

# Computing Minimal Absent Words and Extended Bispecial Factors with CDAWG Space

Shunsuke Inenaga<sup>1</sup>, Takuya Mieno<sup>2</sup>, Hiroki Arimura<sup>3</sup>, Mitsuru Funakoshi<sup>1</sup>, and Yuta Fujishige<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Informatics, Kyushu University, Japan

<sup>2</sup>Department of Computer and Network Engineering, University of Electro-Communications, Japan

<sup>3</sup>Graduate School of IST, Hokkaido University, Japan

## Abstract

A string  $w$  is said to be a *minimal absent word* (MAW) for a string  $S$  if  $w$  does not occur in  $S$  and any proper substring of  $w$  occurs in  $S$ . We focus on non-trivial MAWs which are of length at least 2. Finding such non-trivial MAWs for a given string is motivated for applications in bioinformatics and data compression. Fujishige et al. [TCS 2023] proposed a data structure of size  $\Theta(n)$  that can output the set  $\text{MAW}(S)$  of all MAWs for a given string  $S$  of length  $n$  in  $O(n + |\text{MAW}(S)|)$  time, based on the *directed acyclic word graph* (DAWG). In this paper, we present a more space efficient data structure based on the *compact DAWG* (CDAWG), which can output  $\text{MAW}(S)$  in  $O(|\text{MAW}(S)|)$  time with  $O(\mathbf{e}_{\min})$  space, where  $\mathbf{e}_{\min}$  denotes the minimum of the sizes of the CDAWGs for  $S$  and for its reversal  $S^R$ . For any strings of length  $n$ , it holds that  $\mathbf{e}_{\min} < 2n$ , and for highly repetitive strings  $\mathbf{e}_{\min}$  can be sublinear (up to logarithmic) in  $n$ . We also show that MAWs and their generalization *minimal rare words* have close relationships with *extended bispecial factors*, via the CDAWG.

## 1 Introduction

A string  $w$  is said to be a *minimal absent word* (MAW) for a string  $S$  if  $w$  does not occur in  $S$  and any proper substring of  $w$  occurs in  $S$ . Throughout this paper, we focus on MAWs which are of form  $aub$ , where  $a, b$  are characters and  $u$  is a (possibly empty) string. Finding such MAWs for a given string is motivated for applications including bioinformatics [1, 12, 23, 19] and data compression [14, 15, 3].

Fujishige et al. [16] proposed a data structure of size  $\Theta(n)$  that can output the set  $\text{MAW}(S)$  of all MAWs for a given string  $S$  of length  $n$  in  $O(n + |\text{MAW}(S)|)$  time, based on the *directed acyclic word graph* (DAWG) [9]. The DAWG for string  $S$ , denoted  $\text{DAWG}(S)$ , is the smallest DFA recognizing all suffixes of  $S$ .

In this paper, we present a more space efficient data structure based on the *compact DAWG* (CDAWG) [10], which takes  $O(\mathbf{e}_{\min})$  space and can output  $\text{MAW}(S)$  in  $O(|\text{MAW}(S)|)$  time, where  $\mathbf{e}_{\min} = \{\mathbf{el}(S), \mathbf{er}(S)\}$ , with  $\mathbf{el}(S)$  and  $\mathbf{er}(S)$  being the numbers of edges of the CDAWGs for  $S$  and for its reversal  $S^R$ , respectively. For any string  $S$  of length  $n$  it holds that the number of edges of the CDAWG for  $S$  is less than  $2n$  and it can be sublinear (up to logarithmic) in  $n$  for highly repetitive strings [25, 24, 5].

Our new data structure with the CDAWG is built on our deeper analysis on how the additive  $O(n)$  term is required in the output time of Fujishige et al.’s DAWG-based algorithm [16]. Let  $x$  be a node of  $\text{DAWG}(S)$  and let  $u$  be the longest string represented by  $x$ . Suppose that there is a node  $y$  of which the suffix link points to  $x$ , and let  $a$  be the character such that  $au$  is the shortest string represented by  $y$ . It follows that  $aub$  is a MAW for  $S$  if and only if node  $x$  has an out-edge labeled  $b$  but node  $y$  does not. Fujishige et al.’s algorithm finds such characters  $b$  by comparing the out-edges of  $y$  and  $x$  in sorted order. However, Fujishige et al.’s algorithm performs redundant comparisons even for every pair of *unary nodes*  $x, y$  connected by a suffix link. This observation has led us to the use of the CDAWG for  $S$ , where unary nodes are compacted. Still, we need to manage the case where  $y$  is unary but  $x$  is not unary. We settle this issue by a non-trivial use of the *extended longest path tree* of the CDAWG [18].

In the previous work by Belazzougui and Cunial [5], they proposed another CDAWG-based data structure of size  $O(\max\{\text{el}(S), \text{er}(S)\})$  that can output all MAWs for  $S$  in  $O(\max\{\text{el}(S), \text{er}(S)\} + |\text{MAW}(S)|)$  time. The  $\text{el}(S)$  term comes from the *Weiner links* for all nodes of the CDAWG, which can be as large as  $\Omega(\text{er}(S)\sqrt{n})$  for some strings [18]. Note that our data structures uses only  $O(\mathbf{e}_{\min}) = O(\min\{\text{el}(S), \text{er}(S)\})$  space and takes only  $O(|\text{MAW}(S)|)$  time to report the output. We also present a simpler algorithm that restores the string  $u$  in linear time in its length using the CDAWG-grammar [5], without using level-ancestor data structures [8, 7], which can be of independent interest.

We also show how our CDAWG-based data structure of  $O(\mathbf{e}_{\min})$  space can output all *extended bispecial factors (EBFs)* [2] for the input string  $S$  in output optimal time. This proposed method can be seen as a more space-efficient variant of Almirantis et al.’s method [2] that is built on suffix trees [26]. We also show that *minimal rare words (MRWs)* [4], which are generalizations of MAWs and *minimal unique substrings MUSs* [17], have close relationships with EBFs through the CDAWG.

