

Dynamic index, LZ factorization, and LCE queries in compressed space

Takaaki Nishimoto¹, Tomohiro I², Shunsuke Inenaga¹, Hideo Bannai¹, and Masayuki Takeda¹

¹ Department of Informatics, Kyushu University, Japan
 {takaaki.nishimoto, inenaga, bannai, takeda}@inf.kyushu-u.ac.jp
² Kyushu Institute of Technology, Japan
 tomohiro@ai.kyutech.ac.jp

Abstract. In this paper, we present the following results: (1) We propose a new *dynamic compressed index* of $O(w)$ space, that supports searching for a pattern P in the current text in $O(|P|f(M, w) + \log w \log |P| \log^* M (\log N + \log |P| \log^* M) + \text{occ} \log N)$ time and insertion/deletion of a substring of length y in $O((y + \log N \log^* M) \log w \log N \log^* M)$ time, where N is the length of the current text, M is the maximum length of the dynamic text, z is the size of the Lempel-Ziv77 (LZ77) factorization of the current text, $f(a, b) = O(\min\{\frac{\log \log a \log \log b}{\log \log \log a}, \sqrt{\frac{\log b}{\log \log b}}\})$ and $w = O(z \log N \log^* M)$. (2) We propose a new space-efficient LZ77 factorization algorithm for a given text of length N , which runs in $O(Nf(N, w') + z \log w' \log^3 N (\log^* N)^2)$ time with $O(w')$ working space, where $w' = O(z \log N \log^* N)$. (3) We propose a data structure of $O(w)$ space which supports longest common extension (LCE) queries on the text in $O(\log N + \log \ell \log^* N)$ time, where ℓ is the output LCE length. On top of the above contributions, we show several applications of our data structures which improve previous best known results on grammar-compressed string processing.

1 Introduction

1.1 Dynamic compressed index

In this paper, we consider the *dynamic compressed text indexing problem* of maintaining a compressed index for a text string that can be modified. Although there exists several dynamic *non-compressed* text indexes (see e.g. [27, 3] for recent work), there has been little work for the compressed variants. Hon et al. [13] proposed the first dynamic compressed index of $O(\frac{1}{\epsilon}(NH_0 + N))$ bits of space which supports searching of P in $O(|P| \log^2 N (\log^\epsilon N + \log |\Sigma|) + \text{occ} \log^{1+\epsilon} N)$ time and insertion/deletion of a substring of length y in $O((y + \sqrt{N}) \log^{2+\epsilon} N)$ amortized time, where $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$ and $H_0 \leq \log |\Sigma|$ denotes the zeroth order empirical entropy of the text of length N [13]. Salson et al. [29] also proposed a dynamic compressed index, called *dynamic FM-Index*. Although their approach

works well in practice, updates require $O(N \log N)$ time in the worst case. To our knowledge, these are the only existing dynamic compressed indexes to date.

In this paper, we propose a new dynamic compressed index, as follows:

Theorem 1. *Let M be the maximum length of the dynamic text to index, N the length of the current text T , and z the number of factors in the Lempel-Ziv 77 factorization of T without self-references. Then, there exist a dynamic index of $O(w)$ space which supports searching of a pattern P in $O(|P|f_A + \log w \log |P| \log^* M (\log N + \log |P| \log^* M) + occ \log N)$ time and insertion/deletion of a substring of length y in amortized $O((y + \log N \log^* M) \log w \log N \log^* M)$ time, where $w = O(z \log N \log^* M)$ and $f_A = O(\min\{\frac{\log \log M \log \log w}{\log \log \log M}, \sqrt{\frac{\log w}{\log \log w}}\})$.*

Since $z \geq \log N$, $\log w = \max\{\log z, \log(\log^* M)\}$. Hence, our index is able to find pattern occurrences faster than the index of Hon et al. when the $|P|$ term is dominating in the pattern search times. Also, our index allows faster substring insertion/deletion on the text when the \sqrt{N} term is dominating.

Related work. Our dynamic compressed index uses Mehlhorn et al.’s *locally consistent parsing* and *signature encodings* of strings [22], originally proposed for efficient equality testing of dynamic strings. Alstrup et al. [3] showed how to improve the construction time of Mehlhorn et al.’s data structure (details can be found in the technical report [2]). Our data structure uses Alstrup et al.’s fast string concatenation/split algorithms and linear-time computation of locally consistent parsing, but has little else in common than those. In particular, Alstrup et al.’s dynamic pattern matching algorithm [3,2] requires to maintain specific locations called *anchors* over the parse trees of the signature encodings, but our index does not use anchors.

Our index has close relationship to the ESP-indices [30,31], but there are two significant differences between ours and ESP-indices: The first difference is that the ESP-index [30] is static and its online variant [31] allows only for appending new characters to the end of the text, while our index is fully dynamic allowing for insertion and deletion of arbitrary substrings at arbitrary positions. The second difference is that the pattern search time of the ESP-index is proportional to the number occ_c of occurrences of the so-called “core” of a query pattern P , which corresponds to a maximal subtree of the ESP derivation tree of a query pattern P . If occ is the number of occurrences of P in the text, then it always holds that $occ_c \geq occ$, and in general occ_c cannot be upper bounded by any function of occ . In contrast, as can be seen in Theorem 1, the pattern search time of our index is proportional to the number occ of occurrences of a query pattern P . This became possible due to our discovery of a new property of the signature encoding [2] (stated in Lemma 12). In relation to our problem, there exists the library management problem of maintaining a text collection (a set of text strings) allowing for insertion/deletion of texts (see [24] for recent work). While in our problem a single text is edited by insertion/deletion of substrings, in the library management problem a text can be inserted to or deleted from

the collection. Hence, algorithms for the library management problem cannot be directly applied to our problem.

1.2 Applications and extensions

Computing LZ77 factorization in compressed space. As an application to our dynamic compressed index, we present a new LZ77 factorization algorithm for a string T of length N , running in $O(Nf_{\mathcal{A}} + z \log w \log^3 N (\log^* N)^2)$ time and $O(w)$ working space, where $f_{\mathcal{A}} = O(\min\{\frac{\log \log N \log \log w}{\log \log \log N}, \sqrt{\frac{\log w}{\log \log w}}\})$. Goto et al. [11] showed how, given the grammar-like representation for string T generated by the LCA algorithm [28], to compute the LZ77 factorization of T in $O(z \log^2 m \log^3 N + m \log m \log^3 N)$ time and $O(m \log^2 m)$ space, where m is the size of the given representation. Sakamoto et al. [28] claimed that $m = O(z \log N \log^* N)$, however, it seems that in this bound they do not consider the production rules to represent maximal runs of non-terminals in the derivation tree. The bound we were able to obtain with the best of our knowledge and understanding is $m = O(z \log^2 N \log^* N)$, and hence our algorithm seems to use less space than the algorithm of Goto et al. [11]. Recently, Fischer et al. [10] showed a Monte-Carlo randomized algorithms to compute an approximation of the LZ77 factorization with at most $2z$ factors in $O(N \log N)$ time, and another approximation with at most $(i + \epsilon)z$ factors in $O(N \log^2 N)$ time for any constant $\epsilon > 0$, using $O(z)$ space each. Another line of research is a recent result by Policriti and Prezma [25] which uses $NH_0 + o(N \log |\Sigma|) + O(|\Sigma| \log N)$ bits of space and computes the LZ77 factorization in $O(N \log N)$ time.

Longest common extension queries in compressed space. Furthermore, we consider the *longest common extension* (LCE) problems on: an uncompressed string T of length N ; a grammar-compressed string T represented by an straight-line program (SLP) of size n , or an LZ77-compressed string T with z factors. The best known deterministic LCE data structure on SLPs is due to I et al. [15], which supports LCE queries in $O(h \log N)$ time each, occupies $O(n^2)$ space, and can be built in $O(hn^2)$ time, where h is the height of the derivation tree of a given SLP. Bille et al. [5] showed a Monte Carlo randomized data structure built on a given SLP of size n which supports LCE queries in $O(\log N \log \ell)$ time each, where ℓ is the output of the LCE query and N is the length of the uncompressed text. Their data structure requires only $O(n)$ space, but requires $O(N)$ time to construct. Very recently, Bille et al. [6] showed a faster Monte Carlo randomized data structure of $O(n)$ space which supports LCE queries in $O(\log N + \log^2 \ell)$ time each. The preprocessing time of this new data structure is not given in [6].

In this paper, we present a new, deterministic LCE data structure using compressed space, namely $O(w)$ space, supporting LCE queries in $O(\log N + \log \ell \log^* N)$ time each. We show how to construct this data structure in $O(N \log w)$ time given an uncompressed string of length N , $O(n \log \log n \log N \log^* N)$ time given an SLP of size n , and $O(z \log w \log N \log^* N)$ time given the LZ77 factorization of size z . We remark that our new LCE data structure allows for fastest

deterministic LCE queries on SLPs, and even permits faster LCE queries than the randomized data structure of Bille et al. [6] when $\log^* N = o(\log \ell)$ which in many cases is true.

All proofs omitted due to lack of space can be found in the appendices.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Strings

Let Σ be an ordered alphabet and $\$$ be the lexicographically largest character in Σ . An element of Σ^* is called a string. For string $w = xyz$, x is called a prefix, y is called a substring, and z is called a suffix of w , respectively. The length of string w is denoted by $|w|$. The empty string ε is a string of length 0, that is, $|\varepsilon| = 0$. Let $\Sigma^+ = \Sigma^* - \{\varepsilon\}$. For any $1 \leq i \leq |w|$, $w[i]$ denotes the i -th character of w . For any $1 \leq i \leq j \leq |w|$, $w[i..j]$ denotes the substring of w that begins at position i and ends at position j . Let $w[i..] = w[i..|w|]$ and $w[..i] = w[1..i]$ for any $1 \leq i \leq |w|$. For any string w , let w^R denote the reversed string of w , that is, $w^R = w[|w|] \cdots w[2]w[1]$. For any strings w and u , let $\text{LCP}(w, u)$ (resp. $\text{LCS}(w, u)$) denote the length of the longest common prefix (resp. suffix) of w and u . Given two strings s_1, s_2 and two integers i, j , let $\text{LCE}(s_1, s_2, i, j)$ denote a query which returns $\text{LCP}(s_1[i..|s_1|], s_2[j..|s_2|])$.

For any strings p and s , let $\text{Occ}(p, s)$ denote all occurrence positions of p in s , namely, $\text{Occ}(p, s) = \{i \mid p = s[i..i + |p| - 1], 1 \leq i \leq |s| - |p| + 1\}$.

In this paper, we deal with a dynamic text, namely, we allow for insertion/deletion of a substring to/from an arbitrary position of the text. Let M be the maximum length of the dynamic text to index. Our model of computation is the unit-cost word RAM with machine word size of $\log_2 M$ bits, and space complexities will be evaluated by the number of machine words. Bit-oriented evaluation of space complexities can be obtained with a $\log_2 M$ multiplicative factor.

Lempel-Ziv 77 factorization. We will use the *Lempel-Ziv 77* factorization [32] of a string to bound the running time and the size of our data structure on the string. It is a greedy factorization which scans the string from left to right, and recursively takes as a factor the longest prefix of the remaining suffix with a previous occurrence. Formally, it is defined as follows.

Definition 1 (Lempel-Ziv77 Factorization [32]). *The Lempel-Ziv77 (LZ77) factorization of a string s without self-references is a sequence f_1, \dots, f_z of non-empty substrings of s such that $s = f_1 \cdots f_z$, $f_1 = s[1]$, and for $1 < i \leq z$, if the character $s[|f_1 \cdots f_{i-1}| + 1]$ does not occur in $s[|f_1 \cdots f_{i-1}|]$, then $f_i = s[|f_1 \cdots f_{i-1}| + 1]$, otherwise f_i is the longest prefix of $f_i \cdots f_z$ which occurs in $f_1 \cdots f_{i-1}$.*

The size of the LZ77 factorization f_1, \dots, f_z of string s is the number z of factors in the factorization.

A variant of LZ77 factorization which allows for self-overlapping reference to a previous occurrence is formally defined as follows.

Definition 2 (Lempel-Ziv77 Factorization with self-reference [32]). *The Lempel-Ziv77 (LZ77) factorization of a string s with self-references is a sequence f_1, \dots, f_k of non-empty substrings of s such that $s = f_1 \cdots f_k$, $f_1 = s[1]$, and for $1 < i \leq k$, if the character $s[|f_1 \cdots f_{i-1}| + 1]$ does not occur in $s[|f_1 \cdots f_{i-1}|]$, then $f_i = s[|f_1 \cdots f_{i-1}| + 1]$, otherwise f_i is the longest prefix of $f_i \cdots f_k$ which occurs at some position p , where $1 \leq p \leq |f_1 \cdots f_{i-1}|$.*

We will show that using our data structure, the LZ77 with self-reference can be computed efficiently in compressed space.

Locally consistent parsing. Let p be a string of length n over an integer alphabet of size W where any adjacent elements are different, i.e., $p[i] \neq p[i+1]$ for all $1 \leq i < n$. A locally consistent parsing [22] of p is a parsing (or factorization) q_1, \dots, q_j of p such that $p = q_1 \cdots q_j$, $2 \leq |q_h| \leq 4$ for any $1 \leq h \leq j$, and the boundary between q_{h-1} and q_h is “determined” by $p[|q_1 \cdots q_{h-1}| + 1 - \Delta_L \cdot |q_1 \cdots q_{h-1}| + 1 + \Delta_R]$, where $\Delta_L = \log^* W + 6$ and $\Delta_R = 4$. Clearly, $j \leq n/2$. By “determined” above, we mean that if a position i of an integer string p and a position k of another integer string s share the same left context of length at least Δ_L and the same right context of length at least Δ_R , then there is a boundary of the locally consistent parsing of p between the positions $i-1$ and i iff there is a boundary of the locally consistent parsing of s between the positions $k-1$ and k . A formal definition of locally consistent parsing, and its linear-time computation algorithm, is explained in the following lemma.

