

Work-sensitive Dynamic Complexity of Formal Languages

Jonas Schmidt¹, Thomas Schwentick¹, Till Tantau², Nils Vortmeier³, and Thomas Zeume⁴

¹ TU Dortmund University, Germany
{jonas2.schmidt,thomas.schwentick}@tu-dortmund.de
² Universität zu Lübeck, Germany
tantau@tcs.uni-luebeck.de
³ University of Zurich, Switzerland
nils.vortmeier@uzh.ch
⁴ Ruhr University Bochum, Germany
thomas.zeume@rub.de

Abstract. Which amount of parallel resources is needed for updating a query result after changing an input? In this work we study the amount of work required for dynamically answering membership and range queries for formal languages in parallel constant time with polynomially many processors. As a prerequisite, we propose a framework for specifying dynamic, parallel, constant-time programs that require small amounts of work. This framework is based on the dynamic descriptive complexity framework by Patnaik and Immerman.

Keywords: Dynamic complexity · work · parallel constant time.

1 Introduction

Which amount of parallel resources is needed for updating a query result after changing an input, in particular if we only want to spend constant parallel time?

In classical, non-dynamic computations, parallel constant time is well understood. Constant time on CRAMs, a variant of CRCW-PRAMs used by Immerman [16], corresponds to constant-depth in circuits, so, to the circuit class AC^0 , as well as to expressibility in first-order logic with built-in arithmetic (see, for instance, the books of Immerman [16, Theorem 5.2] and Vollmer [28, Theorems 4.69 and 4.73]). Even more, the amount of work, that is, the overall number of operations of all processors, is connected to the number of variables required by a first-order formula [16, Theorem 5.10].

However, the work aspect of constant parallel time algorithms is less understood for scenarios where the input is subject to changes. To the best of our knowledge, there is only little previous work on constant-time PRAMs in dynamic scenarios. A notable exception is early work showing that spanning trees and connected components can be computed in constant time by CRCW-PRAMs with $O(n^4)$ and $O(n^2)$ processors, respectively [26].

In an orthogonal line of research, parallel dynamic constant time has been studied from a logical perspective in the dynamic complexity framework by Patnaik and Immerman [23] and Dong, Su, and Topor [7,6]. In this framework, the update of query results after a change is expressed by first-order formulas. The formulas may refer to auxiliary relations, whose updates in turn are also specified by first-order formulas (see Section 3 for more details). The queries maintainable in this fashion constitute the dynamic complexity class DynFO. Such queries can be updated by PRAMs in constant time with a polynomial number of processors. In this line of work, the main focus in recent years has been on proving that queries are in DynFO, and thus emphasised the constant time aspect. It has, for instance, been shown that all context-free languages [12] and the reachability query [5] are in DynFO.

However, if one tries to make the “DynFO approach” for dynamic problems relevant for practical considerations, the work that is needed to carry out the specified updates, hence the *work* of a parallel algorithm implementing them, is a crucial factor. The current general polynomial upper bounds are too coarse. In this paper, we therefore initiate the investigation of more work-efficient dynamic programs that can be specified by first-order logic and that can therefore be carried out by PRAMs in constant time. To do so, we propose a framework for specifying such dynamic, parallel, constant-time programs, which is based on the DynFO framework, but allows for more precise (and better) bounds on the necessary work of a program.

Goal 1.1. *Extend the formal framework of dynamic complexity towards the consideration of parallel work.*

Towards this goal, we link the framework we propose to the CRAM framework in Section 3. In fact, the new framework also takes a somewhat wider perspective, since it does not focus exclusively at one query under a set of change operations, but rather considers dynamic problems that may have several change and query operations (and could even have operations that combine the two). Therefore, from now on we speak about dynamic problems and not about (single) queries.

Goal 1.2. *Find work-efficient DynFO-programs for dynamic problems that are known to be in DynFO (but whose dynamic programs⁵ are not competitive, work-wise).*

Ideally we aim at showing that dynamic problems can be maintained in DynFO with sublinear or even polylogarithmic work. One line of attack for this goal is to study dynamic algorithms and to see whether they can be transformed into parallel $\mathcal{O}(1)$ -time algorithms with small work. There is a plethora of work that achieves polylogarithmic sequential update time (even though, sometimes only amortised), see for instance [3,9,13,14]. For many of these problems, it is

⁵ In the field of dynamic complexity the term “dynamic program” is traditionally used for the programs for updating the auxiliary data after a change. The term should not be confused with the “dynamic programming” technique used in algorithm design.

known that they can be maintained in constant parallel time with polynomial work, e.g. as mentioned above, it has been shown that connectivity and maintenance of regular (and even context-free) languages is in DynFO.

In this paper, we follow this approach for dynamic string problems, more specifically, dynamic problems that allow membership and range queries for regular and context-free languages. Our results can be summarised as follows.

We show in Section 5 that regular languages can be maintained in constant time with $\mathcal{O}(n^\epsilon)$ work for all $\epsilon > 0$ and that for star-free languages even work $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ can be achieved. These results hold for range and membership queries.

For context-free languages, the situation is not as nice, as we observe in Section 6. We show that subject to a well-known conjecture, we cannot hope for maintaining membership in general context-free languages in DynFO with less than $\mathcal{O}(n^{1.37-\epsilon})$ work. The same statement holds even for the bound $\mathcal{O}(n^{2-\epsilon})$ and “combinatorial dynamic programs”. For Dyck languages, that is, sets of well-formed strings of parentheses, we show that this barrier does not apply. Their membership problem can be maintained with $\mathcal{O}(n(\log n)^3)$ work in general, and with polylogarithmic work if there is only one kind of parentheses. By a different approach, range queries can be maintained with work $\mathcal{O}(n^{1+\epsilon})$ in general, and $\mathcal{O}(n^\epsilon)$ for one parenthesis type.

Related work. A complexity theory of incremental time has been developed in [22]. We discuss previous work on dynamic complexity of formal languages in Sections 5 and 6.

2 Preliminaries

Since dynamic programs are based on first-order logic, we represent inputs like graphs and strings as well as “internal” data structures as logical structures.

A *schema* τ consists of a set of relation symbols and function symbols with a corresponding arity. A constant symbol is a function symbol with arity 0. A *structure* \mathcal{D} over schema τ with finite domain D has, for every k -ary relation symbol $R \in \tau$, a relation $R^{\mathcal{D}} \subseteq D^k$, as well as a function $f^{\mathcal{D}}: D^k \rightarrow D$ for every k -ary function symbol $f \in \tau$. We allow partially defined functions and write $f^{\mathcal{D}}(\bar{a}) = \perp$ if $f^{\mathcal{D}}$ is not defined for \bar{a} in \mathcal{D} . Formally, this can be realized using an additional relation that contains the domain of $f^{\mathcal{D}}$. We occasionally also use functions $f^{\mathcal{D}}: D^k \rightarrow D^\ell$ for some $\ell > 1$. Formally, such a function represents ℓ functions $f_1^{\mathcal{D}}, \dots, f_\ell^{\mathcal{D}}: D^k \rightarrow D$ with $f^{\mathcal{D}}(\bar{a}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (f_1^{\mathcal{D}}(\bar{a}), \dots, f_\ell^{\mathcal{D}}(\bar{a}))$.

Throughout this work, the structures we consider provide a linear order \leq on their domain D . As we can thus identify D with an initial sequence of the natural numbers, we usually just assume that $D = [n] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ for some natural number n .

We assume familiarity with first-order logic FO, and refer to [19] for basics of Finite Model Theory. In this paper, unless stated otherwise, first-order formulas *always* have access to a linear order on the domain, as well as compatible functions $+$ and \times that express addition and multiplication, respectively. This holds

in particular for formulas in dynamic programs. We use the following “if-then-else” construct: if φ is a formula, and t_1 and t_2 are terms, then $\text{ITE}(\varphi, t_1, t_2)$ is a term. Such a term evaluates to the result of t_1 if φ is satisfied, otherwise to t_2 .

Following [12], we encode words of length (at most) n over an alphabet Σ by *word structures*, that is, as relational structures W with universe $\{0, \dots, n-1\}$, one unary relation R_σ for each symbol $\sigma \in \Sigma$ and the canonical linear order \leq on $\{0, \dots, n-1\}$. We only consider structures for which, for every position i , $R_\sigma(i)$ holds for at most one $\sigma \in \Sigma$ and write $W(i) = \sigma$ if $R_\sigma(i)$ holds and $W(i) = \epsilon$ if no such σ exists. We write $\text{word}(W)$ for the word represented by W , that is, the concatenation $w = W(0) \circ \dots \circ W(n-1)$. As an example, the word structure W_0 with domain $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$, $W(1) = a$, $W(3) = b$ and $W(0) = W(2) = \epsilon$ represents the string ab . We write $\text{word}(W)[\ell, r]$ for the word $W(\ell) \circ \dots \circ W(r)$.

Informally, a *dynamic problem* can be seen as a data type: it consists of some underlying structure together with a set Δ of operations. We distinguish between *change operations* that can modify the structure and *query operations* that yield information about the structure, but combined operations could be allowed, as well. Thus, a dynamic problem is characterised by the schema of its underlying structures and the operations that it supports.⁶

In this paper, we are particularly interested in dynamic language problems, defined as follows. Words are represented as word structures W with elementary change operations $\text{SET}_\sigma(i)$ (with the effect that $W(i)$ becomes σ if it was ϵ before) and $\text{RESET}(i)$ (with the effect that $W(i)$ becomes ϵ).

For some fixed language L over some alphabet Σ , the dynamic problem $\text{RANGEMEMBER}(L)$ further supports one query operation $\text{RANGE}(\ell, r)$. It yields the result true, if $\text{word}(W)[\ell, r]$ is in L , and otherwise false.

In the following, we denote a word structure W as a sequence $w_0 \dots w_{n-1}$ of letters with $w_i \in \Sigma \cup \{\epsilon\}$ in order to have an easier, less formal notation. Altogether, the dynamic problem $\text{RANGEMEMBER}(L)$ is defined as follows.

Problem: $\text{RANGEMEMBER}(L)$

Input: A sequence $w = w_0 \dots w_{n-1}$ of letters with $w_i \in \Sigma \cup \{\epsilon\}$

Changes: $\text{SET}_\sigma(i)$ for $\sigma \in \Sigma$: Sets w_i to σ , if $w_i = \epsilon$

$\text{RESET}(i)$: Sets w_i to ϵ

Queries: $\text{RANGE}(\ell, r)$: Is $w_\ell \circ \dots \circ w_r \in L$?

In this example, the query RANGE maps (binary) pairs of domain elements to a truth value and thus defines a (binary) relation over the universe of the input word structure. We call such a query *relational*. We will also consider *functional* queries mapping tuples of elements to elements.

Another dynamic problem considered here is $\text{MEMBER}(L)$ which is defined similarly as $\text{RANGEMEMBER}(L)$ but instead of RANGE only has the Boolean query operation MEMBER that yields true if $w_0 \circ \dots \circ w_{n-1} \in L$ holds.

⁶ This view is a bit broader than the traditional setting of Dynamic Complexity, where there can be various change operations but usually only one fixed query is supported.

3 Work-sensitive Dynamic Complexity

Since we are interested in the work that a dynamic program does, our specification mechanism for dynamic programs is considerably more elaborated than the one used in previous papers on dynamic complexity. We introduce the mechanism in this section in two steps. First the general form of dynamic programs and then a more pseudo-code oriented syntax. Afterwards, we discuss how these dynamic programs translate into work-efficient constant-time parallel programs.

3.1 The Dynamic Complexity Framework

Our general form of dynamic programs mainly follows [25], but is adapted to the slightly broader view of a dynamic problem as a data type. For a more gentle introduction to dynamic complexity, we refer to [24].

The goal of a *dynamic program* for a dynamic problem Π is to support all its operations Δ . To do so, it stores and updates an auxiliary structure \mathcal{A} over some schema τ_{aux} , over the same domain as the input structure \mathcal{I} for Π .

A (first-order) dynamic program \mathcal{P} consists of a set of (first-order) *update rules* for change operations and *query rules* for query operations. More precisely, a program has one query rule over schema τ_{aux} per query operation that specifies how the (relational) result of that operation is obtained from the auxiliary structure. Furthermore, for each change operation $\delta \in \Delta$, it has one update rule per auxiliary relation or function that specifies the updates after a change based on δ .

A query rule is of the form **on query** $Q(\bar{p})$ **yield** $\varphi_Q(\bar{p})$, where φ_Q is the (first-order) *query formula* with free variables from \bar{p} .

An update rule for a k -ary auxiliary relation R is of the form

on change $\delta(\bar{p})$ **update** R **at** $(t_1(\bar{p}; \bar{x}), \dots, t_k(\bar{p}; \bar{x}))$ **as** $\varphi_\delta^R(\bar{p}; \bar{x})$ **where** $C(\bar{x})$.

Here, φ_δ^R is the (first-order) *update formula*, t_1, \dots, t_k are first-order terms (possibly using the ITE construct) over τ_{aux} , and $C(\bar{x})$, called a *constraint* for the tuple $\bar{x} = x_1, \dots, x_\ell$ of variables, is a conjunction of inequalities $x_i \leq f_i(n)$ using functions $f_i: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, where n is the size of the domain and $1 \leq i \leq \ell$. We demand that all functions f_i are first-order definable from $+$ and \times .

