficult case. Assume that $\beta_1 = b^{-1}$ and $\beta_2 = b$. According to Lemma 47, $w \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$ if and only if $r_1 + 2^{m_1+k} s_1 = 0$. To obtain a formula for k , we apply again Lemma 47 using the rightmost column. We again write $(q, k) =_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} \beta_2 x \beta_2^{-1}$ as in (2), but here we assume that $\beta_3 = b^{-1}$. As we assumed $\beta_2 = b$, we have by the last column in Lemma 47 that

$$(q, k) =_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} \beta_2 x \beta_2^{-1} = \beta_2(r_2, m_2) \beta_3 x' \beta_3^{-1}(s_2, n_2) \beta_2^{-1} =_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} (0, r_2 + 2^{m_2}(q' + s_2))$$

if $\beta_3 x' \beta_3^{-1} =_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} (q', k') \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$. This means that $k = r_2 + 2^{m_2}(q' + s_2)$. Now we have to find a formula for q' . We write

$$(q', k') =_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} \beta_3 x' \beta_3^{-1} = \beta_3(r_3, m_3) \beta_4 x'' \beta_4^{-1}(s_3, n_3) \beta_3^{-1}.$$

We assume $\beta_4 = b$. Then according to Lemma 47 we obtain that $q' = n_3 + \log\left(\frac{-r_3}{s_3}\right)$. This implies that $k = r_2 + 2^{m_2} \cdot (n_3 + \log\left(\frac{-r_3}{s_3}\right) + s_2)$. So, to check whether $w \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$, we have to check if

$$r_1 + 2^{m_1+r_2+2^{m_2} \cdot (n_3 + \log\left(\frac{-r_3}{s_3}\right) + s_2)} \cdot s_1 = 0.$$

If this is the case, then $w =_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} \left(n_1 + \log\left(\frac{-r_1}{s_1}\right), 0\right)$.

Proof of Lemma 47. We distinguish the two cases $\beta_2 = b$ and $\beta_2 = b^{-1}$. Each case consists of two sub-cases depending on β_1 .

Case $\beta_2 = b$: Since $\beta_2 x \beta_2^{-1} \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$, we have $\beta_2 x \beta_2^{-1} =_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} (0, k)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (r, m) \beta_2 x \beta_2^{-1}(s, n) &=_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} (r, m)(0, k)(s, n) \\ &=_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} (r, m+k)(s, n) \\ &=_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} (r + 2^{m+k} s, m+k+n). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if $\beta_1 = b$, we have $w \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$ if and only if $r + 2^{m+k} s \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $m+n+k=0$. Moreover, if the latter conditions are satisfied, we have $w =_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} b(r + 2^{m+k} s, 0) b^{-1} = b(r + 2^{-n} s, 0) b^{-1} =_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} (0, r + 2^{-n} s)$.

On the other hand, if $\beta_1 = b^{-1}$, it follows that $w \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$ if and only if $r + 2^{m+k} s = 0$. Notice that in this case, by the assumption that $\beta_1(r, m) \beta_2$ and $\beta_2^{-1}(s, n) \beta_1^{-1}$ are Britton-reduced, we have $r \neq 0$ and $s \neq 0$. Therefore, if the condition $r + 2^{m+k} s = 0$ is satisfied, we have $k = \log\left(\frac{-r}{2^m s}\right)$. Hence, under this condition, we have $w =_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} b^{-1}(0, m+k+n) b = b^{-1}(0, m + \log\left(\frac{-r}{2^m s}\right) + n) b =_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} (n + \log\left(\frac{-r}{s}\right), 0)$ (because $\log\left(\frac{-r}{2^m s}\right) = \log\left(\frac{-r}{s}\right) - m$).

Case $\beta_2 = b^{-1}$: In this case, we do a similar computation:

$$\begin{aligned} (r, m)\beta_2 x \beta_2^{-1}(s, n) &=_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} (r, m)(q, 0)(s, n) \\ &=_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} (r, m)(q + s, n) \\ &=_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} (r + 2^m(q + s), m + n) \end{aligned}$$

with $q \in \mathbb{Z}$. Again, let us consider the case $\beta_1 = b$ first. In this case we have $w \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$ if and only if $r + 2^m(q + s) \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $m + n = 0$. If these conditions are satisfied, we have $w =_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} b(r + 2^m(q + s), 0)b^{-1} =_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} (0, r + 2^m(q + s))$.

Finally, if $\beta_1 = b^{-1}$, it follows that $w \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$ if and only if $r + 2^m(q + s) = 0$. If this applies, we have $w =_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} b^{-1}(r + 2^m(q + s), m + n)b =_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} (m + n, 0)$. ◀

Let us fix the following notation for elements $v, w \in \mathbf{G}_{1,2}$ written as words over Δ :

$$u = (r_h, m_h)\beta_h \cdots (r_1, m_1)\beta_1(r_0, m_0), \quad v = (s_0, n_0)\tilde{\beta}_1(s_1, n_1) \cdots \tilde{\beta}_\ell(s_\ell, n_\ell) \quad (3)$$

with $(r_j, m_j), (s_j, n_j) \in \mathbb{Z}[1/2] \times \mathbb{Z}$ and $\beta_j, \tilde{\beta}_j \in \{b, b^{-1}\}$. We define

$$uv[i, j] = \beta_i(r_{i-1}, m_{i-1}) \cdots \beta_1(r_0, m_0) (s_0, n_0)\tilde{\beta}_1 \cdots (s_{j-1}, n_{j-1})\tilde{\beta}_j.$$

Notice that as an immediate consequence of Britton's Lemma we obtain that, if u and v as in (3) are Britton-reduced and $uv[i, i] \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$ for some i , then also $uv[j, j] \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$ for all $j \leq i$. Moreover, uv is Britton-reduced if and only if $\beta_1(r_0, m_0)(s_0, n_0)\tilde{\beta}_1 \notin \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$.

For $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ let \mathcal{X}_ℓ denote some set of ℓ variables. Denote by $\text{PowExp}(\mathcal{X}_\ell)$ the set of expressions which can be made up from the variables \mathcal{X}_ℓ using the operations $+$, $-$, $(r, s) \mapsto r \cdot 2^s$ if $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ (and undefined otherwise), and $(r, s) \mapsto \log(r/s)$ if $\log(r/s) \in \mathbb{Z}$ (and undefined otherwise).

► **Lemma 49.** *For every $\vec{\beta} \in \{b, b^{-1}, \perp\}^4$ there are expressions $\theta_{\vec{\beta}}, \xi_{\vec{\beta}}, \varphi_{\vec{\beta}}, \psi_{\vec{\beta}} \in \text{PowExp}(\mathcal{X}_{12})$ such that the following holds: Let $u, v \in \mathbf{G}_{1,2}$ as in (3) be Britton-reduced and assume that $uv[i-1, i-1] \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$ and $\beta_i = \tilde{\beta}_i^{-1}$ and let $V_i = \{r_j, s_j, m_j, n_j \mid j \in \{i-1, i-2, i-3\}\}$. If $\vec{\beta} = (\beta_i, \beta_{i-1}, \beta_{i-2}, \beta_{i-3})$ (where $\beta_j = \perp$ for $j \leq 0$), then*

1. $uv[i, i] \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$ if and only if $\theta_{\vec{\beta}}(V_i) \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\xi_{\vec{\beta}}(V_i) = 0$,
2. if $uv[i, i] \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$, then $uv[i, i] =_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} (\varphi_{\vec{\beta}}(V_i), \psi_{\vec{\beta}}(V_i))$.