## 2 Preliminaries

### 2.1 Basic Notations

Let  $\Sigma$  be an alphabet. An element of  $\Sigma$  is called a character. An element of  $\Sigma^*$  is called a string. The length of a string  $S$  is denoted by  $|S|$ . The empty string  $\varepsilon$  is the string of length 0. Let  $\Sigma^+ = \Sigma^* \setminus \{\varepsilon\}$ . If  $S = xyz$ , then  $x$ ,  $y$ , and  $z$  are called a *prefix*, *substring* (or *factor*), and *suffix* of  $S$ , respectively. Let  $\text{Prefix}(S)$ ,  $\text{Substr}(S)$ , and  $\text{Suffix}(S)$  denote the sets of the prefixes, substrings, and suffixes of  $S$ , respectively. An element in  $\text{Suffix}(S) \setminus \{S\}$  is called a *proper suffix* of  $S$ . For any  $1 \leq i \leq |S|$ ,  $S[i]$  denotes the  $i$ -th character of string  $S$ . For any  $1 \leq i \leq j \leq |S|$ ,  $S[i..j]$  denotes the substring of  $S$  that begins at position  $i$  and ends at position  $j$ . For convenience, let  $T[i..j] = \varepsilon$  for any  $i > j$ . We say that string  $w$  *occurs* in string  $S$  iff  $w$  is a substring of  $S$ . Let  $\text{occ}_S(w) = |\{i \mid w = S[i..i+|w|-1]\}|$  denote the number of occurrences of  $w$  in  $S$ . For convenience, let  $\text{occ}_S(\varepsilon) = |S| + 1$ . For a string  $S$ , let  $S^R = S[|S|] \cdots S[1]$  denote the reversed string of  $S$ .

### 2.2 MAW, MUS, MRW, and EBF

A string  $w$  is said to be an *absent word* for another string  $S$  if  $\text{occ}_S(w) = 0$ . An absent word  $w$  for  $S$  is called a *minimal absent word (MAW)* for  $S$  if  $\text{occ}_S(w[1..|w|-1]) \geq 1$  and  $\text{occ}_S(w[2..|w|]) \geq 1$ . By definition, any character  $c$  not occurring in  $S$  is a MAW for  $S$ . In the rest of this paper, we exclude such trivial MAWs and we focus on non-trivial MAWs of form  $aub$ , where  $a, b \in \Sigma$  and  $u \in \Sigma^*$ . We denote by  $\text{MAW}(S)$  the set of all non-trivial MAWs for  $S$ .

A string  $w$  is called *unique* in another string  $S$  if  $\text{occ}_S(w) = 1$ . A unique substring  $w$  for  $S$  is called a *minimal unique substring (MUS)* for  $S$  if  $\text{occ}_S(w[1..|w|-1]) \geq 2$  and  $\text{occ}_S(w[2..|w|]) \geq 2$ . Let  $\text{MUS}(S)$  denote the set of non-trivial MUSs of form  $aub$  for string  $S$ . Since a unique substring  $w$  of  $S$  has exactly one occurrence in  $S$ , each  $w$  element in  $\text{MUS}(S)$  can be identified with a unique interval  $[i..j]$  such that  $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$  and  $w = S[i..j]$ .

A string  $w$  is called a *minimal rare word MRW* for another string  $S$  if

- (1)  $w = c \in \Sigma$ , or
- (2)  $w = aub$  with  $a, b \in \Sigma$  and  $u \in \Sigma^*$ , such that  $\text{occ}_S(au) > \text{occ}_S(aub)$  and  $\text{occ}_S(ub) > \text{occ}_S(aub)$ .

In particular, an MRW  $w$  for  $S$  is a MAW for  $S$  when  $\text{occ}_S(w) = 0$ . Also, an MRW  $w$  is a MUS for  $S$  when  $\text{occ}_S(w) = 1$ . Let  $\text{MRW}(S)$  denote the set of non-trivial MRWs of type (2) for string  $S$ . Then,  $\text{MAW}(S) \subseteq \text{MRW}(S)$  and  $\text{MUS}(S) \subseteq \text{MRW}(S)$  hold.

A string  $w = aub$  with  $a, b \in \Sigma$  and  $u \in \Sigma^*$  is called an *extended bispecial factor (EBF)* for another string  $S$  if  $\text{occ}_S(a'u) \geq 1$  and  $\text{occ}_S(ub') \geq 1$  for some characters  $a' \neq a$  and  $b' \neq b$ . Let  $\text{EBF}(S)$  denote the set of EBFs for string  $S$ .

### 2.3 Maximal Substrings and Maximal Repeats

A substring  $u$  of a string  $S$  is said to be *left-maximal* in  $S$  if (1) there are distinct characters  $a, b$  such that  $au, bu \in \text{Substr}(S)$ , or (2)  $u \in \text{Prefix}(S)$ . Symmetrically, a substring  $u$  of  $S$  is said to be *right-maximal* in  $S$  iff (1) there are distinct characters  $a, b$  such that  $ua, ub \in \text{Substr}(S)$ , or (2)  $u \in \text{Suffix}(S)$ . A substring  $u$  of  $S$  is said to be *maximal* in  $S$  iff  $u$  is both left-maximal and right-maximal in  $S$ . A maximal substring  $u$  is said to be a *maximal repeat* if  $\text{occ}_S(u) \geq 2$ . Let  $\text{MRep}(S)$  denote the set of maximal repeats in  $S$ . For a maximal repeat  $u$  of a string  $S$ , the characters  $a \in \Sigma$  such that  $\text{occ}_S(au) \geq 1$  are called the *left-extensions* of  $u$ , and the characters  $b \in \Sigma$  such that  $\text{occ}_S(ub) \geq 1$  are called the *right-extensions* of  $u$ .

The following relationship between MAWs and maximal repeats is known:

**Lemma 1** ([4] and Theorem 1 of [22]). *For any MRW  $aub$  for string  $S$  with  $a, b \in \Sigma$  and  $u \in \Sigma^*$ ,  $u$  is a maximal repeat in  $S$ .*

### 2.4 CDAWG

The *compact directed acyclic word graph (CDAWG)* of string  $S$ , that is denoted  $\text{CDAWG}(S) = (\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{E})$ , is a path-compressed smallest partial DFA that represents  $\text{Suffix}(S)$ , such that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the nodes of  $\text{CDAWG}(S)$  and the maximal substrings in  $S$ . Intuitively,  $\text{CDAWG}(S)$  can be obtained by merging isomorphic subtrees of the suffix tree [26] for  $S$ . Therefore, each string represented by a node  $u$  of  $\text{CDAWG}(S)$  is a suffix of all the other longer strings represented by the same node  $u$ . For convenience, for any CDAWG node  $u \in \mathbf{V}$ , let  $\text{str}(u)$  denote the *longest* string represented by the node  $u$ . The *suffix link* of a CDAWG node  $u$  points to another CDAWG node  $v$  iff  $\text{str}(v)$  is the longest proper suffix of  $\text{str}(u)$  that is not represented by  $u$ . We denote it by  $\text{slink}(u) = v$ . See Fig. 1 for an example of  $\text{CDAWG}(S)$ .

