

# Approximate Circular Pattern Matching

Panagiotis Charalampopoulos<sup>1,2</sup>, Tomasz Kociumaka<sup>3</sup>, Jakub Radoszewski<sup>4,5</sup>,  
Solon P. Pissis<sup>6,7</sup>, Wojciech Rytter<sup>4</sup>, Tomasz Waleń<sup>4</sup>, and Wiktor Zuba<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Birkbeck, University of London, UK, [p.charalampopoulos@bbk.ac.uk](mailto:p.charalampopoulos@bbk.ac.uk)

<sup>2</sup>Reichman University, Herzliya, Israel

<sup>3</sup>Max Planck Institute for Informatics, Saarbrücken, Germany, [tomasz.kociumaka@mpi-inf.mpg.de](mailto:tomasz.kociumaka@mpi-inf.mpg.de)

<sup>4</sup>University of Warsaw, Poland, [{jrad,rytter,walen}@mimuw.edu.pl](mailto:{jrad,rytter,walen}@mimuw.edu.pl)

<sup>5</sup>Samsung R&D, Warsaw, Poland

<sup>6</sup>CWI, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, [{solon.pissis,wiktor.zuba}@cwi.nl](mailto:{solon.pissis,wiktor.zuba}@cwi.nl)

<sup>7</sup>Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

## Abstract

We consider approximate *circular pattern matching* (CPM, in short) under the *Hamming* and *edit* distance, in which we are given a length- $n$  text  $T$ , a length- $m$  pattern  $P$ , and a threshold  $k > 0$ , and we are to report all starting positions of fragments of  $T$  (called occurrences) that are at distance at most  $k$  from some cyclic rotation of  $P$ . In the decision version of the problem, we are to check if any such occurrence exists. All previous results for approximate CPM were either average-case upper bounds or heuristics, except for the work of Charalampopoulos et al. [CKP<sup>+</sup>, JCSS'21], who considered only the Hamming distance.

For the reporting version of the approximate CPM problem, under the Hamming distance we improve upon the main algorithm of [CKP<sup>+</sup>, JCSS'21] from  $\mathcal{O}(n + (n/m) \cdot k^4)$  to  $\mathcal{O}(n + (n/m) \cdot k^3 \log \log k)$  time; for the edit distance, we give an  $\mathcal{O}(nk^2)$ -time algorithm.

We also consider the decision version of the approximate CPM problem. Under the Hamming distance, we obtain an  $\mathcal{O}(n + (n/m) \cdot k^2 \log k / \log \log k)$ -time algorithm, which nearly matches the algorithm by Chan et al. [CGKKP, STOC'20] for the standard counterpart of the problem. Under the edit distance, the  $\mathcal{O}(nk \log^3 k)$  runtime of our algorithm nearly matches the  $\mathcal{O}(nk)$  runtime of the Landau–Vishkin algorithm [LV, J. Algorithms'89]. As a stepping stone, we propose an  $\mathcal{O}(nk \log^3 k)$ -time algorithm for the Longest Prefix  $k'$ -Approximate Match problem, proposed by Landau et al. [LMS, SICOMP'98], for all  $k' \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ .

We give a conditional lower bound that suggests a polynomial separation between approximate CPM under the Hamming distance over the binary alphabet and its non-circular counterpart. We also show that a strongly subquadratic-time algorithm for the decision version of approximate CPM under edit distance would refute the Strong ETH.

## 1 Introduction

Pattern matching is one of the most widely studied problems in computer science. Given two strings, a *pattern*  $P$  of length  $m$  and a *text*  $T$  of length  $n \geq m$ , the task is to find all occurrences of  $P$  in  $T$ . In the standard setting, the matching relation between  $P$  and the fragments of  $T$  assumes that the leftmost and rightmost positions of the pattern are conceptually important. In many real-world applications, however, any rotation (cyclic shift) of  $P$  is a relevant pattern. For instance, in bioinformatics [3, 6, 35, 42], the position where a sequence starts can be totally arbitrary due to arbitrariness in the sequencing of a circular molecular structure or due to inconsistencies introduced into sequence databases as a result of different linearization standards [3]. In image

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
P = \begin{array}{c} \text{a b c b b b b} \\ 0 \ 1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 4 \ 5 \ 6 \end{array} & \text{rot}_3(P) = \begin{array}{c} \text{b b b b a b c} \\ 3 \ 4 \ 5 \ 6 \ 0 \ 1 \ 2 \end{array} & \text{rot}_3(P) = \begin{array}{c} \text{b b b b a b c} \\ 3 \ 4 \ 5 \ 6 \ 0 \ 1 \ 2 \end{array} \\
T = \begin{array}{c} \text{a a c c b c b b a b b b} \\ 0 \ 1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 4 \ 5 \ 6 \ 7 \ 8 \ 9 \ 10 \ 11 \end{array} & T' = \begin{array}{c} \text{a a c b b c b a c b c b} \\ 0 \ 1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 4 \ 5 \ 6 \ 7 \ 8 \ 9 \ 10 \ 11 \end{array}
\end{array}$$

Figure 1: Left: a pattern  $P$ . Middle: a circular 2-mismatch occurrence the pattern  $P$  at position 4 in a text  $T$ . Right: a circular 2-edit occurrence of pattern  $P$  (with the same rotation) at position 3 in text  $T'$ ; note that there is no circular 2-mismatch occurrence of  $P$  in  $T'$  at this position.

processing [2, 56, 57, 58], the contours of a shape may be represented through a directional chain code; the latter can be interpreted as a cyclic sequence if the orientation of the image is not important [2].

With such scenarios in mind, when matching a pattern  $P$  against a text  $T$ , one is interested in computing all fragments of  $T$  that match some rotation of  $P$ . Let us introduce the necessary basic notation. The positions of a string  $U$  are numbered from 0 to  $|U| - 1$ , with  $U[i]$  denoting the  $i$ -th letter, and  $U[i..j] = U[i..j+1)$  denoting the substring  $U[i] \cdots U[j]$ , which is empty if  $i > j$ . We now formally define the circular pattern matching problem.

**CIRCULAR PATTERN MATCHING (CPM)**

**Input:** A text  $T$  of length  $n$  and a pattern  $P$  of length  $m$ .

**Output:** The set  $\{i : T[i..i+m) = P' \text{ for some rotation } P' \text{ of } P\}$ .

A textbook solution for CPM works in  $\mathcal{O}(n \log \sigma)$  time (or  $\mathcal{O}(n)$  time with randomization),<sup>1</sup> where  $\sigma$  is the alphabet size, using the suffix automaton of  $P \cdot P$  [55]. Many practically fast algorithms for CPM also exist; see [21, 30, 59] and references therein. For the indexing version of the CPM problem (searching a collection of circular patterns), see [39, 40, 42].

As in the standard pattern matching setting, a single surplus or missing letter in  $P$  or in  $T$  may result in many occurrences being missed. In bioinformatics, this may correspond to a single-nucleotide polymorphism; in image processing, this may correspond to data corruption. Thus, a relatively large body of work has been devoted to practically fast algorithms for *approximate* CPM; see [2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 31, 37, 38] and references therein. All previous results for approximate CPM are average-case upper bounds or heuristics, except for the work of Charalampopoulos et al. [17].

Here, like in the previous works on approximate CPM, we consider two well-known metrics on strings: the Hamming distance  $\delta_H$  (the number of mismatches for two equal-length strings, otherwise equal to  $\infty$ ) and the edit distance  $\delta_E$  (the minimum number of insertions, deletions, and substitutions required to transform one string into the other). For two strings  $U$  and  $V$ , an integer  $k > 0$ , and a string metric  $d$ , we write  $U =_k^d V$  if  $d(U, V) \leq k$  and  $U \approx_k^d V$  if there exists a rotation  $U'$  of  $U$  such that  $U' =_k^d V$ . We define  $\text{CircOcc}_k^d(P, T) = \{i : P \approx_k^d T[i..j) \text{ for some } j \geq i\}$ ; we call it the set of *circular  $k$ -mismatch ( $k$ -edit) occurrences of  $P$  in  $T$*  if  $d = \delta_H$  ( $d = \delta_E$ , respectively). We omit the  $d$ -superscript when it is clear from the context. Next, we formally define four variants of  $k$ -approximate CPM; see Fig. 1 for an example.

**$k$ -APPROXIMATE CPM:  $k$ -MISMATCH CPM AND  $k$ -EDIT CPM**

**Input:** A text  $T$  of length  $n$ , a pattern  $P$  of length  $m$ , a positive integer  $k$ , and a distance function  $d$ :  $d = \delta_H$  for  $k$ -Mismatch CPM and  $d = \delta_E$  for  $k$ -Edit CPM.

**Output:** (**Reporting**)  $\text{CircOcc}_k^d(P, T)$ .

(**Decision**) An arbitrary position  $i \in \text{CircOcc}_k^d(P, T)$ , if any exists.

<sup>1</sup>There is also a simple deterministic  $\mathcal{O}(n)$ -time algorithm which we discuss in Appendix A.

**Our upper bounds.** A summary of the best previous and new worst-case upper bounds on approximate CPM for strings over a polynomially-bounded integer alphabet (we omit “polynomially-bounded” henceforth) is provided in Table 1.

String metric	Time complexity	Version	Reference
Hamming distance	$\mathcal{O}(nk)$	reporting	[17]
	$\mathcal{O}(n + (n/m) \cdot k^4)$		
	$\mathcal{O}(n + (n/m) \cdot k^3 \log \log k)$	reporting	Theorem 1
	$\mathcal{O}(n + (n/m) \cdot k^2 \log k / \log \log k)$	decision	
Edit distance	$\mathcal{O}(nk^2)$	reporting	Theorem 2
	$\mathcal{O}(nk \log^3 k)$	decision	Theorem 4

Table 1: Comparison of previous upper bounds and our results on  $k$ -approximate CPM.

In Sections 2 and 3.1, we prove the following result.

**Theorem 1.** *The reporting and decision versions of  $k$ -Mismatch CPM for strings over an integer alphabet can be solved in time  $\mathcal{O}(n + (n/m) \cdot k^3 \log \log k)$  and  $\mathcal{O}(n + (n/m) \cdot k^2 \log k / \log \log k)$ , respectively.*

A proof of the following theorem, based on the classic Landau–Vishkin algorithm [54], is given in Section 4.

**Theorem 2.** *The reporting version of  $k$ -Edit CPM for strings over an integer alphabet can be solved in  $\mathcal{O}(nk^2)$  time.*

We reduce the decision version of  $k$ -Edit CPM to the following problem.

<p>LONGEST PREFIX <math>k</math>-APPROXIMATE MATCH (<math>k</math>-LPAM)</p> <p><b>Input:</b> A text <math>T</math> of length <math>n</math> and a pattern <math>P</math>.</p> <p><b>Output:</b> An array <math>\text{LPref}_k[0..n]</math> such that <math>\text{LPref}_k[i]</math> is the length of the longest prefix of <math>P</math> that matches a prefix of <math>T[i..n]</math> with at most <math>k</math> edits.</p>
---

Specifically, we introduce a problem called *All- $k$ -LPAM* that consists in solving  $k'$ -LPAM for all  $k' \in [0..k]$ . We show that  $k$ -Edit CPM can be reduced to All- $k$ -LPAM on the same pattern and text and on the reversed pattern and text. Landau et al. [53] gave an  $\mathcal{O}(nk)$ -time solution to  $k$ -LPAM, which yields an  $\mathcal{O}(nk^2)$ -time solution to All- $k$ -LPAM. In Section 5, we show the following result for All- $k$ -LPAM (Theorem 3) which implies Theorem 4; All- $k$ -LPAM can find further applications in approximate pattern matching; for example, see [9].

**Theorem 3.** *All- $k$ -LPAM for strings over an integer alphabet can be solved in  $\mathcal{O}(nk \log^3 k)$  time.*

**Theorem 4.** *The decision version of  $k$ -Edit CPM for strings over an integer alphabet can be solved in  $\mathcal{O}(nk \log^3 k)$  time.*

The complexities of our algorithms for the decision versions of  $k$ -Mismatch and  $k$ -Edit CPM match, up to  $\log^{(1)} k$  factors, the complexities of some of the fastest known algorithms for pattern matching with up to  $k$  mismatches [14, 18, 25, 34] and edits [54], respectively.

In [53], an algorithm for an easier problem of computing, given two strings  $U$  and  $V$  each of length at most  $n$ , the rotation of  $U$  with the minimum edit distance to  $V$  is given. The algorithm works in  $\mathcal{O}(ne)$  time, where  $e$  is the minimum edit distance achieved.

**Our conditional lower bounds.** We reduce known problems to approximate CPM, as shown in Table 2.

Problem	Conditioned on	Complexity	Reference
Mismatch-CPM (unbounded)	BJI	$\Omega(n^{1.5-\varepsilon})$ for all const. $\varepsilon > 0$	Theorem 37
$k$ -Edit CPM (decision)	SETH	$\Omega(n^{2-\varepsilon})$ for all const. $\varepsilon > 0$	Theorem 38

Table 2: Our conditional lower bounds for approximate CPM for alphabets of constant size.

For the Hamming distance, we consider the Mismatch-CPM problem where the number of allowed mismatches is unbounded (see Section 6 for a precise definition). The breakthrough construction of a Binary Jumbled Index (BJI) in  $\mathcal{O}(n^{1.859})$  time [15] was very recently improved to  $\mathcal{O}(n^{1.5} \log^{\mathcal{O}(1)} n)$  time [22]. We show that, for any constant  $\varepsilon > 0$ , obtaining an  $\mathcal{O}(n^{1.5-\varepsilon})$ -time algorithm for Mismatch-CPM over the binary alphabet would require a further improvement to BJI. In contrast, a similar problem of (non-circular) pattern matching with mismatches admits a classic  $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ -time solution (using convolutions) for constant-size alphabets [29], whereas the fastest known solution for a general alphabet works in  $\mathcal{O}(n^{1.5} \sqrt{\log n})$  time [1, 52]. Our conditional lower bound for  $k$ -Edit CPM is based on the hardness of computing the edit distance of two binary strings [12], conditioned on the Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis (SETH) [43]. It implies conditional optimality of our algorithm for the decision version of  $k$ -Edits CPM for a general  $k \leq n$ , up to a subpolynomial factor.

**The PILLAR model.** We work in the PILLAR model that was introduced in [18] with the aim of unifying approximate pattern matching algorithms across different settings. In this model, we assume that the following primitive PILLAR operations can be performed efficiently, where the argument strings are represented as substrings of strings in a given collection  $\mathcal{X}$ :

- **Extract**( $S, \ell, r$ ): Retrieve string  $S[\ell..r]$ .
- **LCP**( $S, T$ ), **LCP<sub>R</sub>**( $S, T$ ): Compute the length of the longest common prefix/suffix of  $S$  and  $T$ .
- **IPM**( $S, T$ ): Assuming that  $|T| \leq 2|S|$ , compute the starting positions of all exact occurrences of  $S$  in  $T$ , expressed as an arithmetic sequence.
- **Access**( $S, i$ ): Retrieve the letter  $S[i]$ .
- **Length**( $S$ ): Compute the length  $|S|$  of the string  $S$ .

The runtime of algorithms in this model can be expressed in terms of the number of primitive PILLAR operations. (Any extra time required by our algorithms is explicitly specified.)

In Section 2, we obtain fast algorithms for  $k$ -Mismatch CPM in the PILLAR model. Then, in Section 3, we derive efficient solutions for the standard, internal, dynamic, and fully compressed settings based on known implementations of the PILLAR model in these settings. In particular, in the standard setting, where the strings are given explicitly and are over an integer alphabet, all primitive PILLAR operations can be performed in  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  time after a linear-time preprocessing.

## 2 $k$ -Mismatch CPM in the PILLAR Model

For a string  $S$  and an integer  $x \in [0..|S|]$ , we denote  $\text{rot}_x(S) = S[x..|S|] \cdot S[0..x]$ . For  $i \in [0..|S| - m]$ , we denote  $S^{(i)} = S[i..i + m]$ . Also, we denote the set of standard (non-circular)  $k$ -mismatch occurrences of  $P$  in  $T$  by  $\text{Occ}_k(P, T) = \{i \in [0..n - m] : T^{(i)} =_k P\}$ .