Be aware that here we have to read the set V_i of cardinality (at most) 12 as assignment to the variables \mathcal{X}_{12} . In particular, given that $uv[i-1, i-1] \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$, one can decide whether $uv[i, i] \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$ by looking at only constantly many letters of uv – this is the crucial observation we shall be using for describing an NC algorithm for the word problem of $\mathbf{G}_{1,2}$ (see Lemma 50 below).

Proof. W.l.o.g. $i \geq 4$. We follow the approach of Example 48. By assumption we know that there exist $q, k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $uv[i-1, i-1] =_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} (q, k) \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$. According to the conditions in Lemma 47, to show Lemma 49 it suffices to find expressions $\varphi_{\vec{\beta}}(V_i), \psi_{\vec{\beta}}(V_i)$ for q and k respectively. If $(\beta_{i-1}, \beta_{i-2}) \neq (b, b^{-1})$, this follows directly from the rightmost column in Lemma 47. Otherwise, we know that $(\beta_{i-2}, \beta_{i-3}) \neq (b, b^{-1})$ and so we obtain the expressions for q and k by applying Lemma 47 to $uv[i-2, i-2]$ (note that $uv[i-2, i-2] \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$ because $uv[i-1, i-1] \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$). This proves the lemma. ◀

5.2 The algorithm

A power circuit representation of $u \in \mathbf{G}_{1,2}$ written as in (3) consists of the sequence $\mathcal{B} = (\beta_h, \dots, \beta_1)$ and a power circuit (Π, δ_Π) with markings U_i, E_i, M_i for $i \in [0..h]$ such that (U_i, E_i) is a power circuit representation of r_i (see Definition 43) and $m_i = \varepsilon(M_i)$.

► **Lemma 50.** *The following problem is in DepParaTC^0 parametrized by $\max_i \text{depth}(\Pi_i)$:*

Input: Britton-reduced power circuit representations of $u, v \in \mathbf{G}_{1,2}$ over power circuits Π_1, Π_2 .

Output: A Britton-reduced power circuit representation of $w \in \mathbf{G}_{1,2}$ over a power circuit Π' such that $w =_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} uv$ and $\text{depth}(\Pi') = \max_i \text{depth}(\Pi_i) + \mathcal{O}(1)$ and $|\Pi'| \in \mathcal{O}(|\Pi_1| + |\Pi_2|)$.

Proof. Let Π be the disjoint union of Π_1 and Π_2 . We need to find the maximal i such that $uv[i, i] \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$. This can be done as follows: By Lemma 44 one can evaluate the expressions $\theta_{\bar{\beta}}(V_i)$ and $\xi_{\bar{\beta}}(V_i)$ of Lemma 49 and test the conditions $\theta_{\bar{\beta}}(V_i) \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\xi_{\bar{\beta}}(V_i) = 0$ in DepParaTC^0 . For every i this can be done independently in parallel giving us Boolean values indicating whether $uv[i-1, i-1] \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$ implies $uv[i, i] \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$. Now, we have to find only the maximal i_0 such that for all $j \leq i_0$ this implication is true. Since $uv[0, 0] = 1 \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$, it follows inductively that $uv[i, i] \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$ for all $i \leq i_0$. Moreover, as the implication $uv[i_0, i_0] \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2} \implies uv[i_0+1, i_0+1] \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$ fails, we have $uv[j, j] \notin \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$ for $j \geq i_0+1$.

Now, using the expressions $\varphi_{\bar{\beta}}, \psi_{\bar{\beta}}$ from Lemma 49 one can compute again using Lemma 44 $(q, k) = (\varphi_{\bar{\beta}}(V_{i_0}), \psi_{\bar{\beta}}(V_{i_0})) =_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} uv[i_0, i_0]$ in DepParaTC^0 . Again using Lemma 44, we can compute in DepParaTC^0 $(s, m) = (r_{i_0}, m_{i_0})(q, k)(s_{i_0}, n_{i_0})$ as a power circuit representation over a power circuit $(\Pi', \delta_{\Pi'})$ with $(\Pi, \delta_\Pi) \leq (\Pi', \delta_{\Pi'})$, $|\Pi'| \in \mathcal{O}(|\Pi|)$ and $\text{depth}(\Pi') \in \text{depth}(\Pi) + \mathcal{O}(1)$. Now, the output is

$$(r_h, m_h)\beta_h \cdots (r_{i_0+1}, m_{i_0+1})\beta_{i_0+1}(s, m)\tilde{\beta}_{i_0+1}(s_{i_0+1}, n_{i_0+1}) \cdots \tilde{\beta}_\ell(s_\ell, n_\ell). \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

Before showing Theorem B, we prove the following slightly more general result. Recall that $\Sigma = \{1, a, a^{-1}, t, t^{-1}, b, b^{-1}\}$.

► **Theorem 51.** *The following problem is in TC^2 :*

Input: A word $w \in \Sigma^*$.

Output: A power circuit representation for a Britton-reduced word $w_{\text{red}} \in \Delta^*$ such that $w =_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} w_{\text{red}}$ and the underlying power circuit has depth $\mathcal{O}(\log |w|)$.

Proof. Let $w = w_1 \cdots w_n$ with $w_j \in \Sigma$ be some input. Since we can pad with the letter 1, we can assume $n = 2^m$ for $m \in \mathbb{N}$. The idea for the proof is simple: First, we transform each letter w_j into a power circuit representation. After that, the first layer computes the Britton reduction of two-letter words using Lemma 50, the next layer takes always two of these Britton-reduced words and joins them to a new Britton-reduced word and so on. After $m = \log n$ layers we have obtained a single Britton-reduced word. By the bound in Lemma 50, the size of the resulting power circuits stays polynomial in n and their depth in $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$. In particular, each application of Lemma 50 is in TC^1 and, hence, the whole computation is in TC^2 .