Lemma 1 (Locally consistent parsing [22,2]). *Let W be a non-negative integer and let p be an integer sequence of length n , called a W -colored sequence, where $p[i] \neq p[i+1]$ for any $1 \leq i < n$ and $0 \leq p[j] \leq W$ for any $1 \leq j \leq n$. For every W there exists a function $f : [-1..W]^{\log^* W + 11} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ such that for every W -colored sequence p , the bit sequence d defined by $d[i] = f(\tilde{p}[i - \Delta_L], \dots, \tilde{p}[i + \Delta_R])$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$, satisfies:*

- $d[1] = 1$,
- $d[i] + d[i+1] \leq 1$ for $1 \leq i < n$, and
- $d[i] + d[i+1] + d[i+2] + d[i+3] \geq 1$ for any $1 \leq i < n-3$,

where $\Delta_L = \log^* W + 6$, $\Delta_R = 4$, and $\tilde{p}[j] = p[j]$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$, $\tilde{p}[j] = -1$ otherwise. Furthermore, d can be computed in $O(n)$ time using a precomputed table of size $o(\log W)$. Also, we can compute this table in $o(\log W)$ time.

Proof. Here we give only an intuitive description of a proof of Lemma 1. More detailed proofs can be found at [22] and [2].

Mehlhorn et al. [22] showed that there exists a function f' which returns a $(\log W)$ -colored sequence p' for a given W -colored sequence p in $O(|p|)$ time, where $p'[i]$ is determined only by $p[i-1]$ and $p[i]$ for $1 \leq i \leq |p|$. Let $p^{(k)}$ denote the outputs after applying f' to p by k times. They also showed that there exists a function f'' which returns a bit sequence d satisfying the conditions of Lemma 1 for a 6-colored sequence p in $O(|p|)$ time, where $d[i]$ is determined only

by $p[i-3..i+3]$ for $1 \leq i \leq |p|$. Hence we can compute d for a W -colored sequence p in $O(|p| \log^* W)$ time by applying f'' to $p^{(\log^* W+2)}$ after computing $p^{(\log^* W+2)}$. Furthermore, Alstrup et al. [2] showed that d can be computed in $O(|p|)$ time using a precomputed table of size $o(\log W)$. The idea is that $p^{(3)}$ is a $\log \log \log W$ -colored sequence and the number of all combinations of a $\log \log \log W$ -colored sequence of length $\log^* W + 11$ is $2^{(\log^* W+11) \log \log \log W} = o(\log W)$. Hence we can compute d for a W -colored sequence in linear time using a precomputed table of size $o(\log W)$. \square

Given a bit sequence d of Lemma 1, let $Eblock_d(p)$ be the function that decomposes an integer sequence p into a sequence q_1, \dots, q_j of substrings called *blocks* of p , such that $p = q_1 \cdots q_j$ and q_i is in the decomposition iff $d[|q_1 \cdots q_{i-1}| + 1] = 1$ for any $1 \leq i \leq j$. We omit d and write $Eblock_d(p)$ when it is clear from the context, and we use implicitly the bit sequence created by Lemma 1 as d . Let $|Eblock(p)| = j$ and let $Eblock(s)[i] = q_i$. For a string s , let $Epow(s)$ be the function which groups each maximal run of same characters a as a^r , where r is the length of the run. $Epow(s)$ can be computed in $O(|s|)$ time. Let $|Epow(s)|$ denote the number of maximal runs of same characters in s and let $Epow(s)[i]$ denote i -th maximal run in s .

Example 1 ($Eblock_d(p)$ and $Epow(s)$). Let $\log^* W = 2$, and then $\Delta_L = 8, \Delta_R = 4$.

If $p = 1, 2, 3, 2, 5, 7, 6, 4, 3, 4, 3, 4, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$ and $d = 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0$, then $Eblock_d(p) = (1, 2, 3), (2, 5), (7, 6, 4), (3, 4, 3, 4), (1, 2), (3, 4, 5), |Eblock_d(p)| = 6$ and $Eblock_d(p)[2] = (2, 5)$. For string $s = aabbbbabbb$, $Epow(s) = a^2b^5a^1b^2$ and $|Epow(s)| = 4$ and $Epow(s)[2] = b^5$.

2.2 Context free grammars as compressed representation of strings

Admissible context free grammars. An *admissible context free grammar* (ACFG) [18] is a CFG which generates only a single string. More formally, an ACFG that generates a single string T is a quadruple $\mathcal{G} = (\Sigma, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, S)$, such that

- Σ is an ordered alphabet of terminal characters,
- $\mathcal{V} = \{e_1, \dots, e_k\}$ is a set of positive integers with $e_1 < \dots < e_k$, called *variables*,
- $\mathcal{D} = \{e_i \rightarrow xexpr_i\}_{i=1}^k$ is a set of *deterministic productions* (or *assignments*) i.e., for each variable $e \in \mathcal{V}$ there is exactly one production in \mathcal{D} whose lefthand side is e ,
- each $e_i \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{S\}$ appears at least once in the righthand side of some production $e_j \rightarrow xexpr_j$ with $e_i < e_j$, and
- $S \in \mathcal{V}$ is the start symbol which derives the string T .

Sometimes we handle a variable sequence as a kind of string. For example, for any variable sequence $y = e_{i_1} \cdots e_{i_d} \in \mathcal{V}^+$, let $|y| = d$ and $y[c] = e_{i_c}$ for $1 \leq c \leq d$. Let $val : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \Sigma^+$ be the function which returns the string derived by an input

variable. If $s = \text{val}(e)$ for $e \in \mathcal{V}$, then we say that the variable e *represents* string s . For any variable sequence $y \in \mathcal{V}^+$, let $\text{val}^+(y) = \text{val}(y[1]) \cdots \text{val}(y[|y|])$.

For two variables $e_1, e_2 \in \mathcal{V}$, we say that e_1 occurs at position c in e_2 if there is a node labeled with e_1 in the derivation tree of e_2 and the leftmost leaf of the subtree rooted at that node labeled with e_1 is the c -th leaf in the derivation tree of e_2 . Furthermore, for variable sequence $y \in \mathcal{V}^+$, we say that y occurs at position c in e if $y[i]$ occurs at position $c + |\text{val}^+(y[1..i-1])|$ in e for $1 \leq i \leq |y|$. We define the function $\text{vOcc}(e_1, e_2)$ which returns all positions of e_1 in the derivation tree of e_2 .

Straight-line programs. A *straight-line program (SLP)* is an ACFG in the Chomsky normal form. Formally, SLP \mathcal{S} of size n is an ACFG $\mathcal{G} = (\Sigma, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, X_n)$, where $\mathcal{V} = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$, $\text{val}(X_n) = T$, $\mathcal{D} = \{X_i \rightarrow \text{expr}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ with each expr_i being either of form $X_\ell X_r$ ($1 \leq \ell, r < i$), or a single character $a \in \Sigma$. The size of the SLP \mathcal{G} is the number n of productions in \mathcal{D} . In the extreme cases the length N of the string T can be as large as 2^{n-1} , however, it is always the case that $n \geq \log_2 N$. For any variable X_i with $X_i \rightarrow X_\ell X_r \in \mathcal{D}$, let $X_i.\text{left} = \text{val}(X_\ell)$ and $X_i.\text{right} = \text{val}(X_r)$, which are called the *left string* and the *right string* of X_i , respectively.

Example 2 (SLP). Let $\mathcal{S} = (\Sigma, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, S)$ be the SLP s.t. $\Sigma = \{A, B, C\}$, $\mathcal{V} = \{X_1, \dots, X_{11}\}$, $\mathcal{D} = \{X_1 \rightarrow A, X_2 \rightarrow B, X_3 \rightarrow C, X_4 \rightarrow X_3 X_1, X_5 \rightarrow X_4 X_2, X_6 \rightarrow X_5 X_5, X_7 \rightarrow X_2 X_3, X_8 \rightarrow X_1 X_2, X_9 \rightarrow X_7 X_8, X_{10} \rightarrow X_6 X_9, X_{11} \rightarrow X_{10} X_6\}$, $S = X_{11}$, the derivation tree of S represents $CABCABBCABCABCAB$.

Run-length ACFGs. We define *run-length ACFGs* as an extension to ACFGs, which allow *run-length encodings* in the righthand sides of productions. Formally, a run-length ACFG is $\mathcal{G} = (\Sigma, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, S)$, where $\mathcal{D} = \{e_i \rightarrow \text{xexpr}_i\}_{i=1}^w$, $\text{val}(S) = T$ and each xexpr_i is in one of the following forms:

$$\text{xexpr}_i = \begin{cases} a \in \Sigma, \\ e_\ell e_r \in \mathcal{V}^+ & (e_\ell, e_r < e_i), \\ \hat{e}^d \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{N} & (\hat{e} < e_i, \text{ and } d > 1). \end{cases}$$

Hence $\text{xexpr}_i \in \Sigma \cup \mathcal{V}^+ \cup (\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{N})$. The *size* of the run-length ACFG \mathcal{G} is the number w of productions in \mathcal{D} .

Let $\text{Sig}_{\mathcal{G}} : \Sigma \cup \mathcal{V}^+ \cup (\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{N}) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ be the function such that

$$\text{Sig}_{\mathcal{G}}(x) = \begin{cases} e & \text{if } (e \rightarrow x) \in \mathcal{D}, \\ \text{Sig}_{\mathcal{G}}(\text{Sig}_{\mathcal{G}}(x[1..|x|-1])x[|x|]) & \text{if } x[i] \in \mathcal{V} \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq |x|, 2 < |x| \leq 4, \\ \text{undefined} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Namely, the function $\text{Sig}_{\mathcal{G}}$ returns, if any, the lefthand side of the corresponding production for a given element in $\Sigma \cup \mathcal{V}^+ \cup (\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{N})$ of length 3 or 4, by recursively applying the Sig function from left to right. Let $\text{Assgn}_{\mathcal{G}}$ be the function such that

ment \mathcal{B} is the DAG of \mathcal{G} introduced in the previous subsection. The corresponding nodes and edges of the DAG can be added/deleted in constant time per addition/deletion of an assignment. By maintaining $parents(e)$ with a doubly-linked list for each node v_e representing a variable $e \in \mathcal{V}$, we obtain the following lemma:

Lemma 2. *Using $\mathcal{H}(f_{\mathcal{A}}, f'_{\mathcal{A}})$ for a dynamic run-length ACFG $\mathcal{G} = (\Sigma, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, S)$ of current size w , $Sig(xexpr)$ can be computed in $O(f_{\mathcal{A}})$ time, for a given $xexpr \in \Sigma \cup \mathcal{V}^+ \cup (\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{N})$. Given a node v_e representing a variable e , $Assgn(e)$ and $|val(e)|$ can be computed in $O(1)$ time, and $parents(e)$ can be computed in $O(|parents(e)|)$ time. We can also update \mathcal{H} in $O(f_{\mathcal{A}})$ time when an assignment is added to/removed from \mathcal{D} .*

Note that $Assgn(e)$, $Sig(xexpr)$ and $parents(e)$ can return not only the signatures but also the corresponding nodes in the DAG.

3 Signature encoding

In this section, we recall the *signature encoding* first proposed by Mehlhorn et al. [22]. The signature encoding of a string T is a run-length ACFG $\mathcal{G} = (\Sigma, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, S)$ where the assignments in \mathcal{D} are determined by recursively applying to T the locally consistent parsing, the *Eblock* function, and the *Sig* function (recall Section 2), until a single integer S is obtained. More formally, we use the *Shrink* and *Pow* functions in the signature encoding of string T defined below:

$$\begin{aligned} Shrink_t^T &= \begin{cases} Sig^+(T) & \text{for } t = 0 \\ Sig^+(Eblock(Pow_{t-1}^T)) & \text{for } 0 < t \leq h, \end{cases} \\ Pow_t^T &= Sig^+(Epow(Shrink_t^T)) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq h, \end{aligned}$$

where h is the minimum integer satisfying $|Pow_h^T| = 1$. Then, the start symbol of the signature encoding is $S = Pow_h^T$, and the height of the derivation tree of the signature encoding of T is $O(h) = O(\log N)$, where $N = |T|$ (see also Fig. 1 below).

Example 4 (Signature encoding). Let $\mathcal{G} = (\Sigma, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, S)$ be a run-length ACFG of Example 3. Assuming $Eblock(Pow_0^T) = (7, 5, 6), (7, 5, 6), (5, 6)^7, (5, 6, 4)$ and $Eblock(Pow_1^T) = (12, 13, 14)$ hold, \mathcal{G} is the signature encoding of T and $id(T) = 17$. See Fig. 1 for an illustration of the derivation tree of \mathcal{G} and the corresponding DAG.

Each variable of the signature encoding (the run-length ACFG defined this way) is called a *signature*. For any string $P \in \Sigma^+$, let $id(T) = Pow_h^T = S$, i.e., the integer S is the signature of T .

plexities, we use balanced binary search trees or the data structure [4] in place of hashing.

The signature encoding of a text T can be efficiently maintained under insertion/deletion of arbitrary substrings to/from T . For this purpose, we use the $\mathcal{H}(f_A, f'_A)$ data structure for the signature encoding of a dynamic text.

3.1 Properties of signature encodings

Here we describe a number of useful properties of signature encodings. The ones with references to the literature are known but we provide their proofs for completeness. The other ones without references are our new discoveries.

Substring extraction. By the definition of the *Eblock* function and Lemma 1, for any $1 \leq t \leq h$, $|\text{Shrink}_t^T| \leq |\text{Pow}_{t-1}^T|/2$ and $|\text{Pow}_t^T| \leq |\text{Pow}_{t-1}^T|/2$. Thus $h \leq \log |s|$ and the height of the derivation tree of e is $O(\log |\text{val}(e)|)$ for any signature $e \in \mathcal{V}$. Since each node of the DAG for a signature encoding stores the length of the corresponding string, we have the following:

Fact 1 *Using the DAG for a signature encoding $\mathcal{G} = (\Sigma, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, S)$ of size w , given a signature $e \in \mathcal{V}$ (and its corresponding node in the DAG), and two positive integers i, k , we can compute $\text{val}(e)[i..i+k-1]$ in $O(\log |\text{val}(e)| + k)$ time.*

Space requirement of the signature encoding. Recall that we handle dynamic text of length at most M . Then, the maximum value of the signatures is bounded by $3M - 1$, since the derivation tree can contain at most M leaves, and $2M - 1$ internal nodes (when there are no runs of same signatures at any height of the derivation tree, *Pow* function generates as many signatures as the *Shrink* function). We also remark that the input of the *Eblock* function is a sequence of signatures. Hence, Δ_L of Lemma 1 is bounded by $\log^* 3M + 6 = O(\log^* M)$. Note that we can bound $M = \Theta(|T|)$ if we do not update \mathcal{G} after we compute $\text{id}(T)$.

