

Computing Longest Common Subsequence under Cartesian-Tree Matching Model

Taketo Tsujimoto¹, Hiroki Shibata², Takuya Mieno³, Yuto Nakashima⁴, and
Shunsuke Inenaga⁴

¹Department of Information Science and Technology, Kyushu University
tsujimoto.taketo.852@s.kyushu-u.ac.jp

²College of Information Science, University of Tsukuba
s2213586@s.tsukuba.ac.jp

³Department of Computer and Network Engineering, University of
Electro-Communications
tmieno@uec.ac.jp

⁴Department of Informatics, Kyushu University
{nakashima.yuto.003, inenaga.shunsuke.380}@m.kyushu-u.ac.jp

Abstract

Two strings of the same length are said to *Cartesian-tree match* (*CT-match*) if their Cartesian-trees are isomorphic [Park et al., TCS 2020]. Cartesian-tree matching is a natural model that allows for capturing similarities of numerical sequences. Oizumi et al. [CPM 2022] showed that subsequence pattern matching under CT-matching model can be solved in polynomial time. This current article follows and extends this line of research: We present the first polynomial-time algorithm that finds the *longest common subsequence under CT-matching* of two given strings S and T of length n , in $O(n^6)$ time and $O(n^4)$ space for general ordered alphabets. We then show that the problem has a faster solution in the binary case, by presenting an $O(n^2/\log n)$ -time and space algorithm.

1 Introduction

The *longest common subsequence* (*LCS*) is one of the most fundamental models for measuring string similarities. It is well known that (the length of) an LCS of two given strings S and T of length n can be computed in $O(n^2)$ time and space by standard dynamic programming, or in $O(n^2/\log n)$ time and space [13] by the so-called “Four-Russians” method in the word RAM [3]. These quadratic and weakly sub-quadratic bounds are believed to be essentially optimal, since a strongly sub-quadratic $O(n^{2-\epsilon})$ -time solution to LCS with any constant $\epsilon > 0$ refutes the famous SETH [1, 5]. Indeed, while there are a number of algorithms for computing LCS whose running times are dependent on other parameters (e.g. [10, 14, 2, 17]), their worst-case time complexities remain $\Omega(n^2)$.

The existing string alignments including LCS can be useful for natural language text and biological sequences, however, these methods have limitations in dealing with sequences for which non-exact matching models are more suitable. For instance, in the analysis of numerical sequences such as time series, capturing “structural” similarities is more important than simply comparing them with standard alignments under the exact matching model.

Order-preserving matching (*OP-matching*) is a natural model for dealing with numerical sequences: Two strings A and B of length n are said to be OP-match iff the lexicographical rank of $A[i]$ in A and that of $B[i]$ in B are equal for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. While *substring* matching is

polynomially solvable under OP-matching [11, 12, 6], it is known that subsequence matching is NP-hard under OP-matching [4]. It is immediate from the latter that *order-preserving longest common subsequence* (*OP-LCS*) is also NP-hard.

Cartesian-tree matching (*CT-matching*), first proposed by Park et al. [16], is another model for dealing with numerical sequences: Two strings A and B of length n are said to be CT-match iff the (unlabeled) Cartesian trees [7] of A and B are isomorphic. The CT-matching model is a relaxation of the OP-matching model, i.e., any OP-matching strings also CT-match, but the opposite is not true (for instance, $A = \langle 1, 1, 2 \rangle$ and $B = \langle 1, 1, 1 \rangle$ CT-match, but they do not OP-match). CT-matching has attracted attention in terms of pattern matching [16, 18], string periodicity [16], and indeterminate strings [8]. The recent work by Oizumi et al. [15] has revealed that this relaxation enables us to perform *subsequence* matching under CT-matching in polynomial time: Given a text T of length n and a pattern P of length m , one can find all minimal intervals $[i, j]$ in T such that $T[i..j]$ contains a subsequence Q that CT-matches P in $O(nm \log \log n)$ time and $O(n \log m)$ space.

The aforementioned result poses the natural question - Is the *CT-LCS problem* also polynomial-time solvable? Here, the CT-LCS problem is, given two strings S and T of length n , to compute (the length) of a longest string Q such that both S and T have subsequences that CT-match Q . We answer this question affirmatively, by presenting an algorithm for computing CT-LCS in $O(n^6)$ time and $O(n^4)$ space for general ordered alphabets. We then present an $O(n^2 / \log n)$ -time and space algorithm for computing CT-LCS in the case of binary alphabets. While the $O(n^6)$ -time solution in the general case is based on the idea of *pivoted Cartesian-trees* from Oizumi et al. [15], the $O(n^2 / \log n)$ -time solution for the binary case is built on a completely different approach that exploits interesting properties of CT-matching of binary strings.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Strings

For any positive integer i , we define a set $[i] = \{1, \dots, i\}$ of i integers. Let Σ be an *ordered alphabet* of size σ . For simplicity, let $\Sigma = \{0, \dots, \sigma - 1\}$. An element of Σ is called a *character*. A sequence of characters is called a *string*. The *length* of string S is denoted by $|S|$. The empty string ε is the string of length 0. If $S = XYZ$, then X , Y , and Z are respectively called a *prefix*, *substring*, and *suffix* of S . For a string S , $S[i]$ denotes the i th character of S for each i with $1 \leq i \leq |S|$. For each i, j with $1 \leq i \leq j \leq |S|$, $S[i..j]$ denotes the substring of S that begins at position i and ends at position j . For convenience, let $S[i..j] = \varepsilon$ for $i > j$. We write $\min(S) = \min\{S[i] \mid i \in [n]\}$ for the minimum value contained in the string S . For any $0 \leq m \leq n$, let \mathcal{I}_m^n be the set consisting of all *subscript sequence* $I = (i_1, \dots, i_m) \in [n]^m$ in ascending order satisfying $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_m \leq n$. For subscript sequence $I = (i_1, \dots, i_m) \in \mathcal{I}_m^n$, we denote by $S_I = \langle S[i_1], \dots, S[i_m] \rangle$ the *subsequence* of S corresponding to I . For a subscript sequence I and its elements $i_s, i_t \in I$ with $i_s \leq i_t$, $I[i_s : i_t]$ denotes the substring of I that starts with i_s and ends with i_t .

