

A fast implementation of the good-suffix array for the Boyer-Moore string matching algorithm

Thierry Lecroq*

Univ Rouen Normandie, INSA Rouen Normandie, Université Le Havre Normandie, Normandie Univ, LITIS UR 4108, CNRS NormaSTIC FR 3638, IRIB, F-76000 Rouen, France

Abstract

String matching is the problem of finding all the occurrences of a pattern in a text. It has been intensively studied and the Boyer-Moore string matching algorithm is probably one of the most famous solution to this problem. This algorithm uses two precomputed shift tables called the good-suffix table and the bad-character table. The good-suffix table is tricky to compute in linear time. Text book solutions perform redundant operations. Here we present a fast implementation for this good-suffix table based on a tight analysis of the pattern. Experimental results show two versions of this new implementation are the fastest in almost all tested situations.

1 Introduction

The string matching problem consists of finding one or more usually all the occurrences of a pattern $x = x[0..m-1]$ of length m in a text $y = y[0..n-1]$ of length n where both strings x and y are build on the same alphabet. It can occur in many applications, for instance in information retrieval, bibliographic search and molecular biology. It has been extensively studied and numerous techniques and algorithms have been designed to solve this problem (see [3, 6]). We are interested here in the problem where the pattern is given first and can then be searched in various texts.

*CURIB, UFR des Sciences et des Techniques, Université de Rouen Normandie, 76821 Mont-Saint-Aignan Cedex, France, Thierry.Lecroq@univ-rouen.fr, monge.univ-mlv.fr/~lecroq/lec_en.html

This specific problem is called exact online string matching. Thus a preprocessing phase is allowed on the pattern.

Basically an online string matching algorithm uses a window to scan the text. The size of this window is equal to the length of the pattern. It first aligns the left ends of the window and the text. Then it checks if the pattern occurs in the window (this specific work is called an *attempt*) and *shifts* the window to the right. It repeats the same procedure again until the right end of the window goes beyond the right end of the text. The many different solutions differ in the way they compare the content of the window and the pattern, in the way they compute the lengths of the shifts and in the information that are stored from one attempt to the next.

There is no universal algorithm in the sense that the efficiency of a particular algorithm mainly depends on the size of the alphabet and the length of the pattern [5]. According to [6], the many algorithms can be classified in character comparison based algorithms, automata based algorithms and bit-parallelism based algorithms.

The Boyer-Moore string matching algorithm [2], which is a character comparison based algorithm, is probably one of the most famous solution to this problem. It has inspired a lot of subsequent works ([7, 8, 1, 9, 11] just to cite a few). This algorithm uses two precomputed shift tables called the good-suffix array and the bad-character array. The good-suffix table is tricky to compute in linear time. Actually the original paper by Boyer and Moore did not specify how to compute it. In [10], the proposed algorithm is not correct in all cases. The first correct algorithm was given by Rytter [12]. Text book solutions perform redundant operations. It uses another table, called *suff* that gives for every position of the pattern the longest suffix of the pattern ending at that position. The classical method for computing the good-suffix table consists of first computing the *suff* table and to perform two successive scans of this *suff* array to compute the good-suffix table that involves three loops on the interval $[0; m[$.

Actually it is easy to see that the computation can be done with only two loops. Redundant operations can be spotted and thus avoided. But how fast is it? Experimental results show that it is fastest in almost all situations. It is surprising that more than 50 years after the publication of the Boyer-Moore algorithm we can still design new algorithm for computing this good-suffix table and it was a lot of fun doing so!

The rest of this article is organized as follows. Section 2 presents basic notions and notations on strings. Section 3 presents the classical computation of the good-suffix table. Section 4 give three new methods for computing this table. In Section 5 experimental results are presented and we give our conclusions in Section 6.

2 Preliminaries

An *alphabet* is a finite set of elements called *letters* or *symbols*. A *string* is a sequence of zero or more symbols from an alphabet Σ of size σ ; the string with zero symbols is denoted by ε . The set of all strings over the alphabet Σ is denoted by Σ^* . A string x of length n is represented by $x[0..n-1]$, where $x[i] \in \Sigma$ for $0 \leq i \leq n-1$. The subset of Σ of letters occurring in a string x is denoted by $\text{alph}(x)$. A string u is a *prefix* of x if $x = uw$ for $w \in \Sigma^*$. Similarly, u is a *suffix* of x if $x = wu$ for $w \in \Sigma^*$. A string u is a *border* of x if u is both a prefix and a suffix of x and $u \neq x$. An integer p such that $1 \leq p \leq |x|$ is a *period* of a string x if $x[i] = x[i+p]$ for every position i such that $0 \leq i < |x| - p$. Borders and periods are dual notions since if $x = uv$ and u is a border of x then $|v|$ is a period of x . Furthermore during the run of an exact online string matching algorithm the length of the optimal shift to apply when an occurrence of a pattern is found is given by the shortest period (usually called *the border*) of the pattern.

3 Classical computation

When an attempt T takes place at right position j on the text y , the window contains the factor $y[j-m+1..j]$ of the text y . The index j is thus the right position of the factor of the text contained in the window. The longest common suffix of two strings u and v being denoted by $\text{lcs}(u, v)$ for an attempt T at position j on the text y , we set $z = \text{lcs}(y[0..j], x)$ and d the length of the shift applied just after the attempt T .

