



On the complexity of enumerating ordered sets

Oded Goldreich
 Department of Computer Science
 Weizmann Institute of Science
 Rehovot, ISRAEL.
 oded.goldreich@weizmann.ac.il

November 28, 2024

Abstract

We consider the complexity of enumerating ordered sets, defined as solving the following type of a computational problem: For a predetermined ordered set, given $i \in \mathbb{N}$, one is required to answer with the i^{th} member of the set (according to the predetermined order).

Our focus is on countable sets such as the primes and the rational numbers, although in these cases we provide no decisive answers. In general, we do not report of any exciting results, but rather make a few observations and suggest some open problems.

A preliminary version of this paper has appeared as TR23-134 of *ECCC*.

Contents

1	Introduction and Overview	1
1.1	The strict notion	2
1.2	The amortized notion	5
1.3	Organization	6
2	The Strict Notion: More Details	6
2.1	Generalization of Theorem 1.5	7
2.2	Additional enumeration problems	9
3	The Amortized Notion: More Details	12
4	An Average Case Notion	14
5	Open Problems (a compilation)	16
	Acknowledgments	18
	Bibliography	18

1 Introduction and Overview

Most studies of the “complexity of enumeration” refer to enumerating the solutions to search problems (see, e.g., [8, 4]). Specifically, for a fixed relation $R \subseteq \{0, 1\}^* \times \{0, 1\}^*$, given an input x , the task is to find *all* solutions to x (i.e., all elements of the set $R(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{y : (x, y) \in R\}$), and the main complexity measure considered is the “delay” (i.e., time spent between outputting two consecutive solutions).¹ In particular, typically, the order in which these elements are generated is at the discretion of the algorithm’s designer.²

The last point holds also with respect to previous studies of the problem of enumerating (or generating) the elements of some combinatorial sets (see, e.g., [10, Sec. 7.2]).³ For example, on input $n \in \mathbb{N}$, one may be asked to generate *all* permutations over $[n] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, whereas the order in which these permutations are generated is typically left to the algorithm’s designer. In fact, the various algorithms suggested in [10, Sec. 7.2.1.2] are aimed at optimizing various “complexity” criteria.

In contrast, by *enumerating ordered sets* we mean enumerating the elements in a single *ordered* (countable) set *according to the predetermined* (total) *order*. Furthermore, we are interested in the *generation of individual elements* according to their location in the predetermined order. Specifically, for a fixed set $S \subseteq \{0, 1\}^*$ and a fixed order on strings (e.g., the lexicographical order), we consider the task in which, given $i \in \mathbb{N}$, one is required to output the i^{th} element in S , denoted $\text{enm}_S(i)$. We consider two notions of complexity, but our focus is on the first (i.e., strict) one.

A strict notion: Here, the complexity of enumerating S is defined as the complexity of computing the function $\text{enm}_S : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$, where (as usual) elements of \mathbb{N} are presented in binary notation.

Typically (but not always), this notion is closely related to the complexity of counting the number of elements in S that precede a given string (according to the predetermined order): See Theorem 1.5.

An amortized notion: Here, we actually consider the time complexity of producing the list of the first i elements, when given $i \in \mathbb{N}$; that is, affecting the mapping $i \mapsto (\text{enm}_S(1), \dots, \text{enm}_S(i))$. Dividing the total time by i yield a notion of *amortized complexity*.

We stress that information generated while producing the first $i - 1$ elements can be used when producing the i^{th} element. A more stringent notion may refer to the *average time* it takes to evaluate enm_S on the first i numbers.

We mention that the aforementioned works (e.g., [4, 8, 10]) are focused on computing the successive function (according to an order that is chosen by the algorithm’s designer). We stress that the complexity of computing the successive function does not yield good upper bounds on the (strict) complexity of computing the corresponding enumeration function.

Our main point is that, while in some cases the order in which elements are enumerated is immaterial, there are cases in which a natural (predetermined) order matters. This is most evident

¹In addition, one also considers the time to generate the first solution and the time to determine that no additional solution exists. Conceptually, we view these as special cases of the main complexity measure (i.e., “delay”).

²We mention that both [8] and [10] refer to cases in which enumeration is according to a natural order (e.g., the lexicographic one), but they seem to view it as an extra feature.

³Given the vast volume of [10, Sec. 7.2], which spans more than 230 pages, it is possible that facts such as Observation 1.3 appear there.

in the case of enumerating “naturally” ordered sets such as the prime numbers and the rational numbers. More generally, in many cases, it is natural to require that elements having shorter description be enumerated before elements having longer description.

Another important point is that we focus on a single countable ordered set rather than on a countable sequence of finite sets. The reason that this technical difference matters is that the enumeration task is stated in terms of a single order, which is an order on the elements not on the sets. Specifically, given $i \in \mathbb{N}$, one is asked to return the i^{th} element in the ordered set (or the i first elements in the case of amortize complexity). In contrast, when considering a countable sequence of finite sets, one is asked to produce all elements in one of these sets, and is not required to figure out (implicitly) the number of elements in all prior sets (see Remark 1.1).

1.1 The strict notion

Let us first spell out the weak relation between our focus and the focus of most prior studies.

Remark 1.1 (relation to enumerating solutions): *For a search problem $R \subseteq \{0, 1\}^* \times \{0, 1\}^*$, we consider the set $S = \{x0^{\ell(|x|)-|y|}1y : (x, y) \in R\}$, where $\ell : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is a monotonically increasing function such that $\ell(n)$ is an upper bound on the length of solutions to n -bit long instances (i.e., $|y| \leq \ell(|x|)$ for every $(x, y) \in R$). Then, the complexity of enumerating solutions to R (in the standard sense (i.e., as in [8, 4])) is upper-bounded by the complexity of enumerating S (according to the lexicographic order). Furthermore, letting $R(x) = \{y : (x, y) \in R\}$, we can generate the j^{th} string in $R(x)$ by first determining (see Theorem 1.5) the number of elements in S that precede $x0^{\ell(|x|)}1$, denoted n_x , and then finding the $n_x + j^{\text{th}}$ element in S . Note, however, that the converse does not hold.*

- *It may be harder to enumerate the solutions according to a predetermined order rather than arbitrarily (i.e., according to the order determined by the enumerator itself).*
- *It may be possible to enumerate solutions to R (i.e., enumerate $R(x)$ when given x) without determining the number of solutions to all prior instances (i.e., $\sum_{z < x} |R(z)|$).*

Note that enumerating (or generating) the elements of some combinatorial set (e.g., [10, Sec. 7.2]) can be cast as a search problem.⁴

Using the fact that efficiently enumerating an ordered set implies efficiently counting the number of elements in the set that precede a given string (see Theorem 1.5), it follows that *some enumeration problems are #P-hard*: This holds for the enumeration problem of a set S that is defined as in Remark 1.1 based on any search problem R for which counting the number of solutions is #P-hard.

Some examples. In contrast to Remark 1.1, we focus on the enumeration of “natural” countable sets, of the type that appear in standard Math textbooks. In order to emphasize this focus as well as offer a complexity-theoretic perspective on traditional claims of countability, we spell out a few simple examples, listing them according to the complexity of enumeration.

1. Enumerating \mathbb{N} itself. This task is, of course, trivial, since $\text{enm}_{\mathbb{N}}(i) = i$.

⁴Typically, on input n , one is required to generate all elements of a finite set S_n . This can be captured by the search problem R such that $(x, y) \in R$ if and only if $y \in S_{|x|}$ (or, alternatively, by the search problem $\{(1^n, y) : n \in \mathbb{N} \wedge y \in S_n\}$).

2. Enumerating the even natural numbers. This task is almost trivial (i.e., it is in \mathcal{NC}^0), since $\text{enm}_{2\mathbb{N}}(i) = 2i$, which means that the algorithm amounts to appending a zero.
3. Enumerating the odd natural numbers. Here, given i we need to compute $2i - 1$, which is slightly less trivial than computing $2i$ (e.g., it is in \mathcal{AC}^0 but not in \mathcal{NC}^0).
4. Enumerating all (natural numbers that are) squares. Here, given i we need to compute i^2 . This is clearly feasible; it is in \mathcal{NC}_1 (but not in $\mathcal{AC}^0[p]$ for any fixed prime p).⁵
5. Enumerating all (natural number that are) powers of two. Here, given i we need to compute 2^i , which means that the output length is exponential in the input length. This is clearly infeasible (i.e., cannot be done in polynomial time).

Examples 1–4 illustrate a fine complexity hierarchy among enumeration problems. In contrast to them, Example 5 illustrates an enumeration problem that requires exponential time, but this lower bound is due to the extreme sparsity of the target set (to be enumerated): the i^{th} element in it has length $i + 1 > 2^{|i|-1}$. A much more natural enumeration problem that seems very hard, although it is dense, is presented next.