Let N be the length of the current text T . The size w of the signature encoding of T is bounded by $3N - 1$ by the same reasoning as above. Also, the following lemma shows that the signature encoding of T requires only *compressed space*:

Lemma 3 ([26]). *The size w of the signature encoding of T is $O(z \log N \log^* M)$, where z is the number of factors in the LZ77 factorization without self-reference of T .*

Proof. See Appendix A.

Hence, we have $w = O(\min\{z \log N \log^* M, N\})$. In the sequel, we assume $z \log N \log^* M \leq N$ and will simply write $w = O(z \log N \log^* M)$, since otherwise we can use some uncompressed dynamic text index in the literature.

Common sequences to all occurrences of same substrings. Here, we recall the most important property of the signature encoding.

Let $\mathcal{G} = (\Sigma, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, S)$ be the signature encoding of text T . Let i, j ($i < j$) be any positions in T , and let $P = T[i..j]$. Let \mathbb{P}_i and \mathbb{P}_j be the paths from the root of the derivation tree of \mathcal{G} to the i th and j th leaves, respectively. Then, at each depth ℓ of the derivation tree of \mathcal{G} , consider the sequence $s_{i,j,\ell}$ of signatures which lie to the right of \mathbb{P}_i with offset $\Delta_L + 3$ and to the left of \mathbb{P}_j with offset $\Delta_R + 2$. By the property of locally consistent parsing of Lemma 1, $s_{i,j,\ell} = s_{i',j',\ell}$ for any occurrences $[i'..j']$ of P in T and for any depth ℓ . We call each signature contained in $s_{i,j,\ell}$ a *consistent signature* w.r.t. P .

Formally, we define the consistent signatures of P in the derivation tree of \mathcal{G} by the $XShrink$ and $XPow$ functions below, where the prefix of length at least Δ_L and the suffix of length at least $\Delta_R + 1$ are “ignored” at each depth of recursion:

Definition 3. For a string P , let

$$\begin{aligned} XShrink_t^P &= \begin{cases} Sig^+(P) & \text{for } t = 0, \\ Sig^+(Eblock_d(XPow_{t-1}^P)[|L_t^P|..|XPow_{t-1}^P| - |R_t^P|]) & \text{for } 0 < t \leq h^P, \end{cases} \\ XPow_t^P &= Sig^+(Epow(XShrink_t^P[|\hat{L}_t^P| + 1..|XShrink_t^P| - |\hat{R}_t^P|])) \text{ for } 0 \leq t < h^P, \end{aligned}$$

where

- L_t^P is the shortest prefix of $XPow_{t-1}^P$ of length at least Δ_L such that $d[|L_t^P| + 1] = 1$,
- R_t^P is the shortest suffix of $XPow_{t-1}^P$ of length at least $\Delta_R + 1$ such that $d[|d| - |R_t^P| + 1] = 1$,
- \hat{L}_t^P is the longest prefix of $XShrink_t^P$ such that $|Epow(\hat{L}_t^P)| = 1$,
- \hat{R}_t^P is the longest suffix of $XShrink_t^P$ such that $|Epow(\hat{R}_t^P)| = 1$, and
- and h^P is the minimum integer such that $|Epow(XShrink_{h^P}^P)| \leq \Delta_L + \Delta_R + 9$.

Note that $\Delta_L \leq |L_t^P| \leq \Delta_L + 3$ and $\Delta_R + 1 \leq |R_t^P| \leq \Delta_R + 4$ hold by the definition. Hence $|XShrink_{t+1}^P| > 0$ holds if $|Epow(XShrink_t^P)| > \Delta_L + \Delta_R + 9$. See Fig. 2 for illustrations of consistent signatures of each occurrence of P in T , which are represented by the gray boxes. Since at each depth we have “ignored” the left and right contexts of respective length at most $\Delta_L + 3$ and $\Delta_R + 4$, the consistent signatures at each depth are determined only by the consistent signatures at the previous depth (1 level deeper). This implies that for *any* occurrences of P in T , there are common consistent signatures (gray boxes), which will simply be called the *common signatures* of P . The next lemma formalizes this argument.

Lemma 4 (common sequences [26]). Let $\mathcal{G} = (\Sigma, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, S)$ be the signature encoding of text T and let P be any string. Then there exists a common sequence $v = e_1, \dots, e_d$ of signatures w.r.t. \mathcal{G} which satisfies the following three conditions: (1) $val^+(v) = P$, (2) $|Epow(v)| = O(\log |P| \log^* M)$, and (3) for any $e \in \mathcal{V}$ and integer i such that $val(e)[i..i + |P| - 1] = P$, v occurs at position i in e .

Proof. We consider the following short sequence $Uniq(P)$ of signatures which represents P (see also Fig. 2):

$$Uniq(P) = \hat{L}_0^P L_0^P \cdots \hat{L}_{h^P-1}^P L_{h^P-1}^P XShrink_{h^P}^P R_{h^P-1}^P \hat{R}_{h^P-1}^P \cdots R_0^P \hat{R}_0^P,$$

where h^P is the minimum integer such that $|Epow(XShrink_{h^P}^P)| \leq \Delta_L + \Delta_R + 9$. We show Lemma 4 using $Uniq(P)$, namely, we show $v = Uniq(P)$ satisfies all conditions (1)-(3). (1) This follows from Definition 3 (see also Fig. 2(2)). (2) $|Epow(XShrink_{h^P}^P)| \leq \Delta_L + \Delta_R + 9$, $h^P \leq \log |P|$, $|L_t^P| = \Theta(\Delta_L)$, $|R_t^P| = \Theta(\Delta_R)$ and $|Epow(\hat{L}_t^P)| = |Epow(\hat{R}_t^P)| = 1$ for $1 \leq t \leq h^P$. Hence $|Epow(Uniq(P))| = O(\log |P| \log^* M)$. (3) For simplicity, here we only consider the case where $val(e) = T$, since other cases can be shown similarly. Consider any integer i with $T[i..i + |P| - 1] = P$ (see also Fig. 2(2)). Note that for $0 \leq t < h^P$, if $XShrink_t^P$ occurs in $Shrink_t^T$, then $XPow_t^P$ always occurs in Pow_t^T , because $XPow_t^P$ is determined only by $XShrink_t^P$. Similarly, for $0 < t \leq h^P$, if $XPow_{t-1}^P$ occurs in Pow_{t-1}^T , then $XShrink_t^P$ always occurs in $Shrink_t^T$. Since $XShrink_0^P$ occurs at position i in $Shrink_0^T$, $XShrink_t^P$ and $XPow_t^P$ occur in the derivation tree of $id(T)$. Hence we discuss the positions of $XShrink_t^P$ and $XPow_t^P$. Now, let $\hat{c}_t + 1$ and $c_t + 1$ be the beginning positions of the corresponding occurrence of $XShrink_t^P$ in $Shrink_t^T$ and that of $XPow_t^P$ in Pow_t^T , respectively. Then $Shrink_t^T[..\hat{c}_t]$ consists of $Pow_{t-1}^T[..\hat{c}_{t-1}]$ and L_{t-1}^P for $0 < t \leq h^P$. Also, $Pow_t^T[..\hat{c}_t]$ consists of $Shrink_t^T[..\hat{c}_t]$ and \hat{L}_t^P for $0 \leq t < h^P$. This means that $Uniq(P)$ occurs at position i in $id(T)$.

Therefore Lemma 4 holds. \square

The sequence v of signatures in Lemma 4 is called a *common sequence* of $P = val(e)[i..i + k - 1]$ w.r.t. \mathcal{G} . Lemma 4 implies that any substring P of T can be represented by a sequence p of signatures with $|Epow(p)| = O(\log |P| \log^* M)$. The common sequences are conceptually equivalent to the *cores* [20] which are defined for the *edit sensitive parsing* of a text, a kind of locally consistent parsing of the text.

The number of ancestors of nodes corresponding to $Uniq(P)$ is upper bounded by the next lemma.

Lemma 5. *Let T and P be strings, and let \mathcal{T} be the derivation tree of the signature encoding of T . Consider an occurrence of P in T , and the induced subtree X of \mathcal{T} whose root is the root of \mathcal{T} and whose leaves are the parents of the nodes representing $Uniq(P)$. Then X contains $O(\log^* M)$ nodes for every height and $O(\log |T| + \log |P| \log^* M)$ nodes in total.*

Proof. By Definition 3, for every height, X contains $O(\log^* M)$ nodes that are parents of the nodes representing $Uniq(P)$. Lemma 5 holds because the number of nodes at some height is halved when *Shrink* is applied. More precisely, considering the x nodes of X at some height to which *Shrink* is applied, the number of their parents is at most $(x + 2)/2$.

The next Lemma immediately follows from Lemma 5, which will be mainly used in the proof of Lemma 3 in Appendix and the proof of Lemma 9.

Lemma 6. Let s_1, s_2, s_3 be any strings such that $s_3 = s_1 s_2$, and let \mathcal{T} be the derivation tree of $\text{id}(s_3)$. Consider the induced subtree X of \mathcal{T} whose root is the root of \mathcal{T} and whose leaves are the parents of the nodes representing $\text{Uniq}(s_1)\text{Uniq}(s_2)$ (see also Fig. 2(4)). Then the size of X is $O(\log |s_3| \log^* M)$.

The following lemma is about the computation of a common sequence of P .

Lemma 7. Using the DAG for a signature encoding $\mathcal{G} = (\Sigma, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, S)$ of size w , given a signature $e \in \mathcal{V}$ (and its corresponding node in the DAG) and two integers i and k , we can compute $\text{Epow}(\text{Uniq}(s[i..i+k-1]))$ in $O(\log |s| + \log k \log^* M)$ time, where $s = \text{val}(e)$.

Proof. Let v be the common sequence of nodes which represents $\text{Uniq}(s[i..i+k-1])$ and occurs at position i in e . Starting at the given node in the DAG which corresponds to e , we compute the induced subtree which represents $\text{Uniq}(s[i..i+k-1])$, rooted at the lowest common ancestor of the nodes in v . By Lemma 5, the size of this subtree is $O(\log |s| + \log k \log^* M)$. We can obtain the root of this subtree in $O(\log |s|)$ time from the node representing e . Hence Lemma 7 holds. \square

The next lemma shows that we can compute LCE efficiently using the signature encoding of the (dynamic) text.

Lemma 8. Using the DAG for a signature encoding $\mathcal{G} = (\Sigma, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, S)$ of size w , we can support queries $\text{LCE}(s_1, s_2, i, j)$ and $\text{LCE}(s_1^R, s_2^R, i, j)$ in $O(\log |s_1| + \log |s_2| + \log \ell \log^* M)$ time for given two signatures $e_1, e_2 \in \mathcal{V}$ and two integers $1 \leq i \leq |s_1|$, $1 \leq j \leq |s_2|$, where $s_1 = \text{val}(e_1)$, $s_2 = \text{val}(e_2)$ and ℓ is the answer to the LCE query.

Proof. We focus on $\text{LCE}(s_1, s_2, i, j)$ as $\text{LCE}(s_1^R, s_2^R, i, j)$ is supported similarly.

Let P denote the longest common prefix of s_1 and s_2 . Our algorithm simultaneously traverses two derivation trees rooted at e_1 and e_2 and computes P by matching the common signatures greedily from left to right. Since $\text{Uniq}(P)$ occurs at position i in e_1 and at position j in e_2 by Lemma 4, we can compute P by at least finding the common sequence of nodes which represents $\text{Uniq}(P)$, and hence, we only have to traverse ancestors of such nodes. By Lemma 5, the number of nodes we traverse, which dominates the time complexity, is upper bounded by $O(\log |s_1| + \log |s_2| + \text{Epow}(\text{Uniq}(P))) = O(\log |s_1| + \log |s_2| + \log \ell \log^* M)$. \square

Construction Recall that a signature encoding \mathcal{G} generating a string T is represented and maintained by a data structure \mathcal{H} . We show how to construct an $\mathcal{H}(\log w, w)$ or $\mathcal{H}(f_{\mathcal{A}}, f'_{\mathcal{A}})$ for \mathcal{G} . It can be constructed from various types of inputs, such as (1) a plain (uncompressed) string T , (2) the LZ77 factorization of T , and (3) an SLP which represents T , as summarized by the following theorem.

- Theorem 2.** 1. Given a string T of length N , we can construct $\mathcal{H}(\log w, w)$ for the signature encoding of size w which represents T in $O(N)$ time and working space, or $\mathcal{H}(f_{\mathcal{A}}, f'_{\mathcal{A}})$ in $O(Nf_{\mathcal{A}})$ time and $O(f'_{\mathcal{A}} + w)$ working space.
2. Given f_1, \dots, f_z LZ77 factors without self reference of size z representing T of length N , we can construct $\mathcal{H}(f_{\mathcal{A}}, f'_{\mathcal{A}})$ for the signature encoding of size w which represents T in $O(zf_{\mathcal{A}} \log N \log^* M)$ time and $O(f'_{\mathcal{A}} + w)$ working space.
3. Given an SLP $\mathcal{S} = \{X_i \rightarrow \text{expr}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ of size n representing T of length N , we can construct $\mathcal{H}(\log w, w)$ for the signature encoding of size w which represents T in $O(n \log \log n \log N \log^* M)$ time and $O(n \log^* M + w)$ working space, or $\mathcal{H}(f_{\mathcal{A}}, f'_{\mathcal{A}})$ in $O(nf_{\mathcal{A}} \log N \log^* M)$ time and $O(f'_{\mathcal{A}} + w)$ working space.

Proof. See Appendix A.

In the static case, the M term of Theorem 2 can be replaced with N .

Update In Section 4, we describe our dynamic index using \mathcal{H} for a signature encoding \mathcal{G} generating a string T . For this end, we consider the following update operations for \mathcal{G} using \mathcal{H} .

- *INSERT*(Y, i): Given a string Y and an integer i , update \mathcal{H} . Updated \mathcal{H} handles a signature encoding \mathcal{G} generates $T' = T[..i - 1]Y[1..|Y|]T[i..]$.
- *DELETE*(i, k): Given two integers i, k , update \mathcal{H} . Updated \mathcal{H} handles a signature encoding \mathcal{G} generates $T' = T[..i - 1]T[i + k..]$.