The effect of such an update rule after a change operation $\delta(\bar{a})$ is as follows: the new relation $R^{\mathcal{A}'}$ in the updated auxiliary structure \mathcal{A}' contains all tuples from $R^{\mathcal{A}}$ that are *not* equal to $(t_1(\bar{a}; \bar{b}), \dots, t_k(\bar{a}; \bar{b}))$ for any tuple \bar{b} that satisfies the constraints C ; and additionally $R^{\mathcal{A}'}$ contains all tuples $(t_1(\bar{a}; \bar{b}), \dots, t_k(\bar{a}; \bar{b}))$ such that \bar{b} satisfies C and $\mathcal{A} \models \varphi_\delta^R(\bar{a}; \bar{b})$ holds.

Phrased more operationally, an update is performed by enumerating all tuples \bar{b} that satisfy C , evaluating $\varphi_\delta^R(\bar{a}; \bar{b})$ on the old auxiliary structure \mathcal{A} , and depending on the result adding the tuple $(t_1(\bar{a}; \bar{b}), \dots, t_k(\bar{a}; \bar{b}))$ to R (if it was not already present), or removing that tuple from R (if it was present).

Update rules for auxiliary functions are similar, but instead of an update formula that decides whether a tuple of the form $(t_1(\bar{a}; \bar{b}), \dots, t_k(\bar{a}; \bar{b}))$ is con-

tained in the updated relation, it features an update term that determines the new function value for a function argument of the form $(t_1(\bar{a}; \bar{b}), \dots, t_k(\bar{a}; \bar{b}))$.

We say that \mathcal{P} is a dynamic program for a dynamic problem Π if it supports all its operations and, in particular, always yields correct results for query operations. More precisely, if the result of applying a query operation after a sequence α of change operations on an initial structure \mathcal{I}_0 yields the same result as the evaluation of the query rule on the auxiliary structure that is obtained by applying the update rules corresponding to the change operations in α to an initial auxiliary structure \mathcal{A}_0 . Here, an initial input structure \mathcal{I}_0 over some domain D is *empty*, that is, it is a structure with empty relations and with all function values being undefined (\perp). The initial auxiliary structure \mathcal{A}_0 is over the same domain D as \mathcal{I}_0 and is defined from \mathcal{I}_0 by some FO-definable initialization.

By DynFO, we denote the class of all dynamic problems that have a dynamic program in the sense we just defined.

3.2 A syntax for work-efficient dynamic programs

In this paper we are particularly interested in dynamic programs that require little work to update the auxiliary structure after every change operation and to compute the result of a query operation. However, since dynamic programs do not come with an execution model, there is no direct way to define, say, when a DynFO-program has polylogarithmic-work, syntactically. But it is even not clear how a *semantic* definition could be obtained: the obvious approach to require that the program has an implementation as a parallel program that only needs polylogarithmic-work does not work, since it is not clear how to define when a parallel program *implements* a given dynamic program. This difficulty occurs in particular if one wants to prove that some problem does *not* have a work-efficient dynamic program.

Since, we are not interested in lower bounds in this paper, we follow a pragmatic approach here. We define a pseudo-code-based syntax for *update* and *query procedures* that will be used in place of the update and query *formulas* in rules of dynamic programs. This syntax has three important properties: (1) it is reasonably well readable (as opposed to strict first-order logic formulas), (2) it allows a straightforward translation of rules into proper DynFO-programs, and (3) it allows to associate a “work-bounding function” to each rule and to translate it into a PRAM program with $\mathcal{O}(1)$ parallel time and work bounded by this function.

The syntax of the pseudo-code has similarities with Abstract State Machines [4] and the PRAM-syntax of [17]. For simplicity, we describe a minimal set of syntactic elements that suffice for the dynamic programs in this paper. We encourage readers to have a look at Section 4 for examples of update rules with pseudo-code syntax. However, we mention some extensions that could be considered for more complicated programs.

We only spell out a syntax for *update procedures* that can be used in place of the update formula $\varphi_\delta^R(\bar{p}; \bar{x})$ of an update rule

on change $\delta(\bar{p})$ update R at $(t_1(\bar{p}; \bar{x}), \dots, t_k(\bar{p}; \bar{x}))$ as $\varphi_\delta^R(\bar{p}; \bar{x})$ where $C(\bar{x})$.

Query procedures are defined similarly, but they can not invoke any change operations for supplementary instances, and their only free variables are from \bar{p} .

We allow some compositionality: a dynamic program on some *main instance* can use *supplementary instances* of other dynamic problems and invoke change or query operations of other dynamic programs on those instances. These supplementary instances are declared on a global level of the dynamic program and each has an associated identifier.

Update procedures $P = P_1; P_2$ consist of two parts. In the *initial procedure* P_1 no reference to the free variables from \bar{x} are allowed, but change operations for supplementary instances can be invoked. We require that, for each change operation δ of the main instance and each supplementary instance \mathcal{S} , at most one update rule for δ invokes change operations for \mathcal{S} . In general, some more flexibility could be added, e.g., additional local instances.

In the *main procedure* P_2 , no change operations for supplementary instances can be invoked, but references to \bar{x} are allowed.

More precisely, both P_1 and P_2 can use (a series of) instructions of the following forms:

- assignments $f(\bar{y}) \leftarrow \mathbf{term}$ of a function value,
- assignments $R(\bar{y}) \leftarrow \mathbf{condition}$ of a Boolean value,
- conditional branches **if condition then P' else P''** , and
- parallel branches **for $z \leq g(n)$ pardo P'** .

Semantically, here and in the following n always refers to the size of the domain of the main instance. The initial procedure P_1 can further use change invocations $\mathbf{instance}.\delta(\bar{y})$.

- change invocations $\mathbf{instance}.\delta(\bar{y})$.

However, they are not allowed in the scope of parallel branches. And we recall that in P_1 no variables from \bar{x} can be used.

The main procedure P_2 can further use return statements **return condition** or **return term**, but not inside parallel branches.

- return statements **return condition** or **return term**, but not inside parallel branches.

Of course, initial procedures can only have initial procedures P' and P'' in conditional and parallel branches, and analogously for main procedures.

Conditions and terms are defined as follows. In all cases, \bar{y} denotes a tuple of terms and z is a *local variable*, not occurring in \bar{p} or \bar{x} . In general, a *term* evaluates to a domain element (or to \perp). It is built from

- local variables and variables from \bar{p} and \bar{x} ,
- function symbols from τ_{aux} and previous function assignments,
- if-then-else terms **if condition then term' else term''**,
- functional queries $\mathbf{instance}.Q(\bar{y})$, and
- expressions $\mathbf{getUnique}(z \leq g(n) \mid \mathbf{condition})$.

For the latter expression it is required that there is always exactly one domain element $a \leq g(n)$ satisfying **condition**.

A *condition* evaluates to **true** or **false**. It may be

- an atomic formula with relation symbols from τ_{aux} or previous assignments, with terms as above,
- an expression **exists**($z \leq g(n) \mid \text{condition}$),
- a relational query **instance**. $Q(\bar{y})$ with terms \bar{y} , and
- a Boolean combination of conditions.

All functions $g: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ in these definitions are required to be FO-definable. For assignments of relations R and functions f we demand that these symbols do *not* appear in τ_{aux} . If an assignment with a head $f(\bar{y})$ or $R(\bar{y})$ occurs in the scope of a parallel branch that binds variable z , then z has to occur as a term y_i in \bar{y} . We further demand that update procedures are well-formed, in the sense that every execution path ends with a return statement of appropriate type.

In our pseudo-code algorithms, we display update procedures $P = P_1; P_2$ with initial procedure P_1 and main procedure P_2 as

on change $\delta(\bar{p})$ **with** P_1
update R **at** $(t_1(\bar{p}, \bar{x}), \dots, t_k(\bar{p}, \bar{x}))$, **for all** $C(\bar{x})$, **by**: P_2 .

to emphasise that P_1 only needs to be evaluated once for the update of R , and not once for every different value of \bar{x} .

In a nutshell, the semantics of an update rule

on change $\delta(\bar{p})$ **update** R **at** $(t_1(\bar{p}; \bar{x}), \dots, t_k(\bar{p}; \bar{x}))$ **as** P **where** $C(\bar{x})$

is defined as in Subsection 3.1, but $\mathcal{A} \models \varphi_\delta^R(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$ has to be replaced by the condition that P returns true under the assignment $(\bar{p} \mapsto \bar{a}; \bar{x} \mapsto \bar{b})$.

For update rules for auxiliary functions, P returns the new function value instead of a Boolean value.

Since P_1 is independent of \bar{x} , in the semantics, it is only evaluated once. In particular, any change invocations are triggered only once.

We refer to the above class of dynamic update programs as Procedural-DynFO-programs. Here and later we will introduce abbreviations as syntactic sugar, for example the sequential loop **for** $z \leq m$ **do** P , where $m \in \mathbb{N}$ needs to be a fixed natural number.

We show next that update and query procedures can be translated into constant-time CRAM programs. Since the latter can be translated into FO-formulas [15, Theorem 5.2], therefore Procedural-DynFO-programs can be translated in DynFO-programs.

It is not hard to see that Procedural-DynFO-programs can be transformed into DynFO-programs, as stated in the following proposition.

Proposition 3.1. *If a dynamic problem Π can be specified by a Procedural-DynFO-program then $\Pi \in \text{DynFO}$.*

However, we do not need to prove this proposition, since we show next that Procedural-DynFO-programs can be translated into constant-time CRAMs and it is known that such programs can be translated into $\text{FO}(\leq, +, \times)$ -formulas [15, Theorem 5.2].

3.3 Implementing Procedural-DynFO-programs as PRAMs

We use *Parallel Random Access Machines* (PRAMs) as the computational model to measure the work of our dynamic programs. A PRAM consists of a number of processors that work in parallel and use a shared memory. We only consider *CRAMs*, a special case of Concurrent-Read Concurrent-Write model (CRCW PRAM), i.e. processors are allowed to read and write concurrently from and to the same memory location, but if multiple processors concurrently write the same memory location, then all of them need to write the same value. For an input of size n we denote the *time* that a PRAM algorithm needs to compute the solution as $T(n)$. The *work* $W(n)$ of a PRAM algorithm is the sum of the number of all computation steps of all processors made during the computation. For further details we refer to [15,17].

It is easy to see that Procedural-DynFO programs \mathcal{P} can be translated into $\mathcal{O}(1)$ -time CRAM-programs \mathcal{C} . To be able to make a statement about (an upper bound of) the work of \mathcal{C} , we associate a function w with update rules and show that every update rule π can be implemented by a $\mathcal{O}(1)$ -time CRAM-program with work $\mathcal{O}(w)$. Likewise for query rules.

In a nutshell, the work of an update procedure mainly depends on the scopes of the (nested) parallel branches and the amount of work needed to query and update the supplementary instances. The work of a whole update rule is then determined by adding the work of the initial procedure once and adding the work of the main procedure for each tuple that satisfies the constraint of the update rule.

The function w is defined as follows. Let the update rule π be of the form

on change $\delta(\bar{p})$
update R at $(t_1(\bar{p}, \bar{x}), \dots, t_k(\bar{p}, \bar{x}))$, **for all** $x_1 \leq g_1(n) \wedge \dots \wedge x_\ell \leq g_\ell(n)$,
by: P

with $P = P_1; P_2$ consisting of an initial procedure P_1 and a main procedure P_2 . For simplicity we require that for each variable x_i there is an inequality $x_i \leq g_i(n)$, but it could be $g_i(n) = n$. We set $w(\pi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max(w(P_1), g_1(n) \cdot \dots \cdot g_\ell(n) \cdot w(P_2))$, where $w(P)$ is inductively defined as follows.

For terms t and conditions C , we define $w(t)$ and $w(C)$, inductively.

$$w(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t \text{ is a constant or a variable} \\ \max(w(t_1), \dots, w(t_\ell)) & \text{if } t = f(t_1, \dots, t_\ell), \\ \max(w(C), w(t_1), w(t_2)) & \text{if } t = \mathbf{if } C \mathbf{ then } t_1 \mathbf{ else } t_2 \\ g(n) \cdot w(C) & \text{if } t = \mathbf{getUnique}(z \leq g(n) \mid C). \end{cases}$$

$$w(C) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } C \text{ is atomic,} \\ \max(w(C_1), \dots, w(C_m)) & \text{if } C \text{ is a Boolean combination} \\ & \text{of conditions } C_1, \dots, C_m, \\ g(n) \cdot w(C') & \text{if } C = \mathbf{exists}(z \leq g(n) \mid C'), \\ w(\pi') & \text{if } C \text{ is } \mathbf{instance.Q}(\bar{y}) \text{ and } \pi' \text{ is} \\ & \text{its query rule.} \end{cases}$$

Furthermore,

- $w(f(\bar{y}) \leftarrow C) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} w(C)$,
- $w(R(\bar{y}) \leftarrow t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} w(t)$,
- $w(\mathbf{if } C \mathbf{ then } P' \mathbf{ else } P'') \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max(w(C), w(P'), w(P''))$,
- $w(\mathbf{for } z \leq g(n) \mathbf{ pardo } P') \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} g(n) \cdot w(P')$,
- $w(\mathbf{return } \varphi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1$,
- $w(\mathbf{instance}.\delta(\bar{y})) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max(w(\pi_1), \dots, w(\pi_m))$, where π_1, \dots, π_m are the update rules for change operation δ .