Let  $P = P_1 P_2$ , where  $|P_1| = \lfloor m/2 \rfloor$ . Each circular  $k$ -mismatch occurrence of  $P$  in  $T$  implies a standard  $k$ -mismatch occurrence of at least one of  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ . Henceforth, we assume (without loss of generality, as the remaining case is symmetric) that it implies a  $k$ -mismatch occurrence of  $P_1$ .

Our goal is to consider all  $k$ -mismatch occurrences of  $P_1$  in  $T$  as *anchors* for computing circular  $k$ -mismatch occurrences of  $P$  in  $T$ . We call  $P_1$  *the sample*.

By the so-called standard trick, we will consider  $\mathcal{O}(n/m)$  substrings of  $T$  of length  $\mathcal{O}(m)$  and process each of them separately. We denote one such substring by  $T'$ . All positions (occurrences) of the sample can be efficiently computed in such a small *window*  $T'$ :

**Theorem 5** ([18, Main Theorems 5 and 8<sup>2</sup>]). *Given a pattern  $P_1$  and a text  $T'$  of length  $|T'| = \mathcal{O}(|P_1|)$ , we can compute a representation of the set  $\text{Occ}_k(P_1, T')$  as  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  pairwise disjoint arithmetic progressions in  $\mathcal{O}(k^2 \log \log k)$  time plus  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  PILLAR operations.*

We want to extend the occurrences of  $P_1$  in  $T'$  into fragments of  $T$  which approximately match some rotation of  $P$ . Consider only rotations of  $P$  of the form  $YP_1X$ , where  $P = P_1XY$ . Define the set of circular  $k$ -mismatch occurrences  $i$  of  $P$  in  $T$  that imply a  $k$ -mismatch standard occurrence of  $P_1$  in a substring  $T' = T[a..b]$  as follows (such occurrences are *anchored* in  $(P_1, T')$ ):

$$\text{Anchored}_k(P, T, P_1, T') = \{i : T^{(i)} =_k YP_1X, P = P_1XY, i + |Y| - a \in \text{Occ}_k(P_1, T')\}.$$

Our algorithms compute a superset of  $\text{Anchored}_k(P, T, P_1, T')$  that may also contain other circular  $k$ -mismatch occurrences of  $P$  in  $T$  (some of the ones that contain a  $k$ -mismatch occurrence of  $P_2$ ). Let  $A = \text{Occ}_k(P_1, T')$ , and recall that this refers to standard  $k$ -mismatch occurrences.

## 2.1 Few $k$ -mismatch Occurrences of the Sample: $|A| = \mathcal{O}(k)$

We first assume that  $|A| = \mathcal{O}(k)$ . Let us denote by  $\text{PAIRMATCH}_k(T, P, i, j)$  the set of all circular  $k$ -mismatch occurrences of  $P$  in  $T$  such that position  $i$  in  $T$  is aligned with position  $j$  in  $P$ :

$$\text{PAIRMATCH}_k(T, P, i, j) = \{p \in [i - m + 1..i] : T^{(p)} =_k \text{rot}_x(P), i - p \equiv j - x \pmod{m}\}.$$

In particular  $\text{PAIRMATCH}_k(T, P, i, 0)$  is the set of circular  $k$ -mismatch occurrences of  $P$  such that the leftmost position of  $P$  is aligned with position  $i$  in  $T$ .

The following lemma was shown in [17] without explicitly mentioning the PILLAR model.

**Lemma 6** ([17, see Lemma 10]). *For any given  $k, i, j$ , the set  $\text{PAIRMATCH}_k(T, P, i, j)$ , represented as a union of  $\mathcal{O}(k)$  intervals, can be computed in  $\mathcal{O}(k)$  time in the PILLAR model.*

**Lemma 7.** *Given  $A = \text{Occ}_k(P_1, T')$  of size  $\mathcal{O}(k)$ , a superset of  $\text{Anchored}_k(P, T, P_1, T')$ , represented as a union of  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  intervals, can be computed in  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  time in the PILLAR model. The computed superset contains only circular  $k$ -mismatch occurrences of  $P$  in  $T$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $T' = T[a..b]$ . We then have

$$\text{Anchored}_k(P, T, P_1, T') \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in A} \text{PAIRMATCH}_k(T, P, i + a, 0) \subseteq \text{CircOcc}_k(P, T).$$

By the assumption  $|A| = \mathcal{O}(k)$ , the result, represented as a union of  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  intervals, can be computed in  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  time in the PILLAR model using the algorithm of Lemma 6.  $\square$

<sup>2</sup>When referring to statements of [18], we use their numbering in the full (arXiv) version of the paper.

## 2.2 Many $k$ -mismatch Occurrences of the Sample: $|A| > 864k$

We henceforth assume that  $|A| = |\text{Occ}_k(P_1, T')| > 864k$ . By [18], this yields approximate periodicity in both  $P_1$  and the portion of  $T'$  spanned by the  $k$ -mismatch occurrences of  $P_1$ . We show that, except for  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  intervals of circular  $k$ -mismatch occurrences of  $P$  that we can compute using  $\mathcal{O}(k)$  calls to  $\text{PAIRMATCH}_k$  as in Section 2.1, our problem reduces to matching length- $m$  substrings of an approximately periodic substring  $V$  of  $T$  and of an approximately periodic substring  $U$  of  $P^2$  with aligned approximate periodicity. Afterward, testing a match of two length- $m$  substrings for  $U$  and  $V$  reduces to a test only involving positions breaking periodicity, called *misperiods*, since the equality on other positions is guaranteed due to common approximate periodicities. The number of misperiods in  $U$  and  $V$  is only  $\mathcal{O}(k)$ , so the complexity of our algorithms, in terms of  $\text{PILLAR}$  operations, depends only on  $k$ .

By  $S^p$  we denote the concatenation of  $p$  copies of a string  $S$ . A string  $Q$  is called primitive if there is no string  $B$  and integer  $p \geq 2$  such that  $Q = B^p$ . We introduce the following problem.

**PERIODICSUBSTRINGMATCH**( $U, V$ )

**Input:** Positive integers  $m, k$ , and  $q$ , an integer  $r \in [0..q)$ , and strings  $U, V$ , and  $Q$  such that  $m \leq |U|, |V| \leq 2m$ ,  $q = |Q|$ , and  $U, V$  are at Hamming distance  $\mathcal{O}(k)$  from prefixes of  $Q^\infty, (\text{rot}_r(Q))^\infty$ , respectively.

**Output:** The set of positions  $p$  in  $U$  for which there exists a position  $x$  in  $V$  such that  $U^{(p)} =_k V^{(x)}$  and  $p - x \equiv r \pmod{q}$ .

Our goal is to reduce  $k$ -Mismatch CPM in this case to **PERIODICSUBSTRINGMATCH**. To this end, we use the idea of repetitive regions from [18].

**Definition 8.** A  $k$ -repetitive region in a string  $S$  of length  $m$  is a substring  $R$  of  $S$  of length  $|R| \geq 3m/8$  for which there exists a primitive string  $Q$  such that

$$|Q| \leq m/(128k) \text{ and } \delta_H(R, Q^\infty[0..|R|]) = \lceil 8k|R|/m \rceil.$$

The following lemma is a simplified version of a lemma from [18] with one repetitive region.

**Lemma 9** (see [18, Lemma 3.11]). *Given a pattern  $P$  of length  $m$ , a text  $T$  of length  $n \leq \frac{3}{2}m$ , and a positive integer threshold  $k \leq m$ , if the pattern  $P$  contains a  $k$ -repetitive region, then  $|\text{Occ}_k(P, T)| \leq 864k$ .*

Intuitively, in our main lemma in this section (Lemma 11), we show that if  $P_1$  has many  $k$ -mismatch occurrences in  $T'$ , then each circular  $k$ -mismatch occurrence of  $P$  in  $T$  that is an element of  $\text{Anchored}_k(P, T, P_1, T')$  is: either (a) computed in an instance of **PERIODICSUBSTRINGMATCH**; or (b) implies a  $k$ -mismatch occurrence of one of at most two  $k$ -repetitive regions of  $P_2P_1P_2$ . The occurrences of the second type can be computed using  $\mathcal{O}(k)$  calls to  $\text{PAIRMATCH}_k$  by viewing  $k$ -repetitive regions as samples and applying Lemma 9 to bound the number of  $k$ -mismatch occurrences.

In the proof of Lemma 11, we use the following theorem from [18]; part 1 is a consequence of [18, Theorem 3.1] (existence of  $Q$ ) and [18, Lemmas 3.8, 3.11, 3.14, and 4.4] (computation of  $Q$ ), whereas the remaining parts are due to [18, Main Theorem 5].

**Theorem 10** ([18]). *Assume that we are given a pattern  $P$  of length  $m$ , a text  $T$  of length  $n \leq \frac{3}{2}m$ , and a positive integer threshold  $k \leq m$ . If  $|\text{Occ}_k(P, T)| > 864k$  and  $T$  starts and ends with  $k$ -mismatch occurrences of  $P$ , that is,  $0, |T| - m \in \text{Occ}_k(P, T)$ , then:*

1. *there is a substring  $Q$  of  $P$  satisfying  $|Q| \leq m/(128k)$  and  $\delta_H(P, Q^\infty[0..|P|]) < 2k$ , and such a substring can be computed in  $\mathcal{O}(k)$  time in the **PILLAR** model;*



2. each element of  $\text{Occ}_k(P, T)$  is a multiple of  $|Q|$ ;
3.  $\delta_H(T, Q^\infty[0..n]) \leq 6k$ ;
4.  $\text{Occ}_k(P, T)$  can be decomposed into  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  arithmetic progressions with difference  $|Q|$ .

**Lemma 11** (Reduction to PERIODICSUBSTRINGMATCH). *If  $|T'| \leq \lfloor \frac{3}{4}m \rfloor$  and  $|\text{Occ}_k(P_1, T')| > 864k$ , then there is a superset of  $\text{Anchored}_k(P, T, P_1, T')$  containing circular  $k$ -mismatch occurrences of  $P$  in  $T$  that is a union of  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  intervals and of the output of PERIODICSUBSTRINGMATCH with  $U$  and  $V$  being substrings of  $T$  and  $P^2$ , respectively. The intervals and the input to the PERIODICSUBSTRINGMATCH call can be computed in  $\mathcal{O}(k^2 \log \log k)$  time plus  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  PILLAR operations.*

*Proof.* We apply Theorem 10 to  $P_1$  and the part  $T''$  of  $T'$  spanned by the  $k$ -mismatch occurrences in  $\text{Occ}_k(P_1, T')$ , obtaining a short primitive string  $Q$ . Consider the occurrence of  $P_1$  at position  $|P_2|$  of  $P_2P_1P_2$ . Let us extend this substring to the right, trying to accumulate enough mismatches with a prefix of  $Q^\infty$  in order to reach the threshold specified in Definition 8, which is  $\Theta(k)$ . In order to compute the next mismatch, it suffices to perform an LCP query between the remaining suffix of  $P_2P_1P_2$  and some rotation of  $Q^\infty$ . An analogous process was described in detail in [18, Lemma 4.4], and the fact that the PILLAR model supports the described LCP queries is shown in [18, Corollary 2.9]. If we manage to accumulate enough mismatches, we call the resulting  $k$ -repetitive region  $R_R$ . We perform the same process by extending this occurrence of  $P_1$  to the left, possibly obtaining a  $k$ -repetitive region  $R_L$ . Then, we let  $V$  be the shortest substring  $(P_2P_1P_2)[v..v']$  of  $P_2P_1P_2$  that spans both  $R_L$  (or  $P_2P_1$  if  $R_L$  does not exist) and  $R_R$  (or  $P_1P_2$  if  $R_R$  does not exist). Let us observe that  $V$  is at distance at most  $2 \cdot \lceil 8km/m \rceil = 16k$  from a prefix of  $(\text{rot}_{r(P)}(Q))^\infty$ , where  $r(P) = v - |P_2| \pmod{|Q|}$ ; this is by the definition of  $k$ -repetitive regions and the fact that  $|R_R|, |R_L| \leq m$ . Moreover, obviously,  $|V| \leq 2m$ .

The rotations of  $P$  that contain  $P_1$  are in one-to-one correspondence with the length- $m$  substrings of  $P_2P_1P_2$ . Each such substring contains  $R_L$ , contains  $R_R$ , or is contained in  $V$ . We now show that we can efficiently compute circular  $k$ -mismatch occurrences of  $P$  that imply  $k$ -mismatch occurrences of either  $R_L$  or  $R_R$  (if they exist) using the tools that developed in Section 2.1. We focus on  $R_R$  as  $R_L$  can be handled symmetrically. Due to Lemma 9,  $R_R$  has  $\mathcal{O}(k)$   $k$ -mismatch occurrences in  $T'$ , and they can be found in  $\mathcal{O}(k^2 \log \log k)$  time plus  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  PILLAR operations using Theorem 5. For each such occurrence at some position  $i$  of  $T$ , we perform a call  $\text{PAIRMATCH}_k$  as in Lemma 7.

We are left with computing elements of  $\text{Anchored}_k(P, T, P_1, T')$  corresponding to  $k$ -mismatch occurrences of length- $m$  substrings of  $V$  in  $T$  in the case where  $|V| \geq m$ . Let us take the considered fragment  $T'' = T[a..b]$  in  $T$ , which is at distance at most  $6k$  from a prefix of  $Q^\infty$ , and extend it to the right until either of the following three conditions is satisfied: (a) we reach the end of  $T$ ; (b) we have appended  $\lceil m/2 \rceil$  letters; or (c) the resulting substring has  $18k$  additional mismatches with the same-length prefix of  $Q^\infty$ . Symmetrically, we extend  $T''$  to the left until either of the following three conditions is satisfied: (a) we reach the beginning of  $T$ ; (b) we have prepended  $\lceil m/2 \rceil$  letters; or (c) the prepended substring has  $18k$  mismatches with the same-length suffix of  $Q^{|T|}$ . We set the obtained substring  $T[u..u']$  of  $T$  to be  $U$ . We observe that  $|U| \leq 2m$  (since  $\lfloor 3m/4 \rfloor \geq |T'| \geq |T''| > 864k$  implies  $m > 1152$  and  $|U| \leq |T''| + 2 \lceil m/2 \rceil \leq 7m/4 + 2$ ) and  $U$  is at distance at most  $6k + 2 \cdot 18k = 42k$  from a prefix of  $(\text{rot}_{r(T)}(Q))^\infty$ , where  $r(T) = u - a \pmod{|Q|}$ . If  $|U| < m$ , we do not construct the instance of PERIODICSUBSTRINGMATCH.

In the call to PERIODICSUBSTRINGMATCH, we set  $Q := \text{rot}_{r(T)}(Q)$  and  $r := (r(P) - r(T)) \pmod{|Q|}$ . Now, since  $Q$  is primitive, it does not match any of its non-trivial rotations. Further, as we have at least  $128k - 42k - 1$  (resp.  $128k - 16k - 1$ ) exact occurrences of  $Q$  in any length- $m$  fragment of  $U$  (resp.  $V$ ), the periodicities must be synchronized in any circular  $k$ -mismatch occurrence. Hence, for any  $p \in \text{Anchored}_k(P, T, P_1, T')$  that corresponds to  $U^{(p)} =_k V^{(x)}$  we must have  $p + r(T) \equiv x + r(P) \pmod{|Q|}$ , and therefore  $p - x \equiv r(P) - r(T) \equiv r \pmod{|Q|}$ .

