

XAV: A High-Performance Regular Expression Matching Engine for Packet Processing

Jincheng Zhong, Shuhui Chen, Chuan Yu

Abstract—Regular expression matching is the core function of various network security applications such as network intrusion detection systems. With the network bandwidth increases, it is a great challenge to implement regular expression matching for line rate packet processing. To this end, a novel scheme named XAV targeting high-performance regular expression matching is proposed in this paper. XAV first employs anchor DFA to tackle the state explosion problem of DFA. Then based on anchor DFA, two techniques including pre-filtering and regex decomposition are utilized to improve the average time complexity. Through implementing XAV with an FPGA-CPU architecture, comprehensive experiments show that a high matching throughput of up to 75 Gbps can be achieved for the large and complex *Snort* rule-set. Compared to state-of-the-art software schemes, XAV achieves two orders of magnitude of performance improvement. While compared to state-of-the-art FPGA-based schemes, XAV achieves more than 2.5x performance improvement with the same hardware resource consumption.

Index Terms—Regular expression matching, finite state automaton, network intrusion detection, packet processing.

I. INTRODUCTION

A regular expression (regex) comprises a sequence of characters, which describe a search pattern that can match a set of strings. For example, regex “[a-zA-Z0-9_-]+@[a-zA-Z0-9_-]+(\.[a-zA-Z0-9_-]+)+\$” describes a search pattern matching any email address. For their powerful expressiveness in defining search patterns, regexes are widely used in defining malicious features within many network security applications such as network intrusion detection systems (NIDS) and web application firewalls (WAF). Usually, regular expression matching (REM) is performed for every incoming packet in these network security applications. If one packet is found to match some regex, it indicates that the packet possibly contains some malicious pattern and further instructions will be performed accordingly.

In order not to affect business applications, network security applications must perform packet checking at line rate [1]–[3]. However, with the rapid growth of the Internet, the network bandwidth of data centers has rapidly increased to 40 Gbps or even 100 Gbps. To the best of our knowledge, very few REM schemes can achieve a matching throughput of tens of Gbps for large-scale regex rule-sets.

Targeting high matching throughput of tens of Gbps, this paper proposes a novel REM scheme – XAV. XAV is named by its three matching stages: Xor filter, Anchor DFA, and Verification. Finite state automaton is the basic way to implement regular expression matching, and nondeterministic finite

automata (NFA) and deterministic finite automata (DFA) are two common forms of finite state automata. However, NFA and DFA both confront severe problems in implementing high-performance REM for large-scale rule-sets. The time complexity of the former is too high, while the space complexity of the latter is too large.

This paper first puts forward the concept of anchor DFA, which is essentially a DFA compiled from regexes all starting with anchor “^”. The application of anchor DFA greatly simplifies the regex semantics, thus avoiding the state explosion problem of DFA. Although anchor DFA has much lower space complexity than DFA, anchor DFA also introduces one big problem it needs to start one matching thread at every position of input to keep the semantics of original regexes. In order to make the average time complexity of anchor DFA close to that of DFA, two optimizations are proposed for anchor DFA. First, the xor filter, which is responsible for the matching of string parts in regexes, is used to reduce the number of anchor DFA matching threads. Second, some regexes are split into multiple parts to prevent a matching thread of the anchor DFA from matching too many input bytes. To cooperate with regex splitting, an extra verification stage is then introduced to perform the regex semantic verification for original regexes that have been split. Consequently, combining the two optimizations for anchor DFA, the three matching stages of our proposed REM scheme are xor filter, anchor DFA, and verification.

We observe that the logic of the first two matching stages of XAV is simple and suitable for hardware implementation to achieve high matching performance. However, the logic of the last matching stage (verification) is complex and only suitable for software implementation. Therefore, an FPGA-CPU architecture is proposed to implement XAV, with implementing xor filter and anchor DFA in FPGA and implementing verification in CPU.

The main contributions of this paper are as follows:

- 1) This paper first proposes to employ anchor DFA to solve the state explosion problem of DFA, thus achieving high-performance regex matching for large-scale rule-sets.
- 2) Xor filter and an extra verification stage are introduced to greatly reduce the time complexity of anchor DFA. Combining the two stages with anchor DFA, a novel REM scheme XAV is proposed.
- 3) A FPGA-CPU architecture is employed to implement XAV and detailed implementations are given in this paper. The compiler source code of XAV will be open-sourced once the paper is accepted.