Proposition 3.2. *For every update rule π a $\mathcal{O}(1)$ -time PRAM-program with work $\mathcal{O}(w(\pi))$ can be constructed. Likewise for query rules.*

A sketch for the straightforward proof can be found in the appendix.

It follows from Proposition 3.2 that a dynamic program \mathcal{P} can be implemented by a $\mathcal{O}(1)$ -time PRAM-program with work $\mathcal{O}(f)$, if for each update rule π of \mathcal{P} it holds $w(\pi) \leq f$.

4 A simple work-efficient Dynamic Program

In this section we consider a simple dynamic problem with a fairly work-efficient dynamic program. It serves as an example for our framework but will also be used as a subroutine in later sections.

The dynamic problem is to maintain a subset K of an ordered set D of elements under insertion and removal of elements in K , allowing for navigation from an element of D to the next larger and smaller element in K . That is, we consider the following dynamic problem:

Problem: NEXTINK

Input: A set $K \subseteq D$ with canonical linear order \leq on D

Changes: $\text{INS}(i)$: Inserts $i \in D$ into K

$\text{DEL}(i)$: Deletes $i \in D$ from K

Queries: $\text{PRED}(i)$: Returns predecessor of i in K , that is, $\max\{j \in K \mid i > j\}$

$\text{SUCC}(i)$: Returns successor of i in K , that is, $\min\{j \in K \mid i < j\}$

For the smallest (largest) element the result of a PRED (SUCC) query is undefined, i.e. \perp . For simplicity, we assume in the following that D is always of the form $[n]$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Algorithm 1 Querying a successor.

```

1: on query succ( $i$ ):
2:   if  $\max(T.\text{root}) \leq i$  then
3:     return  $\perp$ 
4:   else
5:      $k \leftarrow \text{getUnique}(1 \leq k \leq \log(n) \mid \max(T.\text{anc}(i, k)) > i$ 
6:                        $\wedge \max(T.\text{anc}(i, k - 1)) \leq i$ 
7:     return  $\min(T.\text{2nd}(T.\text{anc}(i, k)))$ 

```

Sequentially, the changes and queries of NEXTINK can be handled in sequential time $\mathcal{O}(\log \log n)$ [9]. Here we show that the problem also has a dynamic program with parallel time $\mathcal{O}(1)$ and work $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$.

Lemma 4.1. *There is a DynFO-program for NEXTINK with $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ work per change and query operation.*

Proof. The dynamic program uses an ordered binary balanced tree T with leaf set $[n]$, and with 0 as its leftmost leaf. Each inner node v represents the interval $S(v)$ of numbers labelling the leafs of the subtree of v . To traverse the tree, the dynamic program uses functions 1st and 2nd that map an inner node to its first or second child, respectively, and a function anc(v, j) that returns the j -th ancestor of v in the tree. Formally, the $2|D|$ nodes of T can be represented by pairs (a, b) of elements from the domain D , where b indicates the height of the node in the tree, and a gives the left-to-right position of the node among all nodes with the same height. Then, we have to use pairs of binary functions 1st¹, 1st² etc. that map encodings of a node to the components of the encoding of another node. We disregard these technical issues and use nodes of T just as domain elements, and also identify an element $i \in [n]$ with the i -th leaf of T . The technical translation is straightforward and does not affect our reasoning regarding FO-expressibility and work of dynamic programs. So, anc($v, 2$) returns the parent of the parent of v . If there is no j -th ancestor of a node v , then anc(v, j) is undefined.

The functions 1st, 2nd and anc are static, that is, they are initialized beforehand and not affected by change operations.

The idea of the dynamic program is to maintain, for each node v , the maximal and minimal element in $K \cap S(v)$ (which is undefined if $K \cap S(v) = \emptyset$), by maintaining two functions min and max. It is easy to see that this information can be updated and queries be answered in $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ time as the tree has depth $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$. For achieving $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ work and constant time, we need to have a closer look.

Using min and max, it is easy to determine the K -successor of an element $i \in D$: if v is the lowest ancestor of i with $\max(v) > i$, then the K -successor of i is $\min(w)$ for the second child $w \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2\text{nd}(v)$ of v . Algorithm 1 shows a query rule for the query operation succ(i). The update of these functions is easy when an element i is inserted into K . This is spelled out for min in Algorithm 2. The dynamic program only needs to check if the new element becomes the minimal element in $S(v)$, for every node v that is an ancestor of the leaf i .

Algorithm 2 Updating min after an insertion.

```

1: on change  $\text{INS}(i)$  update min at  $T.\text{anc}(i, k)$ , for all  $k \leq \log n$ , by:
2:    $v \leftarrow T.\text{anc}(i, k)$ 
3:   if  $\text{min}(v) > i$  then
4:     return  $i$ 
5:   else
6:     return  $\text{min}(v)$ 

```

Algorithm 3 Updating min after a deletion.

```

1: on change  $\text{DEL}(i)$ 
2:   with
3:      $s \leftarrow \text{SUCC}(i)$ 
4:   update min at  $T.\text{anc}(i, k)$ , for all  $k \leq \log n$ , by:
5:      $v \leftarrow T.\text{anc}(i, k)$ 
6:     if  $\text{min}(v) \neq i$  then
7:       return  $\text{min}(v)$ 
8:     else if  $\text{max}(v) = i$  then
9:       return  $\perp$ 
10:    else
11:      return  $s$ 

```

Algorithm 3 shows how min can be updated if an element i is deleted from K : if i is the minimal element of K in $S(v)$, for some node v , then $\text{min}(v)$ needs to be replaced by its K -successor, assuming it is in $S(v)$.

It is easy to verify the claimed work upper bounds for \mathcal{P} . Querying a successor or predecessor via Algorithm 1 needs $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ work, since Line 6 requires $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ and all others require $\mathcal{O}(1)$ work. For maintaining the function min the programs in Algorithms 2 and 3 update the value of $\log n$ tuples, but the work per tuple is constant. In the case of a deletion, Line 3 requires $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ work but is executed only once. The remaining part consists of $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ parallel executions of statements, each with $\mathcal{O}(1)$ work.

The handling of max and its work analysis is analogous. □

5 Regular Languages

In this section, we show that the range problem can be maintained with $o(n)$ work for all regular languages and with polylogarithmic work for star-free languages. For the former we show how to reduce the work of a known DynFO-program. For the latter we translate the idea of [9] for maintaining the range problem for star-free languages in $\mathcal{O}(\log \log n)$ sequential time into a dynamic program with $\mathcal{O}(1)$ parallel time.

5.1 DynFO-programs with sublinear work for regular languages

Theorem 5.1. *Let L be a regular language. Then $\text{RANGEMEMBER}(L)$ can be maintained in DynFO with work $\mathcal{O}(n^\epsilon)$ per query and change operation, for every $\epsilon > 0$.*

The proof of this theorem makes use of the algebraic view of regular languages. For readers not familiar with this view, the basic idea is as follows: for a fixed DFA $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$, we first associate with each string w a function f_w on Q that is induced by the behaviour of \mathcal{A} on w via $f_w(q) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \delta^*(q, w)$, where δ^* is the extension of the transition function δ to strings. The set of all functions $f: Q \rightarrow Q$ with composition as binary operation is a *monoid*, that is, a structure with an associative binary operation \circ and a neutral element, the identity function. Thus, composing the effect of \mathcal{A} on subsequent substrings of a string corresponds to multiplication of the monoid elements associated with these substrings. The *syntactic monoid* $M(L)$ of a regular language L is basically the monoid associated with its minimal automaton.

It is thus clear that, for the dynamic problem $\text{RANGEMEMBER}(L)$ where L is regular, a dynamic program can be easily obtained from a dynamic program for the dynamic problem $\text{RANGEEVAL}(M(L))$, where $\text{RANGEEVAL}(M)$, for finite monoids M , is defined as follows.⁷

Problem: $\text{RANGEEVAL}(M)$

Input: A sequence $m_0 \dots m_{n-1}$ of monoid elements $m_i \in M$

Changes: $\text{SET}_m(i)$ for $m \in M$: Replaces m_i by m

Queries: $\text{RANGE}(\ell, r)$: $m_\ell \circ \dots \circ m_r$

For the proof of Theorem 5.1 we do not need any insights into monoid theory. However, when studying languages definable by first-order formulas in Theorem 5.3 below, we will make use of a known decomposition result.

From the discussion above it is now clear that in order to prove Theorem 5.1, it suffices to prove the following result.

Proposition 5.2. *Let M be a finite monoid. For every $\epsilon > 0$, $\text{RANGEEVAL}(M)$ can be maintained in DynFO with work $\mathcal{O}(n^\epsilon)$ per query and change operation.*

Proof sketch. In [12], it was (implicitly) shown that $\text{RANGEMEMBER}(L)$ is in DynProp (that is, quantifier-free DynFO), for regular languages L . The idea was to maintain the effect of a DFA for L on $w[\ell, r]$, for each interval (ℓ, r) of positions. This approach can be easily used for $\text{RANGEEVAL}(M)$ as well, but it requires a quadratic number of updates after a change operation, in the worst case.

We adapt this approach and only store the effect of the DFA for $\mathcal{O}(n^\epsilon)$ intervals, by considering a hierarchy of intervals of bounded depth.

⁷ We note that, unlike for words, each position always carries a monoid element. However, the empty string of the word case corresponds to the neutral element in the monoid case. In particular, the initial “empty” sequence consists of n copies of the neutral element.




Fig. 1. Illustration of special intervals, for $t = 3$. The special intervals of level 3 are $[0, 9), [9, 18), [18, 27), [0, 18)$ and $[9, 27)$ with base interval $[0, 27)$. The result of a query $\text{RANGE}(2, 22)$ can be computed as $\prod_{i=2}^{22} m_i = (m[2, 3) \circ m[3, 9)) \circ m[9, 18) \circ (m[18, 21) \circ m[21, 23))$, illustrated above in blue. The affected base intervals for a change at position 23 are marked in red. E.g., the new product $m'[18, 27)$ can be computed by $m'[18, 27) = m[18, 21) \circ m'[21, 24) \circ m[24, 27)$. As the products are recomputed bottom up, $m'[21, 24)$ is already updated.

The first level in the hierarchy of intervals is obtained by decomposing the input sequence into intervals of length t , for a carefully chosen t . We call these intervals *base intervals* of height 1 and their subintervals *special intervals* of height 1. The latter are *special* in the sense that they are exactly the intervals for which the dynamic program maintains the product of monoid elements. In particular, each base interval of height 1 gives rise to $\mathcal{O}(t^2)$ special intervals of height 1. The second level of the hierarchy is obtained by decomposing the sequence of base intervals of height 1 into sequences of length t . Each such sequence of length t is combined to one base interval of height 2; and each contiguous subsequence of such a sequence is combined to one special interval of height 2. Again, each base interval of height 2 gives rise to $\mathcal{O}(t^2)$ special intervals of height 2. This process is continued recursively for the higher levels of the hierarchy, until only one base interval of height h remains. We refer to Figure 1 for an illustration of this construction.

The splitting factor t is chosen in dependence of n and ϵ such that the height of this hierarchy of special intervals only depends on ϵ and is thus constant for all n . More precisely, we fix $\lambda \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ and $t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} n^\lambda$, rounded up. For simplicity of exposition, we assume from now on that $n = t^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}$. Therefore, $h = \log_t(n) = \frac{1}{\lambda}$.

The idea for the dynamic program is to store the product of monoid elements for each special interval. The two crucial observations are then, that (1) the product of each (not necessary special) interval can be computed with the help of a constant number of special intervals, and (2) that each change operation affects at most t^2 special intervals per level of the hierarchy and thus at most $ht^2 \in \mathcal{O}(n^\epsilon)$ special intervals in total. We refer to the appendix for more details.

□

5.2 DynFO-programs with polylogarithmic work for star-free languages

Although the work bound of Theorem 5.1 for regular languages is strongly sublinear, one might aim for an even more work-efficient dynamic program, especially, since $\text{RANGEMEMBER}(L)$ can be maintained *sequentially* with logarithmic update time for regular languages [9]. We leave it as an open problem whether for every regular language L there is a DynFO-program for $\text{RANGEMEMBER}(L)$ with a polylogarithmic work bound. However, we show next that such programs exist for star-free regular languages, in fact they even have a logarithmic work bound. The star-free languages are those that can be expressed by regular expressions that do not use the Kleene star operator but can use complementation.

Theorem 5.3. *Let L be a star-free regular language. Then $\text{RANGEMEMBER}(L)$ can be maintained in DynFO with work $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ per query and change operation.*

It is well-known that star-free regular languages are just the regular languages that can be defined in first-order logic (without arithmetic!) [20]. Readers might ask why we consider dynamic first-order maintainability of a problem that can actually be *expressed* in first-order logic. The key point is the parallel work here: even though the membership problem for star-free languages can be solved by a parallel algorithm in time $\mathcal{O}(1)$, it inherently requires parallel work $\Omega(n)$.

Proof sketch. The proof uses the well-known connection between star-free languages and group-free monoids (see, e.g., [27, Chapter V.3] and [27, Theorem V.3.2]). It thus follows the approach of [9].