The general situation at the end of the attempt T is the following: the suffix z of x has been identified in the text y and, if $|z| < |x|$, a negative comparison occurred between the letter $a = x[m - |z| - 1]$ of the pattern and the letter $b = y[j - |z|]$ of the text. In other words, by setting $i = m - |z| - 1$, we have $z = x[i+1..m-1] = y[j-m+i+2..j]$ and, either $i = -1$, or $i \geq 0$ with $a = x[i]$, $b = y[j-m+i+1]$ and $a \neq b$ (see Figure 1).

Taking into account the information collected on the text y during the attempt, the natural shift to apply consists in aligning the factor z of the text with its rightmost occurrence in x preceding by a letter different from a . If there is no such occurrence, the shift should take into account the longest prefix of x that is also a suffix of z .

In the two situations that have just been examined, the computation of the shift following T is independent of the text. It can be previously computed for each position of the pattern. To this aim, we define two conditions that correspond to the case where the string z is the suffix $x[i+1..m-1]$ of x . They are the *suffix condition* and the *occurrence condition*. They are defined, for every position i on x , every shift d of x

and every letter $b \in \Sigma$, by:

$$Cond-suff(i, d) = \begin{cases} 0 < d \leq i + 1 \text{ and } x[i - d + 1 .. m - d - 1] \text{ is a suffix of } x \\ \text{or} \\ i + 1 < d \text{ and } x[0 .. m - d - 1] \text{ is a suffix of } x \end{cases}$$

and

$$Cond-occ(i, d) = \begin{cases} 0 < d \leq i \text{ and } x[i - d] \neq x[i] \\ \text{or} \\ i < d. \end{cases}$$

Then, the *good-suffix* table, denoted by *good-suff*, is defined in the following way: for every position i on x ,

$$good-suff[i] = \min\{d \mid Cond-suff(i, d) \text{ and } Cond-occ(i, d) \text{ hold}\}$$

for $0 \leq i \leq m - 1$.

The computation of the good-suffix table is not straightforward. One method consists in using a table called *suff* defined as follows:

$$suff[i] = |lcs(x, x[0 .. i])|$$

for $0 \leq i \leq m - 1$.

The relation between the table *good-suff* and the table *suff* is the following

$$good-suff[i] = \min\{m - 1 - j \mid m - 1 - suff[j] = i\}$$

for $0 \leq i \leq m - 1$ (see Figure 2) when $z = x[i + 1 .. m - 1]$ reoccurs in x otherwise

$$good-suff[i] \leq \min\{m - 1 - j \mid suff[j] = j + 1 \text{ and } suff[j] < m - 1 - i\}$$

for $0 \leq i \leq m - 1$ (see Figure 3) when $z = x[i + 1 .. m - 1]$ does not reoccur in x . The first condition $suff[j] = j + 1$ means that $x[0 .. j]$ is both a prefix of x and a suffix of x thus a border and then $m - 1 - j$ is a period of x . The second condition $suff[j] < m - 1 - i$ means that the border is shorter than $z = x[i + 1 .. m - 1]$ (the shift cannot take into account information about suffixes of x longer than z). It can be noticed that $good-suff[0]$ is equal to the period of x and can be used to shift the window when an occurrence of the pattern has been found.

Table *suff* can be computed by the algorithm SUFFIXES given in Figure 4 and table *good-suff* can be computed by the algorithm SUFFIXES given in Figure 5.

Both algorithms SUFFIXES and GOOD-SUFFIXES runs in linear time (see [4] for the detailed correctness and complexity analysis). Algorithm SUFFIXES computes the

values of the table $suff$ from right to left. When computing $suff[i]$, for $0 \leq i \leq m - 2$, all values $suff[j]$ have already been computed for $i < j < m$. It keeps two variables f and g such that $i < f$ and $g = suff[f] - f$ is minimal. Thus if $g < i$ and if $suff[m - 1 - f + i] \neq i - g$ then $suff[i] = \min\{suff[m - 1 - f + i], i - g\}$ without having to compare letters. Only when $suff[m - 1 - f + i] = i - g$ comparing letters is necessary to compute $suff[i]$. This mainly contributes to the linear time complexity of Algorithm SUFFIXES. The linearity of the computation of table $good-suff$ given table $suff$ is straightforward.

An example of computation of the $good-suff$ table is given in Figure 9.

4 Improved computation

Algorithm GOOD-SUFFIXES performs two scans of the table $suff$ in order to compute the table $good-suff$ after that one scan was necessary to compute table $suff$. We will show that both tables can be computed in the same time with only two scans of the interval $[0; m[$ where m is the length of the pattern. Let us first remark that for any string x of length m , $suff[m - 1]$ is equal to m and this value is never used in the computation of $good-suff$ thus we can avoid to compute it. From now on, let us denote by $a \in \Sigma$ the last letter of x . Let us then observe that for every i on x such that $0 \leq i \leq m - 2$, if $x[i] \neq a$ then $suff[i] = 0$ and only the rightmost such position is used in the computation of $good-suff$. Let us assume that x contains at least two distinct symbols ($|alph(x)| \geq 2$).

Then the proposed improved computation of the table $good-suff$ will consists in computing the tables $suff$ and $good-suff$ together with a single scan of x from right to left and dealing only with occurrences of its last symbol (positions i where $x[i] = a$ for $0 \leq i \leq m - 2$).

Furthermore, if x ends with a run of a of length k_1 , runs of a of length different from k_1 in x will be easily handle.