During updates, a new assignment $e \rightarrow \text{xexpr}$ is appended to \mathcal{G} whenever it is needed, in this paper, where $e = \max \mathcal{V} + 1$ that has not been used as a signature. Specifically, we assign new signature to xeptr when $\text{Sig}(\text{xeptr})$ returns undefined for some form xeptr during updates. Also, updates may produce a redundant signature whose parents in the DAG are all removed. To keep \mathcal{G} admissible, we remove such redundant signatures from \mathcal{G} during updates.

Lemma 9. Using $\mathcal{H}(f_{\mathcal{A}}, f'_{\mathcal{A}})$ for a signature encoding $\mathcal{G} = (\Sigma, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, S)$ of size w which generates T , we can support *INSERT*(i, Y) and *DELETE*(i, k) in $O(f_{\mathcal{A}}(k + \log N \log^* M))$ time, where $|Y| = k$.

Proof. We support *DELETE*(i, k) as follows: (1) Compute a new start variable $S' = \text{id}(T[..i - 1]T[i..])$ by recomputing the new signature encoding from $\text{Uniq}(T[..i - 1])$ and $\text{Uniq}(T[i + k..])$. This can be done in $O(f_{\mathcal{A}} \log N \log^* M)$ time by Lemmas 7 and 6. (2) Remove all redundant signatures Z from $\mathcal{H}(f_{\mathcal{A}}, f'_{\mathcal{A}})$. Note that if a signature is redundant, then all the signatures along the path from S to it are also redundant. Hence, we can remove all redundant signatures efficiently by depth-first search starting from S , which takes $O(f_{\mathcal{A}}|Z|)$ time, where $|Z| = O(k + \log N \log^* M)$ by Lemma 6.

Similarly, we can compute *INSERT* operation in $O(f_{\mathcal{A}}(|Y| + \log N \log^* M))$ time by creating S' using $\text{Uniq}(T[..i - 1])$, $\text{Uniq}(Y)$ and $\text{Uniq}(T[i + k..])$. Note that we can naively compute $\text{id}(s)$ for a given string $s \in \Sigma^+$ in $O(f_{\mathcal{A}}|s|)$ time. Therefore Lemma 9 holds. \square

4 Dynamic Compressed Index

In this section, we present our dynamic compressed index based on signature encoding. As already mentioned in Section 1.1, our strategy for pattern matching is different from that of Alstrup et al. [2]. It is rather similar to the one taken in the static index for SLPs of Claude and Navarro [8]. Besides applying their idea to run-length ACFGs, we show how to speed up pattern matching by utilizing the properties of signature encodings.

The rest of this section is organized as follows: In Section 4.1, we briefly review the idea for the SLP index of Claude and Navarro [8]. In Section 4.2, we extend their idea to run-length ACFGs. In Section 4.3, we consider an index on signature encodings and improve the running time of pattern matching by using the properties of signature encodings. In Section 4.4, we show how to dynamize our index.

4.1 Static Index for SLP

We review how the index in [8] for SLP \mathcal{S} generating a string T computes $Occ(P, T)$ for a given string P . The key observation is that, any occurrence of P in T can be uniquely associated with the lowest node that covers the occurrence of P in the derivation tree. As the derivation tree is binary, if $|P| > 1$, then the node is labeled with some variable $X \in \mathcal{V}$ such that P_1 is a suffix of $X.\text{left}$ and P_2 is a prefix of $X.\text{right}$, where $P = P_1 P_2$ with $1 \leq |P_1| < |P|$. Here we call the pair $(X, |X.\text{left}| - |P_1| + 1)$ a *primary occurrence* of P . Then, we can compute $Occ(P, T)$ by first computing such a primary occurrence and enumerating the occurrences of X in the derivation tree.

Formally, we define the *primary occurrences* of P as follows.

Definition 4 (The set of primary occurrences of P). For a string P with $|P| > 1$ and an integer $1 \leq j < |P|$, we define $pOcc_{\mathcal{S}}(P, j)$ and $pOcc_{\mathcal{S}}(P)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} pOcc_{\mathcal{S}}(P, j) &= \{(X, |X.\text{left}| - j + 1) \mid X \in \mathcal{V}, \\ &\quad P[1..j] \text{ is a suffix of } X.\text{left}, P[j+1..] \text{ is a prefix of } X.\text{right}\}, \\ pOcc_{\mathcal{S}}(P) &= \bigcup_{1 \leq j < |P|} pOcc_{\mathcal{S}}(P, j), \end{aligned}$$

We call each element of $pOcc_{\mathcal{S}}(P)$ a *primary occurrence* of P .

The set $Occ(P, T)$ of occurrences of P in T is represented by $pOcc_{\mathcal{S}}(P)$ as follows.

Observation 1 For any string P ,

$$Occ(P, T) = \begin{cases} \{j + k - 1 \mid (X, j) \in pOcc_{\mathcal{S}}(P), k \in vOcc(X, S)\} & \text{if } |P| > 1, \\ vOcc(X, S)((X \rightarrow P) \in \mathcal{D}) & \text{if } |P| = 1. \end{cases}$$

By Observation 1, the task is to compute $pOcc_{\mathcal{S}}(P)$ and $vOcc(X, S)$ efficiently. Note that $vOcc(X, S)$ can be computed in $O(|vOcc(X, S)|h)$ time by traversing the DAG in a reversed direction (i.e., using $parents(X)$ function recursively) from X to the source, where h is the height of the derivation tree of S . Hence, in what follows, we focus on how to compute $pOcc_{\mathcal{S}}(P)$ for a string P with $|P| > 1$. In order to compute $pOcc_{\mathcal{S}}(P, j)$, we use a data structure to solve the following problem:

Problem 1 (Two-Dimensional Orthogonal Range Reporting Problem). Let \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} denote subsets of two ordered sets, and let $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ be a set of points on the two-dimensional plane, where $|\mathcal{X}|, |\mathcal{Y}| \in O(|\mathcal{R}|)$. A data structure for this problem supports a query $report_{\mathcal{R}}(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2)$; given a rectangle (x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2) with $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ and $y_1, y_2 \in \mathcal{Y}$, returns $\{(x, y) \in \mathcal{R} \mid x_1 \leq x \leq x_2, y_1 \leq y \leq y_2\}$.

Data structures for Problem 1 are widely studied in computational geometry. There is even a dynamic variant, which we finally use for our dynamic index in Section 4.4. Until then, we just use any static data structure that occupies $O(|\mathcal{R}|)$ space and supports queries in $O(\hat{q}_{|\mathcal{R}|} + q_{|\mathcal{R}|} qocc)$ time with $\hat{q}_{|\mathcal{R}|} = O(\log |\mathcal{R}|)$, where $qocc$ is the number of points to report.

Now, given an SLP \mathcal{S} , we consider a two-dimensional plane defined by $\mathcal{X} = \{X.\text{left}^R \mid X \in \mathcal{V}\}$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \{X.\text{right} \mid X \in \mathcal{V}\}$, where elements in \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are sorted by lexicographic order. Then consider a set of points $\mathcal{R} = \{(X.\text{left}^R, X.\text{right}) \mid X \in \mathcal{V}\}$. For a string P and an integer $1 \leq j < |P|$, let $y_1^{(P,j)}$ (resp. $y_2^{(P,j)}$) denote the lexicographically smallest (resp. largest) element in \mathcal{Y} that has $P[j+1..]$ as a prefix. If there is no such element, it just returns NIL and we can immediately know that $pOcc_{\mathcal{S}}(P, j) = \emptyset$. We also define $x_1^{(P,j)}$ and $x_2^{(P,j)}$ in a similar way over \mathcal{X} , i.e., $x_1^{(P,j)}$ (resp. $x_2^{(P,j)}$) is the lexicographically smallest (resp. largest) element in \mathcal{X} that has $P[1..j]^R$ as a prefix. Then, $pOcc_{\mathcal{S}}(P, j)$ can be computed by a query $report_{\mathcal{R}}(x_1^{(P,j)}, x_2^{(P,j)}, y_1^{(P,j)}, y_2^{(P,j)})$. See also Example 5.

Example 5 (SLP). Let \mathcal{S} be the SLP of Example 2. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{X} &= \{x_1, x_4, x_2, x_8, x_5, x_9, x_6, x_{10}, x_{11}, x_3, x_7\}, \\ \mathcal{Y} &= \{y_1, y_8, y_2, y_7, y_9, y_3, y_4, y_5, y_6, y_{10}, y_{11}\},\end{aligned}$$

where $x_i = val(X_i)^R$, $y_i = val(X_i)$ for any $X_i \in \mathcal{V}$. Given a pattern $P = BCAB$, then $pOcc_{\mathcal{S}}(P, 1) = \{(X_6, 3), (X_{11}, 10)\}$, $pOcc_{\mathcal{S}}(P, 2) = \{(X_9, 1)\}$, $pOcc_{\mathcal{S}}(P, 3) = \emptyset$, $vOcc_{\mathcal{S}}(X_6, S) = \{1, 11\}$, $vOcc_{\mathcal{S}}(X_9, S) = \{7\}$ and $vOcc_{\mathcal{S}}(X_{11}, S) = \{1\}$. Hence $pOcc_{\mathcal{S}}(P) = \{(X_6, 3), (X_{11}, 10), (X_9, 1)\}$ and $Occ(P, T) = \{3, 7, 10, 13\}$. See also Fig. 3.

We can get the following result:

Lemma 10. *For an SLP \mathcal{S} of size n , there exists a data structure of size $O(n)$ that computes, given a string P , $pOcc_{\mathcal{S}}(P)$ in $O(|P|(h+|P|) \log n + q_n |pOcc_{\mathcal{S}}(P)|)$ time.*

Proof. For every $1 \leq j < |P|$, we compute $pOcc_{\mathcal{S}}(P, j)$ by $report_{\mathcal{R}}(x_1^{(P,j)}, x_2^{(P,j)}, y_1^{(P,j)}, y_2^{(P,j)})$. We can compute $y_1^{(P,j)}$ and $y_2^{(P,j)}$ in $O((h+|P|) \log n)$ time by binary search on \mathcal{Y} , where each comparison takes $O(h+|P|)$ time for expanding the first $O(|P|)$ characters of variables subjected to comparison. In a similar way, $x_1^{(P,j)}$ and $x_2^{(P,j)}$ can be computed in $O((h+|P|) \log n)$ time. Thus, the total time complexity is $O(|P|((h+|P|) \log n + \hat{q}_n) + q_n |pOcc_{\mathcal{S}}(P)|) = O(|P|(h+|P|) \log n + q_n |pOcc_{\mathcal{S}}(P)|)$. \square

4.2 Static Index for Run-length ACFG

In this subsection, we extend the idea for the SLP index described in Section 4.1 to run-length ACFGs. Consider occurrences of string P with $|P| > 1$ in run-length ACFG $\mathcal{G} = (\Sigma, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, S)$ generating string T . The difference from SLPs is that we have to deal with occurrences of P that are covered by a node labeled with $e \rightarrow \hat{e}^d$ but not covered by any single child of the node in the derivation tree. In such a case, there must exist $P = P_1 P_2$ with $1 \leq |P_1| < |P|$ such that P_1 is a suffix of $e.left = val^+(\hat{e})$ and P_2 is a prefix of $e.right = val^+(\hat{e}^{d-1})$. Let $j = |val(\hat{e})| - |P_1| + 1$ be a position in $val^+(\hat{e}^d)$ where P occurs, then P also occurs at $j + c|val(\hat{e})|$ in $val^+(\hat{e}^d)$ for every positive integer c with $j + c|val(\hat{e})| + |P| - 1 \leq |val^+(\hat{e}^d)|$. Remarking that we apply Definition 4 of primary occurrences to run-length ACFGs as they are, we formalize our observation to compute $Occ(P, T)$ as follows:

Observation 2 *For any string P with $|P| > 1$, $Occ(P, T) = \{j + k + c - 1 \mid (e, i) \in pOcc_{\mathcal{G}}(P), c \in \{0\} \cup Run_{\mathcal{G}}(e, j, |P|), k \in vOcc(e, S)\}$, where*

$$Run_{\mathcal{G}}(e, j, |P|) = \begin{cases} \{c|val(\hat{e})| \mid 1 \leq c, j + c|val(\hat{e})| + |P| - 1 \leq |val^+(\hat{e}^d)|\} & \text{if } e \rightarrow \hat{e}^d, \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By the above observation, we can get the same result for a run-length ACFG as for an SLP in Lemma 10.

4.3 Static Index for Signature Encoding

We can apply the result of Section 4.2 to signature encodings because signature encodings are run-length ACFGs, i.e., we can compute $Occ(P, T)$ by querying $report_{\mathcal{R}}(x_1^{(P,j)}, x_2^{(P,j)}, y_1^{(P,j)}, y_2^{(P,j)})$ for “every” $1 \leq j < |P|$. However, the properties of signature encodings allow us to speed up pattern matching as summarized in the following two ideas: (1) We can efficiently compute $x_1^{(P,j)}, x_2^{(P,j)}, y_1^{(P,j)}$ and $y_2^{(P,j)}$ using LCE queries in compressed space (Lemma 11). (2) We can reduce the number of $report_{\mathcal{R}}$ queries from $O(|P|)$ to $O(\log |P| \log^* M)$ by using the property of the common sequence of P (Lemma 12).

Lemma 11. *Assume that we have the DAG for a signature encoding $\mathcal{G} = (\Sigma, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, S)$ of size w and \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} of \mathcal{G} . Given a signature $id(P) \in \mathcal{V}$ for a string P and an integer j , we can compute $x_1^{(P,j)}, x_2^{(P,j)}, y_1^{(P,j)}$ and $y_2^{(P,j)}$ in $O(\log w (\log N + \log |P| \log^* M))$ time.*

Proof. By Lemma 8 and Fact 1, we can compute $x_1^{(P,j)}$ and $x_2^{(P,j)}$ on \mathcal{X} by binary search in $O(\log w(\log N + \log |P| \log^* M))$ time. Similarly, we can compute $y_1^{(P,j)}$ and $y_2^{(P,j)}$ in the same time. \square

Lemma 12. *Let P be a string with $|P| > 1$. If $|Pow_0^P| = 1$, then $pOcc_{\mathcal{G}}(P) = pOcc_{\mathcal{G}}(P, 1)$. If $|Pow_0^P| > 1$, then $pOcc_{\mathcal{G}}(P) = \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{P}} pOcc_{\mathcal{G}}(P, j)$, where u is the common sequence of P and $\mathcal{P} = \{|val^+(u[1..i])| \mid 1 \leq i < |u|, u[i] \neq u[i+1]\}$.*

Proof. If $|Pow_0^P| = 1$, then $P = a^{|P|}$ for some character $a \in \Sigma$. In this case, P must be contained in a node labeled with a signature $e \rightarrow \hat{e}^d$ such that $\hat{e} \rightarrow a$ and $d \geq |P|$. Hence, all primary occurrences of P can be found by $pOcc_{\mathcal{G}}(P, 1)$.