2.2 Cartesian Tree Matching and CT-LCS

For a string S , let $\min_id(S)$ denote the least index i such that $S[i]$ is the smallest element in S . The *Cartesian tree* of a string S , denoted by $CT(S)$, is the ordered binary tree recursively defined as follows: If $S = \varepsilon$, then $CT(S)$ is an empty tree, and otherwise, $CT(S)$ is the tree rooted at $i = \min_id(S)$ such that the left subtree of i is $CT(S[1..i - 1])$ and the right subtree of i is $CT(S[i + 1..|S|])$. For two strings S and T of equal length, the two Cartesian trees $CT(S)$ and $CT(T)$ are *isomorphic* if they have the same tree topology as ordered trees [9]. We denote it by $CT(S) = CT(T)$. We say that two strings S and T *CT-match* if $CT(S) = CT(T)$.

A string Q is said to be a *CT-subsequence* of a string S if there is a subsequence P of S such that $CT(Q) = CT(P)$. A string Q is said to be a *common CT-subsequence* of two strings S and T if Q is a CT subsequence of both S and T . A string Q is said to be a *longest common CT-*




Figure 1: $Q = \langle 5, 3, 14, 2, 11 \rangle$ is a CT longest common subsequence of $S = \langle 12, 5, 3, 14, 2, 9, 4, 11 \rangle$ and $T = \langle 3, 2, 5, 9, 7, 12, 8, 1 \rangle$. Each node in $\text{CT}(Q)$ is labeled by the corresponding position in Q .

subsequence (CT-LCS) of S and T if there are no common CT-subsequences of S and T longer than Q . We show an example of CT-LCS in Fig. 1. The length of CT-LCS of strings S and T is denoted by $\text{ct_lcs}(S, T)$. We solve the following problem.

Problem 2.1. *Given two strings S and T of length n , compute $\text{ct_lcs}(S, T)$.*

3 Computing CT-LCS for general ordered alphabets

In this section, we propose an algorithm for solving the CT-LCS problem for general ordered alphabets. An $O(n^6)$ -time and $O(n^4)$ -space algorithm, which is our main result will be given in Section 3.2. We start from explaining an $O(n^8)$ -time and $O(n^6)$ -space algorithm for simplicity (Section 3.1).

For each $c \in \Sigma$, let $P_c(S) = \{i \mid S[i] = c\}$ and let S' be the string of length $|S|$ such that $S'[i] = (S[i], r_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq |S|$, where r_i is the rank of i in $P_{S[i]}(S)$. For ordered pairs (c, r) and (c', r') of characters and integers, let $(c, r) < (c', r')$ iff (1) $c < c'$ or (2) $c = c'$ and $r < r'$. Then, it holds that $\text{CT}(S)$ and $\text{CT}(S')$ are isomorphic. Thus, without loss of generality, we can assume that all characters in the string S are distinct. The same assumption applies to the other string T , but S and T may share the same characters.

3.1 $O(n^8)$ -time and $O(n^6)$ -space algorithm

We refer to a pair $(i, j) \in [n]^2$ of positions in S and T as a *pivot*. Our algorithm in the general case is based on the idea of *pivoted Cartesian-trees* from Oizumi et al. [15] defined as follows.

Definition 3.1 (Fixed CT (longest) common subsequence). *Let $(i, j) \in [n]^2$ be a pivot of strings S and T . A string Q is said to be a fixed CT common subsequence (f-CT-CS) of S and T with pivot (i, j) if there exist subscript sequences $I, J \in \mathcal{I}_{|Q|}^n$ such that*

- $\text{CT}(Q) = \text{CT}(S_I) = \text{CT}(T_J)$,
- $S[i] = \min(S_I)$, and
- $T[j] = \min(T_J)$.

Moreover, a string Q is said to be the fixed CT longest common subsequence (f-CT-LCS) of S and T with pivot (i, j) if there are no f-CT-CS with pivot (i, j) longer than Q (see also Fig. 2).

Our solution is a dynamic programming based on the f-CT-LCS. We also consider the f-CT-LCS for substrings of S and T . We will use positions $i, j \in [n]$ of the input strings to indicate a pivot for substrings, namely, we say pivot $(i, j) \in [n]^2$ of substrings $S' = S[\ell_1..r_1]$ and $T' = T[\ell_2..r_2]$ instead of pivot $(i - \ell_1 + 1, j - \ell_2 + 1) \in [r_1 - \ell_1 + 1] \times [r_2 - \ell_2 + 1]$ of S' and T' , where $\ell_1 \leq i \leq r_1$,




Figure 2: $Q = \langle 12, 5, 14, 9 \rangle$ is a fixed CT longest common subsequence of $S = \langle 12, 5, 3, 14, 2, 9, 4, 11 \rangle$ and $T = \langle 3, 2, 5, 9, 7, 12, 8, 1 \rangle$ with pivot $(2, 5)$.