In a nutshell, our dynamic program simply implements the algorithms of the proof of Theorem 2.4.2 in [9]. Those algorithms consist of a constantly bounded number of simple operations and a constantly bounded number of searches for a next neighbour in a set. Since the latter can be done in DynFO with work $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ thanks to Lemma 4.1, we get the desired result for group-free monoids and then for star-free languages. We refer to the appendix for more details. \square

6 Context Free Languages

As we have seen in Section 5, range queries to regular languages can be maintained in DynFO with strongly sublinear work. An immediate question is whether context-free languages are equally well-behaved. Already the initial paper by Patnaik and Immerman showed that DynFO can maintain the membership problem for *Dyck languages* D_k , for $k \geq 1$, that is, the languages of well-balanced parentheses expressions with k types of parentheses [23]. It was shown afterwards in [12, Theorem 4.1] that DynFO actually captures the membership problem for all context-free languages and that Dyck languages even do not require quantifiers in formulas (but functions in the auxiliary structure) [12, Proposition 4.4]. These results can easily be seen to apply to range queries as well. However, the dynamic program of [12, Theorem 4.1] uses 4-ary relations and three nested existential quantifiers, yielding work in the order of n^7 .

In the following, we show that the membership problem for context-free languages is likely *not* solvable in DynFO with sublinear work, but that the Dyck language D_1 with one bracket type can be handled with polylogarithmic work for the membership problem and work $\mathcal{O}(n^\epsilon)$ for the range problem, and that for other Dyck languages these bounds hold with an additional linear factor n .

6.1 A conditional lower bound for context-free languages

Our conditional lower bound for context-free languages is based on a result from Abboud et al. [2] and the simple observation that the word problem for a language L can be solved, given a dynamic program for its membership problem.

Lemma 6.1. *Let L be a language. If $\text{MEMBER}(L)$ can be maintained in DynFO with work $f(n)$, then the word problem for L can be decided sequentially in time $\mathcal{O}(n \cdot f(n))$.*

The announced lower bound is relative to the following conjecture [1].

Conjecture 6.2 (k-Clique conjecture). For any $\epsilon > 0$, and $k \geq 3$, k -Clique has no algorithm with time bound $\mathcal{O}(n^{(1-\epsilon)\frac{\omega}{3}k})$.

Here, ω is the matrix multiplication exponent [11,29], which is known to be smaller than 2.373 and believed to be exactly two [11,29].

In [2], the word problem for context-free languages was linked to the k -Clique problem as follows.

Theorem 6.3 ([2, Theorem 1.1]). *There is a context free grammar G such that, if the word problem for $L(G)$ can be solved in time $T(n)$, k -Clique can be solved on n node graphs in $\mathcal{O}(T(n^{\frac{k}{3}+1}))$ time, for any $k \geq 3$.*

Putting Lemma 6.1 and Theorem 6.3 together, we get the following result.

Theorem 6.4. *There is a context free grammar G such that, if the membership problem for $L(G)$ can be solved by a DynFO-program with work $\mathcal{O}(n^{\omega-1-\epsilon})$, for some $\epsilon > 0$, then the k -Clique conjecture fails.*

The simple proofs of Lemma 6.1 and Theorem 6.4 are presented in the appendix.

Thus, we can not reasonably expect any DynFO-programs for general context-free languages with considerable less work than $\mathcal{O}(n^{1.37})$ barring any breakthroughs for matrix multiplication. In fact, for “combinatorial DynFO-programs”, an analogous reasoning yields a work lower bound of $\mathcal{O}(n^{2-\epsilon})$.

6.2 On work-efficient dynamic programs for Dyck languages

We next turn to Dyck languages. Clearly, all Dyck languages are deterministic context-free, their word problem can therefore be solved in linear time, and thus the lower bound approach of the previous subsection does not work for them. In [8] it was shown that D_1 is maintainable by a sequential dynamic

algorithm in time $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$, per change and query operation, and D_k in time $\mathcal{O}((\log n)^3 \cdot \log^* n)$, for every $k > 1$. We already mentioned that their membership problem can be maintained in DynFO. The challenge is to find dynamic programs (with parallel time $\mathcal{O}(1)$) with little work.

We show that it is actually possible by suitably adapting the idea from [8] to get a DynFO-program for D_1 with polylogarithmic work, but for D_k , for $k > 1$, the approach so far only yields DynFO-programs with an additional linear factor in the work bound. We first present the DynFO-program with polylogarithmic work for the membership problem of D_1 . It basically mimics the sequential algorithm from [8] that maintains D_1 .

Theorem 6.5. *MEMBER(D_1) can be maintained in DynFO with $\mathcal{O}((\log n)^3)$ work.*

Proof sketch. Let $\Sigma_1 = \{\langle, \rangle\}$ be the alphabet underlying D_1 . The dynamic program uses an ordered binary tree T such that each leaf corresponds to one position from left-to-right. A parent node corresponds to the set of positions of its children. We assume for simplicity that the domain is $[n]$, for some number n that is a power of 2. If the input string is w then each node x of T represents a substring $\text{str}(x)$ of w via the leaves of the induced subtree at x in a natural fashion. The main idea from [8] is to maintain for each node x of T information about the unmatched parentheses of $\text{str}(x)$. The input word is in the Dyck language if there are no unmatched parentheses in the root of T .

In a nutshell, the dynamic program for MEMBER(D_1) maintains for each node x of T the numbers $\ell(x)$ and $r(x)$ that represent the number of unmatched closing and unmatched opening brackets of the string $\text{str}(x)$. E.g., if that string is $\rangle\langle\rangle\langle\langle$ for x , then $\ell(x) = 2$ and $r(x) = 1$. The overall string w is in D_1 exactly if $r(\text{root}) = \ell(\text{root}) = 0$.

In the algorithm of [8], the functions ℓ and r are updated in a bottom-up fashion. However, we will observe that they do not need to be updated sequentially in that fashion, but can be updated in parallel constant time. In the following, we describe how \mathcal{P} can update $\ell(x)$ and $r(x)$ for all ancestor nodes x of a position p , after a closing parenthesis \rangle was inserted at p . Maintaining ℓ and r for the other change operations is analogous.

There are two types of effects that an insertion of a closing parenthesis could have on x : either $\ell(x)$ is increased by one and $r(x)$ remains unchanged, or $r(x)$ is decreased by one and $\ell(x)$ remains unchanged. We denote these effects by the pairs $(+1, 0)$ and $(0, -1)$, respectively.

Table 1 shows how the effect of a change at a position p below a node x with children y_1 and y_2 relates to the effect at the affected child. This depends on whether $r(y_1) \leq \ell(y_2)$ and whether the affected child is y_1 or y_2 . A closer inspection of Table 1 reveals a crucial observation: in the upper left and the lower right field of the table, the effect on x is *independent* of the effect on the child (being it y_1 or y_2). That is, these cases induce an effect on x independent of the children. We thus call these cases *effect-inducing*. In the other two fields, the effect on x depends on the effect at the child, but in the simplest possible way:

	p is in $\text{str}(y_1)$	p is in $\text{str}(y_2)$
$r(y_1) \leq \ell(y_2)$	$(+1, 0) \rightarrow (+1, 0)$ $(0, -1) \rightarrow (+1, 0)$	$(+1, 0) \rightarrow (+1, 0)$ $(0, -1) \rightarrow (0, -1)$
$r(y_1) > \ell(y_2)$	$(+1, 0) \rightarrow (+1, 0)$ $(0, -1) \rightarrow (0, -1)$	$(+1, 0) \rightarrow (0, -1)$ $(0, -1) \rightarrow (0, -1)$

Table 1. The effect on x after a closing parenthesis was inserted at position p . The effects depend on the effect on the children y_1 and y_2 of x : for example, an entry ' $(0, -1) \rightarrow (+1, 0)$ ' in the column ' p is in $\text{str}(y_1)$ ' means that if the change operation has effect $(0, -1)$ on y_1 then the change operation has effect $(+1, 0)$ on x .

they are just the same. That is the effect at the child is just adopted by x . We call these cases *effect-preserving*. To determine the effect at x it is thus sufficient to identify the highest affected descendant node z of x , where an effect-inducing case applies, such that for all intermediate nodes between x and z only effect-preserving cases apply.

Our dynamic program implements this idea. First it determines, for each ancestor x of the change position p , whether it is effect-inducing and which effect is induced. Then it identifies, for each x , the node z (represented by its height i above p) as the unique effect-inducing node that has no effect-inducing node on its path to x . The node z can be identified with work $\mathcal{O}((\log n)^2)$, as z is one of at most $\log n$ many nodes on the path from x to the leaf of p , and one needs to check that all nodes between x and z are effect-preserving. As the auxiliary relations need to be updated for $\log n$ many nodes, the overall work of \mathcal{P} is $\mathcal{O}((\log n)^3)$. We refer to the appendix for more details. \square

A work-efficient dynamic program for range queries for D_1 and D_k

Unfortunately, the program of Theorem 6.5 does not support range queries, since it seems that one would need to combine the unmatched parentheses of $\log n$ many nodes of the binary tree in the worst case. However, its idea can be combined with the idea of Proposition 5.2, yielding a program that maintains ℓ and r for $\mathcal{O}(n^\epsilon)$ special intervals on a constant number of levels.

In fact, this approach even works for D_k for $k > 1$. Indeed, with the help of ℓ and r , it is possible to identify for each position of an opening parenthesis the position of the corresponding closing parenthesis in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ parallel time with work n^ϵ , and then one only needs to check that they match everywhere. The latter contributes an extra factor $\mathcal{O}(n)$ to the work, for $k > 1$, but can be skipped for $k = 1$.

Theorem 6.6. *For all $\epsilon > 0$, $k > 1$,*

- a) $\text{RANGEMEMBER}(D_1)$ can be maintained in DynFO with $\mathcal{O}(n^\epsilon)$ work, and
- b) $\text{RANGEMEMBER}(D_k)$ can be maintained in DynFO with $\mathcal{O}(n^\epsilon)$ work per change operation and $\mathcal{O}(n^{1+\epsilon})$ work per query operation.

Proof sketch. In the following we reuse the definition of *special intervals* from the proof of Proposition 5.2 as well as the definition of ℓ and r from the proof of Proposition 6.5. We first describe a dynamic program \mathcal{P} for $\text{RANGEMEMBER}(D_1)$. It maintains ℓ and r for all special intervals, which is clearly doable with $\mathcal{O}(n^\epsilon)$ work per change operation. Similar to the proof of Proposition 5.2, the two crucial observations (justified in the appendix) are that (1) a range query can be answered with the help of a constant number of special intervals, and (2) the change operation affects only a bounded number of special intervals per level.

As stated before, the program for $\text{RANGEMEMBER}(D_k)$ also maintains ℓ and r , but it should be emphasised that also in the case of several parenthesis types, the definition of these functions ignores the bracket type. With that information it computes, for each opening bracket the position of its matching closing bracket, with the help of ℓ and r , and checks that they match. This can be done in parallel and with work $\mathcal{O}(n^\epsilon)$ per position. We refer to the appendix for more details. \square

Moderately work-efficient dynamic programs for D_k We now turn to the membership query for D_k with $k > 1$. Again, our program basically mimics the sequential algorithm from [8] which heavily depends on the dynamic problem STRINGEQUALITY that asks whether two given strings are equal.

Problem: STRINGEQUALITY

Input: Two Sequences $u = u_0 \dots u_{n-1}$ and $v = v_0 \dots v_{n-1}$ of letters
with $u_i, v_i \in \Sigma \cup \{\epsilon\}$

Changes: $\text{SET}_{x,\sigma}(i)$ for $\sigma \in \Sigma, x \in \{u, v\}$: Sets x_i to σ , if $x_i = \epsilon$
 $\text{RESET}_x(i)$ for $x \in \{u, v\}$: Sets x_i to ϵ

Queries: EQUALS : Is $u_0 \circ \dots \circ u_{n-1} = v_0 \circ \dots \circ v_{n-1}$?

It is easy to show that a linear amount of work is sufficient to maintain STRINGEQUALITY .

Lemma 6.7. STRINGEQUALITY is in DynFO with work $\mathcal{O}(n)$.

Because of the linear work bound for STRINGEQUALITY our dynamic program for $\text{MEMBER}(D_k)$ also has a linear factor in the work bound.

Theorem 6.8. $\text{MEMBER}(D_k)$ is maintainable in DynFO with $\mathcal{O}(n \log n + (\log n)^3)$ work for every fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof sketch. The program can be seen as an extension of the one for $\text{MEMBER}(D_1)$. As unmatched parentheses are no longer well-defined if we have more than one type of parenthesis the idea of [8] is to maintain the parentheses to the left and right that remain if we reduce the string by matching opening and closing parentheses regardless of their type. To be able to answer $\text{MEMBER}(D_k)$, the dynamic program maintains the unmatched parentheses for every node x of a tree spanning the input word, and a bit $M(x)$ that indicates whether the types of the parentheses match properly.

How the unmatched parentheses can be maintained for a node x after a change operation depends on the “segment” of $\text{str}(x)$ in which the change happened and in some cases reduces to finding a node z with a local property on the path from x to the leaf that corresponds to the changed position.

To update $M(x)$ for a node x with children y_1 and y_2 the dynamic program compares the unmatched parentheses to the right of y_1 with the ones to the left of y_2 using `STRINGEQUALITY`. We refer to the appendix for more details. \square

Maintaining string equality and membership in D_k for $k > 1$ is even closer related which is stated in the following lemma.