Let us detail this high-level description a bit further: For $j \in [1..n]$ we set $w_j = w_j^{(1)}$. Now for each word $w_j^{(1)}$ we construct its power circuit representation as follows: Let $(\Pi_j^{(1)}, \delta_j^{(1)})$ be a power circuit such that $|\Pi_j^{(1)}| = 1$ for $j \in [1..n]$. Then we define markings U_i, E_i and M_i as follows: If $w_j^{(1)} = a^\alpha$ for $\alpha \in \{-1, 1\}$ then $\varepsilon(U_i) = \alpha$ and $\varepsilon(E_i) = \varepsilon(M_i) = 0$. If

$w_j^{(1)} = t^\alpha$, then $\varepsilon(U_i) = \varepsilon(E_i) = 0$ and $\varepsilon(M_i) = \alpha$. If $w_j^{(1)} = \beta$ with $\beta \in \{b, b^{-1}\}$, then all markings evaluate to 0 and we set $\mathcal{B}_j^{(1)} = (\beta)$ (in all other cases we define $\mathcal{B}_j^{(1)}$ to be the empty sequence). If $w_j^{(1)} = 1$, then all markings evaluate to 0 and $\mathcal{B}_j^{(1)}$ is the empty sequence.

Now let $k \in [2..m+1]$ and $j \in [1.. \frac{n}{2^{k-1}}]$ and assume that the words $w_{2j-1}^{(k-1)}$ and $w_{2j}^{(k-1)}$ are Britton-reduced with power circuit representations over $(\Pi_{2j-1}^{(k-1)}, \delta_{2j-1}^{(k-1)})$ and $(\Pi_{2j}^{(k-1)}, \delta_{2j}^{(k-1)})$, respectively. By Lemma 50 we can construct a power circuit representation for a Britton-reduced word $w_j^{(k)}$ over a power circuit $(\Pi_j^{(k)}, \delta_j^{(k)})$ such that $w_j^{(k)} =_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} w_{2j-1}^{(k-1)} w_{2j}^{(k-1)}$ and

$$|\Pi_j^{(k)}| \leq c_s \cdot \left(|\Pi_{2j-1}^{(k-1)}| + |\Pi_{2j}^{(k-1)}| \right) \text{ and} \\ \text{depth}(\Pi_j^{(k)}) \leq c_d + \max(\text{depth}(\Pi_{2j-1}^{(k-1)}), \text{depth}(\Pi_{2j}^{(k-1)}))$$

for constants c_s and c_d . In order to bound the size and depth of these power circuits inductively, define $\Pi^{(k)}$ to be the disjoint union of the $\Pi_j^{(k)}$ for $j \in [1.. \frac{n}{2^{k-1}}]$. It follows that

$$|\Pi^{(k)}| \leq c_s \cdot |\Pi^{(k-1)}| \quad \text{and} \quad \text{depth}(\Pi^{(k)}) \leq \text{depth}(\Pi^{(k-1)}) + c_d.$$

Let $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ with $c_s \leq 2^\nu$. With $|\Pi^{(1)}| = n$ and $\text{depth}(\Pi^{(1)}) = 1$ we obtain that

$$\text{depth}(\Pi^{(k)}) \leq \text{depth}(\Pi^{(1)}) + (k-1) \cdot c_d \leq 1 + m \cdot c_d = 1 + \log(n) \cdot c_d, \quad (4) \\ |\Pi^{(k)}| \leq c_s^{k-1} \cdot |\Pi^{(1)}| \leq c_s^m \cdot n \leq (2^\nu)^{\log(n)} \cdot n = n^{\nu+1}.$$

Therefore, the size of each $\Pi^{(k)}$ is polynomial in the input size n and its depth is logarithmic in n . In particular, the same applies to the power circuits $\Pi_j^{(k)}$. Therefore, by Lemma 4, Lemma 50 yields a TC^1 circuit for computing $w_j^{(k)}$ from $w_{2j-1}^{(k-1)}$ and $w_{2j}^{(k-1)}$. For each k , all the power circuit representations of the $w_j^{(k)}$ for $j \in [1.. \frac{n}{2^{k-1}}]$ can be computed in parallel with the bound on the depth given by (4). Since we have $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ of these stages, the overall complexity is TC^2 . ◀

Proof of Theorem B. In order to decide whether $w =_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} 1$, we first compute its Britton reduction \hat{w} using Theorem 51. If \hat{w} still contains some b or b^{-1} , by Britton's Lemma, we know that $w \neq_{\mathbf{G}_{1,2}} 1$. Otherwise, $\hat{w} = (r, m) \in \mathbb{Z}[1/2] \rtimes \mathbb{Z}$ where r, m are given as their power circuit representations over a power circuit Π of depth $\mathcal{O}(\log |w|)$. According to Lemma 44, we can check in TC^1 whether $r = m = 0$. ◀

The compressed word problem. The *compressed word problem* of a group is similar to the ordinary word problem. However, the input element is not given directly but as a straight-line program. A *straight-line program* is a context-free grammar which generates exactly one word. The compressed word problem for a group G with presentation $\eta: \Sigma^* \rightarrow G$ is as follows:

Input: A straight-line program generating a word $w \in \Sigma^*$
Question: Is $w =_G 1$?

► **Corollary 52.** *The compressed word problem of the Baumslag group is in PSPACE.*

Proof. It is an easy exercise that all the circuit families we described are, indeed, LOGSPACE-uniform. In particular, the word problem of $\mathbf{G}_{1,2}$ is in LOGSPACE-uniform TC^2 . Since LOGSPACE-uniform TC^2 is contained in $\text{DSPACE}(\log^3 n)$, we can apply [4, Lemma 34] in order to obtain the corollary. ◀

6 Hardness of comparison in power circuits

The main result of this section is to show how Boolean circuits can be simulated by power circuits. This leads to P-completeness of the comparison problem for power circuits (Theorem C). In this section we consider functions computable in DLOGTIME-uniform AC^0 . The reader unfamiliar with the precise definitions might simply think of LOGSPACE-computable. We start by introducing some normalization steps for Boolean circuits.

For a Boolean circuit \mathcal{C} with input gates x_1, \dots, x_n and some $\vec{a} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ we write $\text{eval}_{\vec{a}}(\mathcal{C})$ for the evaluation of the output gate of \mathcal{C} when assigning \vec{a} to the inputs.

Elimination of And-gates. By de Morgan's rule we can simulate each AND-gate by a circuit of depth 3 using an OR-gate and NOT-gates. So for each AC-circuit \mathcal{C} of depth D there is an equivalent Boolean circuit \mathcal{C}' of depth at most $3D$ using only OR and NOT-gates such that $\text{eval}_{\vec{a}}(\mathcal{C}) = \text{eval}_{\vec{a}}(\mathcal{C}')$ for all $\vec{a} \in \{0, 1\}^n$. Moreover, the circuit \mathcal{C}' clearly can be computed in DLOGTIME-uniform AC^0 .

Layered circuits. A circuit is called layered if we can assign a level number to each gate such that input gates are on level 0 and gates on level k only receive inputs from level $k - 1$.

Given an arbitrary AC-circuit \mathcal{C} of depth D , we can construct a layered AC-circuit \mathcal{C}' of depth D as follows: We first make $D + 1$ copies of all gates of \mathcal{C} numbered from 0 to D . The input gates of \mathcal{C}' are the input gates in copy 0. Then we introduce wires between the gates as in the original circuit, but only between copy i and copy $i + 1$. Moreover, for $k \geq 1$ we replace an input gate in copy k by a fan-in one OR-gate which receives its input from the corresponding input gate in copy $k - 1$. The output gate of \mathcal{C}' is the output gate in copy D . So we obtain a layered AC-circuit of depth D and size $(D + 1) \cdot |\mathcal{C}|$. Because the paths that connect input gates with output gates are the same in both circuits, the new circuit evaluates to 1 if and only if this is the case for \mathcal{C} .