It suffices to show that there is no position  $i \in \text{Anchored}_k(P, T, P_1, T')$  such that  $T^{(i)}$  is at distance at most  $k$  from a substring of  $V$  yet  $[i \dots i + m) \not\subseteq [u \dots u')$ . Suppose that this is the case towards a contradiction, and assume without loss of generality that  $i < u$  (the other case is symmetric). We notice that  $i < u$  is possible only if we stopped extending to the left because we accumulated enough mismatches. Further, let the implied  $k$ -mismatch occurrence of  $P_1$  start at some position  $t$  of  $T$ , let  $x$  be an integer such that  $\delta_H(V^{(x)}, T^{(i)}) \leq k$ , and let  $F$  be the length- $(t - i)$  suffix of  $Q^{|T|}$ , i.e.,  $Q^{|T|}[|T| \cdot |Q| - (t - i) \dots |T| \cdot |Q|)$ . Then, via the triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} k &\geq \delta_H(V^{(x)}, T^{(i)}) \geq \delta_H(V^{(x)}[0 \dots t - i], T[i \dots t)) \\ &\geq \delta_H(T[i \dots t), F) - \delta_H(F, V^{(x)}[0 \dots t - i)) \geq 18k - 16k > k, \end{aligned}$$

thus obtaining a contradiction. This completes the proof of this lemma.  $\square$

### 2.3 The Reporting Version of $k$ -Mismatch CPM

In this section, we give a solution to PERIODICSUBSTRINGMATCH. Let us recall the notion of misperiods that was introduced in [17].

**Definition 12.** A position  $a$  in  $S$  is a *misperiod* with respect to a substring  $Q$  of  $S$  if  $S[a] \neq Q^\infty[a]$ . We denote the set of misperiods by  $\text{Misp}(S, Q)$ .

We can compute the sets  $I = \text{Misp}(U, Q)$  and  $J = \text{Misp}(V, \text{rot}_r(Q))$  in  $\mathcal{O}(k)$  time in the PILLAR model. This is due to [18, Corollary 2.9], which allows us to answer queries of the form  $\text{LCP}(S[i \dots j], Q^\infty[a \dots b])$  in  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  time in the PILLAR model. For an integer  $z$ , let us denote  $\mathbf{W}_z = [z \dots z + m)$  (a *window* of size  $m$ ). We define  $\text{Mispers}(i, j) = |\mathbf{W}_i \cap I| + |\mathbf{W}_j \cap J|$ .

The following problem is a simpler version of PERIODICSUBSTRINGMATCH that was considered in [17]. (Actually, [17] considered a slightly more restricted problem which required that no two misperiods in  $U^{(p)}$  and  $V^{(x)}$  are aligned and computed a superset of its solution that corresponds exactly to the statement below.)

PERIODICPERIODICMATCH( $U, V$ )

**Input:** Same as in PERIODICSUBSTRINGMATCH.

**Output:** The set of positions  $p$  in  $U$  for which there exists a position  $x$  in  $V$  such that  $U^{(p)} =_k V^{(x)}$ ,  $p - x \equiv r \pmod{q}$ , and  $\text{Mispers}(p, x) \leq k$ .

For an integer set  $A$  and an integer  $r$ , let  $A \oplus r = \{a + r : a \in A\}$ . An *interval chain* for an interval  $I$  and non-negative integers  $a$  and  $q$  is a set of the form  $I \cup (I \oplus q) \cup (I \oplus 2q) \cup \dots \cup (I \oplus aq)$ . Here,  $q$  is called the *difference* of the interval chain.

**Lemma 13** ([17, Lemma 15]). *Given sets  $I = \text{Misp}(U, Q)$  and  $J = \text{Misp}(V, \text{rot}_r(Q))$ , we can compute in  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  time a solution to PERIODICPERIODICMATCH represented as  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  interval chains, each with difference  $q$ .*

Next, we observe that if  $U^{(p)} =_k V^{(x)}$ , then either some two misperiods in  $U^{(p)}$  and  $V^{(x)}$  are aligned, or the total number of misperiods in these substrings is at most  $k$ .

**Observation 14.** *We have  $\text{PERIODICSUBSTRINGMATCH}(U, V) =$*

$$\text{PERIODICPERIODICMATCH}(U, V) \cup \bigcup_{i \in I, j \in J} \text{PAIRMATCH}_k(U, V, i, j).$$



By the observation, there are  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  instances of  $\text{PAIRMATCH}_k$ , each taking  $\mathcal{O}(k)$  time in the **PILLAR** model, and a **PERIODICPERIODICMATCH** instance that can be solved in  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  time. This results in total time complexity  $\mathcal{O}(k^3)$  for **PERIODICSUBSTRINGMATCH**. Together with the previous reductions and up to transforming the output from a union of intervals and interval chains to a list of circular  $k$ -mismatch occurrences without duplicates, this gives the complete algorithm for the reporting version of  $k$ -Mismatch CPM in the **PILLAR** model.

**Theorem 15.** *The reporting version of  $k$ -Mismatch CPM can be solved in  $\mathcal{O}((n/m) \cdot k^3 \log \log k + \text{Output})$  time plus  $\mathcal{O}((n/m) \cdot k^3)$  **PILLAR** operations.*

*Proof.* Assume that  $P_1$  is the sample. We use the so-called standard trick that covers  $T$  by a collection of its substrings  $T'$  of length  $\lfloor \frac{3}{4}m \rfloor$  starting at positions divisible by  $\lfloor \frac{1}{4}m \rfloor$ . The following computations are performed for each  $T'$ .

We use Theorem 5 to compute a representation of the set  $A = \text{Occ}(P_1, T')$ . If  $|A| \leq 864k$ , we use Lemma 7 that outputs  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  intervals of circular  $k$ -mismatch occurrences in  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  time in the **PILLAR** model. Otherwise, we apply Lemma 11 which, in  $\mathcal{O}(k^2 \log \log k)$  time plus  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  **PILLAR** operations, outputs  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  intervals of circular  $k$ -mismatch occurrences and returns an instance of **PERIODICSUBSTRINGMATCH**. This instance can be reduced, using Observation 14, to an instance of **PERIODICPERIODICMATCH** and  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  instances of  $\text{PAIRMATCH}_k$ . The former can be solved with Lemma 13 in  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  time with the output represented as a union of  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  interval chains with difference  $q$ , while the latter can be solved with Lemma 6 in  $\mathcal{O}(k^3)$  time in the **PILLAR** model and produce  $\mathcal{O}(k^3)$  intervals. Overall, the computations take  $\mathcal{O}(k^3)$  time in the **PILLAR** model and produce  $\mathcal{O}(k^3)$  intervals and  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  interval chains with difference  $q$ .

As shown in [17, Lemma 4], each interval chain with difference  $q$  can be viewed as a union of  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  rectangles in a grid of height  $q$ . The grid points correspond, column by column and bottom-up in columns, to subsequent positions of the text. An interval is a special case of an interval chain. Thus, the problem reduces to computing all grid points in the union of  $\mathcal{O}(k^3)$  rectangles. This problem can be solved using a line sweep algorithm in  $\mathcal{O}(k^3 \log \log k + \text{Output})$  time.

**Claim.** Given  $r$  rectangles on a grid, we can report all grid points contained in any rectangle in  $\mathcal{O}(r \log \log r + \text{Output})$  total time, where **Output** is the total number of reported points. The points are reported column by column and bottom-up in columns.

*Proof.* In [20, Claim 20], a line sweep algorithm was proposed that solves the same problem on an  $n \times n$  grid in  $\mathcal{O}(n + r + \text{Output})$  time (actually, the algorithm solved a more general problem, for many independent families of rectangles at once). The algorithm uses  $\mathcal{O}(n + r)$  time to sort events in the sweep (corresponding to coordinates of rectangles' vertices) using radix sort and the remaining operations work in  $\mathcal{O}(\text{Output})$  time. We use the same algorithm but substitute the radix sort with integer sorting [36]; we obtain  $\mathcal{O}(r \log \log r + \text{Output})$  time.  $\square$

In the end, we compute a sorted list of all circular  $k$ -mismatch occurrences assuming that  $P_2$  is the sample and, in  $\mathcal{O}(\text{Output})$  time, merge the results and remove duplicates.  $\square$

## 2.4 A Faster Algorithm for the Decision Version of $k$ -Mismatch CPM

Two aligned misperiods can correspond to zero or one mismatch, while each misaligned misperiod always yields one mismatch. Let us recall that  $I = \text{Misp}(U, Q)$  and  $J = \text{Misp}(V, \text{rot}_r(Q))$ . We define

the following *mismatch correcting* function that function corrects *surplus mismatches*:

$$\nabla(i, j) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } (i, j) \notin I \times J, \text{ otherwise:} \\ 1 & \text{if } U[i] \neq V[j], \\ 2 & \text{if } U[i] = V[j]. \end{cases}$$

Further, let  $\text{Surplus}(i, j) = \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} \nabla(i+t, j+t)$ .

DECISION PERIODICSUBSTRINGMATCH( $U, V$ )

**Input:** Same as before, with the sets  $I, J$  stored explicitly.

**Output:** Any position  $p \in [0..|U| - m]$  such that  $\text{Mispers}(p, x) - \text{Surplus}(p, x) \leq k$  for some  $x \in [0..|V| - m]$  such that  $p - x \equiv r \pmod{q}$ .

We consider a  $(|U| - m + 1) \times (|V| - m + 1)$  grid  $\mathcal{G}$ . A point  $(i, j) \in \mathcal{G}$  is called *essential* if  $i \in I$ ,  $j \in J$ , and  $i - j \equiv r \pmod{q}$ . The  $\delta$ -th diagonal in  $\mathcal{G}$  consists of points  $(i, j)$  that satisfy  $i - j = \delta$ ; it is an *essential* diagonal if it contains an essential point. Let us observe that only essential points influence the function  $\text{Surplus}$ , and the number of these points is  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$ . This implies the following lemma using a simple 1D sweeping algorithm.

**Lemma 16** (Compact representation of Mispers and Surplus). *In  $\mathcal{O}(k^2 \log \log k)$  time, we can:*

- (a) *Partition the grid  $\mathcal{G}$  by  $\mathcal{O}(k)$  vertical and  $\mathcal{O}(k)$  horizontal lines into  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  disjoint rectangles such that the value  $\text{Mispers}(i, j)$  is the same for all points  $(i, j)$  in a single rectangle. Each rectangle stores the value  $\text{Mispers}(i, j)$  common to all points  $(i, j)$  that it contains.*
- (b) *Partition all essential diagonals in  $\mathcal{G}$  into  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  pairwise disjoint diagonal segments such that the value  $\text{Surplus}(i, j)$  is the same for all points  $(i, j)$  in a single segment. Each segment stores the value  $\text{Surplus}(i, j)$  common to all points  $(i, j)$  that it contains.*

*Proof.* Partitioning (a): We partition the first axis (second axis) into  $\mathcal{O}(k)$  axis segments such that, for all  $i$  ( $j$ , respectively) in the same segment, the set  $\mathbf{W}_i \cap I$  ( $\mathbf{W}_j \cap J$ , respectively) is the same. Then, we create rectangles being Cartesian products of the segments.

Partitioning of an axis is performed with a 1D sweep; we describe it in the context of the first axis. For each  $i \in I$ , we create an event at position  $i - m + 1$ , where the misperiod  $i$  is inserted, and an event at position  $i + 1$  (if  $i + 1 \leq |U| - m + 1$ ), where it is removed. We can now sort all events in  $\mathcal{O}(k \log \log k)$  time using integer sorting [36] and process them in order, storing the number of misperiods. For all  $i$  in a segment without events, the set  $\mathbf{W}_i \cap I$  is the same. We obtain  $\mathcal{O}(k)$  segments on each axis, which yields  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  rectangles. Part (a) works in  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  time.

Partitioning (b): First, we bucket sort essential points by (essential) diagonals using integer sorting. On each essential diagonal, we sort the essential points bottom-up and perform the same kind of 1D sweep as in (a), using  $\nabla$  to compute the weights of the events. The whole algorithm works in  $\mathcal{O}(k^2 \log \log k)$  time.  $\square$

We assume that the grid  $\mathcal{G}$  is partitioned by selected horizontal and vertical lines into disjoint rectangles, called *cells*. These cells and some diagonal segments are weighted. Let us denote by  $\text{cell}(i, j)$  and  $\text{diag}(i, j)$  the weight of the cell and the diagonal segment, respectively, containing point  $(i, j)$ . In the following problem, we care only about points on diagonal segments.

### DIAGONALSEGMENTS

**Input:** A grid partitioned by  $\mathcal{O}(k)$  vertical and  $\mathcal{O}(k)$  horizontal lines into  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  weighted rectangles, called cells, and  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  pairwise disjoint weighted diagonal line segments, all parallel to the line that passes through  $(0, 0)$  and  $(1, 1)$ .

**Output:** Report a point  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$  on some diagonal line segment with minimum value  $\text{val}(x, y) := \text{cell}(x, y) + \text{diag}(x, y)$ .




Figure 2: The weight of the distinguished cell is equal to  $\text{Mispers}(i, j)$  for all points  $(i, j)$  in that cell. The diagonals are partitioned into segments. The weight of a single diagonal segment is equal to  $-\text{Surplus}(i, j)$  for all points  $(i, j)$  that lie on that segment. In the DIAGONALSEGMENTS problem, we are to find any point  $(i, j)$  on some diagonal segment that minimizes the sum of the weight of its cell and of its diagonal segment, i.e.,  $\text{Mispers}(i, j) - \text{Surplus}(i, j)$ . To this end, it suffices to consider endpoints of diagonal segments and crossings of diagonal segments with rectangles' boundaries.

An intuition of the solution to DIAGONALSEGMENTS is shown in Fig. 2.

**Lemma 17.** *The DIAGONALSEGMENTS problem can be solved in  $\mathcal{O}(k^2 \log k / \log \log k)$  time.*

*Proof.* A sought point  $(x, y)$  that minimizes  $\text{val}(x, y)$  either (1) is an endpoint of a diagonal segment or (2) lies on the intersection of a diagonal segment and an edge of a cell.

In case (1), it suffices to identify, for all endpoints of all diagonal segments, the cells to which they belong. Let us assume that vertical and horizontal lines partition the grid into columns and rows, respectively. Then, each cell can be uniquely identified by its column and row. By the following claim, we can compute, in  $\mathcal{O}(k^2 \log \log k)$  time, for all queried points, the rows they belong to; the computation of columns is symmetric.

**Claim.** Given  $\mathcal{O}(p)$  horizontal lines and  $\mathcal{O}(p)$  points, one can compute, for each point, the nearest line above it in  $\mathcal{O}(p \log \log p)$  time in total.

*Proof.* We create a list of integers containing the vertical coordinates of all queried points and all lines. Then, we sort the list in  $\mathcal{O}(p \log \log p)$  time. The required answers can be retrieved by a simple traversal of the sorted list.  $\square$

In case (2), let us consider intersections with horizontal edges; the intersections with vertical edges can be handled symmetrically. Assume  $x$  is the horizontal coordinate. We perform an affine transformation of the plane  $(x, y) \mapsto (y - x, y)$  after which diagonal line segments become vertical, but horizontal line segments remain horizontal. The sought points can be computed using the following claim in  $\mathcal{O}(k^2 \log k / \log \log k)$  time.

**Claim.** Given  $s$  vertical and horizontal weighted line segments such that no two line segments of the same direction intersect, an intersection point of a vertical and a horizontal line segment with minimum total weight can be computed in  $\mathcal{O}(s \log s / \log \log s)$  time.

*Proof.* We perform a left-to-right line sweep. The events are vertical line segments as well as the beginnings and endings of horizontal line segments; they can be sorted by their  $x$ -coordinates in  $\mathcal{O}(s \log \log s)$  time with integer sorting. The horizontal line segments intersecting the sweep line are stored using a dynamic predecessor data structure [63], and their weights in the same order are stored in a dynamic RMQ data structure of size  $\mathcal{O}(s)$  that supports insertions, deletions, and range minimum queries in amortized  $\mathcal{O}(\log s / \log \log s)$  time [13]. This way, when considering a vertical line segment, we can compute the minimum-weight horizontal line segment that intersects it in  $\mathcal{O}(\log s / \log \log s)$  time.  $\square$

This concludes the solution to DIAGONALSEGMENTS.  $\square$

**Theorem 18.** *The decision version of  $k$ -Mismatch CPM can be solved in  $\mathcal{O}((n/m) \cdot k^2 \log k / \log \log k)$  time plus  $\mathcal{O}((n/m) \cdot k^2)$  PILLAR operations.*

*Proof.* Assume that  $P_1$  is the sample. We use the so-called standard trick that covers  $T$  by a collection of its substrings  $T'$  of length  $\lfloor \frac{3}{4}m \rfloor$  starting at positions divisible by  $\lfloor \frac{1}{4}m \rfloor$ . The following computations are performed for each  $T'$ .