The next lemma shows how to handle the positions of the last run of a (i.e. the run that ends x , see Figure 6).

Lemma 1 *Let $x = x_1 b_1 a^{k_1}$ for $x_1 \in \Sigma^*$, $a, b_1 \in \Sigma$, $b_1 \neq a$ and an integer $k_1 \geq 1$. Let $\ell_1 = |x_1 b_1|$ and $r_1 = |x_1 b_1 a^{k_1}| - 2 = m - 2$, then*

1. $suff[i] = i - \ell_1 + 1$;
2. $good-suff[i] = i - \ell_1 + 1$;
3. $good-suff[m - 1] = k_1$;

for $\ell_1 \leq i \leq r_1$.

PROOF For $\ell_1 \leq i \leq r_1$, $i - \ell_1 + 1 < k_1 = r_1 - \ell_1 + 2$.

1. Let $k = i - \ell_1 + 1 < k_1$. Then $x[\ell_1 \dots i] = x[m - k \dots m - 1] = a^k$ is a suffix of x and $x[\ell_1 - 1] = b_1 \neq a = x[m - 1 - k]$, thus $\text{suff}[i] = k$;
2. $\text{Cond-suff}(i, k)$ holds since $0 < k \leq i + 1$ and $x[i - k + 1 \dots m - k - 1] = a^{k_1 - k}$ is a suffix of x . $\text{Cond-occ}(i, k)$ holds since $0 < k \leq i$ and $x[i - k] = b_1 \neq a = x[i]$. For any $0 < d < k$, $\text{Cond-occ}(i, d)$ does not hold since $x[i - d] = a = x[i]$ thus $\text{good-suff}[i] = k$;
3. For any $0 < d < k_1$, $\text{Cond-occ}(m - 1, d)$ does not hold since $x[m - 1 - d] = a = x[m - 1]$ and $\text{Cond-suff}(m - 1, k_1)$ trivially holds since $0 < k_1 \leq m$ and $x[m - 1 - k_1 + 1 \dots m - k_1 - 1] = \varepsilon$ is the empty suffix of x . thus $\text{good-suff}[m - 1] = k_1$.

The next two lemmas show how to handle the case of subsequent runs of a . We start by runs of length k_2 strictly less than k_1 (see Figure 7).

Lemma 2 *If $x = x_2 b_2 a^{k_2} x_3 b_1 a^{k_1}$ for $x_2, x_3 \in \Sigma^*$, $a, b_1, b_2 \in \Sigma$, $b_1 \neq a$, $b_2 \neq a$ and two integers $k_1, k_2 \geq 1$ such that $k_2 < k_1$. Let $\ell_2 = |x_2 b_2|$ and $r_2 = |x_2 b_2 a^{k_2}| - 1$, then*

1. $\text{suff}[i] = i - \ell_2 + 1$;
2. $\text{good-suff}[m - 1 - \text{suff}[i]] < m - 1 - i$;

for $\ell_1 \leq i \leq r_1$.

PROOF For $\ell_2 \leq i \leq r_2$, let $k = i - \ell_2 + 1$.

1. Then $x[\ell_2 \dots i] = x[m - k \dots m - 1] = a^k$ is a suffix of x and $x[\ell_2 - 1] = b_2 \neq a = x[m - 1 - k]$, thus $\text{suff}[i] = k$;
2. $\text{Cond-suff}(m - 1 - k, k_1 - k)$ holds since $0 < k_1 - k \leq m - k$ and $x[m - 1 - k - (k_1 - k) + 1 \dots m - (k_1 - k) - 1] = x[m - k_1 \dots m - k_1 + k - 1] = a^k$ is a suffix of x . $\text{Cond-occ}(m - 1 - k, k_1 - k)$ holds since $0 < k_1 - k \leq m - 1 - k$ and $x[m - 1 - k - (k_1 - k)] = x[m - k_1 - 1] = b_1 \neq a = x[m - 1 - k]$ and $k_1 - k < m - 1 - i$ thus $\text{good-suff}[m - 1 - k] \leq m - 1 - i$;

The next lemma shows how to handle runs of length greater or equal than k_1 (see Figure 8).

Lemma 3 *If $x = x_4 b_4 a^{k_3} x_5 b_1 a^{k_1}$ for $x_4, x_5 \in \Sigma^*$, $a, b_1, b_4 \in \Sigma$, $b_1 \neq a$, $b_4 \neq a$ and two integers $k_1, k_3 \geq 1$ such that $k_3 > k_1$. Let $\ell_3 = |x_4 b_4|$ and $r_3 = |x_4 b_4 a^{k_3}| - 1$, and let $e = \ell_3 + k_1 - 1$ then:*

1. $\text{suff}[i] = k_1$ for $f < i \leq r_3$;
2. $\text{suff}[f] \geq k_1$;
3. $\text{suff}[i] = i - \ell_3 + 1$ for $\ell_3 \leq i < e$;
4. if $k_3 > k_1$ then $\text{good-suff}[m - 1 - \text{suff}[r_3]] \leq m - 1 - r_3$;
5. $\text{good-suff}[m - 1 - \text{suff}[e]] \leq m - 1 - e$;
6. $\text{good-suff}[m - 1 - \text{suff}[i]] < m - 1 - i$ for $e < i < r_3$ and for $\ell_3 \leq i < f$