Notice that we also can perform this construction if D is not the exact depth but only an upper bound. Moreover, if D is given in the input, the construction can be computed in DLOGTIME-uniform AC^0 . Also note that if \mathcal{C} uses only OR and NOT-gates, then also the layered circuit will only use those gates.

► **Theorem 53.** *Let \mathcal{C} be a layered AC-circuit made of unbounded fan-in OR-gates and NOT-gates of size L and depth D and input gates x_1, \dots, x_n . There exists a power circuit (Γ, δ) with special vertices V_1, \dots, V_n and \top, A , and B satisfying the following properties:*

For $\vec{a} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ we define a graph $(\Gamma, \delta_{\vec{a}})$ where $\delta_{\vec{a}}(V_i, \top) = a_i$ and on all other nodes $\delta_{\vec{a}}$ agrees with δ . Then for all $\vec{a} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ we have

- $(\Gamma, \delta_{\vec{a}})$ is a power circuit,
- $\text{depth}(\Gamma, \delta_{\vec{a}}) = 2D + \ell + 1$ and $|\Gamma| \leq 3(L + D) + \ell + 3$,
- $P \neq Q \Rightarrow \varepsilon(P) \neq \varepsilon(Q)$ for all nodes $P, Q \in \Gamma$,
- $\varepsilon(A) \leq \varepsilon(B)$ if and only if $\text{eval}_{\vec{a}}(\mathcal{C}) = 1$.

Moreover, given \mathcal{C} , the power circuit (Γ, δ) can be computed in LOGSPACE.

Note that if each gate actually “knows” its layer (i.e., if the layer number is part of the gate number), (Γ, δ) can be computed even in DLOGTIME-uniform AC^0 .

Intuitively, Theorem 53 states that the family of power circuits $((\Gamma, \delta_{\vec{a}}))_{\vec{a} \in \{0, 1\}^n}$ simulates the circuit \mathcal{C} .

► **Corollary 54.** *Let $k \geq 1$. The following problem is in TC^k and it is hard for AC^k under AC^0 -Turing reductions:*

Input: A power circuit (Π, δ_Π) with $\text{depth}(\Pi) \leq \log^k |\Pi|$ and nodes $A, B \in \Pi$ such that for all $P \in \Pi$ the marking Λ_P is compact and for all $P \neq Q$, $\varepsilon(P) \neq \varepsilon(Q)$.

Question: Is $\varepsilon(A) \leq \varepsilon(B)$?

Corollary 54 shows that Theorem 31 is almost optimal – only the space between AC^k and TC^k is possibly for the “true” complexity of comparison in \log^k -depth power circuits.

Proof. Membership in TC^k is by Corollary 40. As in [39, Theorem 4.22] we see that $\text{AC}^k = \text{AC}^0(\text{AC}^k)$ where for a fixed circuit family the oracle gates for AC^k can be assumed to come from a fixed language in AC^k with layered circuits of depth $\varepsilon \log^k n$ for some small enough $\varepsilon > 0$. By Theorem 53 for each of these circuits there is a power circuit of depth $\log^k n$ simulating it as stated in the theorem. Thus, we can replace any of these depth- $\varepsilon \log^k n$ circuits by an oracle gate for the comparison problem in power circuits where the actual power circuit is hardwired and only depends on the input as described in Theorem 53. ◀

Proof of Theorem 53. We start with a layered AC-circuit \mathcal{C} of size L and depth D consisting of *input gates* x_i for $i = 1, \dots, n$, NOT gates, OR-gates (of fan-in at most L); one of these gates is marked as *output gate*. Each gate is on a unique level: input gates on level 0, and gates on level k only receive inputs from level $k - 1$; the output gate is on level D . We assume that the gates are numbered from 1 to L with gates 1 to n being the input gates (i.e., $g_i = x_i$ for $i \in [1..n]$).

We write $\ell = \log^*(L) + 3$. We assume that $L \geq 3$. Then the following inequalities hold for all $k \geq 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} 2L &\leq 2^L \\ 2^{L+2} &\leq \tau(\ell + k) \\ \tau(k - 1 + \ell) &\leq \tau(k + \ell)/2 - 2^{L+1} \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Invariants of $(\Gamma, \delta_{\vec{a}})$: Starting with the circuit \mathcal{C} , we design a power circuit (Γ, δ) with designated nodes V_1, \dots, V_n such that for every gate g on level k , there is some node P_g such that for all $\vec{a} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ the following inequalities hold:


$$\begin{aligned} \tau(\ell - 1) &< \varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_g}) \leq \tau(2k + 1 + \ell) - L, \\ \varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_g}) &\leq \tau(2k + \ell) - L && \text{if } \text{eval}_{\vec{a}}(g) = 0, \\ \varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_g}) &\geq \tau(2k + \ell) && \text{if } \text{eval}_{\vec{a}}(g) = 1. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Be aware that ε here denotes the evaluation in $(\Gamma, \delta_{\vec{a}})$.


Note that, in particular, if g is the output gate (which is on level D), then $\varepsilon(P_g) \geq \tau(2D + 1 + \ell)$ if and only if $\text{eval}_{\vec{a}}(g) = 1$.

The construction of (Γ, δ) :

- We first create a reduced power circuit consisting of nodes X_0, \dots, X_L such that $\varepsilon(\Lambda_{X_i}) = i$ (i.e., $\varepsilon(X_i) = 2^i$) and the successor markings Λ_{X_i} are compact.
- We create nodes $T_0, \dots, T_{2D+1+\ell}$ such that $\varepsilon(T_0) = 1$ and $\delta(T_i, T_{i-1}) = 1$ for $i \in [1..2D+1+\ell]$ and $\delta(T_i, Q) = 0$ otherwise. Then $\varepsilon(T_i) = \tau(i)$. If there exists a node X_i such that $\tau(j) = \varepsilon(X_i)$, then we set $T_j = X_i$.
- As an abbreviation, we will denote a node $T_{2k+\ell}$ by R_k for $k \in [1..D]$. Note that then $\varepsilon(\Lambda_{R_k}) = \tau(2k - 1 + \ell)$. Moreover, we write \top for T_ℓ .



■ **Figure 5** Power circuit for OR-gates.



■ **Figure 6** Power circuit for NOT-gates.