$\ell_2 \leq j \leq r_2$. Let $C(i, j, \ell_1, r_1, \ell_2, r_2)$ be the length of the f-CT-LCS of substrings $S[\ell_1..r_1]$ and $T[\ell_2..r_2]$ with pivot (i, j) . It is clear from the definition that

$$\text{ct_lcs}(S, T) = \max\{C(i, j, 1, n, 1, n) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq n\}$$

holds. The following lemma shows the main idea of computing $C(i, j, 1, n, 1, n)$ by a dynamic programming (see also Fig. 3 for an illustration).

Lemma 3.2. *For any $(i, j, \ell_1, r_1, \ell_2, r_2) \in [n]^6$ that satisfies $\ell_1 \leq i \leq r_1$, $\ell_2 \leq j \leq r_2$, define \mathcal{M}_L and \mathcal{M}_R as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_L &= \{C(i', j', \ell_1, i-1, \ell_2, j-1) \\ &\quad \mid S[i'] > S[i], T[j'] > T[j], \ell_1 \leq i' \leq i-1, \ell_2 \leq j' \leq j-1\} \cup \{0\}, \\ \mathcal{M}_R &= \{C(i', j', i+1, r_1, j+1, r_2) \\ &\quad \mid S[i'] > S[i], T[j'] > T[j], i+1 \leq i' \leq r_1, j+1 \leq j' \leq r_2\} \cup \{0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then the recurrence $C(i, j, \ell_1, r_1, \ell_2, r_2) = \max \mathcal{M}_L + \max \mathcal{M}_R + 1$ holds.

Proof. Let Q be the f-CT-LCS of $S[\ell_1..r_1]$ and $T[\ell_2..r_2]$ with (i, j) . By Definition 3.1, there exist subscript sequences $I = (i_1, \dots, i_{|Q|})$ and $J = (j_1, \dots, j_{|Q|})$ that satisfy $\text{CT}(Q) = \text{CT}(S_I) = \text{CT}(T_J)$. It is also clear from the definition that $S[i] = \min(S_I)$ and $T[j] = \min(T_J)$ hold. Let $q = \min_id(Q)$. We show that $q-1 = \max \mathcal{M}_L$ holds.

- Assume that $q = 1$. In this case, we need to show $\mathcal{M}_L = \{0\}$. Suppose on the contrary that there exists (i', j') such that $S[i'] > S[i]$, $T[j'] > T[j]$, $\ell_1 \leq i' \leq i-1$, and $\ell_2 \leq j' \leq j-1$. Let $I^* = (i', i_1, \dots, i_{|Q|})$, $J^* = (j', j_1, \dots, j_{|Q|})$, and $Q^* = \alpha \cdot Q$ where α is a character in Σ that satisfies $\alpha > Q[q]$. Also, $\text{CT}(Q^*) = \text{CT}(S_{I^*}) = \text{CT}(T_{J^*})$ holds since $\text{CT}(Q) = \text{CT}(S_I) = \text{CT}(T_J)$, $\alpha > Q[q]$, $S[i'] > S[i]$, and $T[j'] > T[j]$ hold. Moreover, Q^* is an f-CT-CS of $S[\ell_1..r_1]$ and $T[\ell_2..r_2]$ with (i, j) , since $S[i] = \min(S_{I^*})$ and $T[j] = \min(T_{J^*})$. This contradicts the fact that Q is the f-CT-LCS of $S[\ell_1..r_1]$ and $T[\ell_2..r_2]$ with (i, j) (from $|Q^*| > |Q|$). Thus, $\mathcal{M}_L = \{0\}$ and $\max \mathcal{M}_L = 0$.
- Assume that $q > 1$. Let p_1 (resp., p_2) be the predecessor of i in I (resp., the predecessor of j in J). By the definition of the Cartesian tree, $\text{CT}(Q[1..q-1]) = \text{CT}(S_{I_{[i_1:p_1]}}) = \text{CT}(T_{J_{[j_1:p_2]}})$ holds, and there exist i^* and j^* such that $S[i^*] = \min(S_{I_{[i_1:p_1]}}) (> S[i])$ and $T[j^*] = \min(T_{J_{[j_1:p_2]}}) (> T[j])$. This implies that $Q[1..q-1]$ is an f-CT-CS of $S[\ell_1..i-1]$ and $T[\ell_2..j-1]$ with (i^*, j^*) . Thus, $|Q[1..q-1]| = q-1 \leq \max \mathcal{M}_L$ holds. In the rest of this case, we show $q-1 \geq \max \mathcal{M}_L$ to prove the equality. Suppose on the contrary that $q-1 < \max \mathcal{M}_L$. Since $0 < q-1 < \max \mathcal{M}_L$ (from assumptions), there exists $(i'', j'') \in [n]^2$ such that $C(i'', j'', \ell_1, i-1, \ell_2, j-1) = \max \mathcal{M}_L$. Let Q'' be an f-CT-LCS string of $S[\ell_1..i-1]$ and $T[\ell_2..j-1]$ with (i'', j'') . Then there exist subscript sequences I'' and J'' over $\{\ell_1, \dots, i-1\}$ and $\{\ell_2, \dots, j-1\}$, respectively, such that $\text{CT}(Q'') = \text{CT}(S_{I''}) = \text{CT}(T_{J''})$. Let \hat{I} denote the subscript sequence that is the concatenation of I'' and $I[i : i_{|Q|}]$, and




Figure 3: Sketch of our recurrence by Lemma 3.2.