We use Theorem 5 to compute a representation of the set  $A = \text{Occ}(P_1, T')$ . If  $|A| \leq 864k$ , we use Lemma 7 that outputs  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  intervals of circular  $k$ -mismatch occurrences in  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  time in the PILLAR model. Otherwise, we apply Lemma 11, which, in  $\mathcal{O}(k^2 \log \log k)$  time plus  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  PILLAR operations, outputs  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  intervals of circular  $k$ -mismatch occurrences and returns an instance of PERIODICSUBSTRINGMATCH. Next, we use the geometric interpretation of PERIODICSUBSTRINGMATCH. The weight of a cell is the value  $\text{Mispers}(i, j)$  common to all points  $(i, j)$  in this cell. Similarly, the weight of a diagonal segment equals  $-\text{Surplus}(i, j)$ , the number of surplus misperiods that we have to subtract for all points in this segment. These values are computed in  $\mathcal{O}(k^2 \log \log k)$  time using Lemma 16. Now, the decision version of the PERIODICSUBSTRINGMATCH problem is reduced to finding a point minimizing the value  $\text{Mispers}(i, j) - \text{Surplus}(i, j)$ , which is the sum of weights of a cell and diagonal segment meeting at the point  $(i, j)$ . The decision version of PERIODICSUBSTRINGMATCH is thus reduced, in  $\mathcal{O}(k^2 \log \log k)$  time plus  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  PILLAR operations, to one instance of DIAGONALSEGMENTS (if the sought point is on a diagonal segment) and PERIODICPERIODICMATCH (otherwise) problems. The thesis follows from Lemmas 13 and 17.  $\square$

**Remark 19.** Using this geometric approach, the reporting version of  $k$ -Mismatch CPM can also be solved in  $\mathcal{O}((n/m) \cdot k^2 \log^{\mathcal{O}(1)} k + k \cdot \text{Output})$  time plus  $\mathcal{O}((n/m) \cdot k^2)$  PILLAR operations.

### 3 Fast $k$ -Mismatch CPM in Important Settings

Recall that, in the PILLAR model, we measure the running time of an algorithm with respect to the total number of a few primitive operations, which are executed on a collection  $\mathcal{X}$  of input strings. Then, for any fixed setting, an efficient implementation of these primitive operations yields an algorithm for this setting. In this section, we combine Theorems 15 and 18 with known implementations of the primitive PILLAR operations in the standard and internal settings (Section 3.1), in the dynamic setting (Section 3.2), and in the fully compressed setting (Section 3.3), thus obtaining efficient algorithms for  $k$ -Mismatch CPM in these settings.

### 3.1 Standard and Internal Settings

Let  $X$  be any string in collection  $\mathcal{X}$ . We can access any substring  $X[i..j]$  of  $X$  using a pointer to  $X$  along with the two corresponding indices  $i$  and  $j$ . As shown in [18], implementing the PILLAR model in the standard setting is done by putting together a few well-known results:

- **Extract**, **Access**, and **Length** have trivial implementations.
- LCP queries are implemented by constructing the generalized suffix tree for  $\mathcal{X}$  in linear time [28] and preprocessing it for answering lowest common ancestor queries in  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  time [10]. The same construction for the reversed strings in  $\mathcal{X}$  implements  $\text{LCP}_R$  queries.
- IPM queries can be performed in  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  time after a linear-time preprocessing using a data structure by Kociumaka et al. [50, 51].

The above discussion is summarized in the following statement.

**Theorem 20** ([18], Theorem 7.2). *After an  $\mathcal{O}(n)$ -time preprocessing of a collection of strings of total length  $n$ , each PILLAR operation can be performed in  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  time.*

Combining Theorems 15 and 18 with Theorem 20, we obtain the following results.

**Theorem 1.** *The reporting and decision versions of  $k$ -Mismatch CPM for strings over an integer alphabet can be solved in time  $\mathcal{O}(n + (n/m) \cdot k^3 \log \log k)$  and  $\mathcal{O}(n + (n/m) \cdot k^2 \log k / \log \log k)$ , respectively.*

**Theorem 21** (Internal Setting). *Given a string  $S$  of length  $n$  over an integer alphabet, after an  $\mathcal{O}(n)$ -time preprocessing, given any two fragments  $P$  and  $T$  of  $S$  and an integer threshold  $k > 0$ , we can solve the reporting version of  $k$ -Mismatch CPM in  $\mathcal{O}(|T|/|P| \cdot k^3 \log \log k + \text{Output})$  time and the decision version in  $\mathcal{O}(|T|/|P| \cdot k^2 \log k / \log \log k)$  time.*

### 3.2 Dynamic Setting

Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a growing collection of non-empty strings; it is initially empty, and then undergoes updates by means of the following operations:

- **Makestring**( $U$ ): Insert a non-empty string  $U$  to  $\mathcal{X}$
- **Concat**( $U, V$ ): Insert string  $UV$  to  $\mathcal{X}$ , for  $U, V \in \mathcal{X}$
- **Split**( $U, i$ ): Insert  $U[0..i)$  and  $U[i..|U|)$  to  $\mathcal{X}$ , for  $U \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $i \in [0..|U|)$ .

Note that **Concat** and **Split** do not remove their arguments from  $\mathcal{X}$ . By  $N$  we denote an upper bound on the total length of all strings in  $\mathcal{X}$  throughout all updates executed by an algorithm. Gawrychowski et al. [32] showed an efficient data structure for maintaining  $\mathcal{X}$  subject to LCP queries. The authors of [18] showed that this data structure can be augmented to also support all remaining PILLAR operations; see also [16] for a more direct description of an efficient algorithm answering IPM queries in this setting. The data structure is Las-Vegas randomized, that is, it always returns correct results, but the runtimes are guaranteed with high probability (w.h.p.), that is, probability  $1 - 1/N^{\Omega(1)}$ .

**Theorem 22** ([32, 18]). *A collection  $\mathcal{X}$  of non-empty persistent strings of total length  $N$  can be dynamically maintained with operations **Makestring**( $U$ ), **Concat**( $U, V$ ), **Split**( $U, i$ ) requiring time  $\mathcal{O}(\log N + |U|)$ ,  $\mathcal{O}(\log N)$  and  $\mathcal{O}(\log N)$ , respectively, so that PILLAR operations can be performed in time  $\mathcal{O}(\log^2 N)$ . All stated time complexities hold with probability  $1 - 1/N^{\Omega(1)}$ .*

Very recently, Kempa and Kociumaka [49, Section 8 in the arXiv version] presented an alternative deterministic implementation, which supports operations **Makestring**( $U$ ), **Concat**( $U, V$ ), **Split**( $U, i$ )

in  $\mathcal{O}(|U| \log^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \log N)$ ,  $\mathcal{O}(\log |UV| \log^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \log N)$ , and  $\mathcal{O}(\log |U| \log^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \log N)$  time, respectively, so that PILLAR operations can be performed in time  $\mathcal{O}(\log N \log^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \log N)$ .

Combining Theorems 15 and 18 with Theorem 22 and [49], we obtain the following result.

**Theorem 23** (Dynamic Setting). *A collection  $\mathcal{X}$  of non-empty persistent strings of total length  $N$  can be dynamically maintained with operations  $\text{Makestring}(U)$ ,  $\text{Concat}(U, V)$ ,  $\text{Split}(U, i)$  requiring time  $\mathcal{O}(\log N + |U|)$ ,  $\mathcal{O}(\log N)$  and  $\mathcal{O}(\log N)$ , respectively, so that, given two strings  $P, T \in \mathcal{X}$  and an integer threshold  $k > 0$ , we can solve the reporting and decision versions of  $k$ -Mismatch CPM in  $\mathcal{O}(|T|/|P| \cdot k^3 \log^2 N + \text{Output})$  time and  $\mathcal{O}(|T|/|P| \cdot k^2 \log^2 N)$  time, respectively. All stated time complexities hold with probability  $1 - 1/N^{\Omega(1)}$ . Randomization can be avoided at the cost of a  $\log^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \log N$  multiplicative factor in all the update times, with the reporting and decision versions of  $k$ -Mismatch CPM queries answered in  $\mathcal{O}(|T|/|P| \cdot k^3 \log N \log^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \log N + \text{Output})$  time and  $\mathcal{O}(|T|/|P| \cdot k^2 \log N \log^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \log N)$  time, respectively.*

### 3.3 Fully Compressed Setting

In the fully compressed setting, we want to solve  $k$ -Mismatch CPM when both the text and the pattern are given as straight-line programs.

A straight line program (SLP) is a context-free grammar  $G$  that consists of a set  $\Sigma$  of terminals and a set  $N_G = \{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$  of non-terminals such that each  $A_i \in N_G$  is associated with a unique production rule  $A_i \rightarrow f_G(A_i) \in (\Sigma \cup \{A_j : j < i\})^*$ . We can assume without loss of generality that each production rule is of the form  $A \rightarrow BC$  for some symbols  $B$  and  $C$  (that is, the given SLP is in Chomsky normal form). Every symbol  $A \in S_G := N_G \cup \Sigma$  generates a unique string, which we denote by  $\text{gen}(A) \in \Sigma^*$ . The string  $\text{gen}(A)$  can be obtained from  $A$  by repeatedly replacing each non-terminal with its production. In addition,  $A$  is associated with its parse tree  $\text{ParseTree}(A)$  consisting of a root labeled with  $A$ , with two subtrees  $\text{ParseTree}(B)$  and  $\text{ParseTree}(C)$  attached (in this order) if  $A$  is a non-terminal  $A \rightarrow BC$ , or without any subtrees if  $A$  is a terminal.

Let us observe that, if we traverse the leaves of  $\text{ParseTree}(A)$  from left to right, spelling out the corresponding non-terminals, then we obtain  $\text{gen}(A)$ . We say that  $G$  generates  $\text{gen}(G) := \text{gen}(A_n)$ . The parse tree  $\text{ParseTree}(G)$  of  $G$  is then the parse tree of the starting symbol  $A_n \in N_G$ .

As also observed in [18], given an SLP  $G$  of size  $n$  that generates a string  $S$  of length  $N$ , we can efficiently implement the PILLAR operations through dynamic strings. Let us start with an empty collection  $\mathcal{X}$  of dynamic strings. Using  $\mathcal{O}(n)$   $\text{Makestring}(a)$  operations, for  $a \in \Sigma$ , and  $\mathcal{O}(n)$   $\text{Concat}$  operations (one for each non-terminal of  $G$ ), we can insert  $S$  to  $\mathcal{X}$  in  $\mathcal{O}(n \log N)$  time w.h.p. Then, we can perform each PILLAR operation in  $\mathcal{O}(\log^2 N)$  time w.h.p., due to Theorem 22. Next, we outline a deterministic implementation of PILLAR operations in the fully compressed setting.

Following [18], the handle of a fragment  $S = X[\ell..r]$  consists of a pointer to the SLP  $G \in \mathcal{X}$  generating  $X$  along with the positions  $\ell$  and  $r$ . This makes operations **Extract** and **Length** trivial. As argued in [18], all remaining PILLAR operations admit efficient implementations in the considered setting.

- For **Access**, we use the data structure of Bille et al. [11] that can be built in  $\mathcal{O}(n \log(N/n))$  time and supports **Access** queries in  $\mathcal{O}(\log N)$  time.
- For **LCP** and **LCP<sub>R</sub>**, we use the data structure of I [41] that is based on the recompression technique, which is due to Jeř [44, 45]. It can be built in  $\mathcal{O}(n \log(N/n))$  time and supports the said queries in  $\mathcal{O}(\log N)$  time.
- For **IPM**, we use a data structure presented in [18, 48] that is also based on the recompression technique. It can be built in  $\mathcal{O}(n \log N)$  time and answers **IPM** queries in  $\mathcal{O}(\log^2 N \log \log N)$  time.



The above discussion is summarized in the following statement.

**Theorem 24** (see [11, 18, 41, 48]). *Given a collection of SLPs of total size  $n$  generating strings of total length  $N$ , each PILLAR operation can be performed in  $\mathcal{O}(\log^2 N \log \log N)$  time after an  $\mathcal{O}(n \log N)$ -time preprocessing.*

If we applied Theorems 15 and 18 directly in the fully compressed setting, we would obtain  $\Omega(N/M)$  time, where  $N$  and  $M$  are the uncompressed lengths of the text and the pattern, respectively. We now present a more efficient algorithm for  $k$ -Mismatch CPM in this setting; it is an adaptation of an analogous procedure provided in [18, Section 7.2] for (non-cyclic) pattern matching with mismatches. We use the deterministic implementation of the PILLAR model from Theorem 24.

**Theorem 25.** *Let  $G_T$  denote a straight-line program of size  $n$  generating a string  $T$ , let  $G_P$  denote a straight-line program of size  $m$  generating a string  $P$ , let  $k > 0$  denote an integer threshold, and set  $N := |T|$  and  $M := |P|$ . We can solve the decision version of  $k$ -Mismatch CPM in time  $\mathcal{O}(m \log N + nk^2 \log^2 N \log \log N)$  and the reporting version in  $\mathcal{O}(m \log N + nk^3 \log^2 N \log \log N + \text{Output})$  time.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{X} := \{G_T, G_P\}$ . The overall structure of our algorithm is as follows. We first preprocess the collection  $\mathcal{X}$  in  $\mathcal{O}((n + m) \log N)$  time according to Theorem 24. Next, we traverse  $G_T$  and compute, for every non-terminal  $A$  of  $G_T$ , the circular  $k$ -mismatch occurrences of  $P$  in  $T$  that “cross”  $A$ . We apply Theorems 15 and 18 with Theorem 24 to compute such occurrences. Finally, we combine the computed occurrences using dynamic programming.

For each non-terminal  $A \in N_{G_T}$  with production rule  $A \rightarrow BC$ , let

$$\begin{aligned} A_\ell &:= \text{gen}(B)[\max\{0, |\text{gen}(B)| - M + 1\} \dots |\text{gen}(B)|], \text{ and} \\ A_r &:= \text{gen}(C)[0 \dots \min\{M - 1, |\text{gen}(C)|\}] \end{aligned}$$

Observe that circular  $k$ -mismatch occurrences in  $\text{gen}(A)$  can be partitioned to occurrences in  $\text{gen}(B)$ ,  $\text{gen}(C)$ , and  $A_\ell A_r$ .

If we simply want to decide whether  $T$  contains a circular  $k$ -mismatch occurrence of  $P$ , we can use Theorems 18 and 24 to decide whether any  $\text{gen}(A)$  for  $A \in N_{G_T}$  contains an occurrence in  $\mathcal{O}(k^2 \log^2 N \log \log N)$  time per a non-terminal since  $A_\ell A_r$  is a fragment of  $\text{gen}(G_T)$  of length at most  $2(M - 1)$ . This way, we obtain the total complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(m \log N + nk^2 \log^2 N \log \log N)$ .

By using Theorem 15, we can find all the occurrences in  $A_\ell A_r$  for each  $A \in N_{G_T}$  in time  $\mathcal{O}(k^3 \log^2 N \log \log N + \text{Output})$  per non-terminal. To compute  $\text{CircOcc}_k(P, T)$ , we can use a straightforward dynamic programming approach: all  $k$ -mismatch circular occurrences can be reported in time proportional to their number by performing a traversal of  $\text{ParseTree}(G)$ , skipping subtrees that correspond to fragments of  $T$  that do not contain any such occurrences.  $\square$

## 4 $k$ -Edit CPM

In this section, we solve the reporting version of the  $k$ -Edit CPM problem and reduce the decision version of the  $k$ -Edit CPM problem to two instances of the All- $k$ -LPAM problem. Our approach is based on the following observation.