- For every $k \in [1..D]$ we create a node S_k with $\delta(S_k, R_{k-1}) = 1$ and $\delta(S_k, X_0) = -1$. So $\varepsilon(\Lambda_{S_k}) = \tau(2k - 2 + \ell) - 1$. Note that Λ_{S_k} is a compact marking and $\varepsilon(\Lambda_{S_k}) > \tau(\ell - 1)$ by the choice of L .
- For every input gate x_i we create a node V_i with $\delta(V_i, X_i) = \delta(V_i, T_{\ell-1}) = 1$. Notice that $2^L \leq 2^{\tau(\log^* L)} = \tau(\ell - 2)$, so X_i and $T_{\ell-1}$ are guaranteed to be distinct nodes and, thus, δ is well-defined. We write P_{g_i} as an alias for V_i . Note that by the definition of $\delta_{\vec{a}}$ in the theorem we have $\delta_{\vec{a}}(V_i, \top) = a_i$.
- For every OR-gate g_i with incoming edges from gates u_1, \dots, u_h we create nodes $P_{g_i}, Q_{g_i} \in \Gamma$ and set $\delta(P_{g_i}, Q_{g_i}) = 1$ and $\delta(Q_{g_i}, P_{u_j}) = 1$ for $1 \leq j \leq h$. In addition we set $\delta(Q_{g_i}, X_i) = \delta(P_{g_i}, X_i) = 1$.
- For every NOT-gate g_i on level k with incoming edge from gate u , we create a node $P_{g_i} \in \Gamma$ and set $\delta(P_{g_i}, R_k) = \delta(P_{g_i}, S_k) = 1$, and $\delta(P_{g_i}, P_u) = -1$. In addition, we set $\delta(P_{g_i}, X_i) = 1$.

Finally, we set $A = T_{2D+1+\ell}$ and $B = P_g$ where g is the output gate. Thus, once we have proved (6), we know that $\varepsilon(A) \leq \varepsilon(B)$ if and only if $\text{eval}_{\vec{a}}(\mathcal{C}) = 1$.

Size and depth bounds: Observe that for every gate g_i of \mathcal{C} we introduce at most two nodes P_{g_i} and Q_{g_i} plus the node X_i in Γ . So, by adding the number of nodes T_i and S_i plus X_0 , we obtain that $|\Gamma| \leq 3(L + D) + \ell + 3$.

In the following we define the depth of a node as the length of a longest path starting from it (i.e., the depth of Γ is the maximal depth of its nodes). Each node X_i for $i \in [0..L]$ has depth at most ℓ (see also Example 8). Each of the nodes T_k has depth k , so here we obtain nodes of depth at most $2D + \ell + 1$. The node S_k only points to the node R_{k-1} and to X_0 , so it also has depth $2k - 1 + \ell$ with $k \leq D$.

By induction we see that if g is a gate on level k , then the depth of P_g is at most $2k + \ell + 1$. Therefore, for each $\vec{a} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ the depth of $(\Gamma, \delta_{\vec{a}})$ is exactly $2D + \ell + 1$.

Complexity of the construction: The whole construction can be done in LOGSPACE: We can compute the level of each gate and the depth of the circuit in LOGSPACE just by following any path from the gate to the input gates. Since the circuit is layered this always gives the same result.

The actual construction of (Γ, δ) is straightforward: We start by creating only the nodes, without the edges. First create the nodes X_i for $i \in [0..L]$. Then we add the nodes $T_0, \dots, T_{2D+1+\ell}$, and S_1, \dots, S_D . Here we need to be careful and identify each node T_i with $X_{\tau(i-1)}$ if it exists. Since \log^* can be computed in LOGSPACE, both ℓ and this identification can be computed in LOGSPACE. Now it remains to create the nodes P_g and (only for OR-gates) Q_g corresponding to the gates, which also clearly can be done in LOGSPACE.

For every node the outgoing edges can be determined in a straightforward way from the definition.

Let us briefly outline that the construction is also in DLOGTIME-uniform AC^0 given that each gate contains its level as part of the number. In this case, the depth of the circuit can be computed as the maximum over all the levels. Now, note that for a log n -bit number i , the number $\log^* i$ can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$. Hence, ℓ can be computed in DLOGTIME and the whole construction is straightforward in AC^0 . For the identification of the nodes T_i with $X_{\tau(i-1)}$ we use again that $\log^* i$ can be computed in DLOGTIME. In particular, we can decide in DLOGTIME whether $T_i = X_j$ for given i and j . Therefore, even in DLOGTIME-uniform AC^0 we can hard-wire this identification (notice that these nodes only depend on the size L but not on the actual circuit).

Proof of (6) (correctness): Let $\vec{a} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ be some input to \mathcal{C} . Let us show Equation (6) for every power circuit $(\Gamma, \delta_{\vec{a}})$ by induction starting from the input gates (notice that Equation (6) shows that $(\Gamma, \delta_{\vec{a}})$ is a power circuit, indeed). Let $g_i = x_i$ be an input gate and first assume that $a_i = 0$. Then using (5) we obtain

$$\varepsilon(\Lambda_{V_i}) = \varepsilon(T_{\ell-1}) + \varepsilon(X_i) = \tau(\ell-1) + 2^i < \tau(\ell) - L$$

and $\varepsilon(\Lambda_{V_i}) > \tau(\ell-1)$. Now we assume that $a_i = 1$. Then again by (5) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon(\Lambda_{V_i}) &= \varepsilon(T_{\ell-1}) + \varepsilon(T_\ell) + \varepsilon(X_i) = \tau(\ell-1) + \tau(\ell) + 2^i > \tau(\ell) \quad \text{and} \\ \varepsilon(\Lambda_{V_i}) &\leq 2 \cdot \tau(\ell) + 2^L \leq \tau(\ell+1) - L. \end{aligned}$$

This shows Equation (6) for nodes $V_i = P_{g_i}$ corresponding to input gates.

Now let g_i be some OR-gate on level $k \geq 1$ with inputs from gates u_1, \dots, u_h . First assume that $\text{eval}_{\vec{a}}(u_j) = 0$ for all $j \in [1..h]$. By induction, $\varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_{u_j}}) > \tau(\ell-1)$ for all $j \in [1..h]$; hence, also $\varepsilon(\Lambda_{g_i}) > \tau(\ell-1)$. Moreover, by induction, we have $\varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_{u_j}}) \leq \tau(2k-2+\ell) - L$ for all $j \in [1..h]$ meaning that

$$\varepsilon(P_{u_j}) = 2^{\varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_{u_j}})} \leq 2^{\tau(2k-2+\ell)-L} = \tau(2k-1+\ell)/2^L \leq \tau(2k-1+\ell)/(2L).$$

The last inequality is by (5). We know that $h \leq L$, so

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon(\Lambda_{Q_{g_i}}) &= \left(\sum_{j=1}^h \varepsilon(P_{u_j}) \right) + \varepsilon(X_i) \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^h \frac{1}{2L} \cdot \tau(2k-1+\ell) \right) + 2^i \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \tau(2k-1+\ell) + 2^L \\ &\leq \tau(2k-1+\ell) - L \end{aligned} \tag{by (5)}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_{g_i}}) &= 2^{\varepsilon(\Lambda_{Q_{g_i}})} + \varepsilon(X_i) \leq 2^{\tau(2k-1+\ell)-L} + 2^i \\ &= \tau(2k+\ell)/2^L + 2^i \\ &\leq \tau(2k+\ell) - L. \end{aligned} \tag{by (5)}$$