- Lemma 6.9.** *a) If `STRINGEQUALITY` can be maintained in `DynFO` with work $W(n)$ then `MEMBER(D_k)` can be maintained in `DynFO` with work $\mathcal{O}(W(n) \cdot \log n + (\log n)^3)$, for each $k \geq 1$.*
b) If `MEMBER(D_k)` can be maintained in `DynFO` with work $W(n)$ for all k , then `STRINGEQUALITY` can be maintained in `DynFO` with work $\mathcal{O}(W(n))$.

7 Conclusion

In this paper we proposed a framework for studying the aspect of work for the dynamic, parallel complexity class `DynFO`. We established that all regular languages can be maintained in `DynFO` with $\mathcal{O}(n^\epsilon)$ work for all $\epsilon > 0$, and even with $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ work for star-free regular languages. For context-free languages we argued that it will be hard to achieve work bounds lower than $\mathcal{O}(n^{\omega-1-\epsilon})$ in general, where ω is the matrix multiplication exponent. For the special case of Dyck languages D_k we showed that $\mathcal{O}(n \cdot (\log n)^3)$ work suffices, which can be further reduced to $\mathcal{O}(\log^3 n)$ work for D_1 . For range queries, dynamic programs with work $\mathcal{O}(n^{1+\epsilon})$ and $\mathcal{O}(n^\epsilon)$ exist, respectively.

We highlight some research directions. One direction is to improve the upper bounds on work obtained here. For instance, it would be interesting to know whether all regular languages can be maintained with polylog or even $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ work and how close the lower bounds for context-free languages can be matched. Finding important subclasses of context-free languages for which polylogarithmic work suffices is another interesting question. Apart from string problems, many `DynFO` results concern problems on dynamic graphs, especially the reachability query [5]. How large is the work of the proposed dynamic programs, and are more work-efficient dynamic programs possible?

The latter question also leads to another research direction: to establish further lower bounds. The lower bounds obtained here are relative to strong conjectures. Absolute lower bounds are an interesting goal which seems in closer reach than lower bounds for `DynFO` without bounds on the work.

References

1. Abboud, A., Backurs, A., Bringmann, K., Künnemann, M.: Fine-grained complexity of analyzing compressed data: Quantifying improvements over decompress-and-

- solve. In: Umans, C. (ed.) 58th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2017, Berkeley, CA, USA, October 15-17, 2017. pp. 192–203. IEEE Computer Society (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2017.26>
2. Abboud, A., Backurs, A., Williams, V.V.: If the current clique algorithms are optimal, so is Valiant’s parser. *SIAM J. Comput.* **47**(6), 2527–2555 (2018)
 3. Alstrup, S., Husfeldt, T., Rauhe, T.: Dynamic nested brackets. *Inf. Comput.* **193**(2), 75–83 (2004). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2004.04.006>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2004.04.006>
 4. Börger, E.: Abstract state machines: a unifying view of models of computation and of system design frameworks. *Ann. Pure Appl. Log.* **133**(1-3), 149–171 (2005). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apal.2004.10.007>
 5. Datta, S., Kulkarni, R., Mukherjee, A., Schwentick, T., Zeume, T.: Reachability is in DynFO. *J. ACM* **65**(5), 33:1–33:24 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3212685>
 6. Dong, G., Su, J.: First-order incremental evaluation of datalog queries. In: Database Programming Languages (DBPL-4), Proceedings of the Fourth International Workshop on Database Programming Languages - Object Models and Languages, Manhattan, New York City, USA, 30 August - 1 September 1993. pp. 295–308 (1993)
 7. Dong, G., Topor, R.W.: Incremental evaluation of datalog queries. In: Database Theory - ICDT’92, 4th International Conference, Berlin, Germany, October 14-16, 1992, Proceedings. pp. 282–296 (1992). https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-56039-4_48
 8. Frandsen, G.S., Husfeldt, T., Miltersen, P.B., Rauhe, T., Skyum, S.: Dynamic algorithms for the Dyck languages. In: Akl, S.G., Dehne, F.K.H.A., Sack, J., Santoro, N. (eds.) Algorithms and Data Structures, 4th International Workshop, WADS ’95, Kingston, Ontario, Canada, August 16-18, 1995, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 955, pp. 98–108. Springer (1995). https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-60220-8_54
 9. Frandsen, G.S., Miltersen, P.B., Skyum, S.: Dynamic word problems. *J. ACM* **44**(2), 257–271 (1997). <https://doi.org/10.1145/256303.256309>
 10. Freydenberger, D.D., Thompson, S.M.: Dynamic complexity of document spanners. In: Lutz, C., Jung, J.C. (eds.) 23rd International Conference on Database Theory, ICDT 2020, March 30-April 2, 2020, Copenhagen, Denmark. LIPIcs, vol. 155, pp. 11:1–11:21. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2020). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.ICDT.2020.11>, <https://www.dagstuhl.de/dagpub/978-3-95977-139-9>
 11. Gall, F.L.: Powers of tensors and fast matrix multiplication. In: International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation, ISSAC ’14, Kobe, Japan, July 23-25, 2014. pp. 296–303 (2014)
 12. Gelade, W., Marquardt, M., Schwentick, T.: The dynamic complexity of formal languages. *ACM Trans. Comput. Log.* **13**(3), 19 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2287718.2287719>
 13. Holm, J., de Lichtenberg, K., Thorup, M.: Poly-logarithmic deterministic fully-dynamic algorithms for connectivity, minimum spanning tree, 2-edge, and biconnectivity. *J. ACM* **48**(4), 723–760 (2001). <https://doi.org/10.1145/502090.502095>
 14. Holm, J., Rotenberg, E.: Fully-dynamic planarity testing in polylogarithmic time. In: Makarychev, K., Makarychev, Y., Tulsiani, M., Kamath, G., Chuzhoy, J. (eds.) Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2020, Chicago, IL, USA, June 22-26, 2020. pp. 167–180. ACM (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3357713.3384249>
 15. Immerman, N.: Descriptive complexity. Graduate texts in computer science, Springer (1999). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-0539-5>

16. Immerman, N.: Descriptive complexity. Springer Science & Business Media (2012)
17. JáJá, J.: An Introduction to Parallel Algorithms. Addison-Wesley (1992)
18. Krohn, K., Rhodes, J.: Algebraic theory of machines. i. prime decomposition theorem for finite semigroups and machines. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **116**, 450–464 (1965)
19. Libkin, L.: Elements of Finite Model Theory. Springer (2004). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-07003-1>
20. McNaughton, R., Papert, S.: Counter-Free Automata. MIT Press (1971)
21. Mehlhorn, K., Sundar, R., Uhrig, C.: Maintaining dynamic sequences under equality tests in polylogarithmic time. *Algorithmica* **17**(2), 183–198 (1997). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02522825>
22. Miltersen, P.B., Subramanian, S., Vitter, J.S., Tamassia, R.: Complexity models for incremental computation. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **130**(1), 203–236 (1994). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975\(94\)90159-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(94)90159-7)
23. Patnaik, S., Immerman, N.: Dyn-FO: A parallel, dynamic complexity class. In: PODS. pp. 210–221 (1994)
24. Schwentick, T., Vortmeier, N., Zeume, T.: Sketches of dynamic complexity. *SIGMOD Rec.* **49**(2), 18–29 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3442322.3442325>
25. Schwentick, T., Zeume, T.: Dynamic Complexity: Recent Updates. *SIGLOG News* **3**(2), 30–52 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2948896.2948899>
26. Sherlekar, D.D., Pawagi, S., Ramakrishnan, I.V.: $O(1)$ parallel time incremental graph algorithms. In: Maheshwari, S.N. (ed.) *Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science, Fifth Conference, New Delhi, India, December 16-18, 1985, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 206, pp. 477–495. Springer (1985). https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-16042-6_27
27. Straubing, H.: Finite automata, formal logic, and circuit complexity. Birkhauser Verlag (1994)
28. Vollmer, H.: Introduction to circuit complexity: a uniform approach. Springer Science & Business Media (2013)
29. Williams, V.V.: Multiplying matrices faster than Coppersmith-Winograd. In: Karloff, H.J., Pitassi, T. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 44th Symposium on Theory of Computing Conference, STOC 2012, New York, NY, USA, May 19 - 22, 2012*. pp. 887–898. ACM (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2213977.2214056>

A Appendix for Section 3

Proof sketch (for Proposition 3.2). We briefly sketch, how a PRAM \mathcal{P} can evaluate an update rule π of the form

on change $\delta(\bar{p})$
update R **at** $(t_1(\bar{p}, \bar{x}), \dots, t_k(\bar{p}, \bar{x}))$, **for all** $x_1 \leq g_1(n) \wedge \dots \wedge x_\ell \leq g_\ell(n)$,
by: P .

with $P = P_1; P_2$ as before, in constant time and with work $\mathcal{O}(w(\pi))$. The initial procedure P_1 has to be evaluated only once and therefore contributes at most $w(P_1)$. The main procedure P_2 has to be evaluated once, for every tuple \bar{x} that fulfils $x_1 \leq g_1(n) \wedge \dots \wedge x_k \leq g_\ell(n)$. To this end, it can use $m \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} g_1(n) \cdot \dots \cdot g_\ell(n)$ processors, each taking care of one evaluation, as in the following pseudo-code. This amounts to at most m evaluations of P_2 and it thus suffices to show that

Algorithm 4 Evaluation of the update rule for $\delta(\bar{p})$.

```

1: procedure EVALUATE $_{\delta}^R(\bar{p})$ 
2:   Evaluate  $P_1$ 
3:   for  $x_1 = 1$  to  $g_1(n)$  pardo
4:      $\vdots$ 
5:     for  $x_\ell = 1$  to  $g_\ell(n)$  pardo
6:        $R(t_1(\bar{p}, \bar{x}), \dots, t_k(\bar{p}, \bar{x})) \leftarrow \text{EVAL}_{P_2}(\bar{p}, \bar{x})$ 

```

one evaluation of P_2 only requires work $\mathcal{O}(w(P_2))$.

The proof of this is relatively straightforward, but tedious. Each computation path consists only of a constant number of steps (unless a query towards a supplementary instance occurs). Thus, assuming sufficient parallelisation, the PRAM only needs time $\mathcal{O}(1)$. Along each path, w basically yields only 1, but any constant number is captured by the big \mathcal{O} . This explains, why we can use max instead of addition, everywhere. Parallel branches, **exists**-expressions and **unique**-expressions translate into parallel branching of the PRAM, and that is captured in the definition of w by respective factors. Likewise, query operations to supplementary instances are captured, by respective factors in the definition of w . \square

B Appendix for Section 5

Proof sketch (of Proposition 5.2, continued). We start by introducing necessary notation. In the following we fix the length n of a sequence m_0, \dots, m_{n-1} of monoid elements, we chose t as described above, and assume that $t^h = n$. We write $m[\ell, r]$ for the subsequence m_ℓ, \dots, m_{r-1} , and, depending on the context, for the product $m_\ell \circ \dots \circ m_{r-1}$. If $r \leq \ell$ then $m[\ell, r]$ is the neutral monoid element.

In order to define special intervals, we consider positions $j \in [n]$ in t -adic representation as $\sum_{i=0}^{h-1} j_i t^i$, where $j_i \in [t]$, for every $0 \leq i < h$. We say that a number j has *height* k if $k < h$ is the maximum number such that $\sum_{i=k}^{h-1} j_i t^i = \sum_{i=0}^{h-1} j_i t^i$, that is, if j_0, \dots, j_{k-1} are zero and j_k is not (or $j = 0$ and $k = h - 1$).

We say that an interval $[i, j]$ of positions is *special* if, for some k and p , the height of i and j is at least k and $pt^{k+1} \leq i \leq j \leq (p+1)t^{k+1}$. It is easy to see that, for each k and p there are $\mathcal{O}(t^2)$ such special intervals.

The dynamic program maintains the product $m[i, j]$ for all special intervals $[i, j]$.

To show that the two crucial observations (1) and (2) stated above are correct, we need some more notation. For a number $j \in [n]$ we write $\lfloor j \rfloor_k$ for the largest number p of height at least k with $p \leq j$ and $\lceil j \rceil^k$ for the smallest number q of height at least k with $j \leq q$, i.e.

$$\lfloor j \rfloor_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} j_k t^k + \sum_{i=k+1}^{h-1} j_i t^i \quad \text{and} \quad \lceil j \rceil^k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (j_k + 1)t^k + \sum_{i=k+1}^{h-1} j_i t^i.$$

Towards observation (1), it is not hard to see that the following equality holds for all $0 \leq \ell, r \leq n - 1$ and that the product consists of $2(h - 1) + 1 = \mathcal{O}(1)$ factors. Suppose that $k < h$ is the smallest number such that $\lceil \ell \rceil^{k+1} > \lfloor r \rfloor_{k+1}$, then:

$$m[\ell, r] = \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} m[\lceil \ell \rceil^j, \lfloor \ell \rfloor^{j+1}] \circ m[\lceil \ell \rceil^k, \lfloor r \rfloor^k] \circ \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} m[\lfloor r \rfloor_{j+1}, \lceil r \rceil^j]$$

It is thus straightforward to answer range queries by a dynamic program with work $\mathcal{O}(1)$.