**Observation 26.** *If  $T[i \dots r]$  is a  $k$ -edit circular occurrence of a pattern  $P$  in a text  $T$ , then there exists a position  $j \in [i \dots r]$  and a decomposition  $P = P_1 P_2$  such that  $\delta_E(T[i \dots j], P_2) + \delta_E(T[j \dots r], P_1) \leq k$ .*

Our algorithms consider all  $j \in [0 \dots n]$  and, in each iteration, identify the occurrences satisfying Observation 26 with a fixed  $j$ . These occurrences play an analogous role to the set

$\text{PAIRMATCH}(T, P, j, 0)$  in  $k$ -Mismatch CPM. Thus, one might wish to think of  $T[j]$  as the position aligned with  $P[0]$  in these occurrences; this intuition, however, is imperfect because some alignments may delete  $P[0]$ .

As hinted in the introduction, our approach relies on the  $\text{LPref}_{k'}[0..n]$  arrays for  $k' \in [0..k]$ , where  $\text{LPref}_{k'}[j]$  is the maximum length of a prefix of  $P$  at edit distance at most  $k'$  from a prefix  $T[j..n]$ . In our setting, once we fix a decomposition  $P = P_1P_2$  and a fragment  $T[i..j]$  such that  $\delta_E(T[i..j], P_2) = d \leq k$ , the existence of a fragment  $T[j..r]$  such that  $\delta_E(T[j..r], P_1) \leq k - d$  is equivalent to  $\text{LPref}_{k-d}[j] \geq |P_1|$ . In the decision version of the  $k$ -Edit CPM problem, we also use symmetric  $\text{LSuf}_{k'}[0..n]$  arrays, where  $\text{LSuf}_{k'}[j]$  is the maximum length of a suffix of  $P$  at edit distance at most  $k'$  from a suffix of  $T[0..j]$ . Now, once we fix a decomposition  $P = P_1P_2$  and a fragment  $T[j..r]$  such that  $\delta_E(T[j..r], P_1) = d \leq k$ , the existence of a fragment  $T[i..j]$  such that  $\delta_E(T[i..j], P_2) \leq k - d$  is equivalent to  $\text{LSuf}_{k-d}[j] \geq |P_2|$ . Combining Observation 26 with the above insight on  $\text{LPref}_{k'}[0..n]$  and  $\text{LSuf}_{k'}[0..n]$  arrays, we derive the following observation.

**Observation 27.** *The pattern  $P$  has a circular  $k$ -edit occurrence in the text  $T$  if and only if  $\text{LPref}_{k'}[j] + \text{LSuf}_{k-k'}[j] \geq m$  holds for some  $j \in [0..n]$  and  $k' \in [0..k]$ .*

Unfortunately, the  $\text{LPref}_{k'}$  and  $\text{LSuf}_{k-k'}$  arrays alone do not give any handle to the starting positions of the underlying circular  $k$ -edit occurrences. Thus, we also use the following auxiliary lemma whose proof builds upon the Landau–Vishkin algorithm [54].

**Lemma 28.** *Given a text  $T$  of length  $n$ , a pattern  $P$  of length  $m$ , and an integer  $k > 0$ , we can compute, in  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  time in the PILLAR model, an  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$ -size representation of the edit distances between all pairs of prefixes of  $T$  and  $P$  that are at edit distance at most  $k$ , that is, the set  $LV := \{(a, b, d) \in (0..n] \times (0..m] \times [0..k] : \delta_E(T[0..a], P[0..b]) = d \leq k\}$ . Our representation of  $LV$  consists of  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  sets of the form  $\{(a + \Delta, b + \Delta, d) : \Delta \in [0..x)\}$ .*


*Proof.* We rely on the Landau–Vishkin algorithm [54], which is based on the fact that the edit distance of two strings does not decrease if we append a letter to each of them. Thus,  $LV$  can be decomposed into  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  sets of the form  $\{(a + \Delta, b + \Delta, d) : \Delta \in [0..x)\}$ :  $\mathcal{O}(k)$  of them for each of the central  $2k + 1$  diagonals of the standard dynamic programming matrix; see Fig. 3(a). The Landau–Vishkin algorithm computes exactly this partition of the (prefixes of the) main  $2k + 1$  diagonals to intervals. The runtime of this algorithm is dominated by the time required to answer  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  LCP queries.  $\square$

As a warm-up application of Lemma 28, we provide a procedure that, for any  $j \in [0..n]$ , computes all the values  $\text{LPref}_0[j], \dots, \text{LPref}_k[j]$ .

**Corollary 29.** *Given a text  $T$  of length  $n$ , a pattern  $P$ , an integer  $k > 0$ , and a position  $j \in [0..n]$ , we can compute, in  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  time in the PILLAR model, the values  $\text{LPref}_{k'}[j]$  for all  $k' \in [0..k]$ .*

*Proof.* We build the representation of  $LV$  from Lemma 28 for the strings  $T[j..n]$  and  $P$ , and threshold  $k$ . Let us observe that  $\text{LPref}_{k'}[j] = \max\{b : (a, b, d) \in LV \text{ and } d \leq k'\}$ . Thus, we initialize  $\text{LPref}_{k'}[j] := 0$  for all  $k' \in [0..k]$  and iterate over the elements  $\{(a + \Delta, b + \Delta, d) : \Delta \in [0..x)\}$  in the compact representation of  $LV$ . For each such element, we set  $\text{LPref}_d[j]$  to the maximum of the original value and  $b + x - 1$ . Finally, we iterate over the values  $\text{LPref}_{k'}[j]$  for all  $k' \in (0..k]$  (in the increasing order) and set  $\text{LPref}_{k'}[j]$  to the maximum of the original value and  $\text{LPref}_{k'-1}[j]$ . The total running time on top of the algorithm of Lemma 28 is  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  as the representation of  $LV$  has size  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$ .  $\square$

Our main application of Lemma 28, however, is the following result, which allows reporting the starting positions  $i$  of all cyclic  $k$ -edit occurrences satisfying Observation 26 for a given  $j$ .



(a) Example for Lemma 28:  
 $T = abaaabaa$ ,  $P = aabaabaa$ ,  $k = 2$ .

(b) Notation used in the proof of Lemma 30.

Figure 3: Illustrations for Lemmas 28 and 30.

**Lemma 30.** *Given a text  $T$  of length  $n$ , a pattern  $P$  of length  $m$ , an integer  $k > 0$ , and a position  $j \in [0..n]$ , one can compute, in  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  time in the PILLAR model, all positions  $i \in [0..j]$  such that  $\delta_E(T[i..j], P_2) + \delta_E(T[j..r], P_1) \leq k$  holds for some  $r \in [j..n]$  some decomposition  $P = P_1 P_2$ . The output is represented as a union of  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  (possibly intersecting) intervals.*

*Proof.* We start with the calculation of the compact representation of  $LV$  from Lemma 28 for the reversals of strings  $T[0..j]$  and  $P$ , and threshold  $k$ . Next, for each element  $\{(a + \Delta, b + \Delta, d) : \Delta \in I\}$  of this compact representation, we will calculate an interval  $I' \subseteq I$  such that positions from  $\{j - a - \Delta : \Delta \in I'\}$  are in  $\text{CircOcc}_k(P, T)$ . The notation used in this proof is illustrated in Fig. 3(b).

From the definition of  $LV$ , we know that, for any  $\Delta \in I$ , we have  $\delta_E(T[i..j], P_2) = d$ , where  $i = j - a - \Delta$  and  $P_2 = P[m - b - \Delta..m]$ . All we have to do is to verify if there exists a position  $r$  in  $T$  such that  $\delta_E(T[j..r], P_1) \leq k - d$ , where  $P_1 = P[0..m - b - \Delta]$ .

For this, we use Corollary 29 to compute the values  $\text{LPref}_{k'}[j]$  for all  $[0..k]$ . Then, the maximal possible length of  $P_1$  (within our edit distance budget) is  $\alpha := \text{LPref}_{k-d}[j]$ . Now, we need to define  $I'$  in such a way that it corresponds to pairs  $(P_1, P_2)$  with total length  $m$ , that is, we set  $I' := \{\Delta \in I : b + \Delta + \alpha \geq m\}$ .

The most time-consuming parts of this procedure are the applications of Lemma 28 and Corollary 29, taking  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  time in the PILLAR model.  $\square$

The algorithm behind Theorem 2, whose statement is repeated below, is a simple application of Lemma 30.

**Theorem 2.** *The reporting version of  $k$ -Edit CPM for strings over an integer alphabet can be solved in  $\mathcal{O}(nk^2)$  time.*

*Proof.* By Observation 26, it suffices to apply Lemma 30 for all  $j \in [0..n]$  and report all positions in the union of the obtained  $\mathcal{O}(nk^2)$  intervals. The primitive PILLAR operations can be implemented in  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  time after  $\mathcal{O}(n)$ -time preprocessing (Theorem 20), so the applications of Lemma 30 take  $\mathcal{O}(n + n \cdot k^2) = \mathcal{O}(nk^2)$  time in total. The union of the resulting intervals can be computed in  $\mathcal{O}(nk^2)$  time using bucket sort.  $\square$

As for Theorem 4, we also need efficient construction of the  $\text{LPref}_{k'}[0..n]$  and  $\text{LSuf}_{k'}[0..n]$  arrays for all  $k' \in [0..k]$ . Both [53] and Corollary 29 yield  $\mathcal{O}(nk^2)$ -time algorithms. However, Theorem 3, proved in the next section, improves this runtime to  $\mathcal{O}(nk \log^3 k)$ .

**Theorem 4.** *The decision version of  $k$ -Edit CPM for strings over an integer alphabet can be solved in  $\mathcal{O}(nk \log^3 k)$  time.*

*Proof.* By Observation 27, there is a circular  $k$ -edit occurrence if and only if  $\text{LPref}_{k'}[j] + \text{LSuf}_{k-k'}[j] \geq m$  holds for some  $j \in [0..n]$  and  $k \in [0..k']$ . By Theorem 3, the  $\text{LPref}_{k'}[0..n]$  arrays can be constructed in  $\mathcal{O}(nk \log^3 k)$  time. As for the  $\text{LSuf}_{k'}[0..n]$  arrays, it suffices to use Theorem 3 for the reversed strings and then reverse the resulting arrays. Overall, it takes  $\mathcal{O}(nk \log^3 k)$  to decide if  $P$  has a circular  $k$ -edit occurrence in  $T$ .

In case of a positive answer, we also need to report the starting position of a witness occurrence. For this, we fix an arbitrary  $j \in [0..n]$  such that  $\text{LPref}_{k'}[j] + \text{LSuf}_{k-k'}[j] \geq m$  holds for some  $k \in [0..k']$  and run the algorithm of Lemma 30. By Observation 26, this call is guaranteed to report at least one position. The cost of the call is  $\mathcal{O}(n + k^2) = \mathcal{O}(nk)$ ; this includes  $\mathcal{O}(n)$ -time preprocessing for the PILLAR model in the standard setting (see Theorem 20).  $\square$

## 5 An Algorithm for All- $k$ -LPAM: Proof of Theorem 3

In this section, we show how to compute, given a position  $p$  in the text, the values  $\text{LPref}_{k'}[i]$  for all  $k' \in [0..k]$  and  $i \in [p..p+k] \cap [0..n]$  in  $\mathcal{O}(k^2 \log^3 k)$  time in the PILLAR model. This will yield the desired solution to the All- $k$ -LPAM problem by taking values of  $p$  which are multiples of  $k$ .

The *deletion distance*  $\delta_D(U, V)$  of two strings  $U$  and  $V$  is the minimum number of letter insertions and deletions required to transform  $U$  to  $V$ ; in comparison to edit distance, substitutions are not directly allowed (they can be simulated by an insertion and a deletion). For a string  $S$ , by  $S_\$$  we denote the string  $S[0]\$S[1]\$ \dots S[|S|-1]\$$ . By the following fact, we can easily transform the pattern and the text, doubling  $k$ , and henceforth consider the deletion distance instead of the edit distance.

**Fact 31** ([60, Section 6.1]). *For any two strings  $U$  and  $V$  over an alphabet  $\Sigma$  that does not contain  $\$$ , we have  $2 \cdot \delta_E(U, V) = \delta_D(U_\$, V_\$)$ .*

Note that an LCP query on suffixes of  $U_\$$  and  $V_\$$  trivially reduces in  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  time to an LCP query on suffixes of  $U$  and  $V$ .

**Definition 32.** For two strings  $U$  and  $V$  and an integer range  $I$ , we define the *alignment graph*  $G(U, V, I)$  as the weighted undirected graph over the set of vertices  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  with the following edges for each  $(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ :

- $(a, b) \leftrightarrow (a + 1, b)$  with weight 1,
- $(a, b) \leftrightarrow (a, b + 1)$  with weight 1,
- $(a, b) \leftrightarrow (a + 1, b + 1)$  with weight 0, present unless  $a \in [0..|U|)$ ,  $b \in [0..|V|)$ ,  $U[a] \neq V[b]$ , and  $b - a \in I$ .

For an alignment graph  $G(U, V, I)$ , there are  $|I|$  diagonals where diagonal edges may be missing. Intuitively, everything outside these diagonals is considered a match.

**Observation 33** (see [19, Lemma 8.5]). *For all fragments  $U[a..a']$  and  $V[b..b']$  of  $U$  and  $V$ , respectively,  $\delta_D(U[a..a'], V[b..b'])$  is the length of the shortest  $(a, b) \rightsquigarrow (a', b')$  path in  $G(U, V, \mathbb{Z})$ .*

Let  $G := G(P, T, [p - k \dots p + 2k])$ . For each  $t \in [0 \dots m]$ , we define a  $(3k + 2) \times (3k + 2)$  distance matrix  $D_t$  such that  $D_t[i, j]$  is the length of the shortest path between  $(0, i + p - k - 1)$  and  $(t, t + j + p - k - 1)$  in the alignment graph  $G$ . Let us recall that a matrix  $M$  is a *Monge matrix* if, for every pair of rows  $i < j$  and every pair of columns  $\ell < r$ ,  $M[i, \ell] + M[j, r] \leq M[i, r] + M[j, \ell]$ . The planarity of  $G$  and the fact that all vertices of the considered shortest paths lie in  $[0 \dots t] \times \mathbb{Z}$  imply the following.

**Observation 34.** *For every  $t \in [0 \dots m]$ , the matrix  $D_t$  is a Monge matrix.*

Let us recall that a permutation matrix is a square matrix over  $\{0, 1\}$  that contains exactly one 1 in each row and in each column. A permutation matrix  $P$  of size  $s \times s$  corresponds to a permutation  $\pi$  of  $[0 \dots s]$  such that  $P[i, j] = 1$  if and only if  $\pi(i) = j$ . For two permutations  $\pi_1, \pi_2$  and their corresponding permutation matrices  $P_1, P_2$ , by  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi_2) = \Delta(P_1, P_2)$  we denote a shortest sequence of transpositions  $f_1, \dots, f_q$  of neighboring elements such that  $f_q \circ \dots \circ f_1 \circ \pi_1 = \pi_2$  (that is, each transposition swaps two adjacent columns of the maintained permutation matrix). For an  $s \times s$  matrix  $A$ , we denote by  $A^\Sigma$  an  $(s + 1) \times (s + 1)$  matrix such that

$$A^\Sigma[i, j] = \sum_{i' \geq i} \sum_{j' < j} A[i', j'] \quad \text{for } i, j \in [0 \dots s].$$

As explained in Appendix B, the lemma below follows readily from the tools developed in [19, Sections 8 and 9] which, in turn, build upon the ideas of Tiskin [60, 61].