If $|Pow_0^P| > 1$, we consider the common sequence u of P . Recall that u occurs at position j in e for any $(e, j) \in pOcc(P)$ by Lemma 4. Hence at least $pOcc_{\mathcal{G}}(P) = \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{P}'} pOcc_{\mathcal{G}}(P, i)$ holds, where $\mathcal{P}' = \{|val^+(u[1])|, \dots, |val^+(u[|u|-1])|\}$. Moreover, we show that $pOcc_{\mathcal{G}}(P, i) = \emptyset$ for any $i \in \mathcal{P}'$ with $u[i] = u[i+1]$. Note that $u[i]$ and $u[i+1]$ are encoded into the same signature in the derivation tree of e , and that the parent of two nodes corresponding to $u[i]$ and $u[i+1]$ has a signature e' in the form $e' \rightarrow u[i]^d$. Now assume for the sake of contradiction that $e = e'$. By the definition of the primary occurrences, $i = 1$ must hold, and hence, $Shrink_0^P[1] = u[1] \in \Sigma$. This means that $P = u[1]^{|P|}$, which contradicts $|Pow_0^P| > 1$. Therefore the statement holds. \square

Using Lemmas 2, 7, 11 and 12, we get the following lemma:

Lemma 13. *For a signature encoding \mathcal{G} , represented by $\mathcal{H}(f_{\mathcal{A}}, f'_{\mathcal{A}})$, of size w which generates a text T of length N , there exists a data structure of size $O(w)$ that computes, given a string P , $pOcc_{\mathcal{G}}(P)$ in $O(|P|f_{\mathcal{A}} + \log w \log |P| \log^* M(\log N + \log |P| \log^* M) + q_w |pOcc_{\mathcal{S}}(P)|)$ time.*

Proof. We focus on the case $|Pow_0^P| > 1$ as the other case is easier to be solved. We first compute the common sequence of P in $O(|P|f_{\mathcal{A}})$ time. Taking \mathcal{P} in Lemma 12, we recall that $|\mathcal{P}| = O(\log |P| \log^* M)$ by Lemma 4. Then, in light of Lemma 12, $pOcc_{\mathcal{G}}(P)$ can be obtained by $|\mathcal{P}| = O(\log |P| \log^* M)$ range reporting queries. For each query, we spend $O(\log w(\log N + \log |P| \log^* M))$ time to compute $x_1^{(P,j)}, x_2^{(P,j)}, y_1^{(P,j)}$ and $y_2^{(P,j)}$ by Lemma 11. Hence, the total time complexity is $O(|P|f_{\mathcal{A}} + \log |P| \log^* M(\log w(\log N + \log |P| \log^* M) + \hat{q}_w) + q_w |pOcc_{\mathcal{S}}(P)|) = O(|P|f_{\mathcal{A}} + \log w \log |P| \log^* M(\log N + \log |P| \log^* M) + q_w |pOcc_{\mathcal{S}}(P)|)$. \square

4.4 Dynamic Index for Signature Encoding

In order to dynamize our static index in the previous subsection, we consider a data structure for “dynamic” two-dimensional orthogonal range reporting that can support the following update operations:

- $insert_{\mathcal{R}}(p, x_{pred}, y_{pred})$: given a point $p = (x, y)$, $x_{pred} = \max\{x' \in \mathcal{X} \mid x' \leq x\}$ and $y_{pred} = \max\{y' \in \mathcal{Y} \mid y' \leq y\}$, insert p to \mathcal{R} and update \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} accordingly.

- $\text{delete}_{\mathcal{R}}(p)$: given a point $p = (x, y) \in \mathcal{R}$, delete p from \mathcal{R} and update \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} accordingly.

We use the following data structure:

Lemma 14 ([7]). *There exists a data structure that supports $\text{report}_{\mathcal{R}}(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2)$ in $O(\log |\mathcal{R}| + \text{occ}(\log |\mathcal{R}| / \log \log |\mathcal{R}|))$ time, and $\text{insert}_{\mathcal{R}}(p, i, j)$, $\text{delete}_{\mathcal{R}}(p)$ in amortized $O(\log |\mathcal{R}|)$ time, where occ is the number of the elements to output. This structure uses $O(|\mathcal{R}|)$ space.*⁴

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 1.

Proof (Proof of Theorem 1). Our index consists of $\mathcal{H}(f_A, f'_A)$ and a dynamic range reporting data structure Λ of Lemma 14 whose \mathcal{R} is maintained as they are defined in the static version. We maintain \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} in two ways; self-balancing binary search trees for binary search, and Dietz and Sleator's data structures for order maintenance. Then, primary occurrences of P can be computed as described in Lemma 13. Adding the $O(\text{occ} \log N)$ term for computing all pattern occurrences from primary occurrences, we get the time complexity for pattern matching in the statement. Concerning the update of our index, we described how to update \mathcal{H} after *INSERT* and *DELETE* in Lemma 9. What remains is to show how to update Λ when a signature is inserted into or deleted from \mathcal{V} . When a signature e is deleted from \mathcal{V} , we first locate $e.\text{left}^R$ on \mathcal{X} and $e.\text{right}$ on \mathcal{Y} , and then execute $\text{delete}_{\mathcal{R}}(e.\text{left}^R, e.\text{right})$. When a signature e is inserted into \mathcal{V} , we first locate $x_{\text{pred}} = \max\{x' \in \mathcal{X} \mid x' \leq e.\text{left}^R\}$ on \mathcal{X} and $y_{\text{pred}} = \max\{y' \in \mathcal{Y} \mid y' \leq e.\text{right}\}$ on \mathcal{Y} , and then execute $\text{insert}_{\mathcal{R}}((e.\text{left}^R, e.\text{right}), x_{\text{pred}}, y_{\text{pred}})$. The locating can be done by binary search on \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} in $O(\log w \log N \log^* M)$ time as Lemma 11. In a single *INSERT*(i, Y) or *DELETE*(i, y) operation, $O(y + \log N \log^* M)$ signatures are inserted into or deleted from \mathcal{V} , where $|Y| = y$. Hence we get Theorem 1. \square

5 Applications

In this section, we present a number of applications of the data structures of Sections 3 and 4. Theorems 3 and 4 are applications to text compression.

Theorem 3. *Given a string T of length N , we can compute the LZ77 Factorization of T in $O(Nf_A + z \log w \log^3 N (\log^* N)^2)$ time and $O(w + f'_A)$ working space using $\mathcal{H}(f_A, f'_A)$ for a signature encoding of size w which generates T , where z is the size of the LZ77 factorization of T and $w = O(z \log N \log^* N)$.*

⁴ The original problem considers a real plane in the paper [7], however, his solution only need to compare any two elements in \mathcal{R} in constant time. Hence his solution can apply to our range reporting problem by maintains \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} using the data structure of order maintenance problem proposed by Dietz and Sleator [9], which enables us to compare any two elements in a list L and insert/delete an element to/from L in constant time.

Theorem 4. (1) Given an $\mathcal{H}(f_A, f'_A)$ for a signature encoding $\mathcal{G} = (\Sigma, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, S)$ of size w which generates T , we can compute an SLP \mathcal{S} of size $O(w \log |T|)$ generating T in $O(w \log |T|)$ time. (2) Let us conduct a single INSERT or DELETE operation on the string T generated by the SLP of (1). Let y be the length of the substring to be inserted or deleted, and let T' be the resulting string. During the above operation on the string, we can update, in $O((y + \log |T'| \log^* M)(f_A + \log |T'|))$ time, the SLP of (1) to an SLP \mathcal{S}' of size $O(w' \log |T'|)$ which generates T' , where M is the maximum length of the dynamic text, w' is the size of updated \mathcal{G} which generates T' .

Theorems 5-9 are applications to compressed string processing (CSP), where the task is to process a given compressed representation of string(s) without explicit decompression.

Theorem 5. Given an SLP \mathcal{S} of size n generating a string of length N , we can construct, in $O(n \log \log n \log N \log^* N)$ time, a data structure which occupies $O(n \log N \log^* N)$ space and supports $\text{LCP}(X_i, X_j)$ and $\text{LCS}(X_i, X_j)$ queries for variables X_i, X_j in $O(\log N)$ time. The $\text{LCP}(X_i, X_j)$ and $\text{LCS}(X_i, X_j)$ query times can be improved to $O(1)$ using $O(n \log n \log N \log^* N)$ preprocessing time.

Theorem 6. Given an SLP \mathcal{S} of size n generating a string T of length N , there is a data structure which occupies $O(w + n)$ space and supports queries $\text{LCE}(X_i, X_j, a, b)$ for variables X_i, X_j , $1 \leq a \leq |X_i|$ and $1 \leq b \leq |X_j|$ in $O(\log N + \log \ell \log^* N)$ time, where $w = O(z \log N \log^* N)$. The data structure can be constructed in $O(n \log \log n \log N \log^* N)$ preprocessing time and $O(n \log^* N + w)$ working space, where $z \leq n$ is the size of the LZ77 factorization of T and ℓ is the answer of LCE query.

Let h be the height of the derivation tree of a given SLP \mathcal{S} . Note that $h \geq \log N$. Matsubara et al. [21] showed an $O(nh(n + h \log N))$ -time $O(n(n + \log N))$ -space algorithm to compute an $O(n \log N)$ -size representation of all palindromes in the string. Their algorithm uses a data structure which supports in $O(h^2)$ time, LCE queries of a special form $\text{LCE}(X_i, X_j, 1, p_j)$ [23]. This data structure takes $O(n^2)$ space and can be constructed in $O(n^2 h)$ time [19]. Using Theorem 6, we obtain a faster algorithm, as follows:

Theorem 7. Given an SLP of size n generating a string of length N , we can compute an $O(n \log N)$ -size representation of all palindromes in the string in $O(n \log^2 N \log^* N)$ time and $O(n \log^* N + w)$ space.

A non-empty string s is called a Lyndon word if s is the lexicographically smallest suffix of s . The Lyndon factorization of a non-empty string w is a sequence of pairs $(|f_i|, p_i)$ where each f_i is a Lyndon word and p_i is a positive integer such that $w = f_1^{p_1} \cdots f_m^{p_m}$ and f_{i-1} is lexicographically smaller than f_i for all $1 \leq i < m$. I et al. [14] proposed a Lyndon factorization algorithm running in $O(nh(n + \log n \log N))$ time and $O(n^2)$ space. Their algorithm use the LCE data structure on SLPs [16] which requires $O(n^2 h)$ preprocessing time, $O(n^2)$ working space, and $O(h \log N)$ time for LCE queries. We can obtain a faster algorithm using Theorem 6.

Theorem 8. *Given an SLP of size n generating a string of length N , we can compute the Lyndon factorization of the string in $O(n(n + \log n \log N \log^* N))$ time and $O(n^2 + z \log N \log^* N)$ space.*

We can also solve the grammar compressed dictionary matching problem [17] with our data structures. We preprocess an input dictionary SLP (DSLP) $\langle S, m \rangle$ with n productions that represent m patterns. Given an uncompressed text T , the task is to output all occurrences of the patterns in T .

Theorem 9. *Given a DSLP $\langle S, m \rangle$ of size n that represents a dictionary $\Pi_{\langle S, m \rangle}$ for m patterns of total length N , we can preprocess the DSLP in $O((n \log \log n + m \log m) \log N \log^* N)$ time and $O(n \log N \log^* N)$ space so that, given any text T in a streaming fashion, we can detect all occurrences of the patterns in T in $O(|T| \log m \log N \log^* N + \text{occ})$ time.*

It was shown in [17] that we can construct in $O(n^4 \log n)$ time a data structure of size $O(n^2 \log N)$ which finds all occurrences of the patterns in T in $O(|T|(h + m))$ time, where h is the height of the derivation tree of DSLP $\langle S, m \rangle$. Note that our data structure of Theorem 9 is always smaller, and runs faster when $h = \omega(\log m \log N \log^* N)$.

Acknowledgments. We would like to thank Paweł Gawrychowski for drawing our attention to the work by Alstrup et al. [2,3] and for fruitful discussions.