Furthermore, towards observation (2), if position p is changed, only the information for the ht^2 special intervals that include p needs to be updated. This can be done in $h = \mathcal{O}(1)$ phases. In phase k , the special intervals with height k are updated. The new product $m'[i, j]$ can be obtained via

$$m'[i, j] = m[i, \lfloor p \rfloor_k] \circ m'[\lfloor p \rfloor_k, \lceil p \rceil^k] \circ m[\lceil p \rceil^k, j],$$

where $m'[\lfloor p \rfloor_k, \lceil p \rceil^k]$ is the already computed new value of the special interval $[\lfloor p \rfloor_k, \lceil p \rceil^k]$ of height $k - 1$. This completes the proof sketch for Proposition 5.2. \square

Towards a proof of Theorem 5.3, we employ the following algebraic property of syntactic monoids of star-free languages, due to Schützenberger, McNaughton and Papert (see, e.g., [27, Chapter V.3]). A monoid M is called a *group* if for each $m \in M$ there is an inverse m^{-1} with $m \cdot m^{-1} = 1$. A monoid is called *group-free* if it does not contain a nontrivial group.

Lemma B.1 ([27, Theorem V.3.2]). *A language L is star-free iff $M(L)$ is finite and group-free.*

In [9] it was shown that $\text{RANGEEVAL}(M)$ for a group-free monoid M can be maintained in $\mathcal{O}(\log \log n)$ sequential time on RAMs with cell size $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$. We adapt their algorithm to show that $\text{RANGEEVAL}(M)$ can be maintained in DynFO with logarithmic work.

The main ingredient for the algorithm of [9] is the following consequence of a decomposition theorem by Krohn and Rhodes.

Lemma B.2 ([18][9]). *Let M be a finite, group-free monoid. Then one of the following holds:*

- (a) $M = \{1\}$,
- (b) there is a k such that $M - \{1\} = \{\sigma, \sigma^2, \dots, \sigma^k = \sigma^{k+1}\}$,
- (c) $\sigma\sigma' = \sigma$, for all $\sigma, \sigma' \in M - \{1\}$, or
- (d) $M = V \cup T$ where $T \neq M$ and $V \neq M$ are submonoids of M and $T - \{1\}$ is a left ideal of M , i.e. $\sigma_M \sigma_T \in T - \{1\}$ for all $\sigma_M \in M$ and $\sigma_T \in T - \{1\}$

We illustrate this lemma by the following example. It will be reused to illustrate the construction in our dynamic program for maintaining $\text{RANGEEVAL}(M)$.

Example B.3. Consider the language $L = L(c^*ac^*ac^*b(a+b+c)^*)$ that contains all words over the alphabet $\Sigma = \{a, b, c\}$ having at least one b and at least two a 's somewhere before the first b . Its syntactic monoid is $M = \{1, A, A^2, B, D, E\}$ with the following multiplication table:

$x \setminus y$	1	A	A^2	B	D	E
1	1	A	A^2	B	D	E
A	A	A^2	A^2	D	E	E
A^2	A^2	A^2	A^2	E	E	E
B	B	B	B	B	B	B
D	D	D	D	D	D	D
E	E	E	E	E	E	E

The elements of M (and thus the states of the minimal automaton for L) correspond to the following languages. In particular, E corresponds to L .

$$\begin{array}{l|l}
1 & L(c^*) \\
A & L(c^*ac^*) \\
A^2 & L(c^*ac^*ac^*) \\
B & L(c^*b(a+b+c)^*) \\
D & L(c^*ac^*b(a+b+c)^*) \\
E & L(c^*ac^*ac^*b(a+b+c)^*)
\end{array}$$

The monoid can be decomposed as $M = V \cup T$ with $T = \{1, B, D, E\}$ and $V = \{1, A, A^2\}$, which are Type (c) and Type (b) submonoids, respectively, of M in the sense of Lemma B.2.

The characterization of group-free monoids provided by Lemma B.2 is the basis for a recursive approach for maintaining $\text{RANGEVAL}(M)$.

Theorem B.4. *Let M be a group-free monoid. Then $\text{RANGEVAL}(M)$ can be maintained in DynFO with work $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ for each change and query operation.*

Proof. The proof is by induction on the decomposition of M . We describe, for each case of Lemma B.2, how a dynamic program \mathcal{P} can maintain $\text{RANGEVAL}(M)$ with $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ work.

Let $m = m_0 \dots m_{n-1}$ be an input sequence. Case (a) from Lemma B.2 is trivial.

For Case (b), suppose that $M = \{1, \sigma, \sigma^2, \dots, \sigma^k = \sigma^{k+1}\}$ for some fixed k . As in this case the monoid elements (except for 1) only differ in their exponents, the result of a range query $\text{RANGE}(\ell, r)$ can be computed by summing over the exponents of all elements $\neq 1$ between ℓ and r . A closer look reveals that it suffices to sum over the exponents of the first up to k elements differing from the identity element 1, because $\sigma^k = \sigma^{k+1}$. For finding these up to k elements quickly, the program uses a supplementary instance of NEXTINK for the set $K = \{i \mid w_i \neq 1\}$.

These ideas lead to Algorithm 5 for answering range queries. As only a constant number of successors are queried from K , it requires at most $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ work due to Lemma 4.1. For changes of the input instance, only the supplementary NEXTINK instance needs to be updated, which also requires at most $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ work by Lemma 4.1.

For Case (c), suppose that M is a monoid with $\sigma\sigma' = \sigma$ for all $\sigma, \sigma' \in M - \{1\}$. In this case, a range query $\text{RANGE}(\ell, r)$ results in the first element in the interval $[\ell, r]$ which is not the identity element (if such an element does not exist, then the result is the identity element). In order to find such an element quickly, the dynamic program maintains a supplementary NEXTINK instance for the set $K = \{i \mid w_i \neq 1\}$.

Now range queries can be answered according to Algorithm 6, which clearly requires at most $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ work. For changes of the input instance, again only the supplementary NEXTINK instance needs to be updated, which also requires at most $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ work.

Algorithm 5 Querying the product $m_\ell \cdot \dots \cdot m_r$ in Case (b) of the proof of Theorem B.4.

```

1: on query RANGE( $\ell, r$ ):
2:    $s \leftarrow 0$ 
3:    $i \leftarrow (\ell - 1)$ 
4:   for 1 to  $k$  do
5:      $i = K.\text{SUCC}(i)$ 
6:     if  $i \leq r$  then
7:        $s \leftarrow s + \text{exponent}(i)$ 
8:   if  $s > 0$  then
9:     return  $a^s$ 
10:  else
11:    return 1

```

Algorithm 6 Querying the product $m_\ell \cdot \dots \cdot m_r$ in Case (c) of the proof of Theorem B.4.

```

1: on query RANGE( $\ell, r$ ):
2:    $i \leftarrow K.\text{SUCC}(\ell - 1)$ 
3:   if  $i \leq r$  then
4:     return  $m_i$ 
5:   else
6:     return 1

```

For Case (d), suppose that $M = V \cup T$ where $T \neq M$ and $V \neq M$ are submonoids of M and $T - \{1\}$ is a left ideal of M . Because of $T \neq M$ and $V \neq M$, by induction we can assume that $\text{RANGEVAL}(T)$ and $\text{RANGEVAL}(V)$ can be maintained with work $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$.

Denote $T - \{1\}$ by $T_{\neq 1}$. The idea of the dynamic program is to split the input sequence m into $T_{\neq 1}$ -blocks, consisting of a maximal sequence of consecutive elements of $T_{\neq 1}$ only, and $\overline{T_{\neq 1}}$ -blocks consisting of maximal sequence of elements of $\overline{T_{\neq 1}}$ only. The program maintains precomputed products of each $\overline{T_{\neq 1}}$ -block combined with its successive $T_{\neq 1}$ -block. Because $T_{\neq 1}$ is a left ideal, all these precomputed block products result in elements of $T_{\neq 1}$. A range query $\text{RANGE}(\ell, r)$ for m can then be answered by computing the product of these precomputed block products between ℓ and r and adding the at most two incomplete block products at the beginning and the end of the queried range.

For encoding the blocks as well as the precomputed products, the program uses three sequences t, v and u with the following intention. The sequences v and t partition m into elements of $T_{\neq 1}$ and $V - T_{\neq 1}$, respectively. For the definition of u , let $K = \{i \mid w_i \in T_{\neq 1} \wedge w_{i+1} \notin T_{\neq 1}\}$ be the set of *switching positions*, i.e. positions of the input sequence where the monoid element changes from $T_{\neq 1}$ to $V - T_{\neq 1}$. At a switching position i , u_i stores the product of elements between the previous switching position and i . In order to find switching positions quickly, the dynamic program maintains a supplementary NEXTINK instance for the set K .

Algorithm 7 Querying the product $m_\ell \cdot \dots \cdot m_r$ in Case (d) of the proof of Theorem B.4.

1: **on query** RANGE(ℓ, r):
2: $k_1 \leftarrow K.\text{SUCC}(\ell - 1)$
3: $k_q \leftarrow K.\text{PRED}(r)$
4: **return** $v.\text{RANGE}(\ell, k_1) \circ t.\text{RANGE}(\ell, k_1) \circ u.\text{RANGE}(k_1 + 1, k_q)$
5: $\quad \quad \quad \circ v.\text{RANGE}(k_q + 1, r) \circ t.\text{RANGE}(k_q + 1, r)$

More precisely, the three sequences are defined as

$$t_i = \begin{cases} m_i & \text{if } m_i \in T_{\neq 1} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

$$v_i = \begin{cases} m_i & \text{if } m_i \in V - T_{\neq 1} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

$$u_i = \begin{cases} \prod_{j=k_i+1}^i m_j & \text{if } i \in K \\ 1_T & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

where $k_i = K.\text{PRED}(i)$ if $K.\text{PRED}(i) \neq \perp$ and $k_i = 0$ otherwise. Note that $m_i \in T_{\neq 1}$ for all i with $u_i \neq 1$ because $T_{\neq 1}$ is a left interval. We refer to Example B.5 for an illustration of these sequences.

The result of a range query RANGE(ℓ, r) can then be computed as

$$\prod_{i=\ell}^r m_i = \prod_{i=\ell}^{k_1} v_i \prod_{i=\ell}^{k_1} t_i \prod_{i=k_1+1}^{k_q} u_i \prod_{i=k_q+1}^r v_i \prod_{i=k_q+1}^r t_i$$

where $k_1 < \dots < k_q$ are all positions in $K \cap \{\ell - 1, \dots, r\}$. The resulting dynamic program, see Algorithm 7, clearly requires at most $O(\log n)$ work.

For changes of the input instance, the supplementary NEXTINK instance for the switching positions needs to be updated, which requires at most $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ work. Also the sequences t , v and u need to be updated. For v and t this is easy, but updating u requires some effort.

For maintaining u after a change of the input instance at position p , we distinguish the cases as summarized in Table 2. In every case, the precomputed block product stored in the next switching position after p needs to be recomputed. Additionally, if the insertion created a new block by splitting a block (see Cases (4) and (5)) or removed a block by merging two blocks (see Cases (2) and (3)) either u_p or u_{p-1} has to be updated as well.

In all cases, u is updated with a constant number of range queries to v and t which results overall in $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ work. \square

Combining Lemma B.1 and Theorem B.4 we get the desired upper work bound for FO definable languages.

Case condition	Changes to u
(1) Switching positions do not change, i.e. either (a) $m_p \in T_{\neq 1}$ iff $m'_p \in T_{\neq 1}$, (b) $m_{p-1} \notin T_{\neq 1}$ and $m'_p, m_{p+1} \in T_{\neq 1}$, or (c) $m_{p-1}, m'_p \notin T_{\neq 1}$ and $m_{p+1} \in T_{\neq 1}$	$u_k \leftarrow \prod_{i=j+1}^k v_i \circ \prod_{i=j+1}^k t_i$
(2) Two $T_{\neq 1}$ -blocks are merged, i.e. $m_{p-1}, m'_p, m_{p+1} \in T_{\neq 1}$ and $m_p \notin T_{\neq 1}$,	u_k as in Case (1) and $u_{p-1} \leftarrow 1$
(3) Two $T_{\neq 1}$ -blocks are merged, i.e. $m_{p-1}, m'_p, m_{p+1} \notin T_{\neq 1}$ and $m_p \in T_{\neq 1}$,	analogous to (2)
(4) A $T_{\neq 1}$ -block is split, i.e. $m_{p-1}, m_p \in T_{\neq 1}$ and $m'_p \notin T_{\neq 1}$,	$u_k \leftarrow \prod_{i=j+1}^{p-1} v_i \circ \prod_{i=j+1}^{p-1} t_i$ and $u_{p-1} \leftarrow \prod_{i=p}^k v_i \circ \prod_{i=p}^k t_i$,
(5) A $T_{\neq 1}$ -block is split, i.e. $m'_p, m_{p+1} \notin T_{\neq 1}$ and $m_p \in T_{\neq 1}$,	analogous to (4)

Table 2. Summary of the cases for updating u after a change at position p . Suppose that v, t and K are already updated. By m_p and m'_p we denote the elements at position p before and after the change operation, respectively. In all cases $k = K.\text{SUCC}(p)$ is defined as the next switching position after p . For Case (1), j is defined as $K.\text{PRED}(p)$; for Case (3) as $K.\text{PRED}(p - 1)$.