Observation 1.2 (enumerating the prime numbers): *Enumerating the set of all prime numbers, according to their size, seems infeasible, because this problem is computationally equivalent to counting the number of primes that are smaller than a given natural number (see Theorem 1.5). The best known algorithm for the latter problem runs in exponential-time (see [7] and the references therein). We stress that the i^{th} prime number is of length $|i| + o(|i|)$, so (unlike in Example 5) the perceived difficulty of the enumeration task is not due to the length of the desired output.*

Before proceeding let us comment on the choice of the predetermined order. In general, we think of this order as being determined by the ‘user’ (i.e., the application) rather than by the algorithm’s designer. Furthermore, in some cases, standard (and natural) orders are extremely appealing.

Some standard orders. In the case of the natural numbers, the standard order is indeed the one according to which the natural numbers are actually defined (i.e., by use of the successive function). In the case of the set of all strings, the standard order is the lexicographical one (in which longer strings appear after shorter ones, and the bit 1 appears after the bit 0). Needless to say, these two standard orders (almost) coincide under the standard representation of natural numbers by binary strings.⁶ When moving to t -tuples of natural numbers, a standard choice is that (m_1, \dots, m_t) precedes (n_1, \dots, n_t) if either $\sum_{i \in [t]} m_i < \sum_{i \in [t]} n_i$ or $\sum_{i \in [t]} m_i = \sum_{i \in [t]} n_i$ and for some $t' \in [t - 1]$ it holds that $m_{t'} < n_{t'}$ and $m_i = n_i$ for all $i \in [t' - 1]$. This order is used in standard texts that seek enumeration of \mathbb{N}^t , and we call it the **standard order of t -tuples**.

Observation 1.3 (enumerating tuples of natural numbers): *For any $t \in \mathbb{N}$, the set of t -tuples ordered according to the foregoing standard order can be enumerated in polynomial time. Relying*

⁵Note that integer multiplication is \mathcal{AC}^0 -reducible to squaring, whereas integer multiplication is not in $\mathcal{AC}^0[p]$. The latter fact holds because, for any prime $q \neq p$, *addition mod q* , which is hard for $\mathcal{AC}^0[p]$, is \mathcal{AC}^0 -reducible to integer multiplication.

⁶Actually, the most straightforward way of representing the natural numbers by (non-empty) strings avoids the 1-bit long string 0. Alternatively, $\mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ corresponds to $\{0, 1\}^+$. Yet another correspondence is of \mathbb{N} with $\{0, 1\}^*$ (when dropping the leading 1 in the binary representation of numbers).

again on Theorem 1.5, the key observation is that for every $s \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t' \in \mathbb{N}$, the cardinality of the set

$$N_{s,t'} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ (q_1, \dots, q_{t'}) \in \mathbb{N}^{t'} : \sum_{i \in [t']} q_i = s \right\} \quad (1)$$

is $N_{s,t'} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \binom{s-1}{t'-1}$, which is a polynomial of degree $t' - 1$ in s with coefficients that only depend on t' . Hence, given $\bar{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_t)$, we can compute the number of t -tuples preceding \bar{a} in polynomial time, since this number can be represented by a polynomial of degree t in the a_i 's with coefficients that only depend on t (or rather as a sum of t bivariate polynomials of degree t in some partial sums of the a_i 's (with coefficients that only depend on t)).⁷

We are often interested in enumerating an easily recognizable subset of the set of t -tuples of natural numbers (e.g., ordered pairs representing the positive rational numbers). In light of Remark 1.1 (as well as Observation 1.2), this may not be feasible, even in the case of $t = 1$ (when insisting on the standard order).

On enumerating the rational numbers. Indeed, how about enumerating the positive rational numbers? Specifically, we associate the rational numbers with ordered pairs of natural numbers that are relatively prime, and seek to enumerate the set of these pairs according to the standard order of pairs (used in Observation 1.3).

An efficient algorithm for generating all rational numbers was presented in [2], but it generates these numbers in an order that is fundamentally different from the foregoing standard order. Specifically, the i^{th} rational number in the order defined by this algorithm is $f(i)/f(i+1)$ such that $f(1) = f(2) = 1$ whereas $f(2j+1) = f(j)$ and $f(2j+2) = f(j) + f(j+1)$. Observing that, for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, the values $f(i+1)$ and $f(i)$ are easily computed from $f(\lceil i/2 \rceil)$ and $f(\lceil i/2 \rceil - 1)$, the efficiency of enumeration follows. For example, the ten first rational numbers in this order are

$$\frac{1}{1} \quad \frac{1}{2} \quad \frac{2}{1} \quad \frac{1}{3} \quad \frac{3}{2} \quad \frac{3}{1} \quad \frac{1}{4} \quad \frac{4}{3} \quad \frac{3}{5} \quad \frac{5}{2}$$

Furthermore, observing that $f(2^k - 1) = 1$ and $f(2^k) = k$, it follows that the 2^k th rational number in this order is $1/k$, which means that for $i = 2^k$ the length of the i^{th} pair is logarithmic in the length of the index (i.e., $|k| = \log_2 |i|$).

In contrast, we wish to enumerate pairs $(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ such that $\gcd(a, b) = 1$ but do so such that (a, b) appears before (a', b') if $a + b < a' + b'$. (Note that the i^{th} rational number in this order has description length $\Theta(|i|)$.) A key observation is that, for every integer $s \geq 2$, the set $\{(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : a + b = s \wedge \gcd(a, b) = 1\}$ is in 1-1 correspondence with the set $\{a \in [s-1] : \gcd(a, s) = 1\}$; hence, both sets have size $\varphi(s)$, where φ is Euler's function. As observed next, this suggests that it is infeasible to enumerate the rational numbers according to the aforementioned standard order.

Observation 1.4 (enumerating the rational numbers and computing Euler's function): *Consider the following three computational problems:*

⁷Specifically, for every $t' \in [t-1]$, the number of t -tuples of the form $(a_1, \dots, a_{t'-1}, b, b_{t'+1}, \dots, b_t)$ such that $b + \sum_{i \in [t'+1, t]} b_i \leq a_{t'} + \sum_{i \in [t'+1, t]} a_i$ and $b < a_{t'}$ equals $\sum_{b \in [a_{t'}-1]} \sum_{s' \in [a'-b]} N_{s', t'}$, where $a' = \sum_{i \in [t'+1, t]} a_i$. Note that $\sum_{s' \in [x]} N_{s', t'}$ is a polynomial of degree t' in x with coefficients that only depend on t' , whereas $\sum_{r \in [y]} \sum_{s' \in [x-r]} N_{s', t'}$ is a polynomial of total degree $t' + 1$ in x and y (with coefficients that only depend on t').

1. Enumerating the set $\mathbb{Q} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : \gcd(a, b) = 1\}$ according to the standard order on pairs of natural numbers; that is, computing $\text{enm}_{\mathbb{Q}}$.
2. Computing the function $s \mapsto \sum_{i \in [s]} \varphi(i)$, where φ is Euler's function.
3. Computing Euler's function (i.e., φ), which is equivalent to factoring [11, Sec. 10.4].⁸

Then, (3) is reducible to (2), and (2) is reducible to (1), where the latter reduction relies on Theorem 1.5 and the fact that $\sum_{i \in [s]} \varphi(i)$ equals the number of pairs preceding $(1, s)$.

It is not clear whether (1) is reducible to (2), and whether (2) is reducible to (3).

On enumerating the integers. In contrast, it is easy to enumerate the *integers*, when represented as ordered pairs $(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ such that $\{a, b\} \ni 1$ and (a, b) represents $a - b$, according to the standard order on pairs. The first integer in this order is 0 (represented by $(1, 1)$), whereas the $2j^{\text{th}}$ and $(2j + 1)^{\text{st}}$ integers are j and $-j$ (represented by $(j + 1, 1)$ and $(1, j + 1)$, respectively).

Enumerating versus counting. As mentioned already (see, e.g., Observation 1.2), the complexity of enumerating a set is closely related to the complexity of counting the number of members of the set that precede a given string.

Theorem 1.5 (enumerating versus counting, a special case): *For any polynomial-time recognizable set S such that the number of n -bit strings in S is at least $\exp(n^{\Omega(1)})$, the following two tasks are polynomial-time reducible to one another.*

1. On input $i \in \mathbb{N}$, output the i^{th} string in S .
2. On input $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$, output the number of strings in S that precede x .

In both cases, the order is the lexicographic one.

Theorem 1.5, which refers to the lexicographic order only, follows from more general results that refer to wide classes of orders; specifically, Theorem 2.3 asserts that efficient enumeration implies efficient counting, whereas Theorem 2.4 asserts that efficient counting implies efficient enumeration. We mention that the density and efficient recognizability conditions are used only in proving the latter direction.