PROOF 1. For $f < i \leq r_3$, $x[i - k_1 + 1 .. i] = a^{k_1} = x[m - k_1 .. m - 1]$ is a suffix of x and $x[i - k_1] = a \neq b = x[m - 1 - k_1]$ thus $\text{suff}[i] = k_1$;

2. $x[f - k_1 + 1 .. f] = a^{k_1} = x[m - k_1 .. m - 1]$ is a suffix of x thus $\text{suff}[f] \geq k_1$;

3. For $\ell_3 \leq i < e$, $x[\ell_3 .. i] = a^{i - \ell_3 + 1} = x[m - i - \ell_3 .. m - 1]$ is a suffix of x and $x[\ell_3 - 1] = b_4 \neq a = x[m - i - \ell_3 - 1]$ thus $\text{suff}[i] = i - \ell_3 + 1$;

4. if $k_3 > k_1$ then $\text{suff}[r_3] = k_1 < k_3$.

$\text{Cond-suf}(m - 1 - k_1, m - 1 - r_3)$ holds since $x[m - 1 - k_1 - (m - 1 - r_3) + 1 .. m - 1 - (m - 1 - r_3)] = x[r_3 - k_1 + 1 .. r_3] = a^{k_1}$ is a suffix of x and $\text{Cond-occ}(m - 1 - k_1, m - 1 - r_3)$ holds since $0 < m - 1 - r_3 < m - 1 - k_1$ and $x[m - 1 - k_1 - (m - 1 - r_3)] = x[r_3 - k_1] = a \neq b_1 = x[m - 1 - k_1]$.

5. Let $\text{suff}[s] = \text{lcs}(x[0 .. e], x) = s$. Then either $s = f + 1$ or $s \parallel ee$. $\text{Cond-suf}(m - 1 - s, m - 1 - e)$ holds since $x[m - 1 - s - (m - 1 - e) + 1 .. m - 1 - (m - 1 - e)] = x[f - s + 1 .. e]$ is a suffix of x

If $s \leq e$ then $x[e - s] \neq x[m - 1 - s]$ and $\text{Cond-occ}(m - 1 - s, m - 1 - e)$ holds since $0 < m - 1 - e \leq m - 1 - s$ and $x[m - 1 - s - (m - 1 - e)] = x[e - s] \neq x[m - 1 - s]$.

If $s = e + 1$ then $\text{Cond-suf}(m - 1 - s, m - 1 - e)$ holds since $m - 1 - s < m - 1 - e$.

In both cases $\text{good-suff}[m - 1 - \text{suff}[e]] \leq m - 1 - e$.

6. If $e < i < r_3$, $\text{suff}[i] = k_1$ and $\text{Cond-suf}(m - 1 - k_1, m - 1 - r_3)$ and $\text{Cond-occ}(m - 1 - k_1, m - 1 - r_3)$ hold and $m - 1 - r_3 < m - 1 - i$.

If $\ell_3 \leq i < e$, $\text{suff}[i] = i - \ell_3 + 1 = k$.

$\text{Cond-suf}(m - 1 - k, k_1 - k)$ holds since $0 < k_1 - k \leq m - k$ and $x[m - 1 - k - (k_1 - k) + 1 .. m - (k_1 - k) - 1] = x[m - k_1 .. m - k_1 + k - 1] = a^k$ is a suffix of x . $\text{Cond-occ}(m - 1 - k, k_1 - k)$ holds since $0 < k_1 - k \leq m - 1 - k$ and $x[m - 1 - k - (k_1 - k)] = x[m - k_1 - 1] = b_1 \neq a = x[m - 1 - k]$ and $k_1 - k < m - 1 - i$ thus $\text{good-suff}[m - 1 - k] < m - 1 - i$;

The next lemma shows that positions inside borders that do not correspond to end position of borders cannot contribute to new values in the *good-suff* table.

Lemma 4 *Let $x = uvu$ where $u, v \in \Sigma^*$ and u is a border of x . Then for $0 \leq i < |u|$ such that $\text{suff}[i] \leq i$ it holds that $\text{good-suff}[m - 1 - \text{suff}[i]] < m - 1 - i$.*

PROOF Let $k = i + m - |u|$. $\text{Cond-suf}(m - 1 - \text{suff}[i], m - k - 1)$ holds since $0 < m - k - 1 < m - \text{suff}[i] - 1$ and $x[m - 1 - \text{suff}[i] - (m - k - 1) + 1 .. m - (m - k - 1) - 1] = x[k - \text{suff}[i] + 1 .. k]$ is a suffix of x . $\text{Cond-occ}(m - 1 - \text{suff}[i], m - k - 1)$ holds since $0 < m - k - 1 \leq m - 1 - k$ and $x[m - 1 - \text{suff}[i] - (m - k - 1)] = x[k - \text{suff}[i]] = b_1 \neq a = x[m - 1 - \text{suff}[i]]$ by definition of *suff* and because i and k are the same positions in the two occurrences of u .

Then the computation of the table *good-suff* can be done by considering runs of a 's from right to left. The rightmost run of length k_1 is processed according to Lemma 1. Subsequent runs of length strictly smaller than are processed according to Lemma 2: no position can contribute to a new value of the table *good-suff*. Subsequent runs of length greater than are processed according to Lemma 3: at most two positions can contribute to new values of the table *good-suff*. Borders are processed according to Lemma 4.

This new method can be done in linear time by considering the two variables f and g that avoid comparisons or in quadratic time by performing all the comparisons for each one position of the runs that requires comparisons.