We remark that every internal node in  $\text{CDAWG}(S)$  corresponds to a maximal repeat in  $S$ , that is,  $\text{MRep}(S) = \{\text{str}(v) \mid v \text{ is an internal node of } \text{CDAWG}(S)\}$ . The first characters of the labels of the out-going edges of an internal node of  $\text{CDAWG}(S)$  are the right-extensions of the corresponding maximal substring for that node. Hence the number of edges in  $\text{CDAWG}(S)$  is equal to the total number of right-extensions of maximal repeats in  $\text{MRep}(S)$ , which is denoted by  $\text{er}(S)$ . Similarly, we denote by  $\text{el}(S)$  the number of left-extensions of the maximal repeats in  $\text{MRep}(S)$ . Blumer et




Figure 1:  $\text{CDAWG}(S)$  for string  $S = \text{ababcbababcbcb}\$$ .

al. [10] showed that  $\min\{\text{er}(S), \text{el}(S)\} < 2n$  for any string  $S$  of length  $n$ . On the other hand, it is known that there is an  $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$  gap between  $\text{er}(S)$  and  $\text{el}(S)$ :

**Lemma 2** (Lemma 9 of [18]). *There exists a family of strings  $S$  of length  $n$  such that  $\text{er}(S) = \Theta(\sqrt{n})$  and  $\text{el}(S) = \Theta(n)$ .*

The length of an edge  $(u, y, v) \in \mathbf{V} \times \Sigma^+ \times \mathbf{V}$  in  $\text{CDAWG}(S)$  is its string label length  $|y|$ . An edge  $(u, y, v)$  is called a *primary edge* if  $|\text{str}(u)| + |y| = |\text{str}(v)|$ , and  $(u, y, v)$  is called a *secondary edge* otherwise ( $|\text{str}(u)| + |y| < |\text{str}(v)|$ ). Namely, the primary edges are the edges in the *longest* paths from the source to all the nodes of  $\text{CDAWG}(S)$ . Thus, there are exactly  $|\mathbf{V}| - 1$  primary edges. Let  $\text{LPT}(S)$  denote the spanning tree of  $\text{CDAWG}(S)$  that consists of the primary edges, i.e.,  $\text{LPT}(S)$  is the tree of the longest paths from the source to all nodes of  $\text{CDAWG}(S)$ .

Since  $\text{MRep}(S^R) = \{w^R \mid w \in \text{MRep}(S)\}$  holds for any string  $S$ , the CDAWGs for  $S$  and  $S^R$  can share the same nodes. Let  $\mathbf{E}^R$  denote the set of edges of  $\text{CDAWG}(S^R)$ . The primary (resp. secondary) edges in  $\mathbf{E}^R$  are also called *hard* (resp. *soft*) *Weiner links* of  $\text{CDAWG}(S)$ . Each Weiner link is labeled by the first character of the label of the corresponding edge in  $\mathbf{E}^R$ . Note that  $|\mathbf{E}^R| = \text{el}(S)$ .

### 3 CDAWG Grammars

A *grammar-compression* is a method that represents an input string  $S$  with a context-free grammar  $\mathcal{G}$  that only generates  $S$ . The size of  $\mathcal{G}$  is evaluated by the total length of the right-hand sides of the productions, which is equal to the size of the minimal DAG obtained by merging isomorphic subtrees of the derivation tree for  $\mathcal{G}$ . Hence the more repeats  $S$  has, the smaller grammar  $S$  tends to have.

Assume that  $S$  terminates with a unique character  $\$$  not occurring elsewhere in  $S$ . Belazzougui and Cunial [5] proposed a grammar-compression based on the CDAWGs. We use a slightly modified version of their grammar: The *CDAWG-grammar* for string  $S$  of length  $n$ , denoted  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{CDAWG}}$ , is such that:

- The non-terminals are the nodes in  $\text{CDAWG}(S)$ ;
- The root of the derivation tree for  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{CDAWG}}$  is the sink of  $\text{CDAWG}(S)$ ;




Figure 2: CDAWG( $S$ ) (left) and the CDAWG-grammar  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{CDAWG}}$  (right) for the running example from Fig. 1. The dashed arcs represent the suffix links of the nodes of CDAWG( $S$ ). To obtain  $\text{str}(X_3) = \text{ababc}b$  for the CDAWG node  $X_3$ , we first decompress the non-terminal  $X_3$  and obtain  $\text{ababc}$ . We move to the node  $X_2$  by following the suffix link of  $X_3$ . We then decompress the non-terminal  $X_2$  and obtain the remaining  $b$ .

- The derivation tree path from its root to its leaf representing the  $i$ -th character  $S[i]$  is equal to the reversed path from the sink to the source of CDAWG( $S$ ) that spells out the  $i$ -th (text positioned) suffix  $S[i..n]$ .

By definition, the DAG for the CDAWG-grammar  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{CDAWG}}$  is isomorphic to the reversed DAG for CDAWG( $S$ ), and hence, the size for  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{CDAWG}}$  is  $\text{er}(S)$ . See Fig. 2 for an example.

Belazzougui and Cunial [5] showed how to extract the string label  $x$  of a given CDAWG edge in  $O(|x|)$  time in a sequential manner (i.e. from  $x[1]$  to  $x[|x|]$ ), by augmenting the CDAWG-grammar with a level-ancestor data structure [8, 7] that works on the word RAM. This allows one to represent CDAWG( $S$ ) in  $O(\text{er}(S))$  space and perform pattern matching queries in optimal time, without explicitly storing string  $S$ . They also used this technique to output a MAW  $aub$  as a string: Since  $u$  is a maximal repeat, it suffices to decompress the path labels in  $\text{LPT}(S)$  from the source to the node  $v$  that corresponds to  $u$  (i.e.  $\text{str}(v) = u$ ).

We show that, when our goal is simply to obtain the longest string  $\text{str}(v)$  for a given CDAWG node  $v$ , then level-ancestor data structures are not needed.