Category	Scheme	Contributions	Limitations	Performance
Software-based	HFA [4]/XFA [5]	Proposes novel automata to avoid the defects of NFA and DFA	Only achieves a tradeoff between NFA and DFA	Hundreds of Mbps for medium-scale rule-sets with hundreds of regexes
	Hyperscan [6]	Proposes regex decomposition and prefiltering techniques	Performance seriously degrades for complex regexes	About 1 Gbps on large Snort rule-set with thousands of regexes
FPGA-based	Multi-stride NFA [7]	Implements multi-stride NFA using FPGAs	Resource consuming	About 10 Gbps for medium-scale rule-sets with hundreds of regexes
	Multi-stride DFA [8]	Implements multi-stride DFA based on FPGA	Suffers from DFA explosion problem	>100 Gbps for small rule-sets with only tens of regexes
	FB DFA [9]	Greatly alleviates the state explosion problem of DFA	Resource consuming	About 6 Gbps on large Snort rule-set with thousands of regexes
TCAM-based	Pigasus [10]/Fidas [11]	Offloads network intrusion detection to FPGA from the system view	Only supports simple regexes based on string prefiltering	80 Gbps for the Snort rule-set with regexes containing no string fragments
	Chain-based DFA [12]	Employs TCAMs to perform compressed-DFA matching	Suffers from DFA explosion problem	Several Gbps for medium-scale rule-sets with tens of regexes
Memory-centric architecture	Impala [13]	Designs automaton processing architectures from the transistor level	Requires dedicated hardware far from the market	80 Gbps for large Snort rule-set with thousands of complex regexes

4) Comprehensive experiments are conducted to evaluate XAV. Experimental results show that XAV has great spatial and temporal performance and has achieved 75 Gbps throughput for the large *Snort* rule-set.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces the related works and inspirations of the XAV scheme are elaborated in Section III. Next, the compilation procedure of XAV is given in Section IV, and the FPGA-CPU implementation of XAV is depicted in Section V. Finally, Section VI comprehensively evaluates the proposed scheme, and a conclusion is given in Section VII.

II. RELATED WORKS

There have been a large number of prior works concentrating on how to design an efficient REM engine over the past two decades. This paper divides the related works into two big categories: software REM schemes and hardware REM schemes. Table II provides a brief overview of related works.

A. Software REM schemes

Since DFA has the fantastical time complexity of $O(1)$, a variety of studies [14]–[20] concentrate on trying to reduce the memory usage of DFA to support large-scale regex rule-sets. These studies have found that the state transition table of DFA is sparse and propose various compression methods accordingly. Although the proposed DFA compression techniques can cut down the memory usage of DFA by more than 95%, linear memory compression cannot tackle the state explosion problem of DFA, which increases the memory footprint exponentially. Consequently, these REM schemes based on only DFA compression techniques can still only support small-scale rule-sets.

Another variety of studies realized that both NFA and DFA suffer from inherent defects. To achieve high-performance regex matching for large-scale regex rule-sets, novel automata such as HFA [4] and XFA [5] are designed to avoid the

defects of NFA and DFA. Despite alleviating the high space complexity of DFA and the bad time complexity of NFA, these novel automata are essentially a tradeoff between NFA and DFA. These novel automata can only achieve medium matching performance for medium-scale rule-sets. With the regex rule-set size rising, the matching performance of these novel automata will severely drop.

In recent years, regex decomposition methods [6], [21], [22] become popular for achieving fast software REM. The key idea of regex decomposition methods is to extract string parts from original regexes first. Then taking fast string matching as the entry to regex matching, these REM schemes try to avoid expensive automata processing. Since string matching can be two magnitudes faster than regex matching [6] and string parts in regexes are rarely matched to trigger further regex matching, regex decomposition methods have achieved great matching performance. Hyperscan [6], the most famous software REM scheme, claims it can achieve 1 Gbps throughput on *Snort* rule-set with one CPU core.