Figures 10, 11 and 12 give respectively the pseudo-codes for processing the rightmost run, the internal runs until the longest border included and the runs that are located at the left of the longest border. This corresponds to the linear method. Its complexity analysis follows the complexity analysis of the SUFFIXES since it uses the same two variables f and g . Lines 16 to 20 in Figure 11 proceeds runs of a 's according to Lemma 2 while lines 38 to 21 in Figure 11 proceeds runs of a 's according to Lemma 3. It uses BORDER given in Figure 13 that proceeds according Lemma 4.

Figures 10 and 14 present the quadratic method that avoids the computation of the table *suff*.

We also give a mixed version in Figure 15. It partially uses the results of the different lemmas of this section. It processes the rightmost run of a 's and the borders as previously but do not analyse subsequent runs of a 's but is very similar to the classical computation for positions between the rightmost run of a 's and the longest border of the pattern.

5 Experimental results

To evaluate the efficiency of the different methods presented above we perform several experiments with different pattern lengths (from 2 to 1024) and different alphabet sizes (2, 4, 20 and 70).

5.1 Algorithms

We have tested five algorithms:

- BF: a brute force computation of the *good-suff* table;
- CL: the classical method (Algorithm GOOD-SUFFIXES of Figure 5);
- FT1: the linear Fine Tuned method presented in this paper;
- FT2: the quadratic Fine Tuned method presented in this paper;
- FT1: the mixed Fine Tuned method presented in this paper.

These algorithms have been coded in C in an homogeneous way to keep the comparison significant. All codes have been compiled with `gcc` with the `-O3` optimization options. The machine we used has an Intel Core i5 processor at 1.1GHz running macOS Big Sur Version 11.7.10. The codes of the algorithms is available on <https://github.com/lecroq/goodsuff>.

5.2 Results

Tables 1 to 4 shows the running times of the different algorithms (fastest times are in bold face). Figures 16 to 16 show graph of the results where the brute force method has been excluded since it is too slow. Running times correspond to 10,000 runs on 1000 different strings pseudo-randomly generated, there given in ms.

These results show that the new methods are the fastest in almost all cases. For small size alphabet (2 and 4) the quadratic version is the fastest while for large size alphabets (20 and 70) the mixed version is the fastest.

6 Conclusion

In this article we presented methods for computing the *good-suff* table that is used for shifting the pattern in the classical Boyer-Moore exact string matching algorithm. The new methods are based on the processing of runs of the last letter in the pattern.




Figure 1: Suffix $z = x[i + 1 .. m - 1]$ of x is equal to factor $z = y[j - m + i + 2 .. j]$ of y and symbol $a = x[i]$ is different from symbol $b = y[j - m + i + 1]$.




Figure 2: $good-suff[i] = \min\{m - 1 - j \mid m - 1 - suff[j] = i\}$.

However only a mixed method based on the new and the classical method reveals faster than the classical one. It may be that possible tuning could be enable to find another mixed version faster than the one presented in this article. It also gives a new methods for computing only the *suff* table. Being based on analysis of runs, the new method should probably used for computing the *good-suff* table for a pattern given in a RLE (Run Length Encoding) form.

References

- [1] A. Apostolico and R. Giancarlo. The Boyer–Moore–Galil string searching strategies revisited. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 15(1):98–105, 1986.
- [2] R. S. Boyer and J. S. Moore. A fast string searching algorithm. *Commun. ACM*, 20(10):762–772, 1977.
- [3] C. Charras and T. Lecroq. *Handbook of exact string matching algorithms*. King’s College Publications, 2004.




Figure 3: $good-suff[i] = m - j - 1$.

```

SUFFIXES( $x, m$ )
1  $g \leftarrow m - 1$ 
2  $suff[m - 1] \leftarrow m$ 
3 for  $i \leftarrow m - 2$  to 0 do
4   if  $i > g$  et  $suff[i + m - 1 - f] \neq i - g$  then
5      $suff[i] \leftarrow \min\{suff[i + m - 1 - f], i - g\}$ 
6   else  $g \leftarrow \min\{i, g\}$ 
7      $f \leftarrow i$ 
8     while  $g \geq 0$  et  $x[g] = x[g + m + 1 - f]$  do
9        $g \leftarrow g - 1$ 
10     $suff[i] \leftarrow f - g$ 
11 return  $suff$ 

```

Figure 4: SUFFIXES(x, m) returns the table $suff$ of string x of length m .

```

GOOD-SUFFIXES( $x, m, suff$ )
1  $i \leftarrow 0$ 
2 for  $j \leftarrow m - 2$  to  $-1$  do
3   if  $j = -1$  ou  $suff[j] = j + 1$  then
4     while  $i < m - 1 - j$  do
5        $good-suff[i] \leftarrow m - 1 - j$ 
6        $i \leftarrow i + 1$ 
7   for  $j \leftarrow 0$  to  $m - 2$  do
8      $good-suff[m - 1 - suff[j]] \leftarrow m - 1 - j$ 
9   return  $good-suff$ 

```

Figure 5: $GOOD-SUFFIXES(x, m, suff)$ returns the table $good-suff$ of string x of length m given its table $suff$.




Figure 6: x ends with a run of k_1 a's.




Figure 7: x contains a run of a 's of length $k_2 < k_1$.