**Lemma 3.** *Given CDAWG( $S$ ) = ( $V, E$ ) with suffix links and grammar  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{CDAWG}}$  of total size  $O(\text{er}(T))$ , one can decompress the longest string  $\text{str}(v)$  represented by a given node  $v$  in  $O(|\text{str}(v)|)$  time.*

*Proof.* For each CDAWG node  $v \in V$ , let  $X(v)$  denote the non-terminal in the grammar  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{CDAWG}}$  that corresponds to  $v$ . We first decompress  $X(v)$  and let  $p_v$  be the decompressed string. Then, the length of  $p_v$  is equal to the number of (reversed) paths between the source and  $v$  in the CDAWG. Thus, if the suffix link  $\text{slink}(v)$  points to the source, then  $p_v$  is the whole string  $\text{str}(v)$ . Otherwise, then let  $v_0 = v$ . We take the suffix link  $\text{slink}(v_0) = v_1$ , obtain string  $p_{v_1}$  by decompressing  $X(v_1)$ . This gives us a longer prefix  $p_{v_0}p_{v_1}$  of  $\text{str}(v)$ , since in any interval  $[i..i + |\text{str}(v)| - 1]$  of leaves of the derivation tree for  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{CDAWG}}$  that represents  $\text{str}(v)$ ,  $p_{v_1}$  immediately follows  $p_{v_0}$ . We continue this process until we encounter the last node  $v_k$  in the suffix link chain from  $v$ , of which the suffix link points to the source. Then, the concatenated string  $p_{v_0}p_{v_1} \cdots p_{v_k}$  is  $\text{str}(v)$ .

When there are no unary productions of form  $X \rightarrow Y$ , then the total number of nodes visited for obtaining  $p_{v_0}p_{v_1} \cdots p_{v_k} = \text{str}(v)$  is linear in its length. Otherwise, then for each maximal sequence of unary productions  $X_1 \rightarrow X_2 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow X_\ell \rightarrow Y$ , we create a pointer from  $X_i$  to  $Y$  for every  $1 \leq i \leq \ell$  so that we can extract  $\text{str}(v)$  in time linear in its length<sup>1</sup>.  $\square$

## 4 Computing MAWs and EBFs with CDAWG

### 4.1 Computing MAWs

In this section, we first show the following:

**Theorem 1.** *There exists a data structure of  $O(\mathbf{e}_{\min})$  space that can output all MAWs for string  $S$  in  $O(|\text{MAW}(S)|)$  time with  $O(1)$  working space, where  $\mathbf{e}_{\min} = \min\{\text{er}(S), \text{el}(S)\}$ .*

For ease of description of our algorithm, let us assume that our input string  $S$  begins and ends with unique terminal symbols  $\#$  and  $\$$  not occurring inside  $S$ , respectively. We also assume  $\#, \$ \in \Sigma$  so that they can be the first or the last characters for MAWs and EBFs for  $S$ , respectively. The case without  $\#$  and  $\$$  can be treated similarly.

We remark that MAWs have symmetric structures such that  $aub \in \text{MAW}(S)$  iff  $bu^R a \in \text{MAW}(S^R)$ . This implies that one can work with the smaller one of the two:  $\text{CDAWG}(S)$  of  $O(\text{er}(S))$  space and  $\text{CDAWG}(S^R)$  of  $O(\text{el}(S))$  space. In what follows, we assume w.l.o.g. that  $\mathbf{e}_{\min} = \text{er}(S)$ , unless otherwise stated.

On top of the edge-sorted  $\text{CDAWG}(S)$  augmented with suffix links and the  $\text{CDAWG}$ -grammar  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{CDAWG}}$  for  $S$ , we use the extended version of  $\text{LPT}(S)$  proposed in [18], that is denoted  $\text{LPT}^+(S)$ . Let  $v$  be any node in the longest path tree  $\text{LPT}(S)$ , and suppose that its corresponding node in  $\text{CDAWG}(S)$  has a secondary out-going edge  $(v, u)$ . Then, we create a copy  $\ell$  of  $u$  as a leaf, and add a new edge  $(v, \ell)$  to the tree.  $\text{LPT}^+(S)$  is the tree obtained by adding all secondary edges of  $\text{CDAWG}(S)$  to  $\text{LPT}(S)$  in this way, and thus,  $\text{LPT}^+(S)$  has exactly  $\text{er}(S)$  edges. For any node  $v$  in  $\text{LPT}^+(S)$ , let  $\text{str}(v)$  denote the string label in the path from the root to  $v$ .

Let  $u$  be any node in  $\text{CDAWG}(S)$  and suppose it has  $k$  in-coming edges. The above process of adding secondary edges to  $\text{LPT}(S)$  can be regarded as splitting  $u$  into  $k + 1$  nodes  $u', \ell_1, \dots, \ell_k$ , such that  $|\text{str}(u')| < |\text{str}(\ell_1)| < \cdots < |\text{str}(\ell_k)|$ . We define the suffix links of these nodes such that  $\text{slink}(u') = \ell_1$ ,  $\text{slink}(\ell_{i-1}) = \ell_i$  for  $1 \leq i < k$ , and  $\text{slink}(\ell_k) = v'$  such that  $v'$  is the node in  $\text{LPT}^+(S)$  that corresponds to the destination node  $v = \text{slink}(u)$  of the suffix link of  $u$  in  $\text{CDAWG}(S)$ . We call these copied nodes  $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_k$  as *gray nodes*, and the other node  $u'$  as a *white node*. For convenience, we assume that the source is a white node. See Fig. 3 for illustration.

In what follows, we show how to compute MAWs for a given edge  $(\hat{v}, \hat{u})$  in  $\text{LPT}^+(S)$ . Note that  $\hat{v}$  is always a white node since every gray node has no children. Let  $X$  be the string label of  $(\hat{v}, \hat{u})$ . Let  $v$  be the *first* white node in the chain of suffix links from  $\hat{v}$  and let  $u$  be the descendant of  $v$  in  $\text{LPT}^+(S)$  such that the path from  $v$  to  $u$  spells out  $X$ . We maintain a *fast link* from the edge  $(\hat{v}, \hat{u})$  to the path  $\langle v, u \rangle$  so we can access from  $(\hat{v}, \hat{u})$  to the terminal nodes  $v$  and  $u$  in the path in  $O(1)$  time. We have the four following cases (See also Fig. 4):

- (A)  $\hat{u}$  and  $u$  are both white nodes;
- (B)  $\hat{u}$  is a white node and  $u$  is a gray node;
- (C)  $\hat{u}$  is a gray node and  $u$  is a white node;

<sup>1</sup>A similar technique was used in the original  $\text{CDAWG}$ -grammar by Belazzougui and Cunial [5], where they explicitly removed such unary productions.