\hat{J} denote the subscript sequence that is the concatenation of J'' and $J[j : j_{|Q|}]$. Then $\text{CT}(Q'' \cdot Q[q..|Q|]) = \text{CT}(S_{\hat{J}}) = \text{CT}(T_{\hat{J}})$, $S[i] = \min(S_{\hat{J}})$, and $T[j] = \min(T_{\hat{J}})$ hold. This implies that $Q'' \cdot Q[q..|Q|]$ is an f-CT-LCS of $S[\ell_1..i-1]$ and $T[\ell_2..j-1]$ with (i, j) . However, $|Q'' \cdot Q[q..|Q|]| = |Q''| + |Q[q..|Q|]| = \max \mathcal{M}_L + |Q| - q + 1 > q - 1 + |Q| - q + 1 = |Q|$ holds. This contradicts to the fact that Q is the f-CT-LCS of $S[\ell_1..i-1]$ and $T[\ell_2..j-1]$ with (i, j) . Thus $q - 1 = \max \mathcal{M}_L$ also holds for $q > 1$.

We can also prove $|Q| - q = \max \mathcal{M}_R$ by a symmetric manner. Therefore, $|Q| = q - 1 + |Q| - q + 1 = \max \mathcal{M}_L + \max \mathcal{M}_R + 1$ holds. \square

Then we can obtain an $O(n^8)$ -time and $O(n^6)$ -space algorithm for solving the CT-LCS problem based on Lemma 3.2 (see Algorithm 1). Our algorithm computes a six-dimensional table C for any $(i, j, \ell_1, r_1, \ell_2, r_2) \in [n]^6$ that satisfies $\ell_1 \leq i \leq r_1$, $\ell_2 \leq j \leq r_2$. Notice that the processing order i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n (resp., j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n) w.r.t. index i (resp., j) has to satisfy $S[i_1] > S[i_2] > \dots > S[i_n]$ (resp., $T[j_1] > T[j_2] > \dots > T[j_n]$). The algorithm finally returns $\text{ct_lcs}(S, T) = \max\{C(i, j, 1, n, 1, n) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq n\}$. For each fixed $(i, j, \ell_1, r_1, \ell_2, r_2) \in [n]^6$ (i.e., $O(n^6)$ iterations), we can compute \mathcal{M}_L and \mathcal{M}_R in $O(n^2)$ time. Therefore, we can compute table C in $O(n^8)$ time and $O(n^6)$ space.

Theorem 3.3. *The CT-LCS problem can be solved in $O(n^8)$ time and $O(n^6)$ space.*

3.2 $O(n^6)$ -time $O(n^4)$ -space algorithm

In the sequel, we propose an improved algorithm that is based on the previous algorithm and runs in $O(n^6)$ time and $O(n^4)$ space. The key observation is that \mathcal{M}_L and \mathcal{M}_R actually depend on only four variables. Namely, \mathcal{M}_L depends on (i, j, ℓ_1, ℓ_2) , and \mathcal{M}_R depends on (i, j, r_1, r_2) . Let $L(i, j, \ell_1, \ell_2) = \max \mathcal{M}_L$ and $R(i, j, r_1, r_2) = \max \mathcal{M}_R$. Then we can represent $C(i, j, \ell_1, r_1, \ell_2, r_2)$ as

$$C(i, j, \ell_1, r_1, \ell_2, r_2) = L(i, j, \ell_1, \ell_2) + R(i, j, r_1, r_2) + 1.$$

Based on this recurrence, we can obtain the following alternative lemma.

Lemma 3.4. *For any $(i, j, \ell_1, r_1, \ell_2, r_2) \in [n]^6$ that satisfies $\ell_1 \leq i \leq r_1$, $\ell_2 \leq j \leq r_2$, the following recurrences hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} L(i, j, \ell_1, \ell_2) &= \max\{L(i', j', \ell_1, \ell_2) + R(i', j', i-1, j-1) + 1 \mid S[i'] > S[i], \\ &\quad T[j'] > T[j], \ell_1 \leq i' \leq i-1, \ell_2 \leq j' \leq j-1\} \cup \{0\}, \\ R(i, j, r_1, r_2) &= \max\{L(i', j', i+1, j+1) + R(i', j', r_1, r_2) + 1 \mid S[i'] > S[i], \\ &\quad T[j'] > T[j], i+1 \leq i' \leq r_1, j+1 \leq j' \leq r_2\} \cup \{0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Algorithm 1: Algorithm for solving CT-LCS problem