Example B.5. We revisit the monoid M with decomposition into T and V introduced in Example B.3. Consider the sequence m with its sequences t, v and u as defined in the proof of Theorem B.4:

1	2	3
01234567890123456789012345678901		
$m =$	AA1AABBA11A1AABAA1B11A1B1A1A11BB	
$t =$	11111BB1111111B1111B1111B111111BB	
$v =$	AA1AA11A11A1AA1AA1111A111A1A1111	
$u =$	111111E1111111E111E1111D111111E	

The sequences t and u consist of $T_{\neq 1}$ -elements and v of $V - T_{\neq 1}$ -elements only. For a query $\text{RANGE}(1, 26)$ on m the set of switching positions is $\{6, 14, 18, 23\}$, so the result of the query can be computed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \prod_{i=1}^{26} m_i &= \prod_{i=1}^6 v_i \prod_{i=1}^6 t_i \prod_{i=7}^{23} u_i \prod_{i=24}^{26} v_i \prod_{i=24}^{26} t_i \\
 &= \mathbf{A^2BEA1} \\
 &= \mathbf{E}
 \end{aligned}$$

Note, that the results of the five subproducts are determined by subqueries to t, v and u and can be evaluated as described in Case (b) for v and Case (c) for t and u .

C Appendix for Section 6

Proof sketch (of Lemma 6.1). Let \mathcal{P} be a dynamic program that maintains $\text{MEMBER}(L)$ with work $f(n)$. Whether $w \in L$ holds for a given input string $w = \sigma_0\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_{n-1}$ can be decided by simulating \mathcal{P} on the sequence of change operations that inserts σ_1 to σ_n one after the other. By simulating the PRAM sequentially, the work $\mathcal{O}(f(n))$ for one change step translates into sequential time $\mathcal{O}(f(n))$, thus yielding an overall sequential time $\mathcal{O}(n \cdot f(n))$. \square

Proof of Theorem 6.3. Let G be the grammar from Theorem 6.3 and let us assume, towards a contradiction, that there is a dynamic program for $L(G)$ with work $\mathcal{O}(n^{\omega-1-\epsilon})$. By Lemma 6.1 this would yield an algorithm for the word problem for $L(G)$ with time $\mathcal{O}(n^{\omega-\epsilon})$. Theorem 6.3 would then give an algorithm for k -Clique with time bound $\mathcal{O}(n^{(\frac{k}{3}+1)(\omega-\epsilon)})$.

However, for $k \geq \frac{18}{\epsilon}$, this yields a contradiction as follows.

We have $(\frac{k}{3} + 1)(\omega - \epsilon) = \frac{\omega}{3}k + \omega - (\frac{\epsilon}{3}k + \epsilon) \leq \frac{\omega}{3}k - \frac{\epsilon}{6}k$, since $\frac{\epsilon}{3}k + \epsilon = \frac{\epsilon}{6}k + \frac{\epsilon}{6}k + \epsilon \geq 3 + \frac{\epsilon}{6}k + \epsilon$. Thus, k -Clique could be solved in time $\mathcal{O}(n^{(1-\frac{\epsilon}{6})k})$. \square

Proof of Theorem 6.5. We give a complete proof here, repeating parts of the proof sketch in the body, for convenience.

With a string w over Σ_1 we associate the *reduced string* $\mu(w)$ that basically consists of the unmatched closing parentheses of w followed by the unmatched opening parentheses of w .

Formally, $\mu(w)$ can be defined for strings $w \in \Sigma_1^*$ as $\mu(\epsilon) = \epsilon$ and

$$\mu(z\sigma) = \begin{cases} z' & \text{if } \mu(z) = z'\langle \text{ and } \sigma = \rangle \\ \mu(z)\sigma & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

for every $\sigma \in \Sigma_1$ and $z \in \Sigma_1^*$. As indicated before, a reduced string can be split into two strings u and v of the forms \rangle^* and \langle^* , respectively. We call u the unmatched (closing) parentheses of w to the left and v the unmatched (opening) parentheses of w to the right.

The algorithm of [8] stores, for each node x of T , the reduced string $\mu(\text{str}(x))$ of its associated string, and updates these strings bottom up after each change, starting from the changed position, resulting in logarithmic (sequential) update-time. We show that the new reduced strings can be computed in constant parallel time. To this end, we show that for each affected node x of T its new reduced string can be determined by a parallel computation that does not need to know the new reduced string of its affected child.

We describe a dynamic program \mathcal{P} that maintains $\text{MEMBER}(D_1)$, using a binary tree T as sketched above, which is constructed by the first-order initialisation as in the proof of Lemma 4.1. For each node x of the tree, \mathcal{P} represents its reduced string by the number of unmatched closing parentheses of $\text{str}(x)$ to the left and to the right as auxiliary functions $\ell(x)$ and $r(x)$, respectively. In particular, the current word is well-balanced if $r(\text{root}) = \ell(\text{root}) = 0$.

In the following, we describe how \mathcal{P} can update $\ell(x)$ and $r(x)$ for a node x after a closing parenthesis \rangle was inserted at some position p . Maintaining ℓ and r for the other change operations is analogous. Note that ℓ and r only need to be updated for nodes whose substring contains the changed position p , that is, for ancestors of the leaf at position p .

There are two types of effects that an insertion of a closing parenthesis could have on x : Either $\ell(x)$ is increased by one and $r(x)$ remains unchanged, or $r(x)$ is decreased by one and $\ell(x)$ remains unchanged. We denote these effects by the pairs $(+1, 0)$ and $(0, -1)$, respectively. We next analyse how the effect that applies to x depends on the effect of its affected child. We will see then that the effect on the child needs not to be known to update x , but that it can be determined by a direct parallel exploration of the nodes on the path from x to p .

To this end, let y_1 be the left child of x and y_2 its right child. The effect on x depends on whether the changed position p is in $\text{str}(y_1)$ or in $\text{str}(y_2)$, and on the relation between $r(y_1)$ and $\ell(y_2)$ before the change. Table 3 lists all possible combinations for (1) whether the changed position p is in $\text{str}(y_1)$ or in $\text{str}(y_2)$, (2) which effect occurs there, and (3) the relation between $r(y_1)$ and $\ell(y_2)$, and which effect is applied to x in each case. For example, if p is in the subtree of y_1 , the effect on y_1 is $(0, -1)$, and $r(y_1) \leq \ell(y_2)$ holds. Then, the inserted closing parenthesis matches (and is to the right of) a former unmatched opening parenthesis in $\text{str}(y_1)$. As $r(y_1) \leq \ell(y_2)$, all unmatched opening parentheses of $\text{str}(y_1)$ could previously be matched by unmatched closing parentheses of $\text{str}(y_2)$. Since after the change there is one unmatched opening parenthesis less in $\text{str}(y_1)$, the unmatched opening parentheses of y_1 can still be matched but, on the other hand, one more closing parenthesis of y_2 cannot be matched in $\text{str}(x)$, so the effect on x is $(+1, 0)$.

	p is in $\text{str}(y_1)$	p is in $\text{str}(y_2)$
$r(y_1) \leq \ell(y_2)$	$(+1, 0) \rightarrow (+1, 0)$ $(0, -1) \rightarrow (+1, 0)$	$(+1, 0) \rightarrow (+1, 0)$ $(0, -1) \rightarrow (0, -1)$
$r(y_1) > \ell(y_2)$	$(+1, 0) \rightarrow (+1, 0)$ $(0, -1) \rightarrow (0, -1)$	$(+1, 0) \rightarrow (0, -1)$ $(0, -1) \rightarrow (0, -1)$

Table 3. The effect on x after a closing parenthesis was inserted at position p . The effects depend on the effect on the children y_1 and y_2 of x : for example, an entry $(0, -1) \rightarrow (+1, 0)$ in the column ' p is in $\text{str}(y_1)$ ' means that if the change operation has effect $(0, -1)$ on y_1 then the change operation has effect $(+1, 0)$ on x .

A closer inspection of Table 3 reveals a crucial observation: in the upper left and the lower right field of the table, the effect on x is *independent* of the effect on the child (being it y_1 or y_2). That is, these cases induce an effect on x independent of the children. We thus call these cases *effect-inducing*. In the other two fields, the effect on x depends on the effect at the child, but in the simplest possible way: they are just the same. That is the effect at the child

Algorithm 8 Updating (ℓ, r) after the insertion of a closing parenthesis in the proof of Theorem 6.5.

```

1: on change  $\text{INS}_\rangle(p)$ 
2:   with
3:     for  $1 \leq i \leq \log n$  pardo
4:        $x(i) \leftarrow T.\text{anc}(p, i)$ 
5:        $c(i) \leftarrow T.\text{anc}(p, i - 1)$ 
6:        $\text{Ind}+(i) \leftarrow \text{1st}(x(i)) = c(i) \wedge r(\text{1st}(x(i))) \leq \ell(\text{2nd}(x(i)))$ 
7:        $\text{Ind}-(i) \leftarrow \text{2nd}(x(i)) = c(i) \wedge r(\text{1st}(x(i))) > \ell(\text{2nd}(x(i)))$ 
8:        $\text{Ind}(i) \leftarrow \text{Ind}+(i) \vee \text{Ind}-(i)$ 
9:   update  $(\ell, r)$  at  $T.\text{anc}(p, k)$ , for all  $k \leq \log n$ , by:
10:    if  $k = 0$  then
11:      return  $(1, 0)$ 
12:    else
13:       $x \leftarrow T.\text{anc}(p, k)$ 
14:      if exists $(1 \leq i \leq k \mid \text{Ind}(i))$  then
15:         $i \leftarrow \text{getUnique}(1 \leq i \leq k \mid \text{Ind}(i) \wedge \neg \text{exists}(i < j \leq k \mid \text{Ind}(j)))$ 
16:        if  $\text{Ind}+(i)$  then
17:          return  $(\ell(x) + 1, r(x))$ 
18:        else
19:          return  $(\ell(x), r(x) - 1)$ 
20:        else
21:          return  $(\ell(x) + 1, r(x))$ 

```

is just adopted by x . We call these cases *effect-preserving*. To determine the effect at x it is thus sufficient to identify the highest affected descendant node z of x , where an effect-inducing case applies, such that for all intermediate nodes between x and z only effect-preserving cases apply.

Algorithm 8 implements this idea. First it determines, for each ancestor x of the change position p , whether it is effect-inducing (Ind) and which effect is induced (Ind+ for $(+1, 0)$ and Ind- for $(0, -1)$). Then it identifies, for each x , the node z (represented by its height i above p) as the unique effect-inducing node that has no effect-inducing node on its path to x .

The node z can be identified with work $\mathcal{O}((\log n)^2)$, as z is one of at most $\log n$ many nodes on the path from x to v , and one needs to check that all nodes between x and z are effect-preserving. As the auxiliary relations need to be updated for $\log n$ many nodes, the overall work of \mathcal{P} is $\mathcal{O}((\log n)^3)$.

□

Proof sketch (of Theorem 6.6). In the following we reuse the definition of *special intervals* from the proof of Proposition 5.2 as well as the definition of ℓ and r from the proof of Proposition 6.5. We first describe a dynamic program \mathcal{P} for $\text{RANGEMEMBER}(D_1)$. It maintains ℓ and r for all special intervals. Similar to the proof of Proposition 5.2, the two crucial observations are that (1) a range query can be answered with the help of a constant number of special intervals,

and (2) the change operation affects only a bounded number of special intervals per level.

Towards observation (1), recall that each (not necessarily special) interval can be split into a constant number of special intervals. To answer a query $\text{RANGE}(p, q)$ the program can verify whether the *balance factor*, that is the sum of the differences $\ell - r$ over all special intervals splitting $[p, q]$, is zero, and that the balance factor is not negative for any prefix of the sequence of the special intervals.

Towards observation (2), note that a change operation only affects the special intervals that contain the changed position and that ℓ and r can be updated bottom up in the same fashion as in the proof of Proposition 5.2.

We turn now to $\text{RANGEMEMBER}(D_k)$. Here, \mathcal{P} maintains again ℓ and r for all special intervals but ignoring the type of parenthesis. If the query asks whether the string from position p to position q is in D_k , then the program checks that inside $[p, q]$ all opening parentheses have consistent closing parentheses and that the “level” of p is the same as of q , that is, that the number of opening parentheses is the same as the number of closing parentheses. This can be done by inspecting the special intervals that lead from p to q in the canonical way.

As there are a bounded number of levels in the hierarchy the work is $\mathcal{O}(n^\epsilon)$ per position and therefore $\mathcal{O}(n^{1+\epsilon})$ in total. \square

Proof sketch (of Lemma 6.7). The proof is not entirely trivial, as we allow strings to have positions labelled by ϵ , so we cannot simply compare the positions of the input strings one by one in parallel. To deal with positions labelled by ϵ , the dynamic program maintain a bijection between the non- ϵ positions of the two given strings s_1 and s_2 such that the i -th non- ϵ position of s_1 is mapped to the i -th non- ϵ position in s_2 , and vice versa. The strings are equal if all mapped positions have the same label, which can be checked with work $\mathcal{O}(n)$ after each change.

Such a bijection can be defined using the functions $\text{rank}_j(i)$ that map a non- ϵ position i in the string s_j to the number m , if i is the m -th non- ϵ position i in s_j , and the inverse $\text{rank}_j^{-1}(i)$ of this function. The function rank_j for a string s_j can be maintained as follows. If a (non- ϵ) symbol is inserted at position p , the rank of all non- ϵ positions $i > p$ is increased by 1 and the changed position p gets $\text{rank}_j(i') + 1$ where i' is the next non- ϵ position to the left of p . Finding this position can be done in DynFO with $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ work thanks to Lemma 4.1. If a symbol is deleted from a position p , the rank of all non- ϵ positions $i > p$ is decreased by 1 and the $\text{rank}_j(p)$ is no longer defined. The inverse can be maintained in a very similar way. The necessary work for updating the functions rank_j and rank_j^{-1} at the changed position p is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$, for all other positions it is bounded by a constant. So, the overall work is $\mathcal{O}(n)$. \square

Unfortunately, if we generalize the definition of a reduced string $\mu(w)$ to arbitrary many types of parentheses, the result is in general not a string of closing parentheses followed by a string of opening ones. The idea of [8] is now to maintain the parentheses to the left and right that remain if we reduce the string by matching opening and closing parenthesis regardless of their type.