Needless to say, Theorem 1.5 applies to the enumeration of the primes and of the rational numbers (discussed in Observations 1.2 and 1.4, resp.).

1.2 The amortized notion

Note that enumerating S in amortized polynomial-time means that the first i elements are produced in time $i \cdot \text{poly}(|i|) = \tilde{O}(i)$. A sufficient condition for this to happen is that the set is easily recognizable and dense.

⁸It is easy to see that factoring composites that are the product of two different primes reduces to evaluating φ on them: Letting $N = PQ$, for primes $P \neq Q$, it holds that $\varphi(N) = (P - 1) \cdot (Q - 1)$, which implies that $P + Q = N + 1 - \varphi(N)$. Hence, factoring N reduces to solving the quadratic equation $X \cdot (N + 1 - \varphi(N) - X) = N$.

Theorem 1.6 (a sufficient condition): *Suppose that the set S is polynomial-time recognizable and $|S \cap \{0, 1\}^n| \geq 2^n / \text{poly}(n)$. Then, the amortized complexity of enumerating S (according to the lexicographic order) is polynomial.*

Note that low amortized complexity of enumerating S implies (very) *weak* forms of both conditions. In particular, it requires that among the i first elements in S almost all have at most $\text{poly}(|i|)$ length, which implies $|S \cap \{0, 1\}^\ell| \geq 2^{\ell^{\Omega(1)}}$. It also implies that S can be decided in exponential time, because $x \in S$ implies that x appears among the first $2^{|x|+1}$ elements (which means that it will be produced by the enumeration within $\tilde{O}(2^{|x|+1})$ time).

Proof: The density condition implies that if the i^{th} element of S has length ℓ , then $i > |S \cap \{0, 1\}^{<\ell}| \geq 2^\ell / \text{poly}(\ell)$, which implies $2^\ell = \tilde{O}(i)$. Hence, we can afford to enumerate all strings of length at most ℓ , and output the first i elements of S . ■

Corollaries. Using Theorem 1.6, we observe that the amortized complexity of enumerating the following two ordered sets is polynomial.

1. The set of all primes (ordered according to their size).
2. The set of all positive rational numbers (represented by ordered pairs of natural numbers that are ordered as in Observations 1.3 and 1.4).

Needless to say, this stands in contrast to the perceived difficulty of enumerating these sets in the strict sense (cf. Observation 1.2 and 1.4).

1.3 Organization

Sections 2 and 3 provide more details about the notions discussed in the introduction. Specifically, Section 2 expands on the treatment of the strict notion that was discussed in Section 1.1, whereas Section 3 expands the discussion of the amortized notion provided in Section 1.2.

Section 4 addresses a tangential issue that arises naturally when discussing the amortized notion, and Section 5 provides a compilation of some open problems.

2 The Strict Notion: More Details

In this section, we formulate more rigorously the notions that were outlined in Section 1.1, generalize Theorem 1.5, and present a few additional efficient enumerations.

We start by clarifying that by an **order on strings** we mean a correspondence between the set of strings and the set of natural numbers. Hence, an arbitrary order on strings is defined by an arbitrary bijection, called a *successor* function, from $\{0, 1\}^*$ to $\{0, 1\}^* \setminus \{\alpha\}$, where α is an arbitrary string, which is the first according to this order.

Definition 2.1 (the complexity of enumeration): *For an infinite countable set $S \subseteq \{0, 1\}^*$ and an order on strings, denoted \prec , let $\text{enm}_S^\prec(i)$ denote the i^{th} element in S according to \prec ; that is, $\text{enm}_S^\prec(i) \in S$ and $|\{x \in S : x \prec \text{enm}_S^\prec(i)\}| = i - 1$. Then, the complexity of enumerating S is defined as the complexity of evaluating the function enm_S^\prec .*

For a set S and an order as in Definition 2.1, we define the (“counting”) function $\text{cnt}_S^{\prec} : \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $\text{cnt}_S^{\prec}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |\{z \in S : z \prec x\}|$; that is, $\text{cnt}_S^{\prec}(x)$ is the number of elements in S that precede x according to \prec . The following observations can be readily verified.

- For every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds that $\text{cnt}_S^{\prec}(\text{enm}_S^{\prec}(i)) = i - 1$.
- For every $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$, if $x \in S$ then $\text{enm}_S^{\prec}(\text{cnt}_S^{\prec}(x) + 1) = x$, and otherwise $x \prec \text{enm}_S^{\prec}(\text{cnt}_S^{\prec}(x) + 1)$.

Let $\text{succ}^{\prec} : \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$ denote the successor function; that is, $\text{succ}^{\prec}(x) = y$ if $x \prec y$ and $x \prec z$ implies $y \preceq z$. Then:

- For every x , it holds that $x \in S$ if and only if $\text{cnt}_S^{\prec}(x) = \text{cnt}_S^{\prec}(\text{succ}^{\prec}(x)) + 1$; otherwise (i.e., if $x \notin S$) we have $\text{cnt}_S^{\prec}(x) = \text{cnt}_S^{\prec}(\text{succ}^{\prec}(x))$.

We observe that, typically, the counting function (i.e., cnt_S^{\prec}) is in $\#\mathcal{P}$. Specifically, this holds for the lexicographic order and any set $S \in \mathcal{P}$.

Theorem 2.2 (typically, $S \in \mathcal{P}$ implies $\text{cnt}_S^{\prec} \in \#\mathcal{P}$): *Let \prec be a polynomial-time decidable order on strings (i.e., given $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^*$, we can decide in polynomial-time whether $x \prec y$ or $y \prec x$) such that $y \prec x$ implies $|y| \leq \text{poly}(|x|)$. Then, for every polynomial-time recognizable set S , it holds that cnt_S^{\prec} is in $\#\mathcal{P}$.*

Proof: Consider the search problem

$$R \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(x, y) : y \in S \wedge y \prec x\}.$$

Then, R is polynomially bounded (i.e., $(x, y) \in R$ implies $|y| \leq \text{poly}(|x|)$) and is polynomial-time recognizable, which means that $\#R$ is in $\#\mathcal{P}$. On the other hand, $\text{cnt}_S^{\prec}(x) = |\{y \in S : y \prec x\}|$ equals the number of solutions for x (w.r.t R). ■

2.1 Generalization of Theorem 1.5

The two directions of Theorem 1.5 are captured by the following two theorems, which actually generalize it. These generalizations of Theorem 1.5 impose minimal restrictions on the order \prec (hinted at by the word “typically” in the titles of Theorems 2.3 and 2.4). Needless to say, these restrictions are definitely satisfied by the lexicographic order and natural variations of it.

Theorem 2.3 (typically, enumerating S implies computing cnt_S^{\prec}): *Let \prec be a polynomial-time decidable order on strings (i.e., given $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^*$, we can decide in polynomial-time whether $x \prec y$ or $y \prec x$). Then, for any set S such that $\text{cnt}_S^{\prec}(x) \leq \exp(\text{poly}(|x|))$, computing cnt_S^{\prec} is polynomial-time reducible to computing enm_S^{\prec} .*

The condition $\text{cnt}_S^{\prec}(x) \leq \exp(\text{poly}(|x|))$ (equiv., $|\text{cnt}_S^{\prec}(x)| \leq \text{poly}(|x|)$) is obviously a necessary condition for efficiently computing cnt_S^{\prec} (regardless of the oracle we may use). We stress that this condition (which refers both to S and to \prec) is trivial in the case of the lexicographic order.

Proof: On input x , using oracle access to \mathbf{enm}_S^{\prec} (and to \prec), we perform a binary search for the largest $i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ such that $\mathbf{enm}_S^{\prec}(i) \prec x$, while relying on $\mathbf{cnt}_S^{\prec}(x) \leq \exp(\text{poly}(|x|))$. Once found, this i equals $\mathbf{cnt}_S^{\prec}(x)$, as desired. Details follow.