B. Hardware REM schemes

1) *FPGA-based schemes*: A large number of studies utilize FPGA to accelerate regex matching [7], [23]–[26]. Because of the inherent massive parallel logic, FPGA is an ideal platform to perform regex matching based on NFA processing. NFA can contain multiple active states at a time, and multiple state transitions need to be performed to consume one byte of input. Therefore, the software is slow for NFA processing. However, FPGA can perform the multiple state transitions of NFA in parallel. As a consequence, the time complexity of NFA in FPGA becomes $O(1)$, and in each cycle, one byte of input can be handled. To achieve higher matching throughput, [7], [27], [28] further propose multi-stride NFA to handle multiple characters each cycle on FPGA. Benefiting from the multi-stride technique, the FPGA NFA scheme [7] even achieves a high matching throughput of 10 Gbps for *Snort* rule-set. Although FPGA NFA schemes can achieve high matching

performance for complex rule-sets, rule-set updates in FPGA NFA schemes are extremely tricky because FPGA circuit synthesis is required to map NFA state to FPGA circuits.

Some FPGA REM schemes [9], [29]–[31] also employ DFA to perform regex matching. The biggest advantage of employing DFA instead of NFA in FPGA is that the rule-set update for FPGA DFA schemes only needs to rewrite the FPGA memories, which is a fast procedure. However, DFA confronts the state explosion problem. Although in [9], a regex decomposition method is used to tackle the state explosion problem, the space complexity of DFA is still too high for FPGA implementation. In the FPGA DFA scheme proposed in this paper, the space complexity is further reduced significantly. Consequently, our proposed novel scheme can achieve much better matching performance with close hardware resources.

In recent years, there have been researches [10], [11] into accelerating network intrusion detection based on FPGAs from the system view. Zhao et al. [10] design the Pigasus IDS employing an FPGA-CPU architecture. Pigasus has implemented the majority of Snort functionalities (including TCP reassembly, fast string pattern matching, and packet header matching) on the FPGA. Packets that pass the fast string pattern matching and header matching are sent to the CPU for regex matching. Pigasus claims that it can achieve 100 Gbps packet processing throughput with one server and an FPGA board. However, Pigasus focuses on accelerating Snort NIDS from a system view and only employs some other available regex matching engine.

Alibaba Group proposes Fidas [11], which is an FPGA-based intrusion detection offload system and has been deployed in their production data center. Unlike Pigasus, Fidas fully offloads the primary NIC, rule pattern matching, and traffic rate classification with no CPU overhead. Fidas uses a multi-level filter-based approach for efficient regex processing. It is reported that Fidas can achieve about 80 Gbps packet processing throughput in the paper. Although these system works like Pigasus and Fidas remarkably reduce CPU overhead by offloading packet processing to FPGA, they only support simple regex rules with many string fragments. As network threats become more complex and diverse, network intrusion detection gradually needs to support more and more complex regex rules. This paper proposes XAV trying to achieve high-performance regex matching for large-scale and complex rule-sets.

2) *TCAM-based schemes*: Some REM schemes [12], [32], [33] employ TCAMs to perform regex matching. TCAMs are very effective for storing the state transition table of DFA. Employing TCAM to perform DFA matching only needs one TCAM query for handling each byte of input. However, TCAM-based REM schemes confront a similar problem with DFA compression methods: TCAMs can not help DFA tackle the state explosion problem. What is worse, although TCAM-based REM schemes can easily achieve a high matching throughput, they are very power-hungry for each TCAM query is a brute-force search of every TCAM memory entry.

3) *Memory-centric architecture schemes*: In recent years, several memory-centric architecture schemes [13], [34], [35]

are proposed to improve the performance of automata processing. Different from employing existing hardware like FPGA and TCAM, these memory-centric architecture schemes redesign hardware to fit regex matching. The Micron Automata Processor (AP) [34] provides a DRAM-based dedicated automata processing chip, while CA [35] and Impala [13] modify the structure of the last-level cache SRAM for automata processing. Despite up to 80 Gbps throughput being claimed by Impala, the dedicated hardware design is far from the market.

III. MOTIVATIONS FOR XAV

A. Anchor DFA

As a popular way to perform regex matching, DFA suffers from the state explosion problem¹ and requires impossibly large memory for supporting large-scale rule-sets. However, it is found that when a regex set is compiled into an anchor DFA (see definition 1), the state explosion tends not to happen, and the size of the anchor DFA is small. It is reasonable that the semantics of one regex starting with anchor "" is much simpler than the same regex starting with ".*" ². The simpler the semantics of a regex set, the smaller the number of DFA states required to represent the semantics. Therefore, the anchor DFA compiled from all regexes starting with anchor "" is much smaller than the DFA compiled from all the same regexes starting with ".".