Now assume that $\text{eval}_{\vec{a}}(u_j) = 1$ for some $j \in [1..h]$. The same argument as above also shows the bound $\varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_{g_i}}) \leq \tau(2k + 1 + \ell) - L$ in this case. Furthermore, by induction, we have $\varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_{u_j}}) \geq \tau(2k - 2 + \ell)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon(\Lambda_{Q_{g_i}}) &= \sum_{j=1}^h \varepsilon(P_{u_j}) + \varepsilon(X_i) > 2^{\tau(2k-2+\ell)} = \tau(2k - 1 + \ell) \quad \text{and} \\ \varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_{g_i}}) &= \varepsilon(Q_{g_i}) + \varepsilon(X_i) \geq 2^{\tau(2k-1+\ell)} = \tau(2k + \ell).\end{aligned}$$

Next, let g_i be a NOT-gate on level $k \geq 1$ with an incoming edge from gate u . Assume that $\text{eval}_{\vec{a}}(u) = 0$. Then, $\varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_u}) \leq \tau(2k - 2 + \ell) - L$. So $\varepsilon(P_u) \leq \tau(2k - 1 + \ell)/2^L$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_{g_i}}) &= \varepsilon(R_k) + \varepsilon(S_k) - \varepsilon(P_u) + \varepsilon(X_i) \\ &\geq \tau(2k + \ell) + \tau(2k - 1 + \ell)/2 - \tau(2k - 1 + \ell)/2^L \\ &\geq \tau(2k + \ell).\end{aligned}$$

In addition, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_{g_i}}) &= \varepsilon(R_k) + \varepsilon(S_k) - \varepsilon(P_u) + \varepsilon(X_i) \\ &\leq \varepsilon(R_k) + \varepsilon(S_k) + \varepsilon(X_i) \\ &\leq \tau(2k + \ell) + \tau(2k - 1 + \ell)/2 + 2^L \\ &\leq \tau(2k + 1 + \ell) - L.\end{aligned} \tag{by (5)}$$

Now, assume that $\text{eval}_{\vec{a}}(u) = 1$. Then by induction $\varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_u}) \geq \tau(2k - 2 + \ell)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_{g_i}}) &= \varepsilon(R_k) + \varepsilon(S_k) - \varepsilon(P_u) + \varepsilon(X_i) \\ &\leq \tau(2k + \ell) + \tau(2k - 1 + \ell)/2 - \tau(2k - 1 + \ell) + 2^L \\ &\leq \tau(2k + \ell) - \frac{1}{2} \cdot \tau(2k - 1 + \ell) + 2^L \\ &\leq \tau(2k + \ell) - L.\end{aligned} \tag{by (5)}$$

Finally, we know that $\varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_u}) \leq \tau(2k - 1 + \ell) - L$. So,

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_{g_i}}) &= \varepsilon(R_k) + \varepsilon(S_k) - \varepsilon(P_u) + \varepsilon(X_i) \\ &\geq \tau(2k + \ell) + \tau(2k - 1 + \ell)/2 - \tau(2k + \ell)/2^L \\ &\geq \frac{2^L - 1}{2^L} \tau(2k + \ell) > \tau(\ell - 1).\end{aligned}$$

Uniqueness of evaluations. It remains to show that no two nodes have the same evaluation and that each successor marking is compact. Let $P, Q \in \Gamma$. Now we have to show that $\varepsilon(P) \neq \varepsilon(Q)$ if $P \neq Q$. First, we set $\mathcal{X} = \{X_i, T_j \mid i \in [0..L], j \in [0..\ell]\}$. By construction, $\varepsilon(P) \neq \varepsilon(Q)$ if $P \neq Q$ is clear for $P, Q \in \mathcal{X}$ (independently of $\vec{a} \in \{0, 1\}^n$). We further know that $\varepsilon(P) > \tau(\ell)$ for all nodes $P \in \Gamma \setminus \mathcal{X}$ and $\varepsilon(P) \leq \tau(\ell)$ for $P \in \mathcal{X}$; so in particular, $\varepsilon(P) \neq \varepsilon(Q)$ for all nodes $P \in \Gamma \setminus \mathcal{X}$ and $Q \in \mathcal{X}$.

For $P \in \Gamma \setminus \mathcal{X}$ we can conclude that $\tau(\ell)$ divides $\varepsilon(P)$ and so $\varepsilon(P) \equiv 0 \pmod{\tau(\ell)}$ (note that $\varepsilon(P)$ is a power of two). Now let u_i be an arbitrary gate and v_j be an arbitrary OR-gate.

Considering the successor markings of the nodes P_{u_i} and Q_{v_j} we obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_{u_i}}) &\equiv 2^i \pmod{\tau(\ell)}, \\
\varepsilon(\Lambda_{Q_{v_j}}) &\equiv 2^j \pmod{\tau(\ell)}, \\
\varepsilon(\Lambda_{T_r}) &\equiv 0 \pmod{\tau(\ell)} \quad \text{for } r \geq \ell + 1, \\
\varepsilon(\Lambda_{S_k}) &\equiv -1 \pmod{\tau(\ell)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

By the choice of ℓ we know that $2^i \not\equiv \alpha \pmod{\tau(\ell)}$ for $\alpha \in \{-1, 0\}$ and $i \in [1..L]$, and $2^i \not\equiv 2^j \pmod{\tau(\ell)}$ for $i, j \in [1..L]$ and $i \neq j$. Since all nodes of Γ are of the above form (remember that for an input gate g_i we wrote $V_i = P_{g_i}$ and also R_i, \top, A and B were just aliases for other nodes), $\varepsilon(P) \neq \varepsilon(Q)$ whenever $P \neq Q$. Note that these observations hold independently of $\vec{a} \in \{0, 1\}^n$.

The successor markings of the nodes X_i, T_i, S_i are compact by construction. By (7) we have $|\varepsilon(\Lambda_P) - \varepsilon(\Lambda_Q)| \geq 2$ for all nodes $P, Q \in \Gamma \setminus (\mathcal{X} \cup \{S_1, \dots, S_D\})$ with $P \neq Q$. Moreover, $|\varepsilon(\Lambda_P) - \varepsilon(\Lambda_{X_i})| \geq 2$ for all nodes $P \in \Gamma \setminus \mathcal{X}$ and all $i \in [1..L]$. This shows that Λ_{P_i} and Λ_{Q_i} are compact for OR-gates g_i . In order to see that the successor markings of nodes corresponding to NOT-gates are compact, observe that also $|\varepsilon(\Lambda_{R_k}) - \varepsilon(\Lambda_{S_k})| \geq 2$ and $|\varepsilon(\Lambda_{P_{g_i}}) - \varepsilon(\Lambda_{S_k})| \geq 2$ for all $k \in [1..D]$ and $i \in [1..L]$. Finally, successor markings of nodes corresponding to input gates are compact because $\varepsilon(\Lambda_{X_i}) + 2 \leq L + 2 < 2^L \leq \tau(\ell - 2) = \varepsilon(\Lambda_{T_{\ell-1}}) < \tau(\ell - 1) - 2 = \varepsilon(\Lambda_{T_\ell}) - 2$. Thus, all successor markings are compact. \blacktriangleleft

6.1 P-hardness of power circuit comparison

Finally, let us apply Theorem 53 in order to prove some P-hardness results on comparison in power circuits. Here, we use LOGSPACE-reductions.