On input x , we maintain an interval of possible values for $\mathbf{cnt}_S^{\prec}(x)$, which is initiated to $[0, \exp(\text{poly}(|x|))]$. We proceed in iterations such that in each iteration the size of the interval shrinks by approximately a half. While the interval contains more than two integers, we pick an integer i in its (approximate) middle, check whether $\mathbf{enm}_S^{\prec}(i) \prec x$, and update the interval accordingly (i.e., if $\mathbf{enm}_S^{\prec}(i) \prec x$, then the lower bound of the interval is reset to i , and otherwise the upper bound is reset to $i - 1$). Note that checking whether $\mathbf{enm}_S^{\prec}(i) \prec x$ is performed by using oracle access to \mathbf{enm}_S^{\prec} and to \prec . Lastly, note that if $\mathbf{cnt}_S^{\prec}(x) \in \{i, i + 1\}$, then $\mathbf{cnt}_S^{\prec}(x) = i + 1$ if and only if $\mathbf{enm}_S^{\prec}(i + 1) \prec x$. ■

Theorem 2.4 (typically, for sufficiently dense and efficiently recognizable S , computing \mathbf{cnt}_S^{\prec} implies enumerating S): *Let \prec be an order on strings such that the following betweenness task⁹ can be solved in polynomial time: Given $x \prec y$, one should determine whether or not $y = \mathbf{succ}^{\prec}(x)$ (i.e., whether there exists z s.t. $x \prec z \prec y$), and in case $y \neq \mathbf{succ}^{\prec}(x)$ output a string z such that*

$$|\{w \in \{0, 1\}^* : w \prec z\}| = \alpha \cdot |\{w \in \{0, 1\}^* : w \prec x\}| + (1 - \alpha) \cdot |\{w \in \{0, 1\}^* : w \prec y\}|$$

for some $\alpha \in [0.1, 0.9]$.¹⁰ Then, for any polynomial-time recognizable set S such that $\mathbf{cnt}_S^{\prec}(x) \geq \exp(|x|^{\Omega(1)})$, computing \mathbf{enm}_S^{\prec} is polynomial-time reducible to computing \mathbf{cnt}_S^{\prec} .

The condition $\mathbf{cnt}_S^{\prec}(x) \geq \exp(|x|^{\Omega(1)})$ is shown to imply $|\mathbf{enm}_S^{\prec}(i)| \leq \text{poly}(|i|)$, which is obviously a necessary condition. Note that, in case \mathbf{succ}^{\prec} can be computed in polynomial time, deciding S is polynomial-time reducible to computing \mathbf{cnt}_S^{\prec} , because $x \in S$ if and only if $\mathbf{cnt}_S^{\prec}(x) < \mathbf{cnt}_S^{\prec}(\mathbf{succ}^{\prec}(x))$. Of course, in general, it is unlikely that computing \mathbf{cnt}_S^{\prec} is polynomial-time reducible to deciding membership in S (see Remark 1.1).

Proof: We first show that the density condition implies that $|\mathbf{enm}_S^{\prec}(i)| \leq \ell(|i|)$, for some polynomial ℓ . Specifically, suppose that $\mathbf{cnt}_S^{\prec}(x) \geq \exp(|x|^\epsilon)$, for some constant $\epsilon > 0$. Then, for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$, let $x \leftarrow \mathbf{enm}_S^{\prec}(i)$, and observe that $\mathbf{cnt}_S^{\prec}(x) = |\{z \in S : z \prec x\}| = i - 1 < i$. Hence, $\exp(|x|^\epsilon) \leq \mathbf{cnt}_S^{\prec}(x) < i$ implies $|x| \leq |i|^{1/\epsilon}$, and $|\mathbf{enm}_S^{\prec}(i)| \leq |i|^{1/\epsilon}$ follows. We now turn to the reduction itself.

On input $i \in \mathbb{N}$, using oracle access to S and to \mathbf{cnt}_S^{\prec} (and an algorithm for the betweenness task), we perform a binary search for $x \in S$ such that $\mathbf{cnt}_S^{\prec}(x) = i - 1$, while observing that this x satisfies $|x| \leq \ell(|i|) \leq \text{poly}(|i|)$. Once found, this x equals $\mathbf{enm}_S^{\prec}(i)$, as desired. Details follow.

On input i , we maintain a set of possible candidates for $\mathbf{enm}_S^{\prec}(i)$. This set is implicitly defined by two (“bounding”) strings, denoted u and v , and equals $\{z : u \preceq z \preceq v\}$. Initially, we set u to be the first string according to \prec (i.e., there exists no z s.t. $\mathbf{succ}^{\prec}(z) = u$), and $v = 0^{\ell(|i|)+1}$ (which guarantees that $\mathbf{enm}_S^{\prec}(i) \prec v$). We proceed in iterations such that in each iteration the number of candidates shrinks by a factor of at least 0.9. While $v \notin \{u, \mathbf{succ}^{\prec}(u)\}$, we use the “betweenness procedure” to pick string w in between u and v , obtain $\mathbf{cnt}_S^{\prec}(w)$, and update the foregoing bounding strings accordingly; that is, if $\mathbf{cnt}_S^{\prec}(w) \leq i - 1$, then we reset $u \leftarrow w$, and otherwise we reset to $v \leftarrow w$. If $u = v$, then $\mathbf{enm}_S^{\prec}(i) = u$ must hold, and otherwise (i.e., $v = \mathbf{succ}^{\prec}(u)$) we use the fact that $\mathbf{enm}_S^{\prec}(i) \in \{u, v\}$. (Recalling that $\mathbf{enm}_S^{\prec}(i) = x$ if and only if $x \in S$ and $\mathbf{cnt}_S^{\prec}(x) = i - 1$, we are done.) ■

⁹Be warned that this is not the computational problem that is traditional called “betweenness” (cf. [3]).

¹⁰Note that, for every $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $i \leq j + 2$, there exists $\alpha \in [1/3, 2/3]$ such that $\alpha \cdot i + (1 - \alpha) \cdot j \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{i, j\}$. The extra slackness (in α) is meant to make the computational task easier.

Deriving Theorem 1.5 as a special case. As noted upfront, the conditions made in Theorems 2.3 and 2.4 regarding \prec (i.e., being polynomial-time decidable, satisfying $\text{cnt}_S^{\prec}(x) \leq \exp(\text{poly}(|x|))$ for every S , and having an efficient betweenness procedure) hold for the lexicographic order. Hence, combining Theorems 2.3 and 2.4, we derive Theorem 1.5.

2.2 Additional enumeration problems

Continuing with the lexicographic order, we consider the lexicographic order on square Boolean matrices that is imposed by viewing the matrices as strings. Noting that the ordered set of square non-singular Boolean matrices, denoted S_{sns} , satisfies the conditions of Theorem 1.5, we infer that computing $\text{enm}_{S_{\text{sns}}}^{\text{lex}}$ is polynomial-time equivalent to computing $\text{cnt}_{S_{\text{sns}}}^{\text{lex}}$. We found it is somewhat easier to prove the following result in terms of $\text{cnt}_{S_{\text{sns}}}^{\text{lex}}$.

Proposition 2.5 (efficiently enumerating square non-singular Boolean matrices): *The function $\text{cnt}_{S_{\text{sns}}}^{\text{lex}}$ can be computed in polynomial time, where S_{sns} denote the set of square non-singular Boolean matrices.*

Proof: We mimic the standard procedure of selecting an n -by- n non-singular Boolean matrix uniformly at random. Recall that this process proceeds in iterations such that in the i^{th} iteration we select a row that is linearly independent of the previous $i - 1$ rows. The number of such choices is $2^n - 2^{i-1}$, and so the number of non-singular n -by- n matrices is

$$N_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{i \in [n]} (2^n - 2^{i-1}). \quad (2)$$

This leaves us with the problem of determining how many n -by- n non-singular matrices precede a given n -by- n matrix M . This problem reduces to determining, for each $i \in [n]$, the number of non-singular (n -by- n) matrices that precede M while agreeing with it on the first $i - 1$ rows (but not on the i^{th} row).

Hence, for each $i \in [n]$, we consider the number of non-singular n -by- n matrices that agree with the first $i - 1$ rows of M and contain an i^{th} row that precedes the i^{th} row of M . We observe that this number equals 0 if the first $i - 1$ rows of M are dependent. Denoting by $r(M)$ the maximal number r such that the first r rows of M are independent, and assuming that $r(M) > 0$ (since otherwise only singular n -by- n matrices may precede M), we denote by $\mathbb{N}^{(i)}(M)$ the number of n -bit long vectors that are independent of the first $i - 1$ rows of M and precede its i^{th} row. Then, *the number of non-singular n -by- n matrices that precede M equals*

$$\mathbb{N}(M) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i \in [r(M)]} \mathbb{N}^{(i)}(M) \cdot \prod_{j \in [i+1, n]} (2^n - 2^{j-1}), \quad (3)$$

where $\prod_{j \in [i+1, n]} (2^n - 2^{j-1})$ represents the number of possibilities for the remaining $n - i$ rows of a matrix as above. Hence, we are left with the task of computing $\mathbb{N}^{(i)}(M)$, where M is an n -by- n matrix and $i \in [r(M)]$.

Recall that $\mathbb{N}^{(i)}(M)$ denotes the number of vectors that precede the i^{th} row of M but are not spanned by the first $i - 1$ rows of M , where $i \in [r(M)]$. The key observation is that it is simpler to analyze the number of vectors that are spanned by the first $i - 1$ rows of M and precede the i^{th}

row of M . Denoting the latter number by $\bar{N}^{(i)}(M)$, we obtain $N^{(i)}(M)$ by subtracting $\bar{N}^{(i)}(M)$ from the total number of vectors that precede the i^{th} row of M .