Definition 1 (anchor DFA). An anchor DFA refers to a DFA compiled from regexes all starting with anchor "". To compile a set of regexes into an anchor DFA, each regex is added with one anchor "" to the head first.

Experiments are carried out to show that anchor DFA can significantly reduce the number of states. Four rule-sets from Regex [36] benchmark suit are used for the experiment, and each of them is compiled into a DFA and an anchor DFA, respectively. The size comparison of the DFA and the anchor DFA on each rule-set is shown in Table I. For each of the four rule-sets, the anchor DFA size is much smaller than the DFA size. For each of the last three rule-sets, when all regexes in the rule-set are compiled into a DFA, state explosion occurs and the DFA construction is far from completion even when the state number exceeds one million. However, while compiling all regexes in each of the three rule-sets into an anchor DFA, DFA construction is finished when the size reaches only tens of thousands. From the above experiments, it is obvious that anchor DFA can effectively alleviate the state explosion problem of DFA.

Although anchor DFA can greatly reduce the number of DFA states, the semantics of each regex has changed in anchor DFA for that an anchor "" is added to the head. To maintain the semantics of original regexes starting with ".*", anchor DFA should start a matching thread (see definition 2) at each position of the input. For example, if $RE_1 = "abc"$ is compiled

¹The famous state explosion problem of DFA is introduced in Appendix A.

²Note that the starting "." of one regex is usually omitted in practical rule-sets.

TABLE I
COMPARISON OF THE DFA SIZE AND THE ANCHOR DFA SIZE ON
DIFFERENT RULE-SETS

Rule-set	DFA	Anchor DFA
bro217.re	6533	2155
ranges1.conf_300-0.re	>1000000	11509
ranges05.conf_300-0.re	>1000000	11639
dotstar0.3.conf_300-0.re	>1000000	43679




Fig. 1. Example of Anchor DFA matching procedure.

into an anchor DFA A_1 , now A_1 can only match ${}^{\wedge}abc$. For the input text $T_1="ababc"$, to find the occurrences of RE_1 in T_1 , A_1 should start a new matching thread at each position of T_1 as shown in Fig.1. And can only matching thread 3 starting at position 3 find the occurrence of RE_1 . If only one matching thread (i.e., matching thread 1 in the figure) is started at position 1, which is the same as the DFA matching scheme, then no occurrence of RE_1 will be found.

Definition 2 (matching thread). For an anchor DFA, a matching thread refers to the entire DFA matching process, which starts from the initial state and ends when arriving at the dead/trap state or the end of the input.

Because each matching thread can require a number of state transitions, starting a new matching thread at each position of input indicates that anchor DFA has extremely high time complexity. Therefore, directly applying anchor DFA to regex matching is not an advisable option. However, some optimizations can greatly reduce the time complexity of anchor DFA.

B. Optimizations to Anchor DFA

In this section, two optimizations are proposed to reduce the time complexity of anchor DFA. The first is to employ one pre-filter to prevent anchor DFA from starting new matching threads in most positions. The second is to limit the access depth (see definition 3) of each matching thread through regex decomposition.

Definition 3 (access depth). The access depth of one matching thread refers to the total number of state transitions needing to be performed by the matching thread.

1) *Pre-filter*: In most practical DPI-based network security applications, input traffic rarely matches any rule in the rule-set [37]–[39]. Further, it has been observed that one pre-filter built from string fragments of each rule can be very efficient [6], [21], [40], [41]. Therefore, using the string fragments of each regex, one pre-filter can be constructed to prune most anchor DFA matching threads.

Taking $RE_2="ab.*cd"$ as an example, while RE_2 is compiled into anchor DFA A_2 , the string fragment $S="ab"$ can be used to construct a pre-filter of A_2 . Assume that the input text is $T_2="abcd"$. As S is only matched by the pre-filter starting at position 2 of T_2 , only one matching thread of A_2 needs to be started at position 2 in the whole matching process. For all other positions that are not matched by the pre-filter, no matching thread of A_2 is required.

A number of algorithms for multi-string pattern matching, such as [42]–[46], can be selected as the pre-filter. In this paper, the xor filter newly proposed in [47] is used for that the xor filter is fast and small. What is more, the xor filter is friendly for hardware implementation. Therefore, implementing xor filters in FPGAs can help XAV achieve a high matching throughput.