Figure 3:  $LPT^+(S)$  for the running example from Fig. 1 and 2. The double-lined arcs represent primary edges, and the single-lined arcs represent secondary edges. For edge  $(\hat{v}, \hat{u})$  with string label  $c\$$ , consider the path  $\langle v, u_1 \rangle$  that spells out  $c\$$  and is obtained by the fast link. The CDAWG node that corresponds to  $u_2 = bc$  has a virtual soft Weiner link with label  $c$  pointing to the CDAWG node that corresponds to  $\hat{u}$ . Node  $u_2$  has an out-edge with  $b$ . Therefore,  $cu_2b = cbcb$  is a MAW for the string  $S = ababcbababcbcb\$$ .

(D)  $\hat{u}$  and  $u$  are both gray nodes.

**How to deal with Case (A):** In Case (A),  $u = \text{slink}(\hat{u})$ .

Let  $m$  be the number of nodes in the path from  $v$  to  $u$ , with  $v$  exclusive. In the sequel, we consider the case where  $m > 1$ , as the case with  $m = 1$  is simpler to show. Let  $u_1 (= u), u_2, \dots, u_m$  denote these  $m$  nodes in the path arranged in decreasing order of their depths. We process each  $u_i$  in increasing order of  $i$ . For simplicity, we will identify each node  $u_i$  as the string  $\text{str}(u_i)$  represented by  $u_i$ .

For  $i = 1$ , node  $u_1 (= u)$  has a hard Weiner link to  $\hat{u}$ . Let  $a$  be the character label of this hard Weiner link. Let  $\text{child}(\hat{u})$  and  $\text{child}(\text{slink}(u)) = \text{child}(u_1)$  be the sorted lists of the first characters of the out-edge labels from  $\hat{u}$  and from  $u_1$ . Note that  $\text{child}(\hat{u}) \subseteq \text{child}(u_1)$ . Then, it follows from the definition of MAWs and Lemma 2 that  $au_1b \in \text{MAW}(S)$  iff  $b \in \text{child}(u_1) \setminus \text{child}(\hat{u})$ .

For each  $i = 2, \dots, m$ , observe that node  $u_i$  has a (virtual) *soft* Weiner link with the same character label  $a$ , and leading to the same node  $\hat{u}$ . We emphasize that this soft Weiner link only virtual and is *not* stored in our  $O(\text{er}(S))$ -space data structure. We have the following lemma:

**Lemma 4.** *For each internal node  $u_i$  with  $2 \leq i \leq m$  in the path between  $v$  and  $u$ , there exists at least one MAW  $au_i b$  for  $S$ , where  $a, b \in \Sigma$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $c$  be the first character of the label of the edge  $(u_{i+1}, u_i)$ . Let  $\hat{u}_i$  denote the (virtual) implicit node on the edge  $(v, u)$ , such that  $\text{slink}(\hat{u}_i) = u_i$ . Note that  $c$  is the unique character that immediately follows the locus of  $\hat{u}_i$  in the string label of edge  $(v, u)$ . Since  $u_i$  is branching but  $\hat{u}_i$  is non-branching, the set  $\text{child}(u_i) \setminus \text{child}(\hat{u}_i) = \text{child}(u_i) \setminus \{c\}$  is not empty. Thus, for any character  $b \in \text{child}(u_i) \setminus \{c\}$ , we have  $au_i b \in \text{MAW}(S)$ .  $\square$

Due to Lemma 4, we output MAWs  $au_i b$  for every character  $b \in \text{child}(u_i) \setminus \{c\}$ .

**How to deal with Case (B):** In Case (B),  $u$  is a gray node, and there might be other node(s) in the suffix link chain from  $\hat{u}$  to  $u$ . No MAW is reported for the gray node  $u_1 (= u)$ . The rest is the




Figure 4: Cases (A), (B), (C), and (D) for computing MAWs from a given edge  $(\hat{v}, \hat{u})$  on  $\text{LPT}^+(S)$ . The bold arc represents the fast link from edge  $(\hat{v}, \hat{u})$  to path  $\langle v, u \rangle$ , where  $u = u_1$ . The dashed arcs represent suffix links. The dotted arcs in Cases (C) and (D) are additional pointers for  $O(1)$ -time access from  $\hat{u}$  to  $\tilde{u}$ .

same as Case (A).

**How to deal with Cases (C) and (D):** In Cases (C) and (D) where node  $\hat{u}$  is a gray node, we use the white node  $\tilde{u}$ , which corresponds to the CDAWG node from which  $\hat{u}$  is copied. We output MAW(s) by comparing out-edges of  $\tilde{u}$  and  $u_1$ . We store a pointer from  $\hat{u}$  to  $\tilde{u}$ , so that we can access  $\tilde{u}$  from  $\hat{u}$  in  $O(1)$  time (see also Fig. 4). The rest is the same as Cases (B) and (A).

#### 4.1.1 Putting all together.

By performing the above procedure for all edges  $(v, u)$  in  $\text{LPT}^+(S)$ , we can output all elements in  $\text{MAW}(S)$ .

Let us analyze the time complexity and the data structure space usage. In the case with  $i \geq 2$ , by Lemma 4, accessing each node  $u_i$  can be charged to any one of the MAWs reported with  $u_i$ . The time required for  $u_i$  is thus linear in the number of reported MAWs  $au_i b$ . In the case with  $i = 1$ , we compare the sorted lists  $\text{child}(\hat{u})$  and  $\text{child}(u_1)$ . Each successful character comparison with a character  $b \in \text{child}(u_1) \setminus \text{child}(\hat{u})$  for which MAW  $au_1 b$  is reported. On the other hand, each unsuccessful character comparison with a character  $b \in \text{child}(u_1) \cap \text{child}(\hat{u})$  can be charged to the corresponding out-edge of  $\hat{u}$  whose string label begins with  $b$ . Thus, we can output all MAWs in  $O(\text{er}(S) + |\text{MAW}(S)|)$  time. Further, when  $|\text{MAW}(S)| \leq \text{er}(S)$ , then we can store the set  $\text{MAW}(S)$  with  $O(|\text{MAW}(S)|) \subseteq O(\text{er}(S))$  space and output each MAW in  $O(1)$  time, using Lemma 3. This leads to our  $O(|\text{MAW}(S)|)$ -time  $O(\text{er}(S))$ -space data structure.