References

1. Agarwal, P.K., Arge, L., Govindarajan, S., Yang, J., Yi, K.: Efficient external memory structures for range-aggregate queries. *Comput. Geom.* 46(3), 358–370 (2013), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.comgeo.2012.10.003>
2. Alstrup, S., Brodal, G.S., Rauhe, T.: Dynamic pattern matching. Tech. rep., Department of Computer Science, University of Copenhagen (1998)
3. Alstrup, S., Brodal, G.S., Rauhe, T.: Pattern matching in dynamic texts. In: *Proc. SODA 2000*. pp. 819–828 (2000)
4. Beame, P., Fich, F.E.: Optimal bounds for the predecessor problem and related problems. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* 65(1), 38–72 (2002), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jcss.2002.1822>
5. Bille, P., Cording, P.H., Gørtz, I.L., Sach, B., Vildhøj, H.W., Vind, S.: Fingerprints in compressed strings. In: *Proc. WADS 2013*. pp. 146–157 (2013)
6. Bille, P., Christiansen, A.R., Cording, P.H., Gørtz, I.L.: Finger search, random access, and longest common extensions in grammar-compressed strings. *CoRR abs/1507.02853* (2015)
7. Blelloch, G.E.: Space-efficient dynamic orthogonal point location, segment intersection, and range reporting. In: Teng, S.H. (ed.) *SODA*. pp. 894–903. SIAM (2008)
8. Claude, F., Navarro, G.: Self-indexed grammar-based compression. *Fundamenta Informaticae* 111(3), 313–337 (2011)
9. Dietz, P.F., Sleator, D.D.: Two algorithms for maintaining order in a list. In: Aho, A.V. (ed.) *Proceedings of the 19th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, 1987*, New York, New York, USA. pp. 365–372. ACM (1987), <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/28395.28434>

10. Fischer, J., Gagie, T., Gawrychowski, P., Kociumaka, T.: Approximating LZ77 via small-space multiple-pattern matching. In: ESA 2015. pp. 533–544 (2015)
11. Goto, K., Maruyama, S., Inenaga, S., Bannai, H., Sakamoto, H., Takeda, M.: Restructuring compressed texts without explicit decompression. CoRR abs/1107.2729 (2011)
12. Han, Y.: Deterministic sorting in $O(n \log \log n)$ time and linear space. Proc. STOC 2002 pp. 602–608 (2002)
13. Hon, W., Lam, T.W., Sadakane, K., Sung, W., Yiu, S.: Compressed index for dynamic text. In: DCC 2004. pp. 102–111 (2004)
14. I, T., Nakashima, Y., Inenaga, S., Bannai, H., Takeda, M.: Faster Lyndon factorization algorithms for SLP and LZ78 compressed text. In: Proc. SPIRE. pp. 174–185 (2013)
15. I, T., Matsubara, W., Shimohira, K., Inenaga, S., Bannai, H., Takeda, M., Narisawa, K., Shinohara, A.: Detecting regularities on grammar-compressed strings. Inf. Comput. 240, 74–89 (2015)
16. I, T., Matsubara, W., Shimohira, K., Inenaga, S., Bannai, H., Takeda, M., Narisawa, K., Shinohara, A.: Detecting regularities on grammar-compressed strings. Inf. Comput. 240, 74–89 (2015), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2014.09.009>
17. I, T., Nishimoto, T., Inenaga, S., Bannai, H., Takeda, M.: Compressed automata for dictionary matching. Theor. Comput. Sci. 578, 30–41 (2015), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2015.01.019>
18. Kieffer, J.C., Yang, E.: Grammar-based codes: A new class of universal lossless source codes. IEEE Transactions on Information Theory 46(3), 737–754 (2000)
19. Lifshits, Y.: Processing compressed texts: A tractability border. In: Proc. CPM 2007. LNCS, vol. 4580, pp. 228–240 (2007)
20. Maruyama, S., Nakahara, M., Kishiue, N., Sakamoto, H.: Esp-index: A compressed index based on edit-sensitive parsing. J. Discrete Algorithms 18, 100–112 (2013)
21. Matsubara, W., Inenaga, S., Ishino, A., Shinohara, A., Nakamura, T., Hashimoto, K.: Efficient algorithms to compute compressed longest common substrings and compressed palindromes. Theor. Comput. Sci. 410(8–10), 900–913 (2009)
22. Mehlhorn, K., Sundar, R., Urig, C.: Maintaining dynamic sequences under equality tests in polylogarithmic time. Algorithmica 17(2), 183–198 (1997)
23. Miyazaki, M., Shinohara, A., Takeda, M.: An improved pattern matching algorithm for strings in terms of straight-line programs. In: Proc. CPM 1997. pp. 1–11 (1997)
24. Munro, J.I., Nekrich, Y., Vitter, J.S.: Dynamic data structures for document collections and graphs. CoRR abs/1503.05977 (2015)
25. Policriti, A., Prezesa, N.: Fast online Lempel-Ziv factorization in compressed space. In: SPIRE 2015. pp. 13–20 (2015)
26. Sahinalp, S.C., Vishkin, U.: Data compression using locally consistent parsing. TechnicM report, University of Maryland Department of Computer Science (1995)
27. Sahinalp, S.C., Vishkin, U.: Efficient approximate and dynamic matching of patterns using a labeling paradigm (extended abstract). In: FOCS. pp. 320–328. IEEE Computer Society (1996)
28. Sakamoto, H., Maruyama, S., Kida, T., Shimozone, S.: A space-saving approximation algorithm for grammar-based compression. IEICE Transactions 92-D(2), 158–165 (2009)
29. Salson, M., Lecroq, T., Léonard, M., Mouchard, L.: Dynamic extended suffix arrays. J. Discrete Algorithms 8(2), 241–257 (2010)
30. Takabatake, Y., Tabei, Y., Sakamoto, H.: Improved esp-index: A practical self-index for highly repetitive texts. In: Proc. SEA 2014. pp. 338–350 (2014)

31. Takabatake, Y., Tabei, Y., Sakamoto, H.: Online self-indexed grammar compression. In: SPIRE 2015. pp. 258–269 (2015)
32. Ziv, J., Lempel, A.: A universal algorithm for sequential data compression. IEEE Transactions on Information Theory IT-23(3), 337–349 (1977)




Fig. 1. The derivation tree of S (left) and the DAG for \mathcal{G} (right) of Example 3. In the DAG, the black and red arrows represent $e \rightarrow e_l e_r$ and $e \rightarrow \hat{e}^k$ respectively. In Example 4, T is encoded by signature encoding. In the derivation tree of S , the dotted boxes represent the blocks created by the *Eblock* function.




Fig. 2. Abstract images of consistent signatures of substring P of text T , on the derivation trees of the signature encoding of T . Gray rectangles in Figures (1)-(3) represent consistent signature sequences for occurrences of P . (1) Each $XShrink_t^P$ and $XPow_t^P$ occur on substring P in $shrink_t^T$ and Pow_t^T , respectively, where $T = LPR$. (2) The substring P can be represented by $\hat{L}_0^P L_0^P \hat{L}_1^P L_1^P XShrink_2^P R_1^P \hat{R}_1^P R_0^P \hat{R}_0^P$. (3) There exist common signatures on every substring P in the derivation tree. (4) The derivation tree of $id(s_3)$ and the subtree X in the proof of Lemma 6.




Fig. 3. The grid represents the relation between \mathcal{X} , \mathcal{Y} and \mathcal{R} of Example 5. The red rectangle is a query rectangle $(x_1^{(P,1)}, x_2^{(P,1)}, y_1^{(P,1)}, y_2^{(P,1)})$, where $x_1^{(P,1)} = x_2$, $x_2^{(P,1)} = x_{11}$, $y_1^{(P,1)} = y_5$ and $y_2^{(P,1)} = y_{11}$. Therefore, $report_{\mathcal{R}}(x_1^{(P,1)}, x_2^{(P,1)}, y_1^{(P,1)}, y_2^{(P,1)}) = \{X_6, X_{11}\}$.

A Appendix : Theorem 2

A.1 Proof of Theorem 2 (1)

$\mathcal{H}(\log w, w)$ construction in $O(N)$ time and space. Our algorithm computes signatures level by level, i.e., constructs incrementally $Shrink_0^T, Pow_0^T, \dots, Shrink_h^T, Pow_h^T$. For each level, we determine signatures by sorting signature blocks (or run-length encoded signatures) to which we give signatures. The following two lemmas describe the procedure.

Lemma 15. *Given $Eblock(Pow_{t-1}^T)$ for $0 < t \leq h$, we can compute $Shrink_t^T$ in $O((b-a) + |Pow_{t-1}^T|)$ time and space, where b is the maximum integer in Pow_{t-1}^T and a is the minimum integer in Pow_{t-1}^T .*

Proof. Since we assign signatures to signature blocks and run-length signatures in the derivation tree of S in the order they appear in the signature encoding. $Pow_{t-1}^T[i] - a$ fits in an entry of a bucket of size $b - a$ for each element of $Pow_{t-1}^T[i]$ of Pow_{t-1}^T . Also, the length of each block is at most four. Hence we can sort all the blocks of $Eblock(Pow_{t-1}^T)$ by bucket sort in $O((b-a) + |Pow_{t-1}^T|)$ time and space. Since Sig is an injection and since we process the levels in increasing order, for any two different levels $0 \leq t' < t \leq h$, no elements of $Shrink_{t-1}^T$ appear in $Shrink_{t'}^T$, and hence no elements of Pow_{t-1}^T appear in $Pow_{t'}^T$. Thus, we can determine a new signature for each block in $Eblock(Pow_{t-1}^T)$, without searching existing signatures in the lower levels. This completes the proof.

Lemma 16. *Given $Epow(Shrink_t^T)$, we can compute Pow_t^T in $O(x + (b-a) + |Epow(Shrink_t^T)|)$ time and space, where x is the maximum length of runs in $Epow(Shrink_t^T)$, b is the maximum integer in Pow_{t-1}^T , and a is the minimum integer in Pow_{t-1}^T .*

Proof. We first sort all the elements of $Epow(Shrink_t^T)$ by bucket sort in $O(b-a + |Epow(Shrink_t^T)|)$ time and space, ignoring the powers of runs. Then, for each integer r appearing in $Shrink_t^T$, we sort the runs of r 's by bucket sort with a bucket of size x . This takes a total of $O(x + |Epow(Shrink_t^T)|)$ time and space for all integers appearing in $Shrink_t^T$. The rest is the same as the proof of Lemma 15.

The next lemma shows how to construct $\mathcal{H}(\log w, w)$ from a sorted assignment set \mathcal{D} of \mathcal{G} .

Lemma 17. *Given a sorted assignment set \mathcal{D} of \mathcal{G} , we can construct $\mathcal{H}(\log w, w)$ of \mathcal{G} in $O(|\mathcal{V}|)$ time.*

Proof. Recall that \mathcal{H} consists of \mathcal{A} and DAG \mathcal{B} . Clearly, given a sorted assignment set \mathcal{D} , we can construct \mathcal{B} in linear time and space. Also, we can construct, in linear time and space, a balanced search tree for \mathcal{A} from \mathcal{D} . Hence Lemma 17 holds.

We are ready to prove the theorem.

Proof. In the derivation tree of $id(T)$, since the number of nodes in some level is halved when going up two levels higher, every node of Since the size of the derivation tree of $id(T)$ is $O(N)$, by Lemmas 1, 15, and 16, we can compute $id(T)$ and a sorted assignment set \mathcal{D} of \mathcal{G} in $O(N)$ time and space. Finally, by Lemma 17, we can get $\mathcal{H}(\log w, w)$ for \mathcal{G} in $O(N)$ time.

$\mathcal{H}(f_{\mathcal{A}}, f'_{\mathcal{A}})$ construction in $O(Nf_{\mathcal{A}})$ time and $O(f'_{\mathcal{A}} + w)$ working space.

Proof. Note that we can naively compute $id(T)$ for a given string T in $O(Nf_{\mathcal{A}})$ time and $O(N)$ working space. In order to reduce the working space, we consider factorizing T into blocks of size B and processing them incrementally: Starting with the empty signature encoding \mathcal{G} , we can compute $id(T)$ in $O(\frac{N}{B}f_{\mathcal{A}}(\log N \log^* M + B))$ time and $O(w + B + f'_{\mathcal{A}})$ working space by using $INSERT(T[(i-1)B + 1..iB], (i-1)B + 1)$ for $i = 1, \dots, \frac{N}{B}$ in increasing order. Hence our proof is finished by choosing $B = \log N \log^* M$.

A.2 Proof of Theorem 2 (2)

Proof. Consider $\mathcal{H}(f_{\mathcal{A}}, f'_{\mathcal{A}})$ for an empty signature encodings \mathcal{G} . If we can compute $INSERT(Y, i)$ operation in $O(f_{\mathcal{A}} \log N \log^* M)$ time, then Theorem 2 (2) immediately holds by computing $INSERT(f_i, |f_1 \cdots f_{i-1}| + 1)$ for $1 \leq i \leq z$ incrementally. By the proof of Lemma 9, we can compute $INSERT(Y, i)$ for a given $Uniq(Y)$ in $O(f_{\mathcal{A}} \log N \log^* M)$ time. We can compute each $Uniq(f_i)$ in $O(\log N \log^* M)$ time by Lemma 7 because f_i occurs previously in T when $|f_i| > 1$. Hence we get Theorem 2 (2).

Note that we can directly show Lemma 3 from the above proof because the size of \mathcal{G} increases $O(\log N \log^* M)$ by Lemma 6, every time we do $INSERT(f_i, |f_1 \cdots f_{i-1}| + 1)$ for $1 \leq i \leq z$.

A.3 Proof of Theorem 2 (3)

$\mathcal{H}(f_{\mathcal{A}}, f'_{\mathcal{A}})$ construction in $O(nf_{\mathcal{A}} \log N \log^* M)$ time and $O(f'_{\mathcal{A}} + w)$ working space.

Proof. We can construct $\mathcal{H}(f_{\mathcal{A}}, f'_{\mathcal{A}})$ by $O(n)$ $INSERT$ operations as the proof of Theorem 2 (2).

$\mathcal{H}(\log w, w)$ construction in $O(n \log \log n \log N \log^* M)$ time and $O(n \log^* M + w)$ working space. In this section, we sometimes abbreviate $val(X)$ as X for $X \in \mathcal{S}$. For example, $Shrink_t^X$ and Pow_t^X represents $Shrink_t^{val(X)}$ and $Pow_t^{val(X)}$ respectively.

Our algorithm computes signatures level by level, i.e., constructs incrementally $Shrink_0^{X_n}, Pow_0^{X_n}, \dots, Shrink_h^{X_n}, Pow_h^{X_n}$. Like the algorithm described in Section A.1, we can create signatures by sorting blocks of signatures or run-length encoded signatures in the same level. The main difference is that we now

utilize the structure of the SLP, which allows us to do the task efficiently in $O(n \log^* M + w)$ working space. In particular, although $|Shrink_t^{X_n}|, |Pow_t^{X_n}| = O(N)$ for $0 \leq t \leq h$, they can be represented in $O(n \log^* M)$ space.

In so doing, we introduce some additional notations relating to $XShrink_t^P$ and $XPow_t^P$ in Definition 3. By Lemma 4, for any string $P = P_1 P_2$ the following equation holds:

$$\begin{aligned} XShrink_t^P &= \hat{y}_t^{P_1} \hat{z}_t^{(P_1, P_2)} \hat{y}_t^{P_2} \text{ for } 0 < t \leq h^P, \\ XPow_t^P &= y_t^{P_1} z_t^{(P_1, P_2)} y_t^{P_2} \text{ for } 0 \leq t < h^P, \end{aligned}$$

where we define \hat{y}_t^P and y_t^P for a string P as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{y}_t^P &= \begin{cases} XShrink_t^P & \text{for } 0 < t \leq h^P, \\ \varepsilon & \text{for } t > h^P, \end{cases} \\ y_t^P &= \begin{cases} XPow_t^P & \text{for } 0 \leq t < h^P, \\ \varepsilon & \text{for } t \geq h^P. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

For any variable $X_i \rightarrow X_\ell X_r$, we denote $\hat{z}_t^{X_i} = \hat{z}_t^{(val(X_\ell), val(X_r))}$ (for $0 < t \leq h^{val(X_i)}$) and $z_t^{X_i} = z_t^{(val(X_\ell), val(X_r))}$ (for $0 \leq t < h^{val(X_i)}$). Note that $|z_t^{X_i}|, |\hat{z}_t^{X_i}| = O(\log^* N)$ by Lemma 5. We can use $\hat{z}_t^{X_1}, \dots, \hat{z}_t^{X_n}$ (resp. $z_t^{X_1}, \dots, z_t^{X_n}$) as a compressed representation of $XShrink_t^{X_n}$ (resp. $XPow_t^{X_n}$) based on the SLP: Intuitively, $\hat{z}_t^{X_n}$ (resp. $z_t^{X_n}$) covers the middle part of $XShrink_t^{X_n}$ (resp. $XPow_t^{X_n}$) and the remaining part is recovered by investigating the left/right child recursively (see also Figure. 4). Hence, with the DAG structure of the SLP, $XShrink_t^{X_n}$ and $XPow_t^{X_n}$ can be represented in $O(n \log^* M)$ space.