2) *regex decomposition*: Although the introduction of a pre-filter can significantly reduce the number of anchor DFA matching threads, the access depth of some unpruned matching threads may be very large, thereby severely downgrading the matching performance.

Taking the example above, when S is matched by the pre-filter, as ${}^{\cdot}.*$ (i.e., dot-star) in RE_2 means to match any character any time, the activated matching thread of A_2 will run all the time until one match occurs or the input ends. Besides the dot-star components in one regex, all kinds of long regex components (see definition 4) can possibly lead to a large access depth for one anchor DFA matching thread.

Definition 4 (long regex component). One long regex component refers to a regex component that can cause a large expected access depth for one matching thread. Note that the minimum expected access depth for a long regex component can be flexibly defined in the specific implementation. Generally, long regex components include dot-star, almost dot-star such as ${}^{\cdot}[\backslash n]^+$, and big character classes with a large counting constraint such as ${}^{\cdot}[\backslash n]\{500\}$.

To limit the expected access depth of each activated matching thread, each regex can be decomposed into lsREs (see definition 5) and lusREs (see definition 6). Only the lsREs of each regex are employed to construct the anchor DFA, while the matching of lusREs is left to a further verification stage. In this way, the access depth of each anchor DFA matching thread is limited to a small value, thereby reducing the time complexity of anchor DFA.

Definition 5 (lsRE). One lsRE³ refers to a regex fragment with no long regex component. For example, "abc" and "user=[0-9]{32}" are both lsREs.

Definition 6 (lusRE). One lusRE⁴ refers to a regex fragment that contains at least one long regex component. For example, "ab.*cd" and "ab[\backslash n]\{500\}" are both lusREs.

For example, $RE_2="ab.*cd"$ can be split into two lsREs, $lsRE_1="ab"$ and $lsRE_2="cd"$, and one lusRE, $lusRE_1=".*"$.

³lsRE is an abbreviation of Length reStricted REgex, which means that the expected length of each matching text of lsRE is small.

⁴LusRE is an abbreviation of Length UnreStricted REgex, which means that the expected length of each matching text of lusRE can be very large.




Fig. 2. The architecture of XAV.

We compile $lsRE_1$ and $lsRE_2$ into one anchor DFA A_3 . Now, the maximum access depth of each matching thread of A_3 is limited to 3, which is the length of $lsRE_1$ or $lsRE_2$ plus one. As for the matching of $lusRE_1$, only when $lsRE_1$ and $lsRE_2$ are sequentially matched by A_3 , will the further verification stage perform it.

The details of how to achieve the regex decomposition and further verification will be described in Section IV.

C. XAV

Combining the above two optimizations with anchor DFA, this paper proposes a novel REM scheme named XAV, which represents the three matching stages of the scheme, Xor filter, Anchor DFA and Verification. Anchor DFA tackles the state explosion problem to support large-scale rule-sets, while the xor filter and the verification stage reduce the time complexity to achieve high matching performance. The architecture of XAV is as shown in Fig.2.

Firstly, the input is matched by the xor filter, where matches occur only at a small proportion of input positions. Then, these suspicious positions are transmitted to the anchor DFA engine, which will start a new matching thread at each of them. The anchor DFA will find all occurrences of each lsRE fragment and report them to the further verification engine. In the verification engine, the matching results of each lsRE fragment are recorded and verified if any original regex matches the input.

To clarify the overall matching procedure of XAV, a simple example is given below. For the rule-set with one regex, $RE_2="ab.*cd"$, and the input $T_2="abcd"$, the xor filter will report that the input matches at positions 2 and 4. Through two matching threads starting at positions 2 and 4, the anchor DFA can find that $lsRE_1="ab"$ matches at position 2 and $lsRE_2="cd"$ matches at position 4. When the verification engine receives that $lsRE_2="cd"$ matches at position 4, since it knows that $lsRE_1$ has been matched at position 2, it can determine that RE_2 matches the input.

For the use of anchor DFA, the state explosion problem can be avoided when compiling large-scale rule-sets. Therefore, XAV has a low space complexity and can support the parallel matching of hundreds to thousands of regexes. Besides, benefited from the two optimizations to anchor DFA, the number of activated anchor DFA matching threads is small, and the expected access depth of each matching thread is limited. Consequently, XAV has a low matching time complexity and can deliver a high matching performance. The detailed implementation of the XAV scheme is described in the following two sections.