Figure 8: x contains a run of a 's of length $k_3 \geq k_1$.

i	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
$x[i]$	a	a	b	b	a	a	a	a	b	b	a	a	a	a	a	b	b	a	a	a	b	b	a	a	a	a
$suff[i]$	1	2	0	0	1	2	3	8	0	0	1	2	3	9	4	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	1	2	3	26
first loop																										
$j = 7$	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18								
$j = 1$																				24	24	24	24	24	24	
$j = 0$																										25
second loop																										
$j = -1$																										26
$j = 0$																									25	
$j = 1$																								24		
$j = 2$																										23
$j = 3$																										22
$j = 4$																										21
$j = 5$																										20
$j = 6$																								19		
$j = 7$																		18								
$j = 8$																										17
$j = 9$																										16
$j = 10$																										15
$j = 11$																									14	
$j = 12$																								13		
$j = 13$																		12								
$j = 14$																										10
$j = 15$																										9
$j = 16$																										8
$j = 17$																										7
$j = 18$																										6
$j = 19$																										5
$j = 20$																										4
$j = 21$																										3
$j = 22$																										2
$j = 23$																										1
$j = 24$																										0
$good-suff[i]$	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	12	18	24	24	24	11	1	2	3	4

Figure 9: Computation of table $good-suff$ for $x = \text{aabbbaaaabbbaaaabbbaaa}$ with the help of table $suff$. The first and second loops refer respectively to the first and the second **for** loops of Algorithm GOOD-SUFFIXES. Final values are highlighted in bold face.

```

FINETUNEDGOODSUFFIX-PART-I( $x, m$ )
1  $i \leftarrow m - 2$ 
2 while  $i \geq 0$  and  $x[i] = x[m - 1]$  do
3    $i \leftarrow i - 1$ 
    $\triangleright$  According to Lemma 1
4    $(\text{good-suff}[m - 1], k_1) \leftarrow (m - 1 - i, m - 1 - i)$ 
5    $(j, k) \leftarrow (m - 2, k_1 - 1)$ 
6   while  $j > i$  do
7      $(\text{suff}[j], \text{good-suff}[j]) \leftarrow (k, k)$ 
8      $(j, k) \leftarrow (j - 1, k - 1)$ 
9   for  $j \leftarrow 0$  to  $i$  do
10     $\text{good-suff}[j] \leftarrow m$ 

```

Figure 10: FINETUNEDGOODSUFFIX-PART-I(x, m) processes the rightmost run of a 's of string x of length m .

Table 1: Experimental results for an alphabet of size $\sigma = 2$.

m	BF	CL	FT1	FT2	FT3
2	0.008745	0.008731	0.008772	0.008589	0.008573
4	0.005412	0.005586	0.005482	0.005218	0.005512
8	0.007156	0.006581	0.006152	0.005743	0.005952
16	0.013612	0.006990	0.007355	0.006785	0.007183
32	0.033180	0.008698	0.009581	0.008199	0.009244
64	0.111221	0.011614	0.013312	0.010890	0.012055
128	0.434411	0.017598	0.020186	0.015496	0.017973
256	1.712719	0.028663	0.032937	0.024166	0.029018
512	6.929127	0.050306	0.057030	0.041220	0.049889
1024	27.308697	0.090039	0.099594	0.071921	0.088235

```

FINETUNEDGOODSUFFIX-PART-II( $x, m$ )
1 ( $g, j$ )  $\leftarrow$  ( $m, 0$ )
2 while true do
3    $i \leftarrow$  position of the next  $a$  or  $-1$ 
4   if  $i < 0$  then
5      $\mid$  return
6    $r \leftarrow i$ 
7    $i \leftarrow$  position of the next letter  $\neq a$  or  $-1$ 
8   if  $i < 0$  then
9      $\mid$  BORDER( $\min\{k_1, r + 1\}$ )
10    if  $r \geq k_1$  then
11       $\mid$   $good\text{-}suff[m - 1 - k_1] \leftarrow \min\{good\text{-}suff[m - 1 - k_1], m - 1 - r\}$ 
12       $\mid$  return
13     $k_2 \leftarrow r - i$ 
14    if  $k_2 < k_1$  then
15       $\mid$  ( $h, k$ )  $\leftarrow$  ( $r, k_2$ )
16      while  $h > e$  do
17         $\mid$   $suff[h] \leftarrow k$ 
18         $\mid$  ( $h, k$ )  $\leftarrow$  ( $h - 1, k - 1$ )
19         $\mid$  continue
20     $e \leftarrow i + k_1$ 
21    for  $h \leftarrow r$  to  $e + 1$  do
22       $\mid$   $suff[h] \leftarrow k_1$ 
23    if  $k_2 > k_1$  then
24       $\mid$   $good\text{-}suff[m - 1 - k_1] \leftarrow \min\{good\text{-}suff[m - 1 - k_1], m - 1 - r\}$ 
25      ( $h, k$ )  $\leftarrow$  ( $e - 1, k_1 - 1$ )
26      while  $h > i$  do
27         $\mid$   $suff[h] \leftarrow k$ 
28         $\mid$  ( $h, k$ )  $\leftarrow$  ( $h - 1, k - 1$ )
29      if  $g < e$  and  $suff[e + m - 1 - f] \neq e - g$  then
30         $\mid$  if  $suff[e + m - 1 - f] < e - g$  then
31           $\mid$   $suff[e] \leftarrow suff[e + m - 1 - f]$ 
32           $\mid$  else  $suff[e] \leftarrow e - g$ 
33           $\mid$   $good\text{-}suff[m - 1 - suff[e]] \leftarrow \min\{good\text{-}suff[m - 1 - suff[e]], m - 1 - e\}$ 
34          ( $f, g$ )  $\leftarrow$  ( $e, i$ )
35          while  $g \geq 0$  and  $x[g] = x[m - 1 - f + g]$  do
36             $\mid$   $g \leftarrow g - 1$ 
37             $\mid$   $suff[f] \leftarrow f - g$ 
38          if  $g < 0$  then
39             $\mid$  BORDER( $f$ )
40             $\mid$  ( $i, r$ )  $\leftarrow$  ( $i - 1, f$ )
41             $\mid$  break
42           $\mid$  else  $good\text{-}suff[m - 1 - suff[f]] \leftarrow \min\{good\text{-}suff[m - 1 - suff[f]], m - 1 - f\}$ 