**Lemma 35.** (a) *Let  $t \in [0 \dots m]$ ,  $i \in [p \dots p + k]$ ,  $j \in [i - k \dots i + k] \cap [i - t \dots n - t]$ , and  $k' \in [0 \dots k]$ . Then,  $\delta_D(T[i \dots j + t], P[0 \dots t]) \leq k'$  if and only if  $D_t[i - p + k + 1, j - p + k + 1] \leq k'$ .*  
(b) *For each  $t \in [0 \dots m]$ , there is a  $(3k + 1) \times (3k + 1)$  permutation matrix  $P_t$  such that  $D_t[i, j] = 2P_t^\Sigma[i, j] + i - j$  holds for all  $i, j \in [0 \dots 3k + 1]$ . Moreover,  $P_0$  is an identity permutation matrix and a sequence  $\Delta(P_0, P_1), \dots, \Delta(P_{m-1}, P_m)$  contains at most  $3k(3k + 1)/2$  transpositions of neighboring elements in total and all its non-empty elements can be computed in  $\mathcal{O}(k^2 \log \log k)$  time plus  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  LCP queries on pairs of suffixes of  $P$  and  $T$ .*

In the following lemma, we extend a known result on answering submatrix maximum queries on Monge matrices [46] (see also [33]) to a dynamic (the matrix changes by sub-column increments) and partially persistent (we need to be able to query all previously created matrices) setting. Sub-row queries, which were considered as a simpler case in [46, 33], are sufficient for our purposes. We further consider minimum queries instead of maximum queries, which is a fairly straightforward change. The proof of the following lemma is deferred until Section 5.1.

**Lemma 36.** *Let  $M_0 = M$  be an  $s \times s$  Monge matrix such that each entry of  $M_0$  can be retrieved in  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  time. We consider a sequence of operations:*

- *A sub-column increment creates a new matrix  $M_{i+1}$  obtained from the most recent matrix  $M_i$  by increasing the entries in a given sub-column by a given value.*
- *A sub-row minimum query extracts the minimum entry in a given sub-row of a specified previously created matrix  $M_i$ .*

*The data structure for  $M_0$  can be initialized in  $\mathcal{O}(s \log^2 s)$  time. If each created matrix is a Monge matrix, then each update can be performed in  $\mathcal{O}(\log^3 s)$  time and each query can be answered in  $\mathcal{O}(\log^2 s)$  time.*

We are now ready to prove Theorem 3, restated here for convenience.

**Theorem 3.** *All- $k$ -LPAM for strings over an integer alphabet can be solved in  $\mathcal{O}(nk \log^3 k)$  time.*

*Proof.* Let us recall that we make all computations for  $\mathcal{O}(n/k)$  values of  $p$ . We will store  $D_t$ , for  $t \in [0..m]$ , using the data structure of Lemma 36. The initialization of  $D_0$  takes  $\mathcal{O}(k \log^2 k)$  time; we have  $D_0[a, b] = |a - b|$ . Each transposition of adjacent columns in the maintained matrix  $P$  corresponds to a sub-column increment in  $D$  (increasing the entries in the sub-row by 2). Note that, for each  $t \in [0..m]$ ,  $D_t$  is a Monge matrix due to Observation 34. Any intermediate matrix  $D$  is also Monge as it satisfies  $D[i, j] = 2P^\Sigma[i, j] + i - j$  for the maintained permutation matrix  $P$ . Thus, for each  $t$  such that  $\Delta(P_t, P_{t+1}) \neq \emptyset$ , we can update the maintained Monge matrix as necessary using Lemma 36. By Lemma 35(b), the number of updates will be  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  and the updates can be computed in  $\mathcal{O}(k^2 \log \log k)$  time after  $\mathcal{O}(n)$ -time preprocessing for LCP queries. The updates are performed in  $\mathcal{O}(k^2 \log^3 k)$  total time.

We are to compute, for all  $k' \in [0..k]$  and  $i \in [p..p+k]$ , the length of the longest prefix of  $P$  that matches a prefix of  $T[i..n]$  with deletion distance at most  $k'$ . By Lemma 35(a), it suffices to find the maximum  $t \in [0..m]$  such that  $\min\{D_t[i-p+k+1, j-p+k+1] : j \in [i-k..i+k] \cap [i-t..n-t]\} \leq k'$ . To this end, we apply binary search with  $\mathcal{O}(\log k)$  steps on the set of all  $t$  that satisfy  $\Delta(P_t, P_{t+1}) \neq \emptyset$ , using  $\mathcal{O}(\log^2 k)$ -time sub-row minima queries of Lemma 36. Thus, all binary searches take  $\mathcal{O}(k^2 \log^3 k)$  time in total. The overall running time is  $\mathcal{O}(n + (n/k) \cdot k^2 \log^3 k) = \mathcal{O}(nk \log^3 k)$ .  $\square$

## 5.1 Proof of Lemma 36

*Proof.* A matrix  $M$  is called an *inverse Monge matrix* if, for every pair of rows  $i < j$  and every pair of columns  $\ell < r$ ,  $M[i, \ell] + M[j, r] \geq M[i, r] + M[j, \ell]$ . By negating all elements of a Monge matrix, we obtain an inverse Monge matrix. Thus, our goal is to perform sub-column *decrements* and answer sub-row *maximum* queries on a partially persistent inverse Monge matrix.

Let us recall the approach of [46, Lemma 3.1] for answering sub-row maximum queries on a static inverse Monge matrix  $M$ . The approach assumes that each cell of  $M$  can be retrieved in  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  time. For each column  $i$ , we introduce a piecewise linear *column function* on a real interval  $[0, s-1]$  that attains values  $M[x, i]$  for integer arguments  $x \in [0..s-1]$  and linearly interpolates between them. We will consider *upper envelopes* of these functions, where an upper envelope of functions  $f_1, \dots, f_p$  on  $[0, s-1]$  is a function  $\max_i f_i(x)$  on the same domain. Each upper envelope will be stored by a sequence of *breakpoints*, that is, intersection points of pairs of functions forming the upper envelope.

Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a static balanced binary tree formed over the set of columns of  $M$ ; the subtree  $\mathcal{T}_u$  rooted at a node  $u$  of  $\mathcal{T}$  corresponds to a range of columns of  $M$ . Each node  $u$  of  $\mathcal{T}$  stores the upper envelope of the column functions corresponding to columns in  $\mathcal{T}_u$ —let us denote it as  $\mathcal{E}_u$ —represented as a list of breakpoints. It is shown in [46] that, for an inverse Monge matrix, as  $x$  increases from 0 to  $s-1$ , each subsequent column function  $\mathcal{T}_u$  appears in and disappears from the upper envelope  $\mathcal{E}_u$  at most once, in this order. Hence, the size of the representation of  $\mathcal{E}_u$  is linear in the number of leaves of  $\mathcal{T}_u$ . The upper envelopes  $\mathcal{E}$  are computed bottom-up. If  $u$  is a leaf, the upper envelope  $\mathcal{E}_u$  has no breakpoints. Otherwise, if  $u$  has children  $v_L$  and  $v_R$ , then  $\mathcal{E}_u$  consists of a prefix of  $\mathcal{E}_{v_L}$  and a suffix of  $\mathcal{E}_{v_R}$ . In [46],  $\mathcal{E}_u$  is computed using binary search on the columns in  $\mathcal{O}(t + \log s \log t)$  time, where  $t$  is the number of breakpoints in  $\mathcal{E}_u$ . This sums up to  $\mathcal{O}(s \log s)$  over the entire tree.

A query is given a row  $j$  and a range of columns  $[i..i']$ . To answer it, we compute  $\mathcal{O}(\log s)$  so-called *canonical nodes* of  $\mathcal{T}$  whose sets of columns are disjoint and cover  $[i..i']$ . For each such canonical node  $u$ , we use binary search to locate the interval of  $\mathcal{E}_u$  containing  $j$ , which yields the maximum entry in row  $j$  among the columns of  $u$ . The output is the largest of these maxima. The query time is  $\mathcal{O}(\log^2 s)$ .

We use the standard technique for making BST data structures partially persistent (cf. [27]), that is, whenever the BST is updated due to an operation (say, insertion), copies of all nodes that



are changed throughout the operation are created. Some pointers from the copied nodes may lead to nodes from a previous instance. The *state* of the data structure after the  $i$ -th operation is represented by a copy of the root created by the  $i$ -th operation. If the BST has height  $h$ , an operation results in creating  $\mathcal{O}(h)$  nodes, which accounts for  $\mathcal{O}(h)$  additional time and space of each operation. We refer to this generic data structure as PBST.

We make the following modifications to the approach of [46]:

**Modification 1: Storing matrices under sub-column decrements persistently.** Let  $M_0, \dots, M_p$  be the resulting sequence of inverse Monge matrices. We store a balanced PBST that allows inserting key-value pairs and retrieving the sum of values of elements whose keys do not exceed a specified threshold  $x$ . We assume that the stored elements have unique keys and, upon insertion of a key-value pair with a key already present in the PBST, we update the associated value by adding the value of the inserted pair. If the elements  $M[\ell, i], \dots, M[r, i]$  are to be decreased by  $\alpha$  when creating  $M_a$ , we insert pairs  $(is + \ell, -\alpha)$  and  $(is + r + 1, \alpha)$  to the PBST and mark the resulting PBST with the index  $a$ . In order to compute  $M_a[j, i]$ , we consider the PBST with index  $a$  and output  $M[j, i]$  plus the sum of values in the PBST on indices not exceeding  $is + j$ . The total size of the PBSTs is  $\mathcal{O}(p \log s)$ , and each operation (update or query) takes  $\mathcal{O}(\log s)$  time.

**Modification 2: Different representation of upper envelopes.** To avoid  $\Omega(t)$  time for computing  $\mathcal{E}_u$  for a node  $u$  such that  $|\mathcal{T}_u| = t$ , we do not store the list of breakpoints in  $\mathcal{E}_u$  explicitly. Instead,  $\mathcal{E}_u$  stores only the breakpoint where  $\mathcal{E}_{v_L}$  and  $\mathcal{E}_{v_R}$  intersect, with  $v_L$  and  $v_R$  being the children of  $u$ .<sup>3</sup> Hence, every single  $\mathcal{E}_u$  takes only  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  space to store. Each query to  $\mathcal{E}_u$  for a value at a given argument reduces by comparison with the breakpoint stored to at most one query to one of  $\mathcal{E}_{v_L}$  or  $\mathcal{E}_{v_R}$ . Thus, each such query takes  $\mathcal{O}(\log s)$  time. This way,  $\mathcal{E}_u$  can be computed from  $\mathcal{E}_{v_L}$  and  $\mathcal{E}_{v_R}$  in  $\mathcal{O}(\log^2 s)$  time via binary search, which results in  $\mathcal{O}(s \log^2 s)$ -time construction over the entire tree (assuming no updates to the matrix). The query time for a canonical node is still  $\mathcal{O}(\log s)$ .

**Modification 3: Storing upper envelopes persistently.** The tree  $\mathcal{T}$  is stored as a PBST. Each sub-column decrement affects the breakpoints in  $\mathcal{E}_u$  for nodes  $u$  on one root-to-leaf path of  $\mathcal{T}$ . Recomputation of each  $\mathcal{E}_u$  takes  $\mathcal{O}(\log^2 s)$  time: we use binary search to locate the new breakpoint, and, inside the binary search, we compute the values of  $\mathcal{E}_{v_L}$  and  $\mathcal{E}_{v_R}$  for a given argument by traversing down the tree in  $\mathcal{O}(\log s)$  time and then asking a query for a given cell to the data structure from Modification 1, which takes  $\mathcal{O}(\log s)$  time. This gives  $\mathcal{O}(\log^3 s)$  time on the whole path. The newly created nodes of  $\mathcal{T}$  take  $\mathcal{O}(\log s)$  space. The sub-row query time stays  $\mathcal{O}(\log^2 s)$ .  $\square$

## 6 Conditional Hardness of Approximate CPM

We consider the following problem where the number of allowed mismatches is unbounded.

MISMATCH-CPM

**Input:** A text  $T$  of length  $n$  and a pattern  $P$  of length  $m$ .

**Output:** An array  $\text{CPM}[0..n-m]$  with  $\text{CPM}[i] = \min\{k \geq 0 : P \approx_k^H T[i..i+m]\}$ .

In jumbled indexing, we are to answer pattern matching queries in the jumbled (abelian) sense. More precisely, given a Parikh vector of a pattern that specifies the quantity of each letter, we are to check if there is a substring of the text with this Parikh vector. In the case of a binary text, the

<sup>3</sup>An alternative solution could be obtained using persistent joinable balanced BSTs via [47].

problem of constructing a jumbled index is known to be equivalent (up to a  $\log n$ -factor in the case where a witness occurrence needs to be identified; see [24]) to the following problem:

Given a text  $X$  of length  $n$  over alphabet  $\{0, 1\}$ , for all  $t \in [1..n]$  compute the values:

$$\min_t := \min \left\{ \sum_{j=i}^{i+t-1} X[j] : i \in [0..n-t] \right\}, \max_t := \max \left\{ \sum_{j=i}^{i+t-1} X[j] : i \in [0..n-t] \right\}.$$

For a few years since its introduction [23], the problem of constructing a binary jumbled index in  $\mathcal{O}(n^{2-\varepsilon})$  time for  $\varepsilon > 0$  was open. Chan and Lewenstein [15] settled this question affirmatively by proposing an  $\mathcal{O}(n^{1.859})$ -time randomized construction; very recently, it was improved to  $\mathcal{O}(n^{1.5} \log^{O(1)} n)$  time [22]. We make the following reduction.

**Theorem 37.** *If the Mismatch-CPM problem on binary strings can be solved in  $S(n)$  time, then a BJI can be constructed in  $\mathcal{O}(n + S(3n))$  time.*

*Proof.* We show how to compute  $\max_t$  for all  $t \in [1..n]$ . For computing  $\min_t$ , we can negate all the letters of  $X$ . An illustration of our reduction is provided in Fig. 4.

$X = 0100101001001$	$n = 13$	$j = 5$	$t = 6$	$i = n - t = 7$	
$\min_1 = 0 \quad \max_1 = 1$					$\text{CPM}[i] = t - \max_t + j - \max_t = \text{CPM}[7] = 5$
$\min_2 = 0 \quad \max_2 = 1$					$P = 0100101001001000000000000000$
$\min_3 = 1 \quad \max_3 = 2$					
$\min_4 = 1 \quad \max_4 = 2$					$T = \overset{0}{1}111111\overset{7}{1}1111110000000000000000000000000000000000$
$\min_5 = 1 \quad \max_5 = 2$					$\text{rot}_4(P) = 1010010010000000000000000100$
$\min_6 = 2 \quad \max_6 = 3$					
...					

Figure 4:  $\text{CPM}[7] = 5$  corresponds to a Hamming distance of 5 between  $T[7..7 + |P|)$  and some rotation of  $P$ , namely of  $\text{rot}_4(P)$ .

It suffices to consider an instance of the Mismatch-CPM problem with  $P = X0^n$ ,  $T = 1^n0^{2n}$ . A prefix of length at most  $n$  of a rotation of  $P$  is also a substring of a string  $0^nX0^n$ . For each  $i \in [0..n]$ , to compute  $\text{CPM}[i]$ , we need to choose a substring of  $0^nX0^n$  of length  $t = n - i$  with the largest number of 1s as the prefix of some rotation of  $P$ . Indeed, if  $U$  is this prefix and  $P'$  is this rotation, that is,  $P' = UV$ , the remaining 0s in  $U$  and 1s in  $V$  will correspond to mismatches between  $P'$  and  $T[i..i + |P|)$ . The maximum number of 1s among the substrings of  $0^nX0^n$  is the same as the maximum for  $X$  since it is never worse to choose a length- $t$  prefix (suffix) of  $X$  than a shorter prefix (suffix) and a part from  $0^n$ .