Fig. 3. The compilation procedure of XAV.

IV. COMPILATION OF XAV

This section elaborates on the compilation procedure of XAV, which mainly includes regex decomposition, xor filter building, anchor DFA construction, and the verification engine building.

The overall compilation procedure is shown in Fig.3. Firstly, each regex is split into lsRE fragments and lusRE fragments through the regex decomposition. Then the xor filter and anchor DFA are constructed from the lsRE fragment set. While the lusRE fragment set is employed to build the verification engine.

A. Regex decomposition

To implement regex decomposition, each regex is first parsed to a component tree, which will be introduced below. By identifying long regex components in the component tree, the regex is then split into lsRE fragments and lusRE fragments at the position of each long regex component.

1) *Regex parsing*: According to regex semantics, four component classes are defined in this paper, which are character class components, concatenation components, alternation components, and repetition components, respectively. Given regex components R and S , the definitions of the above four component classes are listed below:

- **character class component**: A character class component refers to the most basic regex component that matches a set of literal characters. Character class components include single literal characters (such as "a") and character classes (such as "[0-9]").
- **concatenation component (RS)**: A concatenation component refers to a set of regex components that are concatenated one by one. To successfully match the concatenation component, one text needs to match the set of regex components sequentially. For the concatenation component of R and S , each accepted text of (RS) should match R and S in order.
- **alternation component ($R|S$)**: An alternation component refers to the set union of a regex component set. If one text matches any one regex component in the regex component set, the text matches the alternation component. For the alternation component of R and S , each accepted text of ($R|S$) matches either R or S .
- **repetition component ($R\{m,n\}$)**: A repetition component refers to a component with counting constraints. For




Fig. 4. The component tree for RE_3 .

the repetition component of R , with counting constraints $\{m, n\}$ ($0 \leq m \leq n$ and n can be infinite), each accepted text of $R\{m, n\}$ should match R consecutively for m to n times.

Based on the concepts of the four regex components, each regex can be parsed into a component tree. For example, the regex component tree parsed from regex $RE_3 = "(ab|cd)e[^n]\{100\}"$ is as shown in Fig.4.

2) *Regex splitting*: Based on the component tree of one regex, it is easy to identify where one long regex component is and therefore to split the regex. The definition of long regex components has been given in definition 4. In our actual implementation, one character class component matching more than 128 out of 256 characters with a counting constraint larger than 50 is regarded as a long regex component.

To split one regex into lsRE fragments and lusRE fragments, the corresponding component tree is first traversed to find all the positions of long regex components. Then, the regex is divided into lsRE fragments and lusRE fragments at the position of each long regex component. Finally, the unfriendly lsRE fragments will be merged into neighbor lusRE fragments. Unfriendly lsRE fragments refer to those lsRE fragments that can not adapt to the xor filter, which will be discussed in the remainder of this paper.

Taking $RE_3 = "(ab|cd)e[^n]\{100\}"$ as an example, the repetition component $"[^n]\{100\}"$ will be identified as a long regex component. Then, according to the position of the long regex component, RE_3 is split into one lsRE fragment (i.e., $"(ab|cd)e"$) and one lusRE fragment (i.e., $"[^n]\{100\}"$).

B. Xor filter construction

After decomposing each regex in the rule-set, one lsRE fragment set and one lusRE fragment set are generated. The lsRE fragment set is employed to construct the xor filter and the anchor DFA, while the lusRE fragment set is used for the building of the verification engine.

As xor filter only supports the matching of ldREs (see definition 7). For building the xor filter, given a length limitation⁵, the ldRE fragment with the highest pre-filtering effectiveness is first extracted from each lsRE fragment.

⁵The length limitation of each ldRE, L_T , is set to 8 in detailed implementation.

Definition 7 (ldRE). One ldRE⁶ refers to a regex fragment that comprises only character class components. Note that some repetition components, of which the sub-component is a character class component and the counting constraint is a fixed number, can be regarded as multiple character class components. For instance, "abc", "ab[a-z]", "ab[a-z]{3}" are all ldREs.

