DE Knuth AND RETarjan

and

AND A Store 2 Ragg, sog Aghed 54 to do

(I fund this in old file and thought you might be interested ...)

A 71 78

July 22, 1975

Dr. R. E. Tarjan c/o Don Rose Aiken Computation Laboratory Harvard University Cambridge, Mass. 02138

Dear Bob:

As I told you in June, I make a little progress on the Huffman-coding lower bound. Let F(n) be the number of essentially distinct binary prefix codes, where two codes are "essentially distinct" if they assign a different length codeword to some message. Thus

n = 1 2 3 4 5 6F(n) = 1 1 3 13 75 525

and F(n) is the sum of $n!/t_0! t_1! \dots$ over all nonnegative integer vectors (t_0, t_1, \dots) where $t_0 + t_1 + \dots = n$ and $t_0 + \frac{1}{2} t_1 + \frac{1}{4} t_2 + \dots = 1$.

It follows that F(x) is the coefficient of z2n in the polynomial

 $(z^1+z^2+z^4+\dots+z^{n-1})^n$. From this representation it is obvious that $F(n) \leq n^n$. Hence the best conceivable information-theoretic lower bound will be of the form $n \lg z = \lg n! + n \lg z$; we're getting like more than the lower bound for sorting, while your upper bound is the sorting time plus about 2n.

I believe I can get an asymptotic formula for F(n) using complex analysis, and it will probably be something like $F(n) \sim c \, n^{n-k}$ for constants c and k. Thus the information-theoretic bound will indeed be of the form $n \lg n + O(\lg n)$.

In other words, an improvement on Huffmann's procedure which does, say, n operations of lg n binary decisions each isn't out of the question; but if my analysis works out as expected, an improvement of

the form S(n)+n will be impossible, even on the average, since $S(n) \le n \lg n - 1.329n + O(\log n)$ [exercise 5.3.1-15]. Of course the average time can be reduced if we choose our distribution of essentially-distinct codes to be sufficiently nonuniform.

Cordially,

Donald E. Knuth Professor

- P.S. Can the exact value of F(n) be computed in polynomial time (a polynomial in n not $\log n$)?
- P.P.S. The values of F(n) for $n \le 5$ agree with those of P_{n-1} in my exercise 5.3.1-4, so I thought for a minute that a surprising result was going to turn up. But n = 6 shot this down.

DEK/pw