Thus, we have  $\text{CPM}[i] = t - \max_t + j - \max_t$ , where  $j$  is equal to the number of 1s in  $X$ . Hence, the values  $\max_t = (t + j - \text{CPM}[n - t])/2$  can be recovered from the CPM array in linear time.  $\square$

The following theorem shows how to compute the edit distance of two strings with the use of an algorithm for the decision version of  $k$ -Edit CPM, and thus also that a strongly subquadratic algorithm for this problem would refute SETH [43].

**Theorem 38.** *If  $k$ -Edit CPM on quaternary strings can be solved in  $\mathcal{O}(n^{2-\varepsilon})$  time for some constant  $\varepsilon > 0$ , then the edit distance of two binary strings each of length at most  $n$  can be computed in  $\mathcal{O}(n^{2-\varepsilon} \log n)$  time.*

*Proof.* To compute the edit distance between strings  $U$  and  $V$ , each of length at most  $n$ , it suffices to binary search on  $k$ , solving  $k$ -Edit CPM for pattern  $P = \$^{3n}U\#^{3n}$  and text  $T = \$^{3n}V\#^{3n}$ , where the letters  $\$$  and  $\#$  do not occur in  $UV$ .

Let  $ED(i, j, p)$  denote  $\delta_E(\text{rot}_{j \bmod |P|}(P), T[i..p])$ , that is, the edit distance between the  $(j \bmod |P|)$ -th rotation<sup>4</sup> of  $P$  and the length- $(p - i)$  fragment of  $T$  starting at position  $i$  of  $T$ . Let us notice that  $ED(0, 0, |T|) = \delta_E(P, T) = \delta_E(U, V)$  since an insertion or a deletion of the same letter in the start at the end of both strings does not change their edit distance.

**Claim.**  $ED(i, j, p)$  is minimized when  $i = 0$ ,  $j = 0$ , and  $p = |T|$ .

*Proof.* Notice that, for  $p - i < 5n$ , we have  $ED(i, j, p) > n \geq \delta_E(U, V)$  since the difference in lengths of  $\text{rot}_{j \bmod |P|}(P)$  and  $T[i..p]$  is greater than  $n$ . From now on, we assume that  $i \leq 2n$  and  $p \geq |T| - 2n$ . The proof goes by induction on  $|j|$  for  $j \in (3n - |P|..3n]$ .

In the base case ( $j = 0$ ), we can remove the longest common prefix (common  $\$$  letters) and the longest common suffix (common  $\#$  letters) from the prefix and suffix of both strings without changing the edit distance. We are left with  $V$  as the text (since only  $\$$  and  $\#$  are missing from  $T$  due to the length assumption), and  $\$^*U\#^*$  as the pattern. All those letters  $\$$  and  $\#$  have to be removed or substituted since there is no letter matching those in  $V$ . Any such removal increases the number of edit operations over the case with a smaller number of such letters, while any substitution can be simulated with an insertion in such a case; hence, it is optimal to have the least number of such letters, which is obtained for  $i = 0$  and  $p = |T|$ ; namely, in this case, the length of the longest common prefix (consisting of  $\$$  letters) and suffix (consisting of  $\#$  letters) is maximized.

Assume now that  $0 < j \leq 3n$  so that  $\text{rot}_{j \bmod |P|}(P)$  ends with a letter  $\$$ . This letter cannot be matched in  $T[i..p]$  since  $|P| > 6n$ , and the last  $\$$  in  $T[i..p]$  appears before position  $3n$ ; thus, it has to be either deleted or substituted with the last letter of  $T[i..p]$ . If we delete it, then the resulting string is the same as if we had deleted the first letter of  $\text{rot}_{(j-1) \bmod |P|}(P)$ . If we substitute it with  $\#$  and then remove the last matching letters from both strings, we obtain the same result as if we had deleted the first letter from  $\text{rot}_{(j-1) \bmod |P|}(P)$  and matched it with  $T[i..p-1]$ . Hence,  $ED(i, j, p) \geq \min(ED(i, j-1, p), ED(i, j-1, p-1))$ , which is larger or equal to  $ED(0, 0, |T|)$  by induction hypothesis.

The remaining case is symmetric to the previous one: Assume now that  $3n - |P| < j < 0$  so that  $\text{rot}_{j \bmod |P|}(P)$  starts either with  $\#$  (if  $j \geq -3n$ ) or with a letter from  $U$  (otherwise). In both cases, the letter cannot be matched with a letter from  $T[i..p]$  since  $i \leq 2n$ , and hence  $\$$  appears on the first  $n$  positions there. If we delete the letter, then we would obtain the same result as if we had deleted the last letter from  $\text{rot}_{(j+1) \bmod |P|}(P)$ . If we substitute it with  $\$$  and then remove the matching first letters from both strings, we obtain the same result as if we had deleted the last letter from  $\text{rot}_{(j+1) \bmod |P|}(P)$  and matched it with  $T[i+1..p]$ . Hence,  $ED(i, j, p) \geq \min(ED(i, j+1, p), ED(i+1, j+1, p))$ , which is greater than or equal to  $ED(0, 0, |T|)$  by induction hypothesis.  $\square$

By the above claim,  $k$ -Edit CPM will not find any occurrence for any  $k < \delta_E(U, V)$ , and hence the binary search will result in finding exactly  $\delta_E(U, V)$ .  $\square$

## Acknowledgments

We thank Paweł Gawrychowski and Oren Weimann for suggesting the strategy for the proof of Lemma 36.

<sup>4</sup>Here, we consider  $j \bmod |P|$  instead of just  $j$  to account for the case where  $j < 0$ .

Panagiotis Charalampopoulos was supported by Israel Science Foundation (ISF) grant 810/21 when the work that led to this paper was conducted.

Jakub Radoszewski and Tomasz Waleń were supported by the Polish National Science Center, grant no. 2018/31/D/ST6/03991.

Solon P. Pissis was supported by the PANGAIA and ALPACA projects that have received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreements No 872539 and 956229, respectively.

Wiktor Zuba was supported by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) through Gravitation-grant NETWORKS-024.002.003.

## References

- [1] Karl R. Abrahamson. Generalized string matching. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 16(6):1039–1051, 1987. doi:[10.1137/0216067](https://doi.org/10.1137/0216067).
- [2] Lorraine A. K. Ayad, Carl Barton, and Solon P. Pissis. A faster and more accurate heuristic for cyclic edit distance computation. *Pattern Recognition Letters*, 88:81–87, 2017. doi:[10.1016/j.patrec.2017.01.018](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patrec.2017.01.018).
- [3] Lorraine A. K. Ayad and Solon P. Pissis. MARS: Improving multiple circular sequence alignment using refined sequences. *BMC Genomics*, 18(1):86, 2017. doi:[10.1186/s12864-016-3477-5](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12864-016-3477-5).
- [4] Lorraine A. K. Ayad, Solon P. Pissis, and Ahmad Retha. libFLASM: A software library for fixed-length approximate string matching. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 17:454:1–454:12, 2016. doi:[10.1186/s12859-016-1320-2](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12859-016-1320-2).
- [5] Md. Aashikur Rahman Azim, Costas S. Iliopoulos, M. Sohel Rahman, and M. Samiruzzaman. A filter-based approach for approximate circular pattern matching. In *Bioinformatics Research and Applications - 11th International Symposium, ISBRA 2015*, volume 9096 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 24–35. Springer, 2015. doi:[10.1007/978-3-319-19048-8\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-19048-8_3).
- [6] Carl Barton, Costas S. Iliopoulos, Ritu Kundu, Solon P. Pissis, Ahmad Retha, and Fatima Vayani. Accurate and efficient methods to improve multiple circular sequence alignment. In *Experimental Algorithms, SEA 2015*, volume 9125 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 247–258. Springer, 2015. doi:[10.1007/978-3-319-20086-6\\_19](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-20086-6_19).
- [7] Carl Barton, Costas S. Iliopoulos, and Solon P. Pissis. Fast algorithms for approximate circular string matching. *Algorithms for Molecular Biology*, 9:9, 2014. doi:[10.1186/1748-7188-9-9](https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-7188-9-9).
- [8] Carl Barton, Costas S. Iliopoulos, and Solon P. Pissis. Average-case optimal approximate circular string matching. In *Language and Automata Theory and Applications - 9th International Conference, LATA 2015*, volume 8977 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 85–96. Springer, 2015. doi:[10.1007/978-3-319-15579-1\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-15579-1_6).
- [9] Carl Barton, Costas S. Iliopoulos, Solon P. Pissis, and William F. Smyth. Fast and simple computations using prefix tables under Hamming and edit distance. In *Combinatorial Algorithms - 25th International Workshop, IWOCA 2014*, volume 8986 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 49–61. Springer, 2014. doi:[10.1007/978-3-319-19315-1\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-19315-1_5).

- [10] Michael A. Bender and Martin Farach-Colton. The level ancestor problem simplified. In *LATIN 2002: Theoretical Informatics, 5th Latin American Symposium*, pages 508–515, 2002. doi:[10.1007/3-540-45995-2\\_44](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45995-2_44).
- [11] Philip Bille, Gad M. Landau, Rajeev Raman, Kunihiko Sadakane, Srinivasa Rao Satti, and Oren Weimann. Random access to grammar-compressed strings and trees. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 44(3):513–539, 2015. doi:[10.1137/130936889](https://doi.org/10.1137/130936889).
- [12] Karl Bringmann and Marvin Künnemann. Quadratic conditional lower bounds for string problems and dynamic time warping. In *IEEE 56th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2015*, pages 79–97. IEEE Computer Society, 2015. doi:[10.1109/FOCS.2015.15](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2015.15).
- [13] Gerth Stølting Brodal, Pooya Davoodi, and S. Srinivasa Rao. Path minima queries in dynamic weighted trees. In *Algorithms and Data Structures - 12th International Symposium, WADS 2011*, volume 6844 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 290–301. Springer, 2011. doi:[10.1007/978-3-642-22300-6\\_25](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-22300-6_25).
- [14] Timothy M. Chan, Shay Golan, Tomasz Kociumaka, Tsvi Kopelowitz, and Ely Porat. Approximating text-to-pattern Hamming distances. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2020*, pages 643–656. ACM, 2020. doi:[10.1145/3357713.3384266](https://doi.org/10.1145/3357713.3384266).
- [15] Timothy M. Chan and Moshe Lewenstein. Clustered integer 3SUM via additive combinatorics. In *Proceedings of the Forty-Seventh Annual ACM on Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2015*, pages 31–40. ACM, 2015. doi:[10.1145/2746539.2746568](https://doi.org/10.1145/2746539.2746568).
- [16] Panagiotis Charalampopoulos. *Data structures for strings in the internal and dynamic settings*. PhD thesis, King’s College London, 2020.
- [17] Panagiotis Charalampopoulos, Tomasz Kociumaka, Solon P. Pissis, Jakub Radoszewski, Wojciech Rytter, Juliusz Straszynski, Tomasz Waleń, and Wiktor Zuba. Circular pattern matching with  $k$  mismatches. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 115:73–85, 2021. doi:[10.1016/j.jcss.2020.07.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcss.2020.07.003).
- [18] Panagiotis Charalampopoulos, Tomasz Kociumaka, and Philip Wellnitz. Faster approximate pattern matching: A unified approach. In *61st IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2020*, pages 978–989. IEEE, 2020. arXiv:[2004.08350v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.08350v2), doi:[10.1109/FOCS46700.2020.00095](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS46700.2020.00095).
- [19] Panagiotis Charalampopoulos, Tomasz Kociumaka, and Philip Wellnitz. Faster pattern matching under edit distance. In *Accepted to 63rd IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2022*, 2022. arXiv:[2204.03087](https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.03087).
- [20] Panagiotis Charalampopoulos, Jakub Radoszewski, Wojciech Rytter, Tomasz Waleń, and Wiktor Zuba. The number of repetitions in 2D-strings. In *28th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms, ESA 2020*, volume 173 of *LIPIcs*, pages 32:1–32:18. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020. doi:[10.4230/LIPIcs.ESA.2020.32](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.ESA.2020.32).
- [21] Kuei-Hao Chen, Guan-Shieng Huang, and Richard Chia-Tung Lee. Bit-parallel algorithms for exact circular string matching. *The Computer Journal*, 57(5):731–743, 2014. doi:[10.1093/comjnl/bxt023](https://doi.org/10.1093/comjnl/bxt023).

- [22] Shucheng Chi, Ran Duan, Tianle Xie, and Tianyi Zhang. Faster min-plus product for monotone instances. In *STOC 2022: 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 1529–1542. ACM, 2022. doi:[10.1145/3519935.3520057](https://doi.org/10.1145/3519935.3520057).
- [23] Ferdinando Cicalese, Gabriele Fici, and Zsuzsanna Lipták. Searching for jumbled patterns in strings. In *Proceedings of the Prague Stringology Conference 2009*, pages 105–117, 2009. URL: <http://www.stringology.org/event/2009/p10.html>.
- [24] Ferdinando Cicalese, Travis Gagie, Emanuele Giaquinta, Eduardo Sany Laber, Zsuzsanna Lipták, Romeo Rizzi, and Alexandru I. Tomescu. Indexes for jumbled pattern matching in strings, trees and graphs. In *String Processing and Information Retrieval - 20th International Symposium, SPIRE 2013*, volume 8214 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 56–63. Springer, 2013. doi:[10.1007/978-3-319-02432-5\\_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02432-5_10).
- [25] Raphaël Clifford, Allyx Fontaine, Ely Porat, Benjamin Sach, and Tatiana Starikovskaya. The  $k$ -mismatch problem revisited. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2016*, pages 2039–2052. SIAM, 2016. doi:[10.1137/1.9781611974331.ch142](https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611974331.ch142).
- [26] Maxime Crochemore, Christophe Hancart, and Thierry Lecroq. *Algorithms on Strings*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [27] James R. Driscoll, Neil Sarnak, Daniel Dominic Sleator, and Robert Endre Tarjan. Making data structures persistent. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 38(1):86–124, 1989. doi:[10.1016/0022-0000\(89\)90034-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0000(89)90034-2).
- [28] Martin Farach. Optimal suffix tree construction with large alphabets. In *38th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 1997*, pages 137–143. IEEE Computer Society, 1997. doi:[10.1109/SFCS.1997.646102](https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.1997.646102).
- [29] Michael J. Fischer and Michael S. Paterson. String-matching and other products. Technical report, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, USA, 1974.
- [30] Kimmo Fredriksson and Szymon Grabowski. Average-optimal string matching. *Journal of Discrete Algorithms*, 7(4):579–594, 2009. doi:[10.1016/j.jda.2008.09.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jda.2008.09.001).
- [31] Kimmo Fredriksson and Gonzalo Navarro. Average-optimal single and multiple approximate string matching. *ACM Journal of Experimental Algorithmics*, 9, 2004. doi:[10.1145/1005813.1041513](https://doi.org/10.1145/1005813.1041513).
- [32] Paweł Gawrychowski, Adam Karczmarz, Tomasz Kociumaka, Jakub Łacki, and Piotr Sankowski. Optimal dynamic strings. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2018*, pages 1509–1528. SIAM, 2018. doi:[10.1137/1.9781611975031.99](https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611975031.99).
- [33] Paweł Gawrychowski, Shay Mozes, and Oren Weimann. Submatrix maximum queries in Monge and partial Monge matrices are equivalent to predecessor search. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 16(2):16:1–16:24, 2020. doi:[10.1145/3381416](https://doi.org/10.1145/3381416).
- [34] Paweł Gawrychowski and Przemysław Uznański. Towards unified approximate pattern matching for Hamming and  $L_1$  distance. In *45th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2018*, volume 107 of *LIPIcs*, pages 62:1–62:13. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2018. doi:[10.4230/LIPIcs.ICALP.2018.62](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.ICALP.2018.62).