► **Corollary 55.** *The following problem is P-complete:*

Input: A power circuit (Π, δ_Π) and nodes $A, B \in \Pi$ such that for all $P \in \Pi$ the marking Λ_P is compact and for all $P \neq Q$, $\varepsilon(P) \neq \varepsilon(Q)$.
Question: Is $\varepsilon(A) \leq \varepsilon(B)$?

Note that a weaker form of this result already has been stated in the second author's dissertation [40].

Proof. Membership in P is by [30, Proposition 49] (or Corollary 40 together with the observation that the circuit family we construct is uniform). P-hardness is by Theorem 53 since the circuit value problem (with circuits of unrestricted depth) is P-complete. \blacktriangleleft

Notice that the only feature the power circuit in Corollary 55 lacks for being reduced is the sorting of the nodes. In particular, under the assumption $\text{NC} \neq \text{P}$, it is not possible to sort the nodes of a given power circuit in NC.

- **Remark 56. (a)** It is an immediate consequence of Corollary 55 that the comparison problem of two markings in a power circuit is P-complete. This is because for two nodes A and B in a power circuit (Π, δ_Π) we have $\varepsilon(A) \leq \varepsilon(B)$ if and only if $\varepsilon(\Lambda_A) \leq \varepsilon(\Lambda_B)$.
(b) If the input is given as in Corollary 55, we can check in AC^0 whether $\varepsilon(A) = \varepsilon(B)$ because this is the case if and only if $\Lambda_A(P) = \Lambda_B(P)$ for all $P \in \Gamma$ (see Lemma 19). This can be viewed as a hint that also in an arbitrary power circuit testing for equality might be easier than comparing for less than.

► **Corollary 57.** *The following problem is P-complete:*

Input: A dag Γ such that each node has a successor marking.
 Question: Is Γ already a power circuit?

Proof. The comparison problem for power circuits (Corollary 55) can be reduced to this problem in a straightforward way: As input we have a power circuit (Π, δ_Π) with two nodes $A, B \in \Pi$. Then we construct a dag as follows: We take (Π, δ_Π) and add a node R with $\delta(R, A) = 1$ and $\delta(R, B) = -1$. Then $\varepsilon(\Lambda_R) \geq 0$ if and only if $\varepsilon(A) \geq \varepsilon(B)$, and so the newly defined dag is a power circuit if and only if $\varepsilon(A) \geq \varepsilon(B)$. ◀

► **Corollary 58.** *The following problem is P-complete:*

Input: A power circuit representation of $w \in \mathbf{G}_{1,2}$.
 Question: Is $w \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$?

Proof. By [29, 11], the problem is in P since the algorithms for the word problem also work with power circuit representations as input and they can be used to decide membership in $\mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$ (this is due to Britton's Lemma). Thus, it remains to show the hardness part.

We reduce from the comparison problem for power circuits (Corollary 55). So let (Π, δ_Π) be a power circuit and let M be a marking on Π . Now we consider the word $w = b(2^{\varepsilon(M)}, 0)b^{-1} \in \Delta^*$. Then (Π, δ_Π) together with the marking M is a power circuit representation of w . For w to be in $\mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$ we need the b 's to cancel. This happens if and only if $\varepsilon(M) \geq 0$. So, $w \in \mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$ if and only if $\varepsilon(M) \geq 0$. ◀

As a last result, let us state a straightforward lower bound for the problem of checking two markings for equality. Note that here we even need an arbitrary power circuit as input and cannot restrict it as in Corollary 55.

► **Proposition 59.** *The following problem is NL-hard:*

Input: Given a power circuit and markings M, K .
 Question: Is $\varepsilon(M) = \varepsilon(K)$?

Proof. Reduce the s - t -connectivity problem for dags to this problem. Given a dag $G = (V, E)$ and vertices $s, t \in V$ make two copies of this graph and add a label $+1$ to every edge. In one copy of G add an additional node P and an edge (t, P) . Let s_1, s_2 denote the two copies of s . Then $\varepsilon(s_1) = \varepsilon(s_2)$ if and only if there is no path from s to t in G . ◀

7 Conclusion

We showed that the word problem of the Baumslag group can be solved in TC^2 . The proof relies on the fact that all power circuits used during the execution of the algorithm have logarithmic depth. The comparison problem for such power circuits is in TC^1 , although for arbitrary power circuits it is P-complete. We conclude with some open problems:

- Is it possible to reduce the complexity of the word problem of the Baumslag group any further – e.g. to find a LOGSPACE algorithm?
- Can we prove some non-trivial lower bounds (the word problem is NC^1 -hard as $\mathbf{G}_{1,2}$ contains a non-abelian free group [34])?
- The problem of comparing two markings on a power circuit for equality is NL-hard – is it also P-complete like comparison with less than?

- Is the word problem of the Baumslag group with power circuit representations as input P-complete? (By Corollary 58 this holds for the subgroup membership problem for $\mathbf{BS}_{1,2}$ in $\mathbf{G}_{1,2}$. Moreover, as a consequence of Proposition 59, this variant of the word problem is NL-hard.)
- By Corollary 54 for every k the comparison problem for power circuits of depth $\log^k n$ is in \mathbf{TC}^k and hard for \mathbf{AC}^k under \mathbf{AC}^0 -Turing reductions. Thus, the question remains whether, indeed, this problem is complete for \mathbf{TC}^k under \mathbf{AC}^0 -Turing-reductions.