Input: Strings $S[1..n], T[1..n] \in \Sigma^*$
Output: $\text{ct_lcs}(S, T)$

- 1 Find i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n that satisfy $S[i_1] > S[i_2] > \dots > S[i_n]$;
- 2 Find j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n that satisfy $T[j_1] > T[j_2] > \dots > T[j_n]$;
- 3 $\text{ctlcs} \leftarrow 0$;
- 4 **for** $i \leftarrow i_1$ **to** i_n **do**
- 5 **for** $j \leftarrow j_1$ **to** j_n **do**
- 6 **for** $\ell_1 \leftarrow 1$ **to** i **do**
- 7 **for** $r_1 \leftarrow i$ **to** n **do**
- 8 **for** $\ell_2 \leftarrow 1$ **to** j **do**
- 9 **for** $r_2 \leftarrow j$ **to** n **do**
- 10 $\mathcal{M}_L \leftarrow 0$;
- 11 **if** $\ell_1 \neq i$ **and** $\ell_2 \neq j$ **then**
- 12 **for** $i' \leftarrow \ell_1$ **to** $i - 1$ **do**
- 13 **for** $j' \leftarrow \ell_2$ **to** $j - 1$ **do**
- 14 **if** $S[i'] > S[i]$ **and** $T[j'] > T[j]$ **then**
- 15 $\mathcal{M}_L \leftarrow \max(\mathcal{M}_L, C[i'][j'][\ell_1][i - 1][\ell_2][j - 1])$;
- 16 $\mathcal{M}_R \leftarrow 0$;
- 17 **if** $r_1 \neq i$ **and** $r_2 \neq j$ **then**
- 18 **for** $i' \leftarrow i + 1$ **to** r_1 **do**
- 19 **for** $j' \leftarrow j + 1$ **to** r_2 **do**
- 20 **if** $S[i'] > S[i]$ **and** $T[j'] > T[j]$ **then**
- 21 $\mathcal{M}_R \leftarrow \max(\mathcal{M}_R, C[i'][j'][i + 1][r_1][j + 1][r_2])$;
- 22 $C[i][j][\ell_1][r_1][\ell_2][r_2] \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_L + \mathcal{M}_R + 1$;
- 23 $\text{ctlcs} \leftarrow \max(\text{ctlcs}, C[i][j][1][n][1][n])$;
- 24 **return** ctlcs

It follows from the definitions that

$$\text{ct_lcs}(S, T) = \max\{L(i, j, 1, 1) + R(i, j, n, n) + 1 \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq n\}.$$

Then we can obtain an $O(n^6)$ -time and $O(n^4)$ -space algorithm for solving the CT-LCS problem based on Lemma 3.4 (see also Algorithm 3 in Appendix). Our algorithm computes two dimensional tables L and R . For each fixed $(i, j) \in [n]^2$ (i.e., $O(n^2)$ iterations), we can compute $L(i, j, \cdot, \cdot)$ and $R(i, j, \cdot, \cdot)$ in $O(n^4)$ time. The algorithm finally returns $\text{ct_lcs}(S, T) = \max\{L[i][j][1][1] + R[i][j][n][n] + 1 \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq n\}$. Therefore, we can compute table C in $O(n^6)$ time and $O(n^4)$ space.

Theorem 3.5. *The CT-LCS problem can be solved in $O(n^6)$ time and $O(n^4)$ space.*

We can compute a CT-LCS string by storing the following additional information: We store pivot (i', j') with $L(i, j, \ell_1, \ell_2)$ that satisfies $L[i][j][\ell_1][\ell_2] = L[i'][j'][\ell_1][\ell_2] + R[i'][j'][i - 1][j - 1] + 1$ (also for R). If we do so, we can compute a CT-LCS by tracking back the tables from the pivot (i, j) that gives $\text{ct_lcs}(S, T)$ in $O(|\text{ct_lcs}(S, T)|) = O(n)$ time.

Corollary 3.6. *A CT-LCS string can be computed in $O(n^6)$ time and $O(n^4)$ space.*

4 Computing CT-LCS for binary alphabets

In this section, we propose an algorithm for solving CT-LCS problem for the binary alphabet $\{0, 1\}$. Throughout this section, we assume that the strings S and T are binary strings and discard the assumption that all characters are distinct in S and in T .

We first recall the *parent-distance representation* presented by Park et al. [16]: Given a string $S[1..n]$, the parent-distance representation of S is an integer string $PD(S)[1..n]$, which is defined as follows:

$$PD(S)[i] = \begin{cases} i - \max_{1 \leq j < i} \{j \mid S[j] \leq S[i]\} & \text{if such } j \text{ exists,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For example, the parent-distance representation of string $S = \langle 1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1 \rangle$ is $PD(S) = \langle 0, 0, 1, 1, 3, 1, 1 \rangle$.

Lemma 4.1 ([16]). *Two strings S_1 and S_2 CT-match if and only if S_1 and S_2 have the same parent-distance representations.*

Lemma 4.1 allows for determining whether two strings CT-match or not. We will only use this representation to guarantee the correctness of our algorithm for the binary case, and do not explicitly compute it.

We start from a simple observation of CT-matching for binary strings. The following lemmas will support our algorithm for the binary alphabet.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $S_1 = 1^n$ and S_2 be a binary string of length n . Then, S_1 and S_2 CT-match if and only if $S_2 = 0^i 1^{n-i}$ for some integer $i \geq 0$.*

It is easy to see that $PD(1^n) = 01^{n-1}$. This implies that S_2 should be a non-decreasing binary string. From now on, we discuss the case where 0 appears in both S_1 and S_2 .

Lemma 4.3. *For two binary strings S_1 and S_2 of length n both containing 0, S_1 and S_2 CT-match if and only if there exist a string w and two integers $i \geq 1, j \geq 1$ such that $S_1 = w0^i 1^{n-|w|-i}$ and $S_2 = w0^j 1^{n-|w|-j}$.*

Proof. (\implies) Since S_1 and S_2 CT-match, $PD(S_1) = PD(S_2)$ (by Theorem 4.1). Let p (resp., q) be the smallest integer such that $S_1[p..n] = 0^i 1^j$ (resp., $S_2[q..n] = 0^i 1^j$) for some $i \geq 1, j \geq 0$. Assume that $1 \leq q < p$. Since $S_1[p-1] = 1$ and $S_1[p] = 0$, either $PD(S_1)[p] = 0$ or $PD(S_1)[p] > 1$ holds (i.e., $PD(S_1)[p] \neq 1$). On the other hand, $PD(S_2)[p] = 1$ holds since $S_2[p-1] \leq S_2[p]$. Then $PD(S_1)[p] \neq PD(S_2)[p]$, which is a contradiction. By a similar discussion, $1 \leq p < q$ also leads a contradiction. Next, we assume that $p = q = 1$. This assumption implies that the statement holds since $w = \varepsilon$. Assume that $1 < p = q$. Suppose on the contrary that $S_1[1..p-1] \neq S_2[1..p-1]$. There exists an integer j^* such that $j^* = \max_{1 \leq j \leq p-1} \{j \mid S_1[j] \neq S_2[j]\}$. This means that $S_1[j^* + 1..p-1] = S_2[j^* + 1..p-1]$. We assume w.l.o.g. that $S_1[j^*] = 0$ and $S_2[j^*] = 1$ (the other case is symmetric).