```

Figure 11: FINETUNEDGOODSUFFIX-PART-II(x, m) processes internal riuns of a 's of string x of length m .

```

FINETUNEDGOODSUFFIX-PART-III( $x, m$ )
  ▷ According to Lemma 4
  1 while  $i \geq 0$  do
  2   if  $x[i] = x[m - 1]$  then
  3     if  $i + 1 \leq \text{suff}[i + m - 1 - r]$  then
  4        $\text{suff}[i] \leftarrow i + 1$ 
  5       while  $j < m - 1 - i$  do
  6          $\text{good-suff}[j] \leftarrow \min\{\text{good-suff}[j], m - 1 - i\}$ 
  7          $j \leftarrow j + 1$ 
  8     else  $\text{suff}[i] \leftarrow i + m - 1 - r$ 
  9    $i \leftarrow i - 1$ 

```

Figure 12: **FINETUNEDGOODSUFFIX-PART-III**(x, m) processes remaining borders of string x of length m .

```

BORDER( $v$ )
  1 while  $j \leq m - 1 - v$  do
  2    $\text{good-suff}[j] \leftarrow \min\{\text{good-suff}[j], m - 1 - v\}$ 
  3    $j \leftarrow j + 1$ 

```

Figure 13: **BORDER**(x, m) processes the border of length $v + 1$ of string x of length m .

Table 2: Experimental results for an alphabet of size $\sigma = 4$.

m	BF	CL	FT1	FT2	FT3
2	0.005104	0.005034	0.005107	0.004976	0.004999
4	0.005784	0.005678	0.005702	0.005482	0.005321
8	0.006879	0.005888	0.005803	0.005748	0.005764
16	0.012003	0.006450	0.006716	0.006296	0.006322
32	0.028193	0.008150	0.008162	0.007080	0.007388
64	0.088753	0.009949	0.010225	0.008603	0.008775
128	0.324062	0.014428	0.014754	0.012020	0.012106
256	1.257153	0.023508	0.023479	0.018005	0.018597
512	5.032720	0.041383	0.040230	0.029101	0.030979
1024	20.586937	0.075417	0.070922	0.051622	0.056580


```

FINETUNEGOODSUFFIX-PART-II-BIS( $x, m$ )
1 ( $g, j$ )  $\leftarrow$  ( $m, 0$ )
2 while true do
3    $i \leftarrow$  position of the next  $a$  or  $-1$ 
4   if  $i < 0$  then
5     | return
6    $r \leftarrow i$ 
7    $i \leftarrow$  position of the next letter  $\neq a$  or  $-1$ 
8   if  $i < 0$  then
9     | BORDER( $\min\{k_1, r + 1\}$ )
10    if  $r \geq k_1$  then
11      |  $good\_suff[m - 1 - k_1] \leftarrow \min\{good\_suff[m - 1 - k_1], m - 1 - r\}$ 
12    return
13   $k_2 \leftarrow r - i$ 
14  if  $k_2 < k_1$  then
15    | continue
16   $e \leftarrow i + k_1$ 
17  if  $k_2 > k_1$  then
18    |  $good\_suff[m - 1 - k_1] \leftarrow \min\{good\_suff[m - 1 - k_1], m - 1 - r\}$ 
19  ( $f, g$ )  $\leftarrow$  ( $e, i$ )
20  while  $g \geq 0$  and  $x[g] = x[m - 1 - f + g]$  do
21    |  $g \leftarrow g - 1$ 
22  if  $g < 0$  then
23    | BORDER( $f$ )
24  else  $good\_suff[m - 1 - f + g] \leftarrow \min\{good\_suff[m - 1 - f + g], m - 1 - f\}$ 

```

Figure 14: FINETUNEGOODSUFFIX-PART-II-BIS(x, m) returns the table $good_suff$ of string x of length m without computing the table $suff$.