Hence, for $k \in [n - 1]$, we consider the following problem: *given a full rank k -by- n matrix G and a n -bit vector $x = x_1 \cdots x_n$, how many of the vectors spanned by the rows of G precede x ?* (Indeed, in our application $G = G^{(i)}$ denotes the matrix that represents the first $i - 1$ rows of M , and $x = x^{(i)}$ denotes the i^{th} row of M .) Letting $z_{[t]} = z_1 \cdots z_t$, we observe that $yG \prec x$ if and only if there exists $j \in [n]$ such that $(yG)_{[j-1]} = x_{[j-1]}$ and $(yG)_j < x_j$. Hence, we have

$$|\{y \in \{0, 1\}^k : yG \prec x\}| = \sum_{j \in [n]} |\{y \in \{0, 1\}^k : (yG)_{[j-1]} = x_{[j-1]} \wedge (yG)_j < x_j\}|. \quad (4)$$

Next, observe that the j^{th} term in the r.h.s of Eq. (4) equals zero if $x_j = 0$ and otherwise it equals the number of solutions to a system of j linear equations (which are not necessarily independent or homogeneous).¹¹ Hence, we reduced the foregoing problem to determining the rank of matrices.

Conclusion. For any n -by- n matrix M it holds that

$$\text{cnt}_{\text{Ssns}}^{\text{lex}}(M) = \left(\sum_{i \in [n-1]} N_i \right) + N(M),$$

where N_i is defined in Eq. (2) and $N(M)$ is defined in Eq. (3) (unless the first row of M is 0^n , in which case $N(M) = 0$). As for computing $N^{(i)}(M)$, which appears in Eq. (3), it is easily obtained from $\bar{N}^{(i)}(M)$, which in turn is computed as detailed above (see Eq. (4) and the text surrounding it). ■

Generalization to other finite fields. The proof of Proposition 2.5 extends to any finite field, except that handling the j^{th} term in the r.h.s of Eq. (4) requires considering all values smaller than x_j . Hence, the complexity of enumeration grows linearly with the size of the finite field. Actually, we can get complexity that is linear in the characteristic of the finite field, but it is unclear whether one can do better than that.

On enumerating finite sequences of natural numbers. The set of t -tuples of natural numbers (considered in Observation 1.3) is quite a popular countable set. Another popular countable set is the set of all finite sequences of natural numbers. Recall that we defined the standard order on t -tuples of natural numbers such that the dominant term is the sum of the numbers in the tuple; that is, $(a_1, \dots, a_t) \in \mathbb{N}^t$ precedes (b_1, \dots, b_t) whenever $\sum_{i \in [t]} a_i < \sum_{i \in [t]} b_i$. Applying the same principle of sequences of varying number of elements does not seem natural, because it would mean that the n -long sequence of 1's (resp., any $n/2$ -long sequence over $\{1, 2\}$) precedes the sequence $(1, n)$. Indeed, the foregoing suggestion fails to account for the length of the sequences. In contrast, we argue that the order presented in the next result is the natural one in the current context.

Proposition 2.6 (efficiently enumerating finite sequences of natural numbers according to the length of the sequences): *Consider the set, denoted $\mathbb{N}^+ = \bigcup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{N}^t$, of finite sequences of natural numbers with respect to the following order \prec that places $(m_1, \dots, m_{t'})$ before $(n_1, \dots, n_{t''})$ if one of the following conditions hold.*

¹¹Recalling that G and x are fixed, the actual variables are the bits of y . For $\ell \in [j - 1]$, the ℓ^{th} equation is $(yG)_\ell = x_\ell$, and the j^{th} equation is $(yG)_j = 0$ (since $x_j = 1$).

1. $\sum_{i \in [t']} |m_i| < \sum_{i \in [t'']} |n_i|$, where as usual $|n| = \lceil \log_2(n+1) \rceil$.
2. $\sum_{i \in [t']} |m_i| = \sum_{i \in [t'']} |n_i|$ and $t' < t''$.
3. $t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} t' = t''$ and $\sum_{i \in [t]} |m_i| = \sum_{i \in [t]} |n_i|$ and $(|m_1|, \dots, |m_t|)$ precedes $(|n_1|, \dots, |n_t|)$ according to the standard order of t -tuples over \mathbb{N} .
4. $(|m_1|, \dots, |m_{t'}|) = (|n_1|, \dots, |n_{t''}|)$ and for some $k \in [t' - 1]$ it holds that $m_k < n_k$ and $m_i = n_i$ for all $i \in [k - 1]$.

Then, the foregoing ordered set can be enumerated in polynomial time.

The foregoing order on sequences of varying length induces an alternative order on \mathbb{N}^t . As we shall see in the following proof, it is easier to enumerate \mathbb{N}^t according to this alternative order than to do so according to the standard order (which is considered in Observation 1.3).

Proof: Again, using Theorem 2.4, we focus on computing the corresponding counting function $\text{cnt}_{\mathbb{N}^+}^{\prec}$. Given a sequence $\bar{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_t) \in \mathbb{N}^+$, we proceed as follows.

- Letting $\ell = \sum_{i \in [t]} |a_i|$, for each $\ell' \in [\ell - 1]$ and $t' \in [t]$, we compute the number of sequences $(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_{t'}) \in \mathbb{N}^{t'}$ such that $\sum_{i \in [t']} \ell_i = \ell'$. Recalling that this number equals $N_{\ell', t'} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \binom{\ell' - 1}{t' - 1}$, we can compute all these numbers (i.e., all $N_{\ell', t'}$'s for $\ell' \in [\ell - 1]$ and $t' \in [t]$) in $\text{poly}(\ell)$ -time (see Observation 1.3).

Furthermore, For each $\ell' \in [\ell - 1]$ and $t' \in [t]$, the number of sequences $(b_1, \dots, b_{t'}) \in \mathbb{N}^{t'}$ such that $\sum_{i \in [t']} |b_i| = \ell'$ equals $N_{\ell', t'} \cdot 2^{\ell' - t'}$, because the number of sequences $(b_1, \dots, b_{t'})$ that satisfy $|b_i| = \ell_i$ (equiv., $b_i \in [2^{\ell_i - 1}, 2^{\ell_i} - 1]$) for each $i \in [t']$ equals $\prod_{i \in [t']} 2^{\ell_i - 1} = 2^{\ell' - t'}$.

Hence, we can efficiently compute the number of sequences that precede \bar{a} per Condition 1, which equals

$$\sum_{\ell' \in [\ell - 1]} \sum_{t' \in [t]} N_{\ell', t'} \cdot 2^{\ell' - t'}.$$

- Similarly, we can efficiently compute the number of sequences that precede \bar{a} per Condition 2. Specifically, the number of sequences that precede \bar{a} per Condition 2 is $\sum_{t' \in [t - 1]} N_{\ell, t'} \cdot 2^{\ell - t'}$, where $\ell = \sum_{i \in [t]} |a_i|$.
- Turning to Condition 3, recall that an efficient algorithm for computing the number of sequences (ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_t) that precede $(|a_1|, \dots, |a_t|)$ was outlined in Observation 1.3 (see Footnote 7). The number of sequences that precede \bar{a} per Condition 3 is $2^{\ell - t}$ times larger.
- Lastly, we compute the number of sequences that precede \bar{a} per Condition 4; that is, we compute the number of $(b_1, \dots, b_{t'}) \in \mathbb{N}^{t'}$ such that $(|b_1|, \dots, |b_{t'}|) = (|a_1|, \dots, |a_t|)$ and for some $k \in [t - 1]$ it holds that $b_k < a_k$ and $b_i = a_i$ for all $i \in [k - 1]$. For each $k \in [t - 1]$, the corresponding number is $(a_k - 1) \cdot 2^{\ell - \sum_{i \in [k]} |a_i|}$.

Having established the fact that $\text{cnt}_{\mathbb{N}^+}^{\prec}$ can be computed in polynomial-time and wishing to invoke Theorem 2.4, we need to verify that the betweenness task can be performed in polynomial-time. Unlike in prior cases, this is non-trivial, due to the complexity of the order involved. Given $(m_1, \dots, m_{t'}) \prec (n_1, \dots, n_{t''})$, we solve the “between task” by considering the following two cases.

The case of equal length-sequences: $(|m_1|, \dots, |m_{t'}|) = (|n_1|, \dots, |n_{t''}|)$.