- If 0 does not appear in $S_1[j^* + 1..p-1]$, $PD(S_1)[p] = p - j^* > 0$ holds. On the other hand, either $PD(S_2)[p] = 0$ or $PD(S_2)[p] > p - j^*$ holds. Thus $PD(S_1) \neq PD(S_2)$, which is a contradiction.
- If 0 appears in $S_1[j^* + 1..p-1]$, there exists an integer i^* such that $i^* = \min_{j^*+1 \leq j \leq p-1} \{j \mid S_1[j] = S_2[j] = 0\}$ holds. This implies that $PD(S_1)[i^*] = i^* - j^* > 0$ holds. On the other hand, either $PD(S_2)[i^*] = 0$ or $PD(S_2)[i^*] > i^* - j^*$ holds. Thus $PD(S_1) \neq PD(S_2)$, which is a contradiction.

Therefore, $S_1 = w0^i 1^{n-p+1-i}$ and $S_2 = w0^j 1^{n-p+1-j}$ hold for some integers i, j where $w = S_1[1..p-1] = S_2[1..p-1]$.

(\impliedby) If $w = \varepsilon$, it is clear that S_1 and S_2 CT-match. We consider the case of $w \neq \varepsilon$. We show that $PD(S_1) = PD(S_2)$ holds, which is suffice due to Lemma 4.1. It is easy to see that $PD(S_1)[i] =$

$PD(S_2)[i]$ for all i that satisfies $1 \leq i \leq |w|$. Moreover, $PD(S_1)[i] = PD(S_2)[i] = 1$ also holds for all i with $|w| + 1 < i \leq n$. If 0 does not appear in w , $PD(S_1)[|w| + 1] = PD(S_2)[|w| + 1] = 0$. We assume that 0 appears in w for the remaining case. Let $j^* = \max_{1 \leq j \leq |w|} \{j \mid w[j] = 0\}$. Since $S_1[|w| + 1] = S_2[|w| + 1] = 0$ and $S_1[1..|w|] = S_2[1..|w|]$, $PD(S_1)[|w| + 1] = PD(S_2)[|w| + 1]$ holds. Therefore $PD(S_1) = PD(S_2)$. \square

Based on the above two lemmas, we propose an algorithm for the binary alphabet case. Let $N_1(S)$ be the number of occurrences of 1 in string S , and $L_{01}(S)$ the length of the longest non-decreasing subsequence of S that contains 0. If there is no such subsequence, let $L_{01}(S) = 0$. We also define $\text{cand}(S, T)$ as the maximum integer $k = |w| + i + j = |w| + i' + j'$ such that $w0^i1^j$ is a subsequence of S and $w0^{i'}1^{j'}$ is a subsequence of T for some string w , and integers $i, i' \geq 1$, $j, j' \geq 0$. Then the following properties hold for subsequences S' and T' of S and T that give $\text{ct_lcs}(S, T)$.

- If 0 appears in both S' and T' , $\text{ct_lcs}(S, T) = \text{cand}(S, T)$ (by Lemma 4.3).
- If either S' or T' does not contain 0, $\text{ct_lcs}(S, T)$ equals $\min(N_1(S), L_{01}(T))$ or $\min(N_1(T), L_{01}(S))$, respectively (from Lemma 4.2).
- If 0 does not appear in both S' and T' , $\text{ct_lcs}(S, T) = \min(N_1(S), N_1(T))$.

Due to the above properties, $\text{ct_lcs}(S, T) = \max(\text{cand}(S, T), m_1, m_2, m_3)$ holds for $m_1 = \min(N_1(S), L_{01}(T))$, $m_2 = \min(N_1(T), L_{01}(S))$, and $m_3 = \min(N_1(S), N_1(T))$.

Now we are ready to describe our algorithm. Let $LND_S(i) = L_{01}(S[i..n])$ for any integer i with $1 \leq i \leq n$. For convenience, let $LND_S(n + 1) = 0$. Firstly, we compute $N_1(S[i..n])$, $N_1(T[i..n])$, $LND_S(i)$, and $LND_T(i)$ for all i that satisfies $1 \leq i \leq n$. We can easily compute $N_1(S[i..n])$ and $N_1(T[i..n])$ for all i in $O(n)$ time and space. We can also compute $LND_S(i)$ (and $LND_T(i)$) in a similar way) by using the following recurrence:

$$LND_S(i) = \begin{cases} \max(LND_S(i + 1) + 1, N_1(S[i + 1..n]) + 1) & \text{if } S[i] = 0, \\ LND_S(i + 1) & \text{if } S[i] = 1. \end{cases}$$

These values can also be computed in $O(n)$ time and space.