In addition, we define $\hat{A}_t^P, \hat{B}_t^P, A_t^P$ and B_t^P as follows: For $0 < t \leq h^P$, \hat{A}_t^P (resp. \hat{B}_t^P) is a prefix (resp. suffix) of $Shrink_t^P$ which consists of signatures of $A_{t-1}^P L_{t-1}^P$ (resp. $R_{t-1}^P B_{t-1}^P$); and for $0 \leq t < h^P$, A_t^P (resp. B_t^P) is a prefix (resp. suffix) of Pow_t^P which consists of signatures of $\hat{A}_t^P \hat{L}_t^P$ (resp. $\hat{R}_t^P \hat{B}_t^P$). By the definition, $Shrink_t^P = \hat{A}_t^P XShrink_t^P \hat{B}_t^P$ for $0 \leq t \leq h^P$, and $Pow_t^P = A_t^P XPow_t^P B_t^P$ for $0 \leq t < h^P$. See Figure 5 for the illustration.

Since $Shrink_t^{X_n} = \hat{A}_t^{X_n} XShrink_t^{X_n} \hat{B}_t^{X_n}$ for $0 < t \leq h^{X_n}$, we use $\hat{\Lambda}_t = (\hat{z}_t^{X_1}, \dots, \hat{z}_t^{X_n}, \hat{A}_t^{X_n}, \hat{B}_t^{X_n})$ as a compressed representation of $Shrink_t^{X_n}$ of size $O(n \log^* M)$. Similarly, for $0 \leq t < h^{X_n}$, we use $\Lambda_t = (z_t^{X_1}, \dots, z_t^{X_n}, A_t^{X_n}, B_t^{X_n})$ as a compressed representation of $Pow_t^{X_n}$ of size $O(n \log^* M)$.

Our algorithm computes incrementally $\Lambda_0, \hat{\Lambda}_1, \dots, \hat{\Lambda}_{h^{X_n}}$. Note that, given $\hat{\Lambda}_{h^{X_n}}$, we can easily get $Pow_{h^{X_n}}^{X_n}$ of size $O(\log^* M)$ in $O(n \log^* M)$ time, and then $id(val(X_n))$ in $O(\log^* M)$ time from $Pow_{h^{X_n}}^{X_n}$. Hence, in the following three lemmas, we show how to compute $\Lambda_0, \hat{\Lambda}_1, \dots, \hat{\Lambda}_{h^{X_n}}$.

Lemma 18. *Given an SLP of size n , we can compute Λ_0 in $O(n \log \log n \log^* M)$ time and $O(n \log^* M)$ space.*

Proof. We first compute, for all variables X_i , $Epow(XShrink_0^{X_i})$ if $|Epow(XShrink_0^{X_i})| \leq \Delta_L + \Delta_R + 9$, otherwise $Epow(\hat{L}_0^{X_i})$ and $Epow(\hat{R}_0^{X_i})$. The information can be




Fig. 4. $XPow_t^{X_n}$ can be represented by $z_t^{X_1}, \dots, z_t^{X_n}$.

computed in $O(n \log^* M)$ time and space in a bottom-up manner, i.e., by processing variables in increasing order. For $X_i \rightarrow X_\ell X_r$, if both $|Epow(XShrink_0^{X_\ell})|$ and $|Epow(XShrink_0^{X_r})|$ are no greater than $\Delta_L + \Delta_R + 9$, we can compute $Epow(XShrink_0^{X_i})$ in $O(\log^* M)$ time by naively concatenating $Epow(XShrink_0^{X_\ell})$ and $Epow(XShrink_0^{X_r})$. Otherwise $|Epow(XShrink_0^{X_i})| > \Delta_L + \Delta_R + 9$ must hold, and $Epow(\hat{L}_0^{X_i})$ and $Epow(\hat{R}_0^{X_i})$ can be computed in $O(1)$ time from the information for X_ℓ and X_r .

The run-length encoded signatures represented by $z_0^{X_i}$ can be obtained by using the above information for X_ℓ and X_r in $O(\log^* M)$ time: $z_0^{X_i}$ is created over run-length encoded signatures $Epow(XShrink_0^{X_\ell})$ (or $Epow(\hat{R}_0^{X_\ell})$) followed by $Epow(XShrink_0^{X_r})$ (or $Epow(\hat{R}_0^{X_r})$). Also, by definition $A_0^{X_n}$ and $B_0^{X_n}$ represents $Epow(\hat{L}_0^{X_n})$ and $Epow(\hat{R}_0^{X_n})$, respectively.

Hence, we can compute in $O(n \log^* M)$ time $O(n \log^* M)$ run-length encoded signatures to which we give signatures. We determine signatures by sorting the run-length encoded signatures as Lemma 16. However, in contrast to Lemma 16, we do not use bucket sort for sorting the powers of runs because the maximum length of runs could be as large as N and we cannot afford $O(N)$ space for buckets. Instead, we use the sorting algorithm of Han [12] which sorts x integers in $O(x \log \log x)$ time and $O(x)$ space. Hence, we can compute A_0 in $O(n \log \log n \log^* M)$ time and $O(n \log^* M)$ space.

Lemma 19. *Given $\hat{\Lambda}_t$, we can compute Λ_t in $O(n \log \log n \log^* M)$ time and $O(n \log^* M)$ space.*

Proof. The computation process is similar to that of Lemma 18, except that we also use the information in $\hat{\Lambda}_t$.

$\text{Shrink}_2^P =$	\hat{A}_2^P		XShrink_2^P	\hat{B}_2^P	
$\text{Pow}_1^P =$	A_1^P	L_1^P		R_1^P	B_1^P
$\text{Shrink}_1^P =$	\hat{A}_1^P	\hat{L}_1^P		\hat{R}_1^P	\hat{B}_1^P
$\text{Pow}_0^P =$	A_0^P	L_0^P		R_0^P	B_0^P
$\text{Shrink}_0^P =$	\hat{L}_0^P				\hat{R}_0^P
	P				

Fig. 5. An abstract image of Shrink_t^P and Pow_t^P for a string P . For $0 \leq t < h^P$, $A_t^P L_t^P$ (resp. $R_t^P B_t^P$) is encoded into \hat{A}_{t+1}^P (resp. \hat{B}_{t+1}^P). Similarly, for $0 < t < h^P$, $\hat{A}_t^P \hat{L}_t^P$ (resp. $\hat{R}_t^P \hat{B}_t^P$) is encoded into A_t^P (resp. B_t^P).

We first compute, for all variables X_i , $\text{Epow}(\text{XShrink}_t^{X_i})$ if $|\text{Epow}(\text{XShrink}_t^{X_i})| \leq \Delta_L + \Delta_R + 9$, otherwise $\text{Epow}(\hat{L}_t^{X_i})$ and $\text{Epow}(\hat{R}_t^{X_i})$. The information can be computed in $O(n \log^* M)$ time and space in a bottom-up manner, i.e., by processing variables in increasing order. For $X_i \rightarrow X_\ell X_r$, if both $|\text{Epow}(\text{XShrink}_t^{X_\ell})|$ and $|\text{Epow}(\text{XShrink}_t^{X_r})|$ are no greater than $\Delta_L + \Delta_R + 9$, we can compute $\text{Epow}(\text{XShrink}_0^{X_i})$ in $O(\log^* M)$ time by naively concatenating $\text{Epow}(\text{XShrink}_t^{X_\ell})$, $\text{Epow}(\hat{z}_t^{X_i})$ and $\text{Epow}(\text{XShrink}_t^{X_r})$. Otherwise $|\text{Epow}(\text{XShrink}_t^{X_i})| > \Delta_L + \Delta_R + 9$ must hold, and $\text{Epow}(\hat{L}_0^{X_i})$ and $\text{Epow}(\hat{R}_0^{X_i})$ can be computed in $O(1)$ time from $\text{Epow}(\hat{z}_t^{X_i})$ and the information for X_ℓ and X_r .

The run-length encoded signatures represented by $z_t^{X_i}$ can be obtained in $O(\log^* M)$ time by using $\hat{z}_t^{X_i}$ and the above information for X_ℓ and X_r : $z_t^{X_i}$ is created over run-length encoded signatures that are obtained by concatenating $\text{Epow}(\text{XShrink}_0^{X_\ell})$ (or $\text{Epow}(\hat{R}_0^{X_\ell})$), $z_t^{X_i}$ and $\text{Epow}(\text{XShrink}_0^{X_r})$ (or $\text{Epow}(\hat{R}_0^{X_r})$). Also, $A_t^{X_n}$ and $B_t^{X_n}$ represents $\hat{A}_t^{X_n} \hat{L}_t^{X_n}$ and $\hat{R}_t^{X_n} \hat{B}_t^{X_n}$, respectively.

Hence, we can compute in $O(n \log^* M)$ time $O(n \log^* M)$ run-length encoded signatures to which we give signatures. We determine signatures in $O(n \log \log n \log^* M)$ time by sorting the run-length encoded signatures as Lemma 19.

Lemma 20. *Given A_t , we can compute \hat{A}_{t+1} in $O(n \log^* M)$ time and $O(n \log^* M)$ space.*

Proof. In order to compute $\hat{z}_{t+1}^{X_i}$ for a variable $X_i \rightarrow X_\ell X_r$, we need a signature sequence on which $\hat{z}_{t+1}^{X_i}$ is created, as well as its context, i.e., Δ_L signatures to the left and Δ_R to the right. To be precise, the needed signature sequence is $v_t^{X_\ell} z_t^{X_i} u_t^{X_r}$, where $u_t^{X_j}$ (resp. $v_t^{X_j}$) denotes a prefix (resp. suffix) of $y_t^{X_j}$ of length $\Delta_L + \Delta_R + 4$ for any variable X_j (see also Figure 6). Also, we need $A_t u_t^{X_n}$ and $v_t^{X_n} B_t$ to create $\hat{A}_{t+1}^{X_n}$ and $\hat{B}_{t+1}^{X_n}$, respectively.

Note that by Definition 3, $|z_t^X| > \Delta_L + \Delta_R + 9$ if $z_t^X \neq \varepsilon$. Then, we can compute $u_t^{X_i}$ for all variables X_i in $O(n \log^* M)$ time and space by processing variables in increasing order on the basis of the following fact: $u_t^{X_i} = u_t^{X_\ell}$ if




Fig. 6. Abstract images of the needed signature sequence $v_t^{X_\ell} z_t^{X_i} u_t^{X_r}$ ($v_t^{X_\ell}$ and $u_t^{X_r}$ are not shown when they are empty) for computing $z_{t+1}^{X_i}$ in three situations: Top for $0 \leq t < h^{X_\ell}, h^{X_r}$; middle for $h^{X_r} \leq t < h^{X_\ell}$; and bottom for $h^{X_\ell}, h^{X_r} \leq t < h^{X_i}$.

$z_t^{X_\ell} \neq \varepsilon$, otherwise $u_t^{X_i}$ is the prefix of $z_t^{X_i}$ of length $\Delta_L + \Delta_R + 4$. Similarly $v_t^{X_i}$ for all variables X_i can be computed in $O(n \log^* M)$ time and space.

Using $u_t^{X_i}$ and $v_t^{X_i}$ for all variables X_i , we can obtain $O(n \log^* M)$ blocks of signatures to which we give signatures. We determine signatures by sorting the blocks by bucket sort as Lemma 15 in $O(n \log^* M)$ time.

Hence, we can compute \hat{A}_{t+1} in $O(n \log^* M)$ time and $O(n \log^* M)$ space.

We are ready to prove the theorem.

Proof. Using Lemmas 18, 19 and 20, we can get $\hat{A}_{h^{X_n}}$ in $O(n \log \log n \log N \log^* M)$ time by computing $A_0, \hat{A}_1, \dots, \hat{A}_{h^{X_n}}$ incrementally. Note that during the computation we only have to keep A_t (or \hat{A}_t) for the current t and the assignments of \mathcal{G} . Hence the working space is $O(n \log^* M + w)$. By processing $\hat{A}_{h^{X_n}}$ in $O(n \log^* M)$ time, we can get a sorted assignment set \mathcal{D} of \mathcal{G} of size $O(w)$. Finally, we process \mathcal{G} in $O(w)$ time and space to get $\mathcal{H}(\log w, w)$ by Lemma 17.

B Appendix: Applications

B.1 Proof of Theorem 3

For integers j, k with $1 \leq j \leq j+k-1 \leq N$, let $Fst(j, k)$ be the function which returns the minimum integer i such that $i < j$ and $T[i..i+k-1] = T[j..j+k-1]$, if it exists. Our algorithm is based on the following fact:

Fact 2 Let f_1, \dots, f_z be the LZ77-Factorization of a string T . Given f_1, \dots, f_{i-1} , we can compute f_i with $O(\log |f_i|)$ calls of $Fst(j, k)$ (by doubling the value of k , followed by a binary search), where $j = |f_1 \dots f_{i-1}| + 1$.

We explain how to support queries $Fst(j, k)$ using the signature encoding. We define $e.\text{min} = \min vOcc(e, S) + |e.\text{left}|$ for a signature $e \in \mathcal{V}$ with $e \rightarrow e_\ell e_r$

or $e \rightarrow e^k$. We also define $FstOcc(P, i)$ for a string P and an integer i as follows:

$$FstOcc(P, i) = \min\{e.min \mid (e, i) \in pOcc_{\mathcal{G}}(P, i)\}$$

Then $Fst(j, k)$ can be represented by $FstOcc(P, i)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Fst(j, k) &= \min\{FstOcc(T[j..j+k-1], i) - i \mid i \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}\} \\ &= \min\{FstOcc(T[j..j+k-1], i) - i \mid i \in \mathcal{P}\}, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{P} is the set of integers in Lemma 12 with $P = T[j..j+k-1]$.