References

- 1 Carme Álvarez and Birgit Jenner. A very hard log-space counting class. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 107(1):3–30, 1993. doi:10.1016/0304-3975(93)90252-0.
- 2 Sanjeev Arora and Boaz Barak. *Computational Complexity - A Modern Approach*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- 3 Owen Baker. The conjugacy problem for Higman’s group. *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.*, 30(6):1211–1235, 2020. doi:10.1142/S0218196720500393.
- 4 Laurent Bartholdi, Michael Figelius, Markus Lohrey, and Armin Weiß. Groups with ALOGTIME-hard word problems and PSPACE-complete circuit value problems. In *35th Computational Complexity Conference, CCC 2020, July 28-31, 2020, Saarbrücken, Germany (Virtual Conference)*, volume 169 of *LIPICs*, pages 29:1–29:29. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.CCC.2020.29.
- 5 G. Baumslag, A. G. Myasnikov, and V. Shpilrain. Open problems in combinatorial group theory. Second Edition. In *Combinatorial and geometric group theory*, volume 296 of *Contemporary Mathematics*, pages 1–38. American Mathematical Society, 2002.
- 6 Gilbert Baumslag. A non-cyclic one-relator group all of whose finite quotients are cyclic. *Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society*, 10(3-4):497–498, 1969.
- 7 W. W. Boone. The Word Problem. *Ann. of Math.*, 70(2):207–265, 1959.
- 8 John L. Britton. The word problem. *Ann. of Math.*, 77:16–32, 1963.
- 9 Thomas H. Cormen, Charles E. Leiserson, Ronald L. Rivest, and Clifford Stein. *Introduction to Algorithms*. The MIT Press, 3 edition, 2009.
- 10 Max Dehn. Ueber unendliche diskontinuierliche Gruppen. *Math. Ann.*, 71:116–144, 1911.
- 11 Volker Diekert, Jörn Laun, and Alexander Ushakov. Efficient algorithms for highly compressed data: The word problem in Higman’s group is in P. *International Journal of Algebra and Computation*, 22(8), 2013. doi:10.1142/S0218196712400085.
- 12 Volker Diekert, Alexei G. Myasnikov, and Armin Weiß. Conjugacy in Baumslag’s group, generic case complexity, and division in power circuits. *Algorithmica*, 74:961–988, 2016. doi:10.1007/s00453-016-0117-z.
- 13 Will Dison, Eduard Einstein, and Timothy R. Riley. Taming the hydra: The word problem and extreme integer compression. *Int. J. Algebra Comput.*, 28(7):1299–1381, 2018. doi:10.1142/S0218196718500583.
- 14 S. M. Gersten. Isodiametric and isoperimetric inequalities in group extensions. Preprint, 1991.
- 15 Graham Higman. A finitely generated infinite simple group. *J. London Math. Soc.*, 26:61–64, 1951.
- 16 I. Kapovich, A. G. Miasnikov, P. Schupp, and V. Shpilrain. Generic-case complexity, decision problems in group theory and random walks. *Journal of Algebra*, 264:665–694, 2003.
- 17 Jonathan Kausch. *The parallel complexity of certain algorithmic problems in group theory*. Dissertation, Institut für Formale Methoden der Informatik, Universität Stuttgart, 2017.
- 18 Daniel König and Markus Lohrey. Evaluation of circuits over nilpotent and polycyclic groups. *Algorithmica*, 80(5):1459–1492, 2018. doi:10.1007/s00453-017-0343-z.
- 19 Jörn Laun. Efficient algorithms for highly compressed data: The word problem in generalized Higman groups is in P. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 55(4):742–770, 2014. doi:10.1007/s00224-013-9509-5.

- 20 J. Lehnert and P. Schweitzer. The co-word problem for the Higman-Thompson group is context-free. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 39:235–241, 2007. URL: <http://blms.oxfordjournals.org/content/39/2/235.abstract>, doi:10.1112/blms/bd1043.
- 21 Richard J. Lipton and Yechezkel Zalcstein. Word problems solvable in logspace. *J. ACM*, 24:522–526, 1977.
- 22 Markus Lohrey. Decidability and complexity in automatic monoids. *International Journal of Foundations of Computer Science*, 16(4):707–722, 2005.
- 23 Markus Lohrey. *The Compressed Word Problem for Groups*. Springer Briefs in Mathematics. Springer, 2014. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-0748-9>.
- 24 Roger Lyndon and Paul Schupp. *Combinatorial Group Theory*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer, 2001. First edition 1977.
- 25 Wilhelm Magnus. Das Identitätsproblem für Gruppen mit einer definierenden Relation. *Mathematische Annalen*, 106:295–307, 1932.
- 26 Wilhelm Magnus, Abraham Karrass, and Donald Solitar. *Combinatorial Group Theory*. Dover, 2004.
- 27 Caroline Mattes and Armin Weiß. Parallel algorithms for power circuits and the word problem of the Baumslag group. In Filippo Bonchi and Simon J. Puglisi, editors, *46th International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science, MFCS 2021, August 23-27, 2021, Tallinn, Estonia*, volume 202 of *LIPICs*, pages 74:1–74:24. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.MFCS.2021.74.
- 28 Alexei Miasnikov and Andrey Nikolaev. On parameterized complexity of the word search problem in the Baumslag-Gersten group. In *ISSAC '20: International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation, Kalamata, Greece, July 20-23, 2020*, pages 360–363, 2020. doi:10.1145/3373207.3404042.
- 29 Alexei G. Myasnikov, Alexander Ushakov, and Won Dong-Wook. The Word Problem in the Baumslag group with a non-elementary Dehn function is polynomial time decidable. *Journal of Algebra*, 345:324–342, 2011. URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0021869311004492>.
- 30 Alexei G. Myasnikov, Alexander Ushakov, and Won Dong-Wook. Power circuits, exponential algebra, and time complexity. *International Journal of Algebra and Computation*, 22(6):3–53, 2012.
- 31 Alexei G. Myasnikov and Sasha Ushakov. Cryptography and groups (CRAG). Software Library. URL: <http://www.stevens.edu/algebraic/downloads.php>.
- 32 P. S. Novikov. On the algorithmic unsolvability of the word problem in group theory. *Trudy Mat. Inst. Steklov*, pages 1–143, 1955. In Russian.
- 33 A. N. Platonov. Isoperimetric function of the Baumslag-Gersten group. *Vestnik Moskov. Univ. Ser. I Mat. Mekh.*, 3:12–17, 2004. Russian. Engl. transl. Moscow Univ. Math. Bull. 59 (3) (2004), 12–17.
- 34 David Robinson. *Parallel Algorithms for Group Word Problems*. PhD thesis, University of California, San Diego, 1993.
- 35 Mark V. Sapir, Jean-Camille Birget, and Eliyahu Rips. Isoperimetric and Isodiametric Functions of Groups. *Ann. Math.*, 156(2):345–466, 2002.
- 36 A. L. Semenov. Logical theories of one-place functions on the natural number series. *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.*, 47(3):623–658, 1983.
- 37 Hans-Ulrich Simon. Word problems for groups and contextfree recognition. In *Proceedings of Fundamentals of Computation Theory (FCT'79), Berlin/Wendisch-Rietz (GDR)*, pages 417–422. Akademie-Verlag, 1979.
- 38 Stephen D. Travers. The complexity of membership problems for circuits over sets of integers. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 369(1-3):211–229, 2006. doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2006.08.017.
- 39 Heribert Vollmer. *Introduction to Circuit Complexity*. Springer, Berlin, 1999.
- 40 Armin Weiß. *On the Complexity of Conjugacy in Amalgamated Products and HNN Extensions*. Dissertation, Institut für Formale Methoden der Informatik, Universität Stuttgart, 2015.

- 41 Armin Weiß. A logspace solution to the word and conjugacy problem of generalized Baumslag-Solitar groups. In *Algebra and Computer Science*, volume 677 of *Contemporary Mathematics*, pages 185–212. American Mathematical Society, 2016.