Table 3: Experimental results for an alphabet of size $\sigma = 20$.

m	BF	CL	FT1	FT2	FT3
2	0.005233	0.005077	0.005256	0.005024	0.005093
4	0.005434	0.005361	0.005361	0.005259	0.005276
8	0.006379	0.005757	0.005432	0.005250	0.005259
16	0.009964	0.005923	0.005603	0.005406	0.005436
32	0.025321	0.006496	0.006112	0.006406	0.005582
64	0.084819	0.007816	0.007029	0.006477	0.006461
128	0.316767	0.010470	0.008664	0.007432	0.007606
256	1.230335	0.015584	0.012013	0.010109	0.009604
512	4.902985	0.025234	0.018403	0.014375	0.013772
1024	20.015751	0.044632	0.030326	0.023298	0.022046

```

FINETUNEGOODSUFFIX-PART-II-TER( $x, m$ )
1   $i \leftarrow$  position of the next  $a$  or  $-1$ 
2  if  $i < 0$  then
3  | return
4   $(f, g) \leftarrow (i, i - 1)$ 
5  while  $g \geq 0$  and  $x[g] = x[m - 1 - f + g]$  do
6  |  $g \leftarrow g - 1$ 
7   $\text{suff}[f] \leftarrow f - g$ 
8  if  $g < 0$  then
9  | BORDER( $f$ )
10 |  $i \leftarrow i - 1$ 
11 | goto lastStep
12 else  $\text{good-suff}[m - 1 - \text{suff}[i]] \leftarrow \min\{\text{good-suff}[m - 1 - \text{suff}[i]], m - 1 - i\}$ 
13  $i \leftarrow i - 1$ 
14 while  $i \geq 0$  do
15 |  $i \leftarrow i - 1$ 
16 | if  $x[i] = x[m - 1]$  then
17 | | if  $g < i$  and  $\text{suff}[e + m - 1 - i] \neq i - g$  then
18 | | | if  $\text{suff}[e + m - 1 - i] < i - g$  then
19 | | | |  $\text{suff}[i] \leftarrow \text{suff}[i + m - 1 - f]$ 
20 | | | else  $\text{suff}[i] \leftarrow i - g$ 
21 | | | |  $\text{good-suff}[m - 1 - \text{suff}[i]] \leftarrow \min\{\text{good-suff}[m - 1 - \text{suff}[i]], m - 1 - i\}$ 
22 | | else  $(f, g) \leftarrow (i, \min\{g, i - 1\})$ 
23 | | | while  $g \geq 0$  and  $x[g] = x[m - 1 - f + g]$  do
24 | | | |  $g \leftarrow g - 1$ 
25 | | | |  $\text{suff}[i] \leftarrow f - g$ 
26 | | | if  $g < 0$  then
27 | | | | BORDER( $i$ )
28 | | | |  $i \leftarrow i - 1$ 
29 | | | | break
30 | | | else  $\text{good-suff}[m - 1 - \text{suff}[i]] \leftarrow \min\{\text{good-suff}[m - 1 - \text{suff}[i]], m - 1 - i\}$ 
31 | |  $i \leftarrow i - 1$ 
32 lastStep:
33 while  $i \geq 0$  do
34 | | if  $x[i] = x[m - 1]$  then
35 | | | if  $i + 1 \leq \text{suff}[i + m - 1 - f]$  then
36 | | | |  $\text{suff}[i] \leftarrow i + 1$ 
37 | | | | BORDER( $i$ )
38 | | | else  $\text{suff}[i] \leftarrow i + m - 1 - f$ 
39 | |  $i \leftarrow i - 1$ 

```

Figure 15: FINETUNEGOODSUFFIX-PART-II-TER(x, m) computes the table *good-suff* of string x of length m using a mixed strategy.

Table 4: Experimental results for an alphabet of size $\sigma = 70$.

m	BF	CL	FT1	FT2	FT3
2	0.005144	0.005125	0.005142	0.005057	0.004933
4	0.005428	0.005364	0.005449	0.005239	0.005205
8	0.006245	0.005771	0.005371	0.005772	0.005400
16	0.009442	0.005767	0.005626	0.005400	0.005407
32	0.023653	0.006466	0.005857	0.005697	0.005860
64	0.078086	0.007575	0.006712	0.006249	0.005986
128	0.289294	0.009746	0.007809	0.007066	0.006884
256	1.136308	0.014193	0.010026	0.008646	0.008529
512	4.533947	0.022483	0.014530	0.012153	0.011148
1024	18.628668	0.041737	0.024159	0.019512	0.017977




Figure 16: Experimental results an alphabet of size $\sigma = 2$.




Figure 17: Experimental results an alphabet of size $\sigma = 4$.




Figure 18: Experimental results an alphabet of size $\sigma = 20$.




Figure 19: Experimental results an alphabet of size $\sigma = 70$.

- [4] M. Crochemore, C. Hancart, and T. Lecroq. *Algorithms on strings*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [5] S. Faro and T. Lecroq. The Exact String Matching Problem: a Comprehensive Experimental Evaluation. Report arXiv:1012.2547, 2010.
- [6] S. Faro and T. Lecroq. The exact online string matching problem: a review of the most recent results. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 45(2):13, 2013.
- [7] Z. Galil. On improving the worst case running time of the Boyer–Moore string searching algorithm. *Commun. ACM*, 22(9):505–508, 1979.
- [8] R. N. Horspool. Practical fast searching in strings. *Software – Practice & Experience*, 10(6):501–506, 1980.
- [9] A. Hume and D. M. Sunday. Fast string searching. *Software – Practice & Experience*, 21(11):1221–1248, 1991.
- [10] D. E. Knuth, J. H. Morris, Jr, and V. R. Pratt. Fast pattern matching in strings. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 6(1):323–350, 1977.

- [11] T. Lecroq. A variation on the Boyer-Moore algorithm. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 92(1):119–144, 1992.
- [12] W. Rytter. A correct preprocessing algorithm for Boyer–Moore string searching. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 9(3):509–512, 1980.