To analyze the working memory usage, let us consider the number of pointers. For each given edge  $(\hat{v}, \hat{u})$ , we climb up the path from  $\text{slink}(\hat{u}) = u_1$  to  $u_m$  one by one, until reaching  $\text{slink}(\hat{v}) = v$ , which requires  $O(1)$  pointers. We also use  $O(1)$  additional pointers for the character comparisons on the sorted lists of each pair of nodes. Thus the total working space is  $O(1)$ . We have proven Theorem 1.

#### 4.1.2 Combinatorics on MAWs with CDAWG.

Theorem 1 also leads to the following combinatorial property of MAWs:



**Theorem 2.** For any string  $S$ ,  $|\text{MAW}(S)| = O(\sigma \mathbf{e}_{\min})$ . This bound is tight.

*Proof.* For each node  $u_i$  of  $\text{LPT}^+(S)$ , the number of distinct characters  $a$  such that  $au_ib \in \text{MAW}(S)$  is at most the number of (hard or soft) Weiner links from  $u_i$ , which is bounded by  $\sigma$ . The number of distinct characters  $b$  such that  $au_ib \in \text{MAW}(S)$  does not exceed the number of out-edges from  $u_i$ . By summing them up for all nodes  $u_i$  of  $\text{LPT}^+(S)$ , we obtain  $|\text{MAW}(S)| = O(\sigma \cdot \text{er}(S))$ . Since the same argument holds for the reversed string  $S^R$  and  $\text{LPT}^+(S^R)$ , we have  $|\text{MAW}(S)| = O(\sigma \cdot \min\{\text{er}(S), \text{el}(S)\}) = O(\sigma \mathbf{e}_{\min})$ .

It is known [20] that for the de Bruijn sequence  $B_{k,\sigma}$  of order  $k$  over an alphabet of size  $\sigma$ ,  $\text{MAW}(B_{k,\sigma}) = \Omega(\sigma n)$ , where  $n = |B_{k,\sigma}|$ . Since  $\mathbf{e}_{\min} \leq \text{er}(S) < 2n$  for any string  $S$  of length  $n$ , we have  $\Omega(\sigma \mathbf{e}_{\min})$  for  $B_{k,\sigma}$ .  $\square$

## 4.2 Computing EBFs

We first prove the following combinatorial property for EBFs:

**Lemma 5.** For any string  $S$ ,  $|\text{EBF}(S)| \leq \text{er}(S) + \text{el}(S) - |V| + 1$ .

*Proof.* Recall our algorithm for computing  $\text{MAW}(S)$  in Section 4.1. Let  $u_i$  be a node that has (soft or hard) Weiner link with label  $a \in \Sigma$  and has an out-edge starting with  $b \in \Sigma$ . Assuming  $S[1] = \#$  and  $S[|S|] = \$$ , there are characters  $a', b' \in \Sigma$  such that  $a' \neq a$ ,  $b' \neq b$ , and  $a'u_i, u_ib' \in \text{Substr}(S)$ . Note also that  $au_i, u_ib \in \text{Substr}(S)$ . Thus, if  $au_ib \in \text{Substr}(S)$ , then  $au_ib \in \text{EBF}(S)$ . If the locus for  $au_i$  is the node  $\hat{u}$ , in which case the Weiner link from  $u_i (= u_1)$  to  $\hat{u}$  is hard, then the EBF  $au_ib$  is charged to the out-edge of  $\hat{u}$  that starts with  $b$ . If the locus for  $au_i$  is on the edge  $(\hat{v}, \hat{u})$ , then the EBF  $au_ib$  is charged to the soft-Weiner link from  $u_i$  that labeled  $a$ . Since the number of hard Weiner links is  $|V| - 1$ , the number of soft-Weiner links is  $\text{el}(S) - |V| + 1$ . Thus we have  $|\text{EBF}(S)| = \text{er}(S) + \text{el}(S) - |V| + 1$  for any string  $S$  with  $S[1] = \#$  and  $S[|S|] = \$$ .

If  $S[1] \neq \#$  and/or  $S[|S|] \neq \$$ , then some node(s)  $u_i$  in  $\text{CDAWG}(S)$  may only have unique characters  $a, b$  such that  $au_i, u_ib \in \text{Substr}(S)$ . Thus the bound is  $|\text{EBF}(S)| \leq \text{er}(S) + \text{el}(S) - |V| + 1$  for arbitrary strings  $S$ .  $\square$

By modifying our algorithm for computing MAWs for  $S$  as is described in the poof for Lemma 5, we can obtain the following:

**Theorem 3.** There exists a data structure of  $O(\mathbf{e}_{\min})$  space that can output all EBFs for string  $S$  in  $O(|\text{EBF}(S)|)$  time with  $O(1)$  working space.

## 4.3 Computing length-bounded MAWs and EBFs

For any set  $A \subseteq \Sigma^*$  of strings and an integer  $\ell > 1$ , let  $A^{\geq \ell} = \{w \in A \mid |w| \geq \ell\}$  and  $A^{\leq \ell} = \{w \in A \mid |w| \leq \ell\}$ .

**Theorem 4.** There exists a data structure of  $O(\mathbf{e}_{\min})$  space which, given a query length  $\ell$ , can output

- $\text{MAW}(S)^{\geq \ell}$  in  $O(|\text{MAW}(S)^{\geq \ell}| + 1)$  time,
- $\text{MAW}(S)^{\leq \ell}$  in  $O(|\text{MAW}(S)^{\leq \ell}| + 1)$  time,
- $\text{EBF}(S)^{\geq \ell}$  in  $O(|\text{EBF}(S)^{\geq \ell}| + 1)$  time,
- $\text{EBF}(S)^{\leq \ell}$  in  $O(|\text{EBF}(S)^{\leq \ell}| + 1)$  time,

with  $O(1)$  working space.

*Proof.* We only describe how to compute length-bounded MAWs. We can compute length-bounded EBFs similarly.