Since $\text{cand}(S, T)$ requires the length of w which is described in the above discussion, we use a data structure for computing the longest common subsequence $\text{LCS}(i, j)$ of $S[1..i]$ and $T[1..j]$. For convenience, we set $\text{LCS}(i, 0) = \text{LCS}(0, i) = 0$ for all $i \in [n] \cup \{0\}$. By using the Four-Russians method [13], we can compute an $O(n^2/\log n)$ -space data structure in $O(n^2/\log n)$ time that can answer $\text{LCS}(i, j)$ in $O(\log^2 n)$ time for any $i \in [n] \cup \{0\}$ and $j \in [n] \cup \{0\}$. By the definition of cand , the following equation can be obtained:

$$\text{cand}(S, T) = \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq n} \{\text{LCS}(p_\ell - 1, q_\ell - 1) + \ell\}$$

where $p_\ell = \max\{p \mid LND_S(p) = \ell\}$ and $q_\ell = \max\{q \mid LND_T(q) = \ell\}$ (see also Fig. 4 for an illustration). Since we have already computed $LND_S(i)$, $LND_T(i)$, and the data structure for LCS, we can compute $\text{cand}(S, T)$ in $O(n \log^2 n)$ time based on the above equation. Finally, we can obtain $\text{ct_lcs}(S, T)$ by computing $\max(\text{cand}(S, T), m_1, m_2, m_3)$ in constant time (see also Algorithm 2).

Theorem 4.4. *The CT-LCS problem on binary can be solved in $O(n^2/\log n)$ time and $O(n^2/\log n)$ space.*

We can reconstruct a CT-LCS of S and T in $O(n \log n)$ time as follows: If one of m_1 , m_2 , and m_3 gives $\text{ct_lcs}(S, T)$, we can easily obtain a CT-LCS string in $O(n)$ time by using $LND_S(i)$ and $LND_T(i)$. Otherwise, two subsequences S' and T' which give $\text{ct_lcs}(S, T)$ can be represented as $S' = w0^i1^{\ell-i}$ and $T' = w0^j1^{\ell-j}$ for some i and j . Integers i and j can be obtained by $LND_S(i)$ and $LND_T(i)$. In the Four-Russians method, $(n \times n)$ -table LCS is factorized into $(n/\log n \times n/\log n)$ -blocks. The data structure actually stores LCS values on boundaries of blocks. Thus we can obtain string w by tracing back in $O((n/\log n) \cdot \log^2 n) = O(n \log n)$ time (see also Fig. 5).




Figure 4: Illustration for our idea for computing $\text{cand}(S, T)$.




Figure 5: Illustration for an idea for reconstructing the LCS part.

Corollary 4.5. *The CT-LCS string of two binary strings can be computed in $O(n^2/\log n)$ time and $O(n^2/\log n)$ space.*

Acknowledgments

The authors thank Shay Mozes, Oren Weimann, and Tsubasa Oizumi for discussions on subsequence CT-matching in the binary case.

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP23H04381 (TM), JP21K17705, JP23H04386 (YN), JP20H05964, JP22H03551 (SI).

Algorithm 2: Algorithm for solving CT-LCS problem on binary

Input: Binary strings $S[1..n], T[1..n] \in \{0, 1\}^*$

Output: $\text{ct_lcs}(S, T)$

- 1 Precompute data structure $LCS[i][j]$ that can answer $LCS(i, j)$ in $O(\log^2 n)$ time for any $i \in [n] \cup \{0\}$ and $j \in [n] \cup \{0\}$;
 - 2 $N_S[n+1] \leftarrow 0$;
 - 3 **for** $i \leftarrow n$ **to** 1 **do**
 - 4 **if** $S[i] = 0$ **then**
 - 5 $N_S[i] \leftarrow N_S[i+1]$;
 - 6 **else**
 - 7 $N_S[i] \leftarrow N_S[i+1] + 1$;
 - 8 $LND_S[n+1] \leftarrow 0$;
 - 9 **for** $i \leftarrow n$ **to** 1 **do**
 - 10 **if** $S[i] = 0$ **then**
 - 11 $LND_S[i] \leftarrow \max(LND_S[i+1] + 1, N_S[i+1] + 1)$;
 - 12 **else**
 - 13 $LND_S[i] \leftarrow N_S[i+1]$;
 - 14 $p[\ell] \leftarrow 0$ for all $\ell \in [n]$;
 - 15 **for** $i \leftarrow 1$ **to** n **do**
 - 16 $p[LND_S[i]] \leftarrow i$;
 - 17 Compute $N_T[i] = N_1(T[i..n])$, $LND_T[i] = LND_T(i)$, $q[\ell] = \max\{q \mid LND_T[q] = \ell\}$ for all $i \in [n+1]$ and $\ell \in [n]$ in the same way;
 - 18 $cand \leftarrow 0$;
 - 19 **for** $\ell \leftarrow 1$ **to** n **do**
 - 20 **if** $p[\ell] \neq 0$ **and** $q[\ell] \neq 0$ **then**
 - 21 $cand \leftarrow \max(cand, LCS[p[\ell]-1][q[\ell]-1] + \ell)$;
 - 22 $m_1 \leftarrow \min(N_S[1], LND_T[1])$;
 - 23 $m_2 \leftarrow \min(LND_S[1], N_T[1])$;
 - 24 $m_3 \leftarrow \min(N_S[1], N_T[1])$;
 - 25 **return** $\max(cand, m_1, m_2, m_3)$
-