- [35] Roberto Grossi, Costas S. Iliopoulos, Robert Mercas, Nadia Pisanti, Solon P. Pissis, Ahmad Retha, and Fatima Vayani. Circular sequence comparison: algorithms and applications. *Algorithms for Molecular Biology*, 11:12, 2016. doi:[10.1186/s13015-016-0076-6](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13015-016-0076-6).
- [36] Yijie Han. Deterministic sorting in  $O(n \log \log n)$  time and linear space. *Journal of Algorithms*, 50(1):96–105, 2004. doi:[10.1016/j.jalgor.2003.09.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jalgor.2003.09.001).
- [37] Tommi Hirvola and Jorma Tarhio. Bit-parallel approximate matching of circular strings with  $k$  mismatches. *ACM Journal of Experimental Algorithmics*, 22, 2017. doi:[10.1145/3129536](https://doi.org/10.1145/3129536).
- [38] ThienLuan Ho, Seungroh Oh, and Hyunjin Kim. New algorithms for fixed-length approximate string matching and approximate circular string matching under the Hamming distance. *The Journal of Supercomputing*, 74(5):1815–1834, 2018. doi:[10.1007/s11227-017-2192-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11227-017-2192-6).
- [39] Wing-Kai Hon, Tsung-Han Ku, Rahul Shah, and Sharma V. Thankachan. Space-efficient construction algorithm for the circular suffix tree. In *Combinatorial Pattern Matching, 24th Annual Symposium, CPM 2013*, volume 7922 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 142–152. Springer, 2013. doi:[10.1007/978-3-642-38905-4\\_15](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-38905-4_15).
- [40] Wing-Kai Hon, Chen-Hua Lu, Rahul Shah, and Sharma V. Thankachan. Succinct indexes for circular patterns. In *Algorithms and Computation - 22nd International Symposium, ISAAC 2011*, volume 7074 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 673–682. Springer, 2011. doi:[10.1007/978-3-642-25591-5\\_69](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-25591-5_69).
- [41] Tomohiro I. Longest common extensions with recompression. In *28th Annual Symposium on Combinatorial Pattern Matching, CPM 2017*, volume 78 of *LIPIcs*, pages 18:1–18:15. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2017. doi:[10.4230/LIPIcs.CPM.2017.18](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CPM.2017.18).
- [42] Costas S. Iliopoulos, Solon P. Pissis, and M. Sohel Rahman. Searching and indexing circular patterns. In *Algorithms for Next-Generation Sequencing Data, Techniques, Approaches, and Applications*, pages 77–90. Springer, 2017. doi:[10.1007/978-3-319-59826-0\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-59826-0_3).
- [43] Russell Impagliazzo and Ramamohan Paturi. On the complexity of  $k$ -SAT. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 62(2):367–375, 2001. doi:[10.1006/jcss.2000.1727](https://doi.org/10.1006/jcss.2000.1727).
- [44] Artur Jeż. Faster fully compressed pattern matching by recompression. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 11(3):20:1–20:43, 2015. doi:[10.1145/2631920](https://doi.org/10.1145/2631920).
- [45] Artur Jeż. Recompression: A simple and powerful technique for word equations. *Journal of the ACM*, 63(1):4:1–4:51, 2016. doi:[10.1145/2743014](https://doi.org/10.1145/2743014).
- [46] Haim Kaplan, Shay Mozes, Yahav Nussbaum, and Micha Sharir. Submatrix maximum queries in Monge matrices and Monge partial matrices, and their applications. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2012*, pages 338–355. SIAM, 2012. doi:[10.1137/1.9781611973099.31](https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611973099.31).
- [47] Haim Kaplan and Robert Endre Tarjan. Purely functional representations of catenable sorted lists. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing*, pages 202–211. ACM, 1996. doi:[10.1145/237814.237865](https://doi.org/10.1145/237814.237865).
- [48] Dominik Kempa and Tomasz Kociumaka. Resolution of the Burrows-Wheeler transform conjecture. In *61st IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2020*, pages 1002–1013. IEEE, 2020. doi:[10.1109/FOCS46700.2020.00097](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS46700.2020.00097).

- [49] Dominik Kempa and Tomasz Kociumaka. Dynamic suffix array with polylogarithmic queries and updates. In *STOC 2022: 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 1657–1670. ACM, 2022. [arXiv:2201.01285](#), [doi:10.1145/3519935.3520061](#).
- [50] Tomasz Kociumaka. *Efficient Data Structures for Internal Queries in Texts*. PhD thesis, University of Warsaw, 2018.
- [51] Tomasz Kociumaka, Jakub Radoszewski, Wojciech Rytter, and Tomasz Waleń. Internal pattern matching queries in a text and applications. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2015*, pages 532–551. SIAM, 2015. [doi:10.1137/1.9781611973730.36](#).
- [52] S. Rao Kosaraju. Efficient string matching. Manuscript, 1987.
- [53] Gad M. Landau, Eugene W. Myers, and Jeanette P. Schmidt. Incremental string comparison. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 27(2):557–582, 1998. [doi:10.1137/S0097539794264810](#).
- [54] Gad M. Landau and Uzi Vishkin. Fast parallel and serial approximate string matching. *Journal of Algorithms*, 10(2):157–169, 1989. [doi:10.1016/0196-6774\(89\)90010-2](#).
- [55] M. Lothaire. *Applied Combinatorics on Words*. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, 2005. [doi:10.1017/CB09781107341005](#).
- [56] Vicente Palazón-González and Andrés Marzal. On the dynamic time warping of cyclic sequences for shape retrieval. *Image and Vision Computing*, 30(12):978–990, 2012. [doi:10.1016/j.imavis.2012.08.012](#).
- [57] Vicente Palazón-González and Andrés Marzal. Speeding up the cyclic edit distance using LAESA with early abandon. *Pattern Recognition Letters*, 62:1–7, 2015. [doi:10.1016/j.patrec.2015.04.013](#).
- [58] Vicente Palazón-González, Andrés Marzal, and Juan Miguel Vilar. On hidden Markov models and cyclic strings for shape recognition. *Pattern Recognition*, 47(7):2490–2504, 2014. [doi:10.1016/j.patcog.2014.01.018](#).
- [59] Robert Susik, Szymon Grabowski, and Sebastian Deorowicz. Fast and simple circular pattern matching. In *Man-Machine Interactions 3, Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Man-Machine Interactions, ICMMI 2013*, volume 242 of *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing*, pages 537–544. Springer, 2013. [doi:10.1007/978-3-319-02309-0\\_59](#).
- [60] Alexander Tiskin. Semi-local string comparison: algorithmic techniques and applications, 2007. [doi:10.48550/ARXIV.0707.3619](#).
- [61] Alexander Tiskin. Semi-local string comparison: Algorithmic techniques and applications. *Mathematics in Computer Science*, 1(4):571–603, 2008. [doi:10.1007/s11786-007-0033-3](#).
- [62] Esko Ukkonen. Algorithms for approximate string matching. *Information and Control*, 64(1-3):100–118, 1985. [doi:10.1016/S0019-9958\(85\)80046-2](#).
- [63] Dan E. Willard. Log-logarithmic worst-case range queries are possible in space  $\Theta(N)$ . *Information Processing Letters*, 17(2):81–84, 1983. [doi:10.1016/0020-0190\(83\)90075-3](#).

## A Exact Circular Pattern Matching

In this section, for completeness, we present a linear-time solution for CPM *for any alphabet*.<sup>5</sup>

We use the so-called *prefix array* PREF of a string  $S$  such that, for  $i \in [0 \dots |S|]$ , the value  $\text{PREF}[i]$  is the maximum  $j \geq 0$  such that  $S[0 \dots j] = S[i \dots i + j]$ . An algorithm constructing the prefix array can be found in [26]. It works in linear time for any alphabet.

To solve CPM, assume that we have precomputed array PREF for string  $PT$ , which we denote by  $\Pi$ , and array PREF for string  $P^R T^R$ , where  $P^R$  and  $T^R$  are the reversals of strings  $P$  and  $T$ , which we denote by  $\Pi_R$ . Then,  $T[i \dots i + m] = P[j \dots j + m]$  holds for some  $j$  if and only if there exists  $p \in [i + m \dots i + 2m]$  such that  $\Pi[p] + \Pi_R[2m + n - p] \geq m$ . By the definition of PREF, this implies the following fact.

**Fact 39.** *The set of positions in  $T$  where some rotation of  $P$  occurs is*

$$\bigcup_{p \in [m \dots m+n]} [p - \Pi_R[2m + n - p] \dots p + \Pi[p] - m].$$

We compute all such intervals by iterating over  $p$ , and then we compute the intervals' union in  $\mathcal{O}(n)$  time using radix sort. We thus obtain the following result.

**Theorem 40.** *CPM can be solved in  $\mathcal{O}(n)$  time.*

## B Lemma 35: Online Seaweed Combing

Let us restate Lemma 35 for convenience.

**Lemma 35.** (a) *Let  $t \in [0 \dots m]$ ,  $i \in [p \dots p + k]$ ,  $j \in [i - k \dots i + k] \cap [i - t \dots n - t]$ , and  $k' \in [0 \dots k]$ . Then,  $\delta_D(T[i \dots j + t], P[0 \dots t]) \leq k'$  if and only if  $D_t[i - p + k + 1, j - p + k + 1] \leq k'$ .*  
 (b) *For each  $t \in [0 \dots m]$ , there is a  $(3k + 1) \times (3k + 1)$  permutation matrix  $P_t$  such that  $D_t[i, j] = 2P_t^\Sigma[i, j] + i - j$  holds for all  $i, j \in [0 \dots 3k + 1]$ . Moreover,  $P_0$  is an identity permutation matrix and a sequence  $\Delta(P_0, P_1), \dots, \Delta(P_{m-1}, P_m)$  contains at most  $3k(3k + 1)/2$  transpositions of neighboring elements in total and all its non-empty elements can be computed in  $\mathcal{O}(k^2 \log \log k)$  time plus  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  LCP queries on pairs of suffixes of  $P$  and  $T$ .*

**Diagonal-band restriction** Item (a) follows from the well-known diagonal-band argument that originates from a work of Ukkonen [62] and has been used, for instance, by Landau and Vishkin [54] towards their  $\mathcal{O}(nk)$ -time algorithm for pattern matching under edit distance:

- Since  $G(P, T, \mathbb{Z})$  is a subgraph of  $G(P, T, I)$  (for any interval  $I$ ), Observation 33 and the definition of  $D_t$  yield  $D_t[i - p + k + 1, j - p + k + 1] \leq \delta_D(T[i \dots j + t], P[0 \dots t])$ .
- Moreover, if  $I \supseteq [b - a - k \dots b - a + k]$ , then any  $(a, b) \rightsquigarrow (c, d)$  path in  $G(P, T, I)$  of weight at most  $k$  contains only vertices  $(x, y)$  with  $y - x \in I$ , and thus the same path is also present in  $G(P, T, \mathbb{Z})$ . Hence, if  $D_t[i - p + k + 1, j - p + k + 1] \leq k' \leq k$ , then  $\delta_D(T[i \dots j + t], P[0 \dots t]) \leq k'$ .

**Online seaweed combing** We proceed to give a high-level description of the proof of [19, Lemma 8.23], which provides an efficient construction algorithm of a permutation matrix  $P_m$  that satisfies  $D_m[i, j] = 2P_m^\Sigma[i, j] + i - j$ , arguing that it directly implies Item (b). This proof is reminiscent of the seaweed combing technique of Tiskin (cf. [60, Chapter 5]).

<sup>5</sup>This solution may be regarded as folklore, but we were unable to find an appropriate citation.

Let us fix a graph  $G' = G(P, T, (\ell \dots r))$  and denote  $\text{half}(\mathbb{Z}) := \{i + 1/2 : i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ . We think of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  as an infinite grid, and we build another graph  $H$  on top  $G'$  with vertices

$$V(H) := \{(a, b) \in (\mathbb{Z} \times \text{half}(\mathbb{Z})) \cup (\text{half}(\mathbb{Z}) \times \mathbb{Z}) : b - a \in [\ell \dots r] \text{ and } a \in [0 \dots m]\},$$

corresponding the midpoints of vertical and horizontal edges incident to at least one vertex  $(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$  with  $b - a \in (\ell \dots r)$ . We add the following edges to  $H$  for all  $(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ :

- $(a, b + 1/2) \leftrightarrow (a + 1, b + 1/2)$  if both endpoints exist and  $(a, b) \leftrightarrow (a + 1, b + 1) \notin E(G')$ ;
- $(a + 1/2, b) \leftrightarrow (a + 1/2, b + 1)$  if both endpoints exist and  $(a, b) \leftrightarrow (a + 1, b + 1) \notin E(G')$ ;
- $(a, b + 1/2) \leftrightarrow (a + 1/2, b + 1)$  if both endpoints exist and  $(a, b) \leftrightarrow (a + 1, b + 1) \in E(G')$ ;
- $(a + 1/2, b) \leftrightarrow (a + 1, b + 1/2)$  if both endpoints exist and  $(a, b) \leftrightarrow (a + 1, b + 1) \in E(G')$ .

Thus, in each cell of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ , we have a single diagonal edge in  $G'$  and two parallel diagonal edges in  $H$ , or a vertical and a horizontal edge in  $H$  that cross; the latter happens when this cell does not contain a diagonal edge in  $G'$ —in the natural embedding of diagonal edges in  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ —and hence corresponds to a mismatch between letters of  $P$  and  $T$ .

Then, the graph  $H$  is a collection of  $r - \ell + 1$  (maximal) vertex-disjoint paths whose sources are the vertices of  $H$  of the form  $(0, \star)$  and whose sinks are the vertices of  $H$  of the form  $(m, \star)$ .<sup>6</sup> Note that paths only cross in cells that correspond to mismatches between letters of  $P$  and  $T$ .

Let us now describe an (inefficient) procedure for computing  $P_m$  that underlies the proof of [19, Lemma 8.23]. Consider iterating over all cells of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  spanned by vertices of  $H$  in the lexicographic order, i.e., row by row from top to bottom, in a left-to-right manner in each row. Whenever we reach a cell where the two paths that cross have already crossed, we replace edges  $(a, b + 1/2) \leftrightarrow (a + 1, b + 1/2)$  and  $(a + 1/2, b) \leftrightarrow (a + 1/2, b + 1)$  with edges  $(a, b + 1/2) \leftrightarrow (a + 1/2, b + 1)$  and  $(a + 1/2, b) \leftrightarrow (a + 1, b + 1/2)$ , thus removing the second crossing of these paths. At the end of this process, the resulting source-to-sink paths are in one-to-one correspondence with the non-zeroes of the sought permutation matrix  $P_m$ , that is, a path from the  $i$ -th source to the  $j$ -th sink means that  $P_m[i, j] = 1$ .<sup>7</sup> Further, we observe that, once we have processed the first  $t$  rows of cells, the paths from the sources to the vertices of the form  $(t, \star)$  are in one-to-one correspondence with the non-zeroes of permutation matrix  $P_t$ ; to this end, notice that the same algorithm applied to  $G(P[0 \dots t], T, (\ell \dots r))$  would have computed the exact same paths.

The proof of [19, Lemma 8.23] relies on directly computing the final source-to-sink paths in  $\mathcal{O}(k^2 \log \log k)$  time plus  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  LCP queries. It does so using a line sweep algorithm with the sweep line moving along the first coordinate. Notice that the sought  $3k + 1$  paths have at most  $3k(3k + 1)/2$  crossings in total. Let us now consider the process of extending the paths from the sources row by row. At any time, adjacent paths either have already crossed (and will never cross again) or they wait for a mismatch until they can cross. Thus, the algorithm stores a list of paths (in the left-to-right order). Every two adjacent paths store a possible crossing time (either  $\infty$  or the result of an LCP query). Whenever the sweep line reaches one of those events, the paths actually cross; this implies the removal of three old events, including the one that fired, and the creation of at most two new ones, one for every two newly adjacent paths that have not crossed already.

This completes our sketch of the proof of [19, Lemma 8.23]. It is evident that each of the  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  computed crossings of paths corresponds to a transposition of neighboring elements.

<sup>6</sup>These paths are analogous to Tiskin's *uncombed seaweeds*, with the difference that in his work there was no restriction to a diagonal band.

<sup>7</sup>This process corresponds to Tiskin's seaweed combing procedure and the resulting paths are analogous to the *combed seaweeds* in his work.