In our data structure for reporting  $\text{MAW}(S)^{\leq \ell}$ , we precompute the largest integer  $m$  with  $|\text{MAW}(S)^{\leq m}| \leq e_{\min}$ , and store the elements in  $\text{MAW}(S)^{\leq m}$  using Lemma 3, sorted in their lengths. Given a query length  $\ell$ , if  $\ell \leq m$ , then we can output the elements of  $\text{MAW}(S)^{\leq \ell}$  by reporting the stored MAWs in increasing order, in  $O(|\text{MAW}(S)^{\leq \ell}| + 1)$  time. Otherwise (if  $\ell > m$ ), then we process each edge  $(\hat{v}, \hat{u})$  in  $\text{LPT}^+(S)$  in increasing order of  $|\text{str}(\hat{u})|$ . We need to access the internal nodes in the path from  $\text{slink}(\hat{v})$  to  $\text{slink}(\hat{u})$  topdown, in  $O(1)$  time each. This can be done in  $O(1)$  time per node by augmenting  $\text{LPT}^+(S)$  with the level-ancestor (LA) data structure [8, 6]. We stop processing the edge  $(\hat{v}, \hat{u})$  as soon as we find the shallowest ancestor  $u_i$  of  $u = \text{slink}(\hat{u})$  such that  $|\text{str}(u_i)| > \ell - 2$ . Since  $|\text{MAW}(S)^{\leq \ell}| > e_{\min}$  for any  $\ell < m$ , this algorithm outputs  $\text{MAW}(S)^{\leq \ell}$  in  $O(|\text{MAW}(S)^{\leq \ell}| + 1)$  time.

Computing  $\text{MAW}(S)^{\geq \ell}$  is symmetric, except that the LA data structure is not needed: We can check the nodes between  $\text{slink}(\hat{u})$  and  $\text{slink}(\hat{v})$  in decreasing order of their lengths, in  $O(1)$  time each, by simply climbing up the path.  $\square$

Theorem 4 is an improvement and a generalization over the previous work [11] that gave an  $O(\ell n)$ -space data structure that reports  $\text{MAW}(S)^{\leq \ell}$  in  $O(\sigma n)$  time.

## 5 Computing MRWs

Let  $\text{MRW}_k(S) = \{w \in \text{MRW}(S) \mid \text{occ}_S(w) = k\}$ . Then  $\text{MRW}_0(S) = \text{MAW}(S)$  and  $\bigcup_{k \geq 0} \text{MRW}_k(S) = \text{MRW}(S)$  hold. We show the following lemma. Recall that any string in  $\text{MAW}(S)$  or  $\text{EBF}(S)$  is of length at least 2.

**Lemma 6.** *For any string  $S$  with  $S[1] = \#$  and  $S[|S|] = \$$ ,  $\text{MRW}(S) \setminus \text{EBF}(S) = \text{MAW}(S)$ . In other words,  $\text{MRW}(S) \cap \text{EBF}(S) = \bigcup_{k \geq 1} \text{MRW}_k(S)$ .*

*Proof.* Clearly,  $\text{MAW}(S) \cap \text{EBF}(S) = \emptyset$ . It suffices to show that  $\bigcup_{k \geq 1} \text{MRW}_k(S) \subseteq \text{EBF}(S)$ . Let  $aub$  be an element in  $\text{MRW}_k(S)$  for some  $k \geq 1$  where  $a, b \in \Sigma$  and  $u \in \Sigma^*$ . Since  $aub$  is a minimal rare word occurring  $k$  times in  $S$ ,  $\text{occ}_S(au) \geq k + 1$  and  $\text{occ}_S(ub) \geq k + 1$ . Also, since  $k + 1 \geq 2$ , the last character of  $au$  is not equal to  $\$$ , which is a unique character. Similarly, the first character of  $ub$  is not equal to  $\#$ . Thus, any occurrence of  $au$  (resp.,  $ub$ ) in  $S$  is not a suffix (resp., prefix) of  $S$ . Hence, there must be characters  $b' \neq b$  and  $a' \neq a$  such that  $aub', a'ub \in \text{Substr}(S)$ . Therefore,  $aub$  is an extended bispecial factor.  $\square$

Next, we estimate the number of minimal rare words occurring in  $S$ .

**Lemma 7.**  $|\bigcup_{k \geq 1} \text{MRW}_k(S)| \leq e_{\min}$ .

*Proof.* For any  $w \in \bigcup_{k \geq 1} \text{MRW}_k(S)$ , the locus of  $w$  is the position on some edge  $(v_1, v_2)$  exactly one character down from  $v_1$  since  $\text{occ}_S(w[1..|w| - 1]) > \text{occ}_S(w)$ . For the sake of contradiction, we assume that the locus of  $w_1 = a_1u_1b \in \bigcup_{k \geq 1} \text{MRW}_k(S)$  is the same as that of another  $w_2 = a_2u_2b \in \bigcup_{k \geq 1} \text{MRW}_k(S)$  where  $a_1, a_2, b \in \Sigma$  and  $u_1, u_2 \in \Sigma^*$ . We further assume  $|w_1| \leq |w_2|$  w.l.o.g. Since  $a_1u_1$  and  $a_2u_2$  reach the same CDAWG node,  $a_1u_1$  is a suffix of  $a_2u_2$ . Since  $w_1 \neq w_2$ ,  $|w_1| < |w_2|$  holds, and thus,  $w_1$  is a proper suffix of  $w_2$ . This contradicts the minimality of  $\text{MRW}$   $w_2$ . Hence, the number of  $\text{MRW}$ s in  $\bigcup_{k \geq 1} \text{MRW}_k(S)$  is never larger than  $|E|$ . The above argument holds even if the reversal of  $S$  is considered. Therefore, the upper bound is  $\min\{|E|, |E^R|\} = e_{\min}$ .  $\square$

The proof of Lemma 7 implies that if the locus of an MRW  $aub$  is on an edge  $(v_1, v_2)$ , then  $au$  is the *shortest* string represented by the node  $v_1$ . Namely,  $\text{slink}(v_1) = u$ . From this fact, we can represent each MRW  $aub$  as its corresponding edge  $(v_1, v_2)$  where the character label of the hard Weiner link from  $\text{slink}(v_1)$  to  $v_1$  is  $a$ , the longest string represented by  $\text{slink}(v_1)$  is  $u$ , and the first character of the edge label of  $(v_1, v_2)$  is  $b$ . Also, by Lemma 3, we can restore the MRW  $aub$  from  $(v_1, v_2)$  in time linear in its length. Thus, the following lemma holds.

**Lemma 8.** *There exists a data structure of  $O(\mathbf{e}_{\min})$  space that can output all MRWs occurring in  $S$  in  $O(|\bigcup_{k \geq 1} \text{MRW}_k(S)|)$  time with  $O(1)$  working space.*

If  $k$  is fixed in advance, we can store  $\text{MRW}_k(S)$  in  $O(\mathbf{e}_{\min})$  space and can output them in  $O(|\text{MRW}_k(S)|)$  time. We obtain the next corollary by fixing  $k = 1$ .