Letting $t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} t' = t''$ and $\ell_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |m_i| = |n_i|$ for every $i \in [t]$, we identify $k \in [t-1]$ such that $m_k < n_k$ and $m_j = n_j$ for every $j \in [k-1]$. If $m_k \leq n_k - 2$, then $(m_1, \dots, m_{k-1}, i_k, i_{k+1}, \dots, i_t)$ such that $i_k = \lfloor (m_k + n_k)/2 \rfloor$ and $i_j = \lceil 0.75 \cdot 2^{\ell_j} - 1 \rceil$ for every $j \in [k+1, t]$ is an adequate answer.¹² Otherwise (i.e., $m_k = n_k - 1$), a more careful examination of the sequences is required.

The case of different length-sequences: $(|m_1|, \dots, |m_{t'}|) \neq (|n_1|, \dots, |n_{t''}|)$.

In this case, we observe that

$$(m_1, \dots, m_{t'}) \preceq (2^{|m_1|} - 1, \dots, 2^{|m_{t'}|} - 1) \prec (2^{|n_1| - 1}, \dots, 2^{|n_{t''} - 1}| - 1) \preceq (n_1, \dots, n_{t''}).$$

Computing the value of $\text{cnt}_{\mathbb{N}^+}$ on these four sequences, we determine whether one of the two intermediate sequences can be used as a valid answer. Otherwise, a valid answer should appear inbetween one of the three adjacent pairs. The first and third subcases are handled by the previous case, and so we are left with solving the betweenness problem for the second subcase (i.e., $(2^{|m_1|} - 1, \dots, 2^{|m_{t'}|} - 1) \prec (2^{|n_1| - 1}, \dots, 2^{|n_{t''} - 1}| - 1)$).

Thus, given $(\ell'_1, \dots, \ell'_r)$ and $(\ell''_1, \dots, \ell''_s)$ such that $(2^{\ell'_1} - 1, \dots, 2^{\ell'_r} - 1) \prec (2^{\ell''_1 - 1}, \dots, 2^{\ell''_s - 1})$, we have to find (w_1, \dots, w_t) that satisfies the betweenness condition. Letting $\ell' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i \in [r]} \ell'_i$ and $\ell'' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i \in [s]} \ell''_i$, this is done by considering all possible $\ell \in [\ell', \ell'']$ and all possible $t \in [\ell]$ and $(p, q) \in [t] \times [\ell]$, which correspond to Conditions 1–3, respectively. The key observation is that the number of possibilities is polynomial in ℓ'' , which is the length of our original input (i.e., the sequences $(m_1, \dots, m_{t'})$ and $(n_1, \dots, n_{t''})$), and for each possibility the relevant computations are easy.

Indeed, the tedious details were omitted here. ■

3 The Amortized Notion: More Details

In this section, we formulate more rigorously the notions that are outlined in Section 1.2

Whereas Definition 2.1 refers to the complexity of finding the i^{th} element in a set S , here we consider the complexity of producing the list of the first i elements. This notion yield a notion of amortized complexity, but one in which information generated for producing the first $i-1$ elements can be used in producing the i^{th} element. A more stringent notion may refer to the average time it takes to evaluate enm_S^{\prec} on the first i numbers (see Section 4).

Definition 3.1 (the amortized complexity of enumeration): *For an infinite countable set $S \subseteq \{0, 1\}^*$ and an order on strings, denoted \prec , let enm_S^{\prec} be as in Definition 2.1. Then, the amortized complexity of enumerating S is defines as $T_S(i)/i$, where $T_S(i)$ is the total time it takes to produce the first i elements in S ; that is, we consider the time complexity of algorithms that, given $i \in \mathbb{N}$, output the sequence $(\text{enm}_S^{\prec}(1), \dots, \text{enm}_S^{\prec}(i))$.*

¹²The key observation is that, for every v_k , the number of $(t-k)$ -tuples $(v_{k+1}, \dots, v_t) \in \mathbb{N}^{t-k}$ such that $|v_j| = \ell_j$ (equiv., $v_j \in [2^{\ell_j - 1}, 2^{\ell_j} - 1]$) equals $\prod_{j=k+1}^t 2^{\ell_j - 1} = 2^{\ell' - (t-k)}$, where $\ell' = \sum_{j=k+1}^t \ell_j$. The argument then focuses on the worst case in which $m_j = 2^{\ell_j - 1}$ and $n_j = 2^{\ell_j} - 1$ for every $j \in [k+1, t]$.

Note that the amortized complexity of enumerating S is polynomial if and only if $T_S(i) = \tilde{O}(i) = i \cdot \text{poly}(|i|)$. We also observe that if the “successive function of S w.r.t \prec ” (i.e., the mapping $\text{enm}_S^\prec(i) \mapsto \text{enm}_S^\prec(i+1)$) can be computed in polynomial-time and $|\text{enm}_S^\prec(i)| \leq \text{poly}(|i|)$, then the amortized complexity of enumerating S is polynomial. The corresponding algorithm works by iterative invocations of the successive function (of S w.r.t \prec), and makes a modest requirement regarding the density of S (i.e., $|\text{enm}_S^\prec(i)| \leq \text{poly}(|i|)$ implies that for some constant $\epsilon > 0$ it holds that $|S \cap \bigcup_{i \in [n]} \{0, 1\}^i| \geq 2^{n^\epsilon}$). A different algorithm is used for the following result.

Theorem 3.2 (the amortized complexity of enumerating dense and efficiently recognizable sets): *For an infinite countable set $S \subseteq \{0, 1\}^*$ and the lexicographic order on strings, suppose that S is polynomial-time recognizable and that $|S \cap \{0, 1\}^n| \geq 2^n/\text{poly}(n)$ (for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$). Then, the amortized complexity of enumerating S is polynomial.*

For simplicity, we have restricted ourselves to the lexicographic order on strings, but any order \prec that is monotonically non-decreasing with the length of strings (i.e., $x \prec y$ implies $|x| \leq |y|$) will do. A more general statement appears in Theorem 3.4.

Proof: We consider an algorithm that, on input $i \in \mathbb{N}$, generates the first $\text{poly}(|i|) \cdot 2^{|i|}$ strings (in lexicographic order), determines which of these strings is in S , and outputs the i first strings that are in S . Correctness follows by the density guarantee, which implies that the initial list contains more than i elements of S (i.e., for $n = |i| + O(\log |i|)$, we have $|S \cap \{0, 1\}^n| \geq 2^n/\text{poly}(n)$, which is greater than $2^{|i|}$). The total time spend by this algorithm is $\text{poly}(|i|) \cdot 2^{|i|} \cdot \text{poly}(|i|) = \tilde{O}(i)$, which implies that the amortized complexity is $\text{poly}(|i|)$. ■

Corollary 3.3 (the amortized complexity of enumerating the primes and the rationals): *The amortized complexity of enumerating the following two sets is polynomial.*

1. *The set of all primes* (ordered according to their size).
2. *The set of all positive rational numbers* (represented by ordered pairs of natural numbers that are ordered as in Observation 1.3).

Proof: Item 1 follows by invoking Theorem 3.2, while recalling that the number of n -bit long primes is $\Omega(2^n/n)$ and using the primality tester of [1]. To establish Item 2, we need to show that the number of rationals that are represented by pairs (a, b) such that $|(a, b)| = n$ (and $\text{gcd}(a, b) = 1$) is at least $2^n/\text{poly}(n)$. This follows even by considering only pairs of the form $(p, 1)$ such that p is a prime. ■

Theorem 3.4 (a generalization of Theorem 3.2): *Suppose that \prec is an order on strings such that the amortized complexity of enumerating $U \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{0, 1\}^*$ according to order \prec is polynomial. For an infinite countable set $S \subseteq \{0, 1\}^*$, suppose that S is polynomial-time recognizable and that $|S \cap \{\text{enm}_U^\prec(i) : i \in [2^n]\}| \geq 2^n/\text{poly}(n)$ (for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$). Then, the amortized complexity of enumerating S according to \prec is polynomial.*

The restriction to orders that allow for an efficient amortized enumeration of all strings is essential. Violations of this restriction may be due to the order having huge gaps; specifically, it may be that for a fast growing function $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ there are infinitely many i 's such that $|\text{enm}_U^\prec(i)| \geq f(i)$.¹³

¹³Consider, for example, for any monotonically increasing function $g: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, an order derived from the standard lexicographic order by moving $0^{g(n)+1}$ from its standard location (right after $1^{g(n)}$) to the location right after 0^{n+1} .

Proof: We follow the proof strategy of Theorem 3.2, except that here we generate the first $\text{poly}(|i|) \cdot 2^{|i|}$ strings *according to the order* \prec . Correctness follows by relying on the modified density guarantee, which refers to the order \prec . ■

Transitivity. By a straightforward generalization of the proof of Theorem 3.4, we obtain the following.