Recall that in Section 4.3 we considered the two-dimensional orthogonal range reporting problem to enumerate $pOcc_{\mathcal{G}}(P, i)$. Note that $FstOcc(P, i)$ can be obtained by taking $(e, i) \in pOcc_{\mathcal{G}}(P, i)$ with $e.min$ minimum. In order to compute $FstOcc(P, i)$ efficiently instead of enumerating all elements in $pOcc_{\mathcal{G}}(P, i)$, we give every point corresponding to e the weight $e.min$ and use the next data structure to compute a point with the minimum weight in a given rectangle.

Lemma 21 ([1]). *Consider n weighted points on a two-dimensional plane. There exists a data structure which supports the query to return a point with the minimum weight in a given rectangle in $O(\log^2 n)$ time, occupies $O(n)$ space, and requires $O(n \log n)$ time to construct.*

Using Lemma 21, we get the following lemma.

Lemma 22. *Given a signature encoding $\mathcal{G} = (\Sigma, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, S)$ of size w which generates T , we can construct a data structure of $O(w)$ space in $O(w \log w \log N \log^* N)$ time to support queries $Fst(j, k)$ in $O(\log w \log k \log^* N (\log N + \log k \log^* N))$ time.*

Proof. For construction, we first compute $e.min$ in $O(w)$ time using the DAG of \mathcal{G} . Next, we prepare the plane defined by the two ordered sets \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} in Section 4.3. This can be done in $O(w \log w \log N \log^* N)$ time by sorting elements in \mathcal{X} (and \mathcal{Y}) by LCE algorithm (Lemma 8) and a standard comparison-based sorting. Finally we build the data structure of Lemma 21 in $O(w \log w)$ time.

To support a query $Fst(j, k)$, we first compute $Epow(Uniq(P))$ with $P = T[j..j+k-1]$ in $O(\log N + \log k \log^* N)$ time by Lemma 7, and then get \mathcal{P} in Lemma 12. Since $|\mathcal{P}| = O(\log k \log^* M)$ by Lemma 4, $Fst(j, k) = \min\{FstOcc(P, i) - i \mid i \in \mathcal{P}\}$ can be computed by answering $FstOcc$ $O(\log k \log^* M)$ times. For each computation of $FstOcc(P, i)$, we spend $O(\log w (\log N + \log k \log^* N))$ time to compute $x_1^{(P,j)}, x_2^{(P,j)}, y_1^{(P,j)}$ and $y_2^{(P,j)}$ by Lemma 11, and $O(\log^2 w)$ time to compute a point with the minimum weight in the rectangle $(x_1^{(P,j)}, x_2^{(P,j)}, y_1^{(P,j)}, y_2^{(P,j)})$. Hence it takes $O(\log k \log^* M (\log w (\log N + \log k \log^* N) + \log^2 w)) = O(\log w \log k \log^* N (\log N + \log k \log^* N))$ time in total.

We are ready to prove Theorem 3 holds.

Proof (Proof of Theorem 3). We first compute the signature encoding of T in $O(|T|f_{\mathcal{A}})$ time and $O(f'_{\mathcal{A}} + w)$ working space by the algorithm of Theorem 2 (1).

Using a data structure $\mathcal{H}(f_A, f'_A)$ achieving $f_A = O\left(\min\left\{\frac{\log \log M \log \log w}{\log \log \log M}, \sqrt{\frac{\log w}{\log \log w}}\right\}\right)$ time and $f'_A = O(w)$ space, the working space becomes $O(w)$ space. Next we compute the z factors of the LZ77-Factorization of T incrementally by using Fact 2 and Lemma 22 in $O(z \log w \log^3 N (\log^* N)^2)$ time. Therefore the statement holds.

B.2 Proof of Theorem 4

Proof of Theorem 4 (1)

Proof. For any signature $e \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $e \rightarrow e_\ell e_r$, we can easily translate e to a production of SLPs because the assignment is a pair of signatures, like the right-hand side of the production rules of SLPs. For any signature $e \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $e \rightarrow \hat{e}^k$, we can translate e to at most $2 \log k$ production rules of SLPs: We create $t = \lfloor \log k \rfloor$ variables which represent $\hat{e}^{2^1}, \hat{e}^{2^2}, \dots, \hat{e}^{2^t}$ and concatenating them according to the binary representation of k to make up k \hat{e} 's. Therefore we can compute \mathcal{S} in $O(w \log |T|)$ time.

Proof of Theorem 4 (2)

Proof. Note that the number of created or removed signatures in \mathcal{V} is bounded by $O(y + \log |T'| \log^* M)$ by Lemma 6. For each of the removed signatures, we remove the corresponding production from \mathcal{S} . For each of created signatures, we create the corresponding production and add it to \mathcal{S} as in the proof of (1). Therefore Theorem 4 holds. \square

B.3 Proof of Theorem 5

We use the following known result.

Lemma 23 ([2]). *Using the DAG for a signature encoding $\mathcal{G} = (\Sigma, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, S)$, we can support*

- $LCP(s_1, s_2)$ in $O(\log |s_1| + \log |s_2|)$ time,
- $LCS(s_1, s_2)$ in $O((\log |s_1| + \log |s_2|) \log^* M)$ time

where $id(s_1), id(s_2) \in \mathcal{V}$.

Proof. We compute $LCP(s_1, s_2)$ by $LCE(s_1, s_2, 1, 1)$, namely, we use the algorithm of Lemma 8. Let P denote the longest common prefix of s_1 and s_2 . We use the notation \hat{A}^P defined in Section A.3. There exists a signature sequence $v = \hat{A}_{h^P}^P XShrink_{h^P}^P R_{h^P-1}^P \hat{R}_{h^P-1}^P \dots R_0^P \hat{R}_0^P$ that occurs at position 1 in $id(s_1)$ and $id(s_2)$ by a similar argument of Lemma 4. Since $|Epow(v)| = O(\log |P| + \log^* M)$, we can compute $LCP(s_1, s_2)$ in $O(\log |s_1| + \log |s_2|)$ time. Similarly, we can compute $LCS(s_1, s_2)$ in $O((\log |s_1| + \log |s_2|) \log^* M)$ time. More detailed proofs can be found at [2]. \square

To use Lemma 23 for $id(val(X_1)), \dots, id(val(X_n))$, we show the following lemma.

Lemma 24. *Given an SLP \mathcal{S} , we can compute $id(val(X_1)), \dots, id(val(X_n))$ in $O(n \log \log n \log N \log^* N)$ time and $O(n \log N \log^* N)$ space.*

Proof. Recall that the algorithm of Theorem 2 (3) computes $id(val(X_n))$ in $O(n \log \log n \log N \log^* N)$ time. We can modify the algorithm to compute $id(val(X_1)), \dots, id(val(X_n))$ without changing the time complexity: We just compute $A_t^X, \hat{A}_t^X, B_t^X$ and \hat{B}_t^X for “all” $X \in \mathcal{S}$, not only for X_n . Since the total size is $O(n \log N \log^* N)$, Lemma 24 holds.

We are ready to prove Theorem 5.

Proof. The first result immediately follows from Lemma 23 and 24. To speed-up query times for LCP and LCS, We sort variables in lexicographical order in $O(n \log n \log N)$ time by LCP query and a standard comparison-based sorting. Constant-time LCP queries are then possible by using a constant-time RMQ data structure [33] on the sequence of the lcp values. LCS queries can be supported similarly. \square

B.4 Proof of Theorem 6

Proof. We can compute $\mathcal{H}(\log w, w)$ for a signature encoding $\mathcal{G} = (\Sigma, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, S)$ of size w representing T in $O(n \log \log n \log N \log^* N)$ time and $O(n \log^* M + w)$ working space using Theorem 2, where $w = O(z \log N \log^* N)$. Notice that each variable of the SLP appears at least once in the derivation tree of T_n of the last variable X_n representing the string T . Hence, if we store an occurrence of each variable X_i in \mathcal{T}_n and $|val(X_i)|$, we can reduce any LCE query on two variables to an LCE query on two positions of $val(X_n) = T$. In so doing, for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ we first compute $|val(X_i)|$ and then compute the leftmost occurrence ℓ_i of X_i in \mathcal{T}_n , spending $O(n)$ total time and space. By Lemma 8, each LCE query can be supported in $O(\log N + \log \ell \log^* N)$ time. Since $z \leq n$ [34], the total preprocessing time is $O(n \log \log n \log N \log^* N)$ and working space is $O(n \log^* M + w)$. \square

B.5 Proof of Theorem 7

Proof. For a given SLP of size n representing a string of length N , let $P(n, N)$, $S(n, N)$, and $E(n, N)$ be the preprocessing time and space requirement for an LCE data structure on SLP variables, and each LCE query time, respectively.

Matsubara et al. [21] showed that we can compute an $O(n \log N)$ -size representation of all palindromes in the string in $O(P(n, N) + E(n, N) \cdot n \log N)$ time and $O(n \log N + S(n, N))$ space. Hence, using Theorem 6, we can find all palindromes in the string in $O(n \log \log n \log N \log^* N + n \log^2 N \log^* N) = O(n \log^2 N \log^* N)$ time and $O(n \log^* N + w)$ space. \square

B.6 Proof of Theorem 8

Proof. It is shown in [14] that we can compute the Lyndon factorization of the string in $O(P(n, N) + E(n, N) \cdot n \log n)$ time using $O(n^2 + S(n, N))$ space. Hence, using Theorem 6, we can compute the Lyndon factorization of the string in $O(n \log \log n \log N \log^* N + n \log n \log N \log^* N) = O(n \log n \log N \log^* N)$ time. We remark that since $m \leq n$ due to [14], the output size m is omitted in the total time complexity. \square

B.7 Proof of Theorem 9

Proof. In the preprocessing phase, we construct an $\mathcal{H}(\log w', w')$ for a signature encoding $\mathcal{G} = (\Sigma, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{D}, S)$ of size w' such that $id(val(X_1)), \dots, id(val(X_n)) \in \mathcal{V}$ using Lemma 24, spending $O(n \log \log n \log N \log^* M)$ time, where $w' = O(n \log N \log^* M)$. Next we construct a compacted trie of size $O(m)$ that represents the m patterns, which we denote by $PTree$ (*pattern tree*). Formally, each non-root node of $PTree$ represents either a pattern or the longest common prefix of some pair of patterns. $PTree$ can be built by using LCP of Theorem 5 in $O(m \log m \log N)$ time. We let each node have its string depth, and the pointer to its deepest ancestor node that represents a pattern if such exists. Further, we augment $PTree$ with a data structure for level ancestor queries so that we can locate any prefix of any pattern, designated by a pattern and length, in $PTree$ in $O(\log m)$ time by locating the string depth by binary search on the path from the root to the node representing the pattern. Supposing that we know the longest prefix of $T[i..|T|]$ that is also a prefix of one of the patterns, which we call the *max-prefix* for i , $PTree$ allows us to output occ_i patterns occurring at position i in $O(\log m + occ_i)$ time. Hence, the pattern matching problem reduces to computing the max-prefix for every position.

In the pattern matching phase, our algorithm processes T in a streaming fashion, i.e., each character is processed in increasing order and discarded before taking the next character. Just before processing $T[j + 1]$, the algorithm maintains a pair of signature p and integer l such that $val(p)[1..l]$ is the longest suffix of $T[1..j]$ that is also a prefix of one of the patterns. When $T[j + 1]$ comes, we search for the smallest position $i \in \{j - l + 1, \dots, j + 1\}$ such that there is a pattern whose prefix is $T[i..j + 1]$. For each $i \in \{j - l + 1, \dots, j + 1\}$ in increasing order, we check if there exists a pattern whose prefix is $T[i..j + 1]$ by binary search on a sorted list of m patterns. Since $T[i..j] = val(p)[i - j + l..l]$, LCE with p can be used for comparing a pattern prefix and $T[i..j + 1]$ (except for the last character $T[j + 1]$), and hence, the binary search is conducted in $O(\log m \log N \log^* M)$ time. For each i , if there is no pattern whose prefix is $T[i..j + 1]$, we actually have computed the max-prefix for i , and then we output the occurrences of patterns at i . The time complexity is dominated by the binary search, which takes place $O(|T|)$ times in total. Therefore, the algorithm runs in $O(|T| \log m \log N \log^* N + occ)$ time.

By the way, one might want to know occurrences of patterns as soon as they appear as Aho-Corasick automata do it by reporting the occurrences of

the patterns by their ending positions. Our algorithm described above can be modified to support it without changing the time and space complexities. In the preprocessing phase, we additionally compute *RPTree* (*reversed pattern tree*), which is analogue to *PTree* but defined on the reversed strings of the patterns, i.e., *RPTree* is the compacted trie of size $O(m)$ that represents the reversed strings of the m patterns. Let $T[i..j]$ be the longest suffix of $T[1..j]$ that is also a prefix of one of the patterns. A suffix $T[i'..j]$ of $T[i..j]$ is called the *max-suffix for j* iff it is the longest suffix of $T[i..j]$ that is also a suffix of one of the patterns. Supposing that we know the max-suffix for j , *RPTree* allows us to output $eocc_j$ patterns occurring with ending position j in $O(\log m + eocc_j)$ time. Given a pair of signature p and integer l such that $T[i..j] = val(p)[1..l]$, the max-suffix for j can be computed in $O(\log m \log N \log^* N)$ time by binary search on a list of m patterns sorted by their “reversed” strings since each comparison can be done by “leftward” LCE with p . Except that we compute the max-suffix for every position and output the patterns ending at each position, everything else is the same as the previous algorithm, and hence, the time and space complexities are not changed.

References used in Appendix

- 33. Bender, M.A., Farach-Colton, M., Pemmasani, G., Skiena, S., Sumazin, P.: Lowest common ancestors in trees and directed acyclic graphs. *J. Algorithms* 57(2), 75–94 (2005)
- 34. Rytter, W.: Application of Lempel-Ziv factorization to the approximation of grammar-based compression. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 302(1–3), 211–222 (2003)