**Corollary 1.** *There exists a data structure of  $O(\mathbf{e}_{\min})$  space that can output all MUSs for string  $S$  in  $O(|\text{MUS}(S)|)$  time with  $O(1)$  working space.*

## 6 Conclusions and Future Work

In this paper, we proposed space-efficient  $O(\mathbf{e}_{\min})$ -size data structures that can output MAWs, EBFs, and MRWs for an input string  $S$  of length  $n$  in time linear in the output size, where  $\mathbf{e}_{\min}$  denotes the minimum of the left-extensions and the right-extensions of the maximal repeats in  $S$ . The key tools of our method are the  $O(\mathbf{e}_{\min})$ -size grammar-representation of the CDAWG, and the extended longest path tree of size  $O(\mathbf{e}_{\min})$ .

Our future work includes the following: Is it possible to extend our method for reporting length-bounded MAWs/EBFs of Section 4.3 to the problem of reporting MAWs/EBFs of length *exactly*  $\ell$  for a query length  $\ell > 1$ ? This would be a space-improvement of the previous work [13]. Okabe et al. [21] proposed a (non-compacted) DAWG-based data structure that can report the symmetric difference of the sets of MAWs for multiple strings, using  $O(n)$  space and time linear in the output size, where  $n$  is the total length of the strings. Can our CDAWG-based data structure be extended to this problem?

## References

- [1] Yannis Almirantis, Panagiotis Charalampopoulos, Jia Gao, Costas S. Iliopoulos, Manal Mohamed, Solon P. Pissis, and Dimitris Polychronopoulos. On avoided words, absent words, and their application to biological sequence analysis. *Algorithms for Molecular Biology*, 12(1):5, 2017.
- [2] Yannis Almirantis, Panagiotis Charalampopoulos, Jia Gao, Costas S. Iliopoulos, Manal Mohamed, Solon P. Pissis, and Dimitris Polychronopoulos. On overabundant words and their application to biological sequence analysis. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 792:85–95, 2019.
- [3] Lorraine A. K. Ayad, Golnaz Badkobeh, Gabriele Fici, Alice Héliou, and Solon P. Pissis. Constructing antidictionaries of long texts in output-sensitive space. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 65(5):777–797, 2021.
- [4] Djamal Belazzougui and Fabio Cunial. Space-efficient detection of unusual words. In *SPIRE 2015*, volume 9309 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 222–233, 2015.

- [5] Djamel Belazzougui and Fabio Cunial. Fast label extraction in the CDAWG. In *SPIRE 2017*, pages 161–175, 2017.
- [6] Michael A. Bender and Martin Farach-Colton. The LCA problem revisited. In *LATIN 2000*, volume 1776, pages 88–94, 2000.
- [7] Michael A. Bender and Martin Farach-Colton. The level ancestor problem simplified. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 321(1):5–12, 2004.
- [8] Omer Berkman and Uzi Vishkin. Finding level-ancestors in trees. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 48(2):214–230, 1994.
- [9] Anselm Blumer, J. Blumer, David Haussler, Andrzej Ehrenfeucht, M.T. Chen, and Joel Seiferas. The smallest automation recognizing the subwords of a text. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 40:31–55, 1985.
- [10] Anselm Blumer, J. Blumer, David Haussler, Ross McConnell, and Andrzej Ehrenfeucht. Complete inverted files for efficient text retrieval and analysis. *Journal of the ACM*, 34(3):578–595, 1987.
- [11] Supaporn Chairungsee and Maxime Crochemore. Using minimal absent words to build phylogeny. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 450:109 – 116, 2012.
- [12] Panagiotis Charalampopoulos, Maxime Crochemore, Gabriele Fici, Robert Mercas, and Solon P. Pissis. Alignment-free sequence comparison using absent words. *Inf. Comput.*, 262:57–68, 2018.
- [13] Panagiotis Charalampopoulos, Maxime Crochemore, and Solon P. Pissis. On extended special factors of a word. In *SPIRE 2018*, volume 11147 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 131–138. Springer, 2018.
- [14] M. Crochemore, F. Mignosi, A. Restivo, and S. Salemi. Data compression using antidictionaries. *Proc. IEEE*, 88(11):1756–1768, 2000.
- [15] Maxime Crochemore and Gonzalo Navarro. Improved antidictionary based compression. In *12th International Conference of the Chilean Computer Science Society, 2002. Proceedings.*, pages 7–13. IEEE, 2002.
- [16] Yuta Fujishige, Yuki Tsujimaru, Shunsuke Inenaga, Hideo Bannai, and Masayuki Takeda. Linear-time computation of DAWGs, symmetric indexing structures, and MAWs for integer alphabets. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 973:114093, 2023.
- [17] Lucian Ilie and William F Smyth. Minimum unique substrings and maximum repeats. *Fundamenta Informaticae*, 110(1-4):183–195, 2011.
- [18] Shunsuke Inenaga. Linear-size suffix tries and linear-size CDAWGs simplified and improved. *CoRR*, abs/2401.04509, 2024.
- [19] Grigorios Koulouras and Martin C Frith. Significant non-existence of sequences in genomes and proteomes. *Nucleic acids research*, 49(6):3139–3155, 2021.
- [20] Filippo Mignosi, Antonio Restivo, and Marinella Sciortino. Words and forbidden factors. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 273(1-2):99–117, 2002.

- [21] Kouta Okabe, Takuya Mieno, Yuto Nakashima, Shunsuke Inenaga, and Hideo Bannai. Linear-time computation of generalized minimal absent words for multiple strings. In *SPIRE 2023*, volume 14240 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 331–344, 2023.
- [22] Armando J. Pinho, Paulo Jorge S. G. Ferreira, Sara P. Garcia, and João M. O. S. Rodrigues. On finding minimal absent words. *BMC Bioinform.*, 10, 2009.
- [23] Diogo Pratas and Jorge M Silva. Persistent minimal sequences of SARS-CoV-2. *Bioinformatics*, 36(21):5129–5132, 2020.
- [24] Jakub Radoszewski and Wojciech Rytter. On the structure of compacted subword graphs of Thue-Morse words and their applications. *J. Discrete Algorithms*, 11:15–24, 2012.
- [25] Wojciech Rytter. The structure of subword graphs and suffix trees of Fibonacci words. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 363(2):211–223, 2006.
- [26] Peter Weiner. Linear pattern matching algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 14th Annual Symposium on Switching and Automata Theory*, pages 1–11. IEEE, 1973.