For a string w over the alphabet $\Sigma_k = \Sigma_k^{\langle \rangle} \cup \Sigma_k^{\rangle \langle} = \{\langle 1, \dots, \langle k \rangle \cup \{ \rangle 1, \dots, \rangle k \}$ we define a *type-aware reduced string* $\mu_a(w)$ and a *type-unaware reduced string* $\mu_u(w)$ as $\mu_a(\epsilon) = \mu_u(\epsilon) = \epsilon$ and

$$\mu_a(z\sigma) = \begin{cases} z' & \text{if } \mu_a(z) = z'\langle_i \text{ and } \sigma = \rangle_i, \text{ for some } i \leq k \\ \mu_a(z)\sigma & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

$$\mu_u(z\sigma) = \begin{cases} z' & \text{if } \mu_u(z) = z'\langle_i \text{ and } \sigma = \rangle_j, \text{ for some } i, j \leq k \\ \mu_u(z)\sigma & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Note that, as before, the type-unaware reduced string can always be split into a first and second part that consist only of closing and opening parentheses, respectively. For a string $w \in \Sigma_k^*$, we therefore use the type-unaware reduced string to define the unmatched parentheses to the left $\mu_u^\ell(w)$ and to the right $\mu_u^r(w)$. We slightly abuse the notation by writing $\mu_u^\ell(x)$ for a node x instead of $\mu_u^\ell(\text{str}(x))$ (as well as $\mu_u^r(x)$, $\mu_a(x)$ and $\mu_u(x)$).

To be able to answer $\text{MEMBER}(D_k)$, the dynamic program we construct maintains the unmatched parentheses for every node x of a tree spanning the input word, and a bit $M(x)$ that indicates whether $\mu_a(x) = \mu_u(x)$ holds.

In [8] the unmatched parentheses and the bit $M(x)$ are updated bottom up after a change operation. For a node x with children y_1 and y_2 the bit $M(x)$ is set to 1 if both $M(y_1)$ and $M(y_2)$ are set to 1 and if the unmatched opening parentheses of $\text{str}(y_1)$ match correctly with the unmatched closing parentheses of $\text{str}(y_2)$ to the left. The latter condition can be tested by testing whether two strings are equal, namely the string $\mu_u^r(y_1)$ and the string that results from $\mu_u^\ell(y_2)$ by reversing the string and exchanging a closing parenthesis by an opening parenthesis of the same type (assuming that both strings have equal length, otherwise surplus symbols in the longer string are ignored).

In [8], STRINGEQUALITY is maintained in polylogarithmic sequential time using [21], in [10] it is shown that maintaining whether two substrings are equal is in DynFO with a polynomial amount of work. Lemma 6.7 tells us that a linear amount of work is sufficient if one is only interested in equality of entire strings.

Proof sketch (of Lemma 6.8). We describe a dynamic program \mathcal{P} that maintains $\text{MEMBER}(D_k)$, using a precomputed binary tree T spanning the input word. For each node x of T the program maintains $\mu_u^\ell(x)$ and $\mu_u^r(x)$, represented by the subset of positions that constitute these strings, the bit $M(x)$, as well as the string $(\overline{\mu_u^\ell(x)})^R$ that results from $\mu_u^\ell(x)$ by first exchanging each closing parenthesis by an opening parenthesis of the same type, and then reversing the string. Further auxiliary information is introduced later on. The input word is in D_k if the root of the tree satisfies $M(\text{root}) = 1$ and $\mu_u^\ell(\text{root}) = \mu_u^r(\text{root}) = \epsilon$.

We first describe how $\mu_u^\ell(x)$ and $\mu_u^r(x)$ can be maintained with work $\mathcal{O}((\log n)^3)$ for a node x after a closing parenthesis is inserted at a position p corresponding to a leaf below x . Similar to D_1 , after such an insertion either an opening parenthesis has to be removed from $\mu_u^r(x)$ or a closing one has to be inserted into $\mu_u^\ell(x)$. In contrast to D_1 it is not sufficient to maintain only the number

of unmatched parentheses, as we have to check whether only parenthesis of the same type are matched, so the unmatched parentheses will be maintained explicitly. But similar to D_1 , one can infer how the unmatched parentheses need to be updated for a tree node x either directly from the existing auxiliary information of x and its children, or from the auxiliary information of some easy-to-identify node that lies on the path from x to the leaf corresponding to the changed position p . Which case applies depends on in which “segment” of $\text{str}(x)$ the change happened.

Suppose that y_1 and y_2 are the children of x . We call x *right-heavy* if $|\mu_u^r(y_1)| \leq |\mu_u^\ell(y_2)|$ and *left-heavy* otherwise. Denote by $p_r(x)$ the position of the first unmatched opening parenthesis in $\mu_u^r(x)$ (if it exists), let $p_m(x)$ be the position of the first unmatched opening parenthesis in $\mu_u^r(y_1)$ (if it exists), and let $p'_m(x)$ be the position of the parenthesis that is matched with the parenthesis at position p_m (so, the parenthesis at position $|\mu_u^r(y_1)| - 1$ in $\mu_u^\ell(y_2)$).

We first assume that x is right-heavy. In this case we have that $p_m(x) < p'_m(x) < p_r(x)$ (if these positions exist) and consider the following four cases:

- (1) $p_r(x)$ is defined and $p > p_r(x)$,
- (2) $p_m(x)$ is defined and $p_m(x) < p < p'_m(x)$,
- (3) Cases (1) and (2) do not apply and
 - (3a) there is a node z on the path from x to the leaf for p such that Case (2) applies for z , or
 - (3b) there is no such node z .

In Case (1), that is, if $p_r(x)$ is defined and $p > p_r(x)$, the next opening parenthesis to the left of p in $\mu_u^r(x)$ has to be removed from $\mu_u^r(x)$ since it is now matched by the new parenthesis. The problem of finding this position is an instance of NEXTINK for the set of opening parentheses, which can be solved with work $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ thanks to Lemma 4.1.

In all other cases, a closing parenthesis has to be inserted into $\mu_u^\ell(x)$.

In Case (2), that is, if $p_m(x)$ is defined and $p_m(x) < p < p'_m(x)$, the closing parenthesis at position $p'_m(x)$ is no longer matched by the opening parenthesis at position $p_m(x)$. It is also not matched by any other opening parentheses, as no such unmatched parentheses exist, so it needs to be inserted into $\mu_u^\ell(x)$.

In Case (3) we distinguish two subcases. For Case (3a), suppose that z is the first right-heavy node on the path from x to the leaf of p such that $p_m(z) < p < p'_m(z)$ holds. The same closing parenthesis that has to be inserted into $\mu_u^\ell(z)$ has to be inserted into $\mu_u^\ell(x)$, that is, the parenthesis at position $p'_m(z)$. For Case (3b), that is, if there is no such node z , the newly inserted parenthesis itself has to be inserted into $\mu_u^\ell(x)$.

We now argue the correctness of Case (3). As Cases (1) and (2) do not apply, the position p lays in a substring v of $\text{str}(x)$ that either (i) begins at the first position of $\text{str}(x)$ and ends at $p_m(x) - 1$, or (ii) begins at $p'_m(x) + 1$ and ends at $p_r(x)$. The string v may be balanced, or it may have some unmatched closing parentheses, but there are no unmatched opening parentheses. So, v can be split into the unmatched closing parentheses and the balanced substrings v_1, \dots, v_j

between them, that is, $v = v_1\sigma_1v_2\sigma_2\dots\sigma_{j-1}v_j$ with $\sigma_i \in \Sigma_{k_i}^{\setminus}$ and $\mu_u(v_i) = \epsilon$, for all i .

We first consider the case that p is directly before or after an unmatched parenthesis σ_i . In this case, there is no opening parenthesis before position p that the newly inserted parenthesis can match with. Therefore, this parenthesis has to be inserted into $\mu_u^\ell(x)$. Observe that there is no node z with $p_m(z) < p < p'_m(z)$ on the path from x to the leaf of p , as that would imply that the inserted parenthesis could be matched. So, in this case, the reasoning above is correct.

Now we consider the case that p lies in some v_i . The balanced substring v_i can be split again into minimal balanced substrings. Let p_\lceil and p_\rceil be the first and the last position of the minimal balanced substring that contains p . Because a closing parenthesis is inserted between p_\lceil and p_\rceil , the parenthesis at position p_\lceil gets matched by another parenthesis than before. Therefore, the parenthesis at position p_\rceil remains unmatched and has to be inserted into $\mu_u^\ell(x)$.

To see that p_\rceil is in fact $p'_m(z)$ for the first right-heavy node z with $p_m(z) < p < p'_m(z)$ on the path from x to the leaf of p , let z' be the node for which p_\lceil is in the left child z'_1 and p_\rceil is in the right child z'_2 of z' . Since p_\lceil and p_\rceil matched each other before the insertion, they were part of $\mu_u^r(z'_1)$ and $\mu_u^\ell(z'_2)$, respectively. So, p is strictly between $p_m(z')$ and $p'_m(z')$, and z' must be right-heavy, since the string from p_\lceil to p_\rceil is well-balanced, and any prefix of $\text{str}(z')$ that consists of positions smaller than p_\lceil cannot contain unmatched opening parentheses. Additionally, if there was another right-heavy node z'' between z' and x for which p is also between $p_m(z'')$ and $p'_m(z'')$, this would be a contradiction to the definition of p_\lceil and p_\rceil as being the first and last position of a minimal balanced substring of v_i that contains p : the existence of such a node z'' would imply that there are unmatched opening parentheses before position p_\lceil . It follows that $z' = z$ and therefore $p_\rceil = p'_m(z)$ for the first right-heavy node z with $p_m(z) < p < p'_m(z)$ on the path from x to the leaf of p .

Now, let x be a left-heavy node. As $p_r(x) = p_r(y_1) = p_m(x)$ (and as $p'_m(x)$ is undefined), we have one case less. The reasoning for the other cases is exactly as for right-heavy nodes.

The strings $\mu_u^\ell(x)$ and $\mu_u^r(x)$ need to be updated for all $\log n$ nodes x on the path from the root to the leaf of p . The work for a single node is $\mathcal{O}((\log n)^2)$, the dominating factor is the case where the dynamic program has to find some specific node z , for which it examines all $\mathcal{O}((\log n)^2)$ pairs of nodes between x and the leaf of position p . So, overall the work to update $\mu_u^\ell(x)$ and $\mu_u^r(x)$ is $\mathcal{O}((\log n)^3)$.

The updates after an insertion of an opening parenthesis are completely dual. For deletions of opening or closing parentheses, observe that we can simulate the deletion of, e.g., an opening parenthesis at position p by inserting a closing one at position $p + 1$ and deleting both afterwards. To ensure that position $p + 1$ is always free \mathcal{P} maintains the auxiliary structure actually on a string w' of length $2 \cdot |w|$. If an opening parenthesis is inserted at position p it is inserted at position $2 \cdot p - 1$ (i.e. at the p -th odd position) in w' . A closing parenthesis is inserted at the p -th even position. Removing both parentheses afterwards is easy. Because

they match each other, both parentheses just have to be removed from $\mu_u^\ell(x)$ and $\mu_u^r(x)$ for every node x .

Because on each change operation just one parenthesis is inserted to or removed from $\mu_u(x)$, maintaining the positions $p_r(x), p_m(x)$ and $p'_m(x)$ is easy.

As mentioned above, $M(x) = 1$ if $M(y_1) = M(y_2) = 1$ and the first t positions of $\mu_u^r(y_1)$ and the last t positions of $(\mu_u^\ell(y_2))^R$ coincide, where t is the length of the shorter of the two strings. So, $M(x) = 1$ is one if for all nodes y on the path from x to the leaf of p it holds that $M(y') = 1$ for the child y' of y that does not lie on this path, and that the partial string equality condition holds for the other child. Given the latter information, the necessary work to update M is bounded by $\mathcal{O}((\log n)^2)$.

As maintaining string equality needs a linear amount of work, using Lemma 6.7 the overall work for maintaining the partial string equality for all the $\log n$ many nodes whose strings $\mu_u^\ell(x)$ and $\mu_u^r(x)$ are updated is $\mathcal{O}(n \cdot \log n)$. In sum, \mathcal{P} maintains D_k with work $\mathcal{O}(n \cdot \log n + (\log n)^3)$. \square

Proof sketch (of Lemma 6.9). Part a) follows directly from the proof of Theorem 6.8 as the linear factor in the work bound is due to maintaining string equality for $\log n$ many nodes. For b), observe that two strings $s_1 = \sigma_1^1 \dots \sigma_n^1$ and $s_2 = \sigma_1^2 \dots \sigma_n^2$ over an alphabet of size k are equal if and only if the word $w \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle \sigma_1^1 \dots \langle \sigma_n^1 \rangle_{\sigma_n^2} \dots \rangle_{\sigma_1^2}$ is in D_k . \square