References

- [1] A. Abboud, A. Backurs, and V. V. Williams. Tight hardness results for LCS and other sequence similarity measures. In *FOCS 2015*, pages 59–78, 2015.
- [2] A. Apostolico, S. Browne, and C. Guerra. Fast linear-space computations of longest common subsequences. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 92(1):3–17, 1992.
- [3] V. Arlazarov, E. Dinic, M. Kronrod, and I. Faradzev. On economical construction of the transitive closure of a directed graph. *Soviet Mathematics Doklady*, 11(5):1209–1210, 1970.
- [4] P. Bose, J. F. Buss, and A. Lubiw. Pattern matching for permutations. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 65(5):277–283, 1998.
- [5] K. Bringmann and M. Künnemann. Quadratic conditional lower bounds for string problems and dynamic time warping. In *FOCS 2015*, pages 79–97, 2015.
- [6] M. Crochemore, C. S. Iliopoulos, T. Kociumaka, M. Kubica, A. Langiu, S. P. Pissis, J. Radoszewski, W. Rytter, and T. Walen. Order-preserving indexing. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 638:122–135, 2016.
- [7] H. N. Gabow, J. L. Bentley, and R. E. Tarjan. Scaling and related techniques for geometry problems. In *STOC 1984*, pages 135–143, 1984.
- [8] P. Gawrychowski, S. Ghazawi, and G. M. Landau. On indeterminate strings matching. In *CPM 2020*, volume 161 of *LIPICs*, pages 14:1–14:14, 2020.
- [9] C. M. Hoffmann and M. J. O’Donnell. Pattern matching in trees. *J. ACM*, 29(1):68–95, 1982.
- [10] J. W. Hunt and T. G. Szymanski. A fast algorithm for computing longest common subsequences. *Commun. ACM*, 20(5):350–353, 1977.
- [11] J. Kim, P. Eades, R. Fleischer, S. Hong, C. S. Iliopoulos, K. Park, S. J. Puglisi, and T. Tokuyama. Order-preserving matching. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 525:68–79, 2014.
- [12] M. Kubica, T. Kulczynski, J. Radoszewski, W. Rytter, and T. Walen. A linear time algorithm for consecutive permutation pattern matching. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 113(12):430–433, 2013.
- [13] W. J. Masek and M. S. Paterson. A faster algorithm computing string edit distances. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 20(1):18–31, 1980.
- [14] N. Nakatsu, Y. Kambayashi, and S. Yajima. A longest common subsequence algorithm suitable for similar text strings. *Acta Inf.*, 18:171–179, 1982.
- [15] T. Oizumi, T. Kai, T. Mieno, S. Inenaga, and H. Arimura. Cartesian tree subsequence matching. In *CPM 2022*, volume 223 of *LIPICs*, pages 14:1–14:18, 2022.
- [16] S. G. Park, M. Bataa, A. Amir, G. M. Landau, and K. Park. Finding patterns and periods in Cartesian tree matching. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 845:181–197, 2020.
- [17] Y. Sakai. Computing the longest common subsequence of two run-length encoded strings. In *ISAAC 2012*, pages 197–206, 2012.
- [18] S. Song, G. Gu, C. Ryu, S. Faro, T. Lecroq, and K. Park. Fast algorithms for single and multiple pattern Cartesian tree matching. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 849:47–63, 2021.

Appendix

$O(n^6)$ -time $O(n^4)$ -space algorithm

Algorithm 3: Faster algorithm for solving CT-LCS problem

Input: $S[1..n], T[1..n]$
Output: $ct_lcs(S, T)$

- 1 Find i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n that satisfy $S[i_1] > S[i_2] > \dots > S[i_n]$;
- 2 Find j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n that satisfy $T[j_1] > T[j_2] > \dots > T[j_n]$;
- 3 $ctlcs \leftarrow 0$;
- 4 **for** $i \leftarrow i_1$ **to** i_n **do**
 - 5 **for** $j \leftarrow j_1$ **to** j_n **do**
 - 6 **for** $\ell_1 \leftarrow 1$ **to** i **do**
 - 7 **for** $\ell_2 \leftarrow i$ **to** j **do**
 - 8 $L[i][j][\ell_1][\ell_2] \leftarrow 0$;
 - 9 **if** $\ell_1 \neq i$ **and** $\ell_2 \neq j$ **then**
 - 10 **for** $i' \leftarrow \ell_1$ **to** $i - 1$ **do**
 - 11 **for** $j' \leftarrow \ell_2$ **to** $j - 1$ **do**
 - 12 **if** $S[i'] > S[i]$ **and** $T[j'] > T[j]$ **then**
 - 13 $L[i][j][\ell_1][\ell_2]$
 $\leftarrow \max(L[i][j][\ell_1][\ell_2], L[i'][j'][\ell_1][\ell_2] + R[i'][j'][i - 1][j - 1] + 1)$;
- 14 **for** $r_1 \leftarrow i$ **to** n **do**
 - 15 **for** $r_2 \leftarrow j$ **to** n **do**
 - 16 $R[i][j][r_1][r_2] \leftarrow 0$;
 - 17 **if** $r_1 \neq i$ **and** $r_2 \neq j$ **then**
 - 18 **for** $i' \leftarrow i + 1$ **to** r_1 **do**
 - 19 **for** $j' \leftarrow j + 1$ **to** r_2 **do**
 - 20 **if** $S[i'] > S[i]$ **and** $T[j'] > T[j]$ **then**
 - 21 $R[i][j][r_1][r_2]$
 $\leftarrow \max(R[i][j][r_1][r_2], L[i'][j'][i + 1][j + 1] + R[i'][j'][r_1][r_2] + 1)$;

- 22 $ctlcs \leftarrow \max(ctlcs, L[i][j][1][1] + R[i][j][n][n] + 1)$;
- 23 **return** $ctlcs$