Theorem 3.5 (a generalization of Theorem 3.4): *For infinite countable sets S, T and an order \prec on T , suppose that the amortized complexity of enumerating T according to \prec is polynomial. If S is polynomial-time recognizable and $|S \cap \{\text{enm}_T^\prec(i) : i \in [2^n]\}| \geq 2^n/\text{poly}(n)$ (for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$), then the amortized complexity of enumerating S according to \prec is polynomial.*

Note that T is *not* necessarily dense with respect to U (i.e., $|T \cap \{\text{enm}_U^\prec(i) : i \in [2^n]\}| \geq 2^n/\text{poly}(n)$ does not necessarily hold). Consider, for example, the lexicographic order and the set $T = \{x0^{|x|} : x \in T'\}$ such that the amortized complexity of enumerating T' is polynomial (e.g., T' is the set of primes).

Some “degrees of freedom”. We observe that in the current context, when given $i \in \mathbb{N}$, the ability to generate a list that contains the i first elements of the ordered set suffices (i.e., the said elements may appear in arbitrary order in that list).

Observation 3.6 (implicit in [8]): *Let \prec be a polynomial-time decidable order on strings (i.e., given $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^*$, we can decide in polynomial-time whether $x \prec y$ or $y \prec x$). Suppose that the set S is polynomial-time recognizable and there exists an algorithm that, given $i \in \mathbb{N}$, runs for $t = \tilde{O}(i)$ steps and outputs a list that contains the i first elements of S . Then, the amortized complexity of enumerating S according to \prec is polynomial. The key observation is that, using the hypothesis, we can recognize the elements of S in the list, and sort the residual list according to \prec , all within $\tilde{O}(t)$ -time.*

4 An Average Case Notion

In continuation to brief comments made in the introduction and in Section 3, we present a definition of average case complexity of enumeration problems. Following Levin [9] (see [5, Apx]), we avoid the naive formulation, and present instead the following one.

Definition 4.1 (average case complexity of enumeration):

- Let $c_A : \mathbb{N}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^*$ be an arbitrary notion of complexity of algorithm A such that $c_A(i)$ is a function of the number of steps that A takes on input i (e.g., $c_A(i)$ may be a square root of the number of steps). For (S, \prec) and enm_S^\prec as in Definition 3.1, we say that A enumerates S within average complexity $C : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ if $\sum_{i \in [n]} c_A(i)/n \leq C(|n|)$.
- Letting $t_A(i)$ denote the number of steps taken by A on input i , we say that A enumerates S in average polynomial time if for some polynomial p and a complexity measure $c_A : \mathbb{N}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^*$ it holds that $t_A(i) \leq p(c_A(i))$ and $\sum_{i \in [n]} c_A(i)/n \leq O(|n|)$.

The naive formulation being avoided uses $c_A = t_A$ and $C = p$; that is, it says that a function is polynomial on the average if its average is polynomial. Instead, we say that a function is polynomial on the average if it is polynomial in a function that is linear on the average. The point is that the alternative formulation is closed under polynomial composition, whereas the naive one is not. Actually, we believe that the notion of *typically polynomial-time* is more appealing than the notion of *average polynomial-time* (see [6, Sec. 10.2.1.1]).

Definition 4.2 (enumeration in typical polynomial-time): *For (S, \prec) and t_A as in Definition 4.1, we say that A enumerates S in typical polynomial time if for some polynomial p and some negligible¹⁴ function μ , for all n 's it holds that $|\{i \in [n] : t_A(i) > p(|i|)\}| \leq \mu(|n|) \cdot n$.*

Obviously the strict notion of polynomial-time implies the average (resp., typical) notion, which in turn implies the amortized notion. Evidence for the separation between the average (resp., typical) and the amortized notions is provided by the problems of enumerating primes and rational numbers. Recall that these two ordered sets are enumerated in amortized polynomial-time (Corollary 3.3), whereas the difficulties in enumerating them in the strict sense (cf. Observation 1.2 and 1.4) extend also to the average (resp., typical) sense. Specifically, the issue is not finding an object of an approximate desired size, which is typically easy, but rather finding an object of a specific location in the order. For example, given N , it is “typically” easy to find a prime in the interval $[N, N + \text{poly}(\log N)]$, but it is typically hard to determine the number of primes that are smaller than N (equiv., find the i^{th} prime, when given i).¹⁵

As for a separation between the strict notion of polynomial-time and the average (resp., typical) notion, we provide evidence to it by using a construction akin to Remark 1.1

Observation 4.3 (strict vs average (resp., typical) polynomial-time enumeration): *Assuming that $\#\mathcal{P}$ -complete problems cannot be solved in polynomial-time, there exists a set $S \subset \{0, 1\}^*$ that cannot be enumerated in strict polynomial-time, but can be enumerated in typical and average polynomial-time, where in all cases the enumeration is according to the lexicographic order.*

Proof: Let $R \subseteq \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$ be a $\#\mathcal{P}$ -complete search problem and let $R(x) = \{y : (x, y) \in R\}$. Note that we may assume, without loss of generality, that $y \in R(x)$ implies that $|y| = \ell(|x|)$ for some polynomial $\ell : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. Let $\chi_R(x, y) = 1$ if $(x, y) \in R$ and $\chi_R(x, y) = 0$ otherwise. Consider the set $S = S' \cup S''$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} S' &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ x0^{\ell(|x|)}1y : y \in R(x) \right\} \cup \left\{ x0^{\ell(|x|)}0y : y \in \left(\{0, 1\}^{\ell(|x|)} \setminus R(x) \right) \right\} \\ &= \left\{ x0^{\ell(|x|)}\chi_R(x, y)y : y \in \{0, 1\}^{\ell(|x|)} \right\} \\ S'' &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ xz'z'' \in \{0, 1\}^* : z' \in \left(\{0, 1\}^{\ell(|x|)} \setminus \{0^{\ell(|x|)}\} \right) \wedge z'' \in \{0, 1\}^{\ell(|x|)+1} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Note that $w \in S$ implies that $|w| = n + 2\ell(n) + 1$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore, for $w = xz'z'' \in \{0, 1\}^{n+2\ell(n)+1}$ such that $|x| = n$ and $|z'| = \ell(n)$, either $z' \neq 0^{\ell(n)}$ and $z'' \in \{0, 1\}^{\ell(n)+1}$ (equiv.,

¹⁴A function $\mu : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is called negligible if for every positive polynomial q and all sufficiently large ℓ it holds that $\mu(\ell) < 1/q(\ell)$.

¹⁵The first assertion (i.e., ease of finding primes) is a bit inaccurate. The prime number theorem only implies that, for any constant $c > 0$, the fraction of n -bit numbers N such that $[N, N + n^{c+1}]$ contains no prime is at most n^{-c} . Recall, however, that Cramer’s conjecture is that $[N, N + n^2]$ always contains a prime.

$w \in S''$) or $z' = 0^{\ell(n)}$ and $z'' = \sigma y$ such that $y \in R(x)$ if and only if $\sigma = 1$ (equiv., $w \in S''$). We stress that S' contains a negligible fraction of the strings in S (i.e., $|S' \cap \{0, 1\}^{n+2\ell(n)+1}| = 2^{n+\ell(n)}$ whereas $|S'' \cap \{0, 1\}^{n+2\ell(n)+1}| = 2^{n+2\ell(n)+1} - 2^{n+\ell(n)+1}$) and that $S' \cap S'' = \emptyset$. Intuitively, membership in S' reflects membership in R (i.e., if $x0^{\ell(|x|)}\sigma y \in S'$ for $|y| = \ell(|x|)$, then $\sigma = 1$ iff $y \in R(x)$), whereas S'' is a very simple set that is oblivious of R .

Note that computing the number of R -solutions for x (i.e., $|R(x)|$) reduces to computing $\text{cnt}_{\tilde{S}}$. Specifically,

$$|R(x)| = \text{cnt}_{\tilde{S}}(x0^{\ell(|x|)-1}10^{\ell(|x|)+1}) - \text{cnt}_{\tilde{S}}(x0^{\ell(|x|)}10^{\ell(|x|)})$$

because

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cnt}_{\tilde{S}}(x0^{\ell(|x|)-1}10^{\ell(|x|)+1}) &= \text{cnt}_{\tilde{S}}(x0^{2\ell(|x|)+1}) + \left| \left\{ z'' \in \{0, 1\}^{\ell(|x|)+1} : x0^{\ell(|x|)}z'' \in S' \right\} \right| \\ &= \text{cnt}_{\tilde{S}}(x0^{2\ell(|x|)+1}) + 2^{\ell(|x|)} \end{aligned}$$

whereas

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cnt}_{\tilde{S}}(x0^{\ell(|x|)}10^{\ell(|x|)}) &= \text{cnt}_{\tilde{S}}(x0^{2\ell(|x|)+1}) + \left| \left\{ y \in \{0, 1\}^{\ell(|x|)} : x0^{\ell(|x|)}0y \in S' \right\} \right| \\ &= \text{cnt}_{\tilde{S}}(x0^{2\ell(|x|)+1}) + \left| \left\{ y \in \{0, 1\}^{\ell(|x|)} \setminus R(x) \right\} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, counting the number of strings that precede a given string in S'' is easy, whereas $|S'' \cap \{0, 1\}^{n+2\ell(n)+1}| = 2^{n+2\ell(n)} - 2^{n+\ell(n)+1}$. This is the case because the number of strings in $S' \cap \{0, 1\}^{n+2\ell(n)+1}$ with a fixed n -bit prefix is exactly $2^{\ell(n)}$. Hence, given $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\text{enm}_{\tilde{S}}(i) \in S''$, we can compute $\text{enm}_{\tilde{S}}(i)$ in polynomial time. Lastly, note that $(n + 2\ell(n) + 1)$ -bit long strings of S' can be enumerated in time $2^{n+\ell(n)} \cdot \text{poly}(n)$. Thus, S can be enumerated in (typical and) average polynomial-time. ■

5 Open Problems (a compilation)

In this section, we compile a list of the open problem that are explicit or implicit in the prior sections. We focus on problems related to the strict notion of enumeration.

Recall that, by Theorem 1.5, enumerating prime numbers is computationally equivalent to counting the number of primes that are smaller than a given natural number. The latter problem was studied in the number theoretic community, and the best known algorithm for the latter problem runs in exponential-time: on input an n -bit number, the algorithm runs in $\tilde{O}(2^{n/2})$ -time (see [7] and references therein). Putting aside the obvious question of whether this can be improved, we wonder if some additional evidence can be given for the perceived difficulty of the problem.

Open Problem 5.1 (the complexity of strictly enumerating the prime numbers): *Can one provide complexity theoretic justification for the perceived difficulty of strictly enumerating the prime numbers?*

Turning to the other classical problem (i.e., enumeration of rational numbers), we ask the obvious question (see next title) as well as questions regarding the relative complexity of sub-tasks.

Open Problem 5.2 (the complexity of strictly enumerating the rational numbers): For $\mathbb{Q} = \{(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : \gcd(a, b) = 1\}$ and $\text{enm}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\text{lex}}$, when defined according to the lexicographic order on these pairs (i.e., (a, b) appears before (a', b') if either $a + b < a' + b'$ or $a + b = a' + b'$ and $a < a'$), what is the complexity of computing $\text{enm}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\text{lex}}$? Recall that, by Observation 1.4, computing $\text{enm}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\text{lex}}$ is at least as hard as computing $s \mapsto \sum_{i \in [s]} \varphi(i)$, which is at least as hard as factoring integers. Are any of these three problem computationally equivalent?

A positive answer regarding the first two problems would follow if, given $s \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a \in [s - 1]$ along with the factorization of s , one can efficiently determine the size of the set $|\{a' \in [a - 1] : \gcd(a', s) = 1\}|$. This is the case because of the following facts:

1. The number of pairs in \mathbb{Q} that precede (a, b) equals

$$\left(\sum_{i \in [a+b-1]} \varphi(i) \right) + |\{a' \in [a-1] : \gcd(a', a+b) = 1\}|. \quad (5)$$

2. Computing $s \mapsto \sum_{i \in [s]} \varphi(i)$ allows to compute the main sum in Eq. (5) as well as to compute the function φ .
3. Computing φ allows to factor integers [11, Sec. 10.4].

Hence, we pose the following problem.

Open Problem 5.3 (the complexity of determining the size of a prefix of the multiplicative group modulo a factored composite): Given $((p_1, e_1), \dots, (p_t, e_t))$ and $r \in [s - 1]$, where $s = \prod_{i \in [t]} p_i^{e_i}$, can we efficiently determine the size of the set $|\{m \in [r] : (\forall i \in [t]) \gcd(m, p_i) = 1\}|$?

We note that the special case in which the e_i 's are all 1 is computationally equivalent to the general case.

We now turn to another natural enumeration problem (i.e., enumerating non-singular square matrices). Recall that the proof of Proposition 2.5 extends to any finite field, except that the complexity may be linear in the characteristic of the finite field. Recall that difficulty is in evaluating the quantity in Eq. (4). This leads to the following problem.

Open Problem 5.4 (the complexity of strictly enumerating square non-singular matrices over arbitrary finite fields) *Can the complexity of enumerating square non-singular matrices over a finite field be polylogarithmic in the size of the field? In particular, can the following problem be solved in $\text{poly}(n \log p)$ -time? Given a full rank k -by- n matrix G over $\text{GF}(p)$, where $k < n$ and p is a prime number, and a vector $x \in \text{GF}(p)^n$, determine the number of the vectors spanned by the rows of G that precede x in lexicographic order.*

Computationally tractable orders on strings. The general results stated in Section 2 impose three minimal restrictions on the order \prec (hinted at by the word “typically” in the titles of Theorems 2.2–2.4). These restrictions (or conditions), which are briefly discussed next, assert the tractability of natural computational problems regarding orders on strings.

Efficient decidability: There exists a polynomial-time algorithm that, on input x and y , determines whether or not $x \prec y$.

Weak conformity with length : If $x \prec y$, then $|x| \leq \text{poly}(|y|)$.

(A much more stringent requirement may postulate that $x \prec y$ implies $|x| \leq |y|$.)

An efficient betweenness procedure: For starters, we require an efficient decision procedure that, on input x and y , determines whether or not $y = \text{succ}^{\prec}(x)$, where $\text{succ}^{\prec}(x)$ is the successor of x with respect to \prec .

Furthermore, letting $\text{idx}^{\prec}(v) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |\{w \in \{0, 1\}^* : w \prec v\}| + 1$, we require an efficient algorithm that, given x and y such that $\text{succ}^{\prec}(x) \prec y$, outputs a string z such that for some $\beta \in [0.1, 0.9]$ it holds that $\text{idx}^{\prec}(z) = \text{idx}^{\prec}(x) + \beta \cdot (\text{idx}^{\prec}(y) - \text{idx}^{\prec}(x))$.

Note that the combination of the last two conditions implies that succ^{\prec} can be computed in polynomial-time.¹⁶ In contrast, even assuming that $x \prec y$ implies $|x| \leq |y|$ (and that \prec can be efficiently decided), does not allow to reduce the betweenness task to succ^{\prec} .

We wonder whether these three conditions capture what one may consider as the class of “computationally tractable orders on the set of strings” and what one can say about this class.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to Madhu Sudan for crucial help with the proof of Proposition 2.5.

References

- [1] M. Agrawal, N. Kayal, and N. Saxena. PRIMES is in P. *Annals of Mathematics*, Vol. 160 (2), pages 781–793, 2004.
- [2] N. Calkin and H.S. Wilf. Recounting the Rationals. *American Math. Monthly*, Vol. 107 (4), pages 360–363, 2000.
- [3] B. Chor and M. Sudan. A geometric approach to betweenness. *SIAM J. on Disc. Math.*, Vol. 11 (4), pages 511–523, 1998.
- [4] N. Creignou, M. Kroll, R. Pichler, S. Skritek, and H. Vollmer. A Complexity Theory for Hard Enumeration Problems. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, Vol. 268, pages 191–209, 2019.
- [5] O. Goldreich. Notes on Levin’s Theory of Average-Case Complexity. *ECCC*, TR97-058, Dec. 1997.
- [6] O. Goldreich. *Computational Complexity: A Conceptual Perspective*. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- [7] D. Hirsch, I. Kessler, and U. Mendlovic. Computing $\pi(N)$: An elementary approach in $\tilde{O}(N^{1/2})$ time. [arXiv:2212.09857](https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.09857) [math.NT], 2022.
- [8] D.S. Johnson, C.H. Papadimitriou, and M. Yannakakis. On generating all maximal independent sets. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, Vol. 27 (3), pages 119–123, 1988.

¹⁶The claim follows by observing that, given x and y such that $x \prec y$, we can find $\text{succ}^{\prec}(x)$ by iteratively replacing y with a string y' that is between x and y . Letting $\ell(|x|) \geq |x|$ be an upper-bound on the length of strings that precede x according to \prec , we observe that $x \prec 1^{\ell(|x|)+1}$ must hold, and so we can start the foregoing process with $y \leftarrow 1^{\ell(|x|)+1}$.

- [9] L.A. Levin. Average Case Complete Problems. *SIAM J. on Comput.*, Vol. 15, pages 285–286, 1986.
- [10] D.E. Knuth. *The Art of Computer Programming, Volume 4A*. Addison-Wesley Professional, 2011.
- [11] V. Shoup. *A Computational Introduction to Number Theory and Algebra*. Cambridge University Press, 2008.