Taking the lsRE fragment set in Fig.3 as an example, ldREs "user=", "AUTH\s", "PARTIAL", "BODY", and "\x00mic\x7c" will be extracted from $lsRE_{1-1}$, $lsRE_{2-1}$, $lsRE_{3-1}$, $lsRE_{3-3}$ and $lsRE_{4-1}$ in the compilation procedure, respectively.

Note that every lsRE fragment is ensured in the regex decomposition procedure to have at least one ldRE fragment with high pre-filtering effectiveness⁷. Otherwise, the lsRE fragment is denoted as an unfriendly lsRE fragment, which is merged into neighboring lusRE fragments as described in Section IV-A2.

After extracting one proper ldRE from each lsRE fragment, all the ldREs can then be employed to construct the xor filter as depicted in [47]. Since each xor filter unit can only support the matching of patterns with the same length, multiple xor filter units are used to support different lengths as shown in Fig.5. The detailed implementation of the xor filter will be further discussed in Section V.

C. Anchor DFA construction

According to the ldRE position of each lsRE, we divide each lsRE fragment into two parts, the front part, and the back part. The front part for one lsRE starts from the head and ends at the end of the ldRE, while the back part is the remaining part of the lsRE. For $lsRE_{1-1} = "user=[a-f0-9]\{32\}"$ in Fig.3, the front part is "user=" and the back part is "[a-f0-9]{32}". While for $lsRE_{4-1} = "d\{1,6\}\x00mic\x7c"$, since the extracted ldRE (i.e., "\x00mic\x7c") ends at the end of $lsRE_{4-1}$, it has only the front part, which is $lsRE_{4-1}$ itself.

After dividing each lsRE fragment, all front parts of the lsRE fragment set are compiled into one anchor DFA. While the back part of each lsRE fragment is compiled into one anchor DFA. Note that when the xor filter reports a match at some position pos , to perform the matching of all front parts for the lsRE set, the anchor DFA should match the input from pos reversely. Therefore, the front parts of all lsREs are reversed⁸ first and then compiled into one anchor DFA, which is denoted as **reverse DFA** in the remaining text. As for the matching of the back part for each lsRE, since the corresponding anchor DFA only needs to perform it forward from $pos + 1$ as typical DFAs, the anchor DFA for each back part is denoted as one **forward DFA** in this paper.

⁶ldRE is an abbreviation of **L**ength **D**etermined **R**EGEX, which means that each accepted text of one ldRE has the same length.

⁷Assuming random traffic, if the matching probability of one ldRE is lower than P_T , the ldRE is thought with high pre-filtering effectiveness. In our actual implementation, P_T is set to 0.0001.

⁸A reversed version of one regex matches the reverse of original accepted texts. For example, the reversed version of $lsRE_{1-1} = "user=[a-f0-9]\{32\}"$ is "[a-f0-9]{32}=resu".

Consequently, the anchor DFA engine in XAV includes one reverse DFA and multiple forward DFAs. The matching procedure of the anchor DFA engine is as below. When the xor filter reports some match at a position pos , a matching thread of the reverse DFA is activated at pos and matches the input reversely. The reverse DFA can determine whether the input matches some front part of one lsRE fragment. If the reverse DFA is matched successfully by the input, the anchor DFA engine will find if there is one back part corresponding to the matched front part. If the back part exists, the corresponding forward DFA for the back part is then used to match the input from $pos+1$ forward. If there is no back part to be matched or the back part is successfully matched, the anchor DFA engine will report the lsRE matching result to the further verification engine.

D. Verification engine construction

The verification engine is for the semantic verification of original regexes, which needs to record lsRE fragment matches and perform the matching of the lusRE fragment set.

Any regex RE can be regarded as the form of $R_1S_1R_2S_2\dots S_nR_{n+1}$ (for $1 \leq i \leq n$, R_i represents a lusRE fragment and S_i represents a lsRE fragment), where R_1 and R_{n+1} may be empty. To match RE , one text should match R_1, S_1, \dots, S_n and R_{n+1} in order. As described earlier, the matching of each lsRE fragment (i.e., S_i in RE) is performed by the xor filter and the anchor DFA engine. When some lsRE fragment S_k is reported to match the input text T starting at position pos_{s_k} and ending at position pos_{e_k} , the verification engine should perform the semantic verification of RE as follows.

- 1) If $k=1$, the verification engine will check if R_1 matches T ending at $pos_{s_k} - 1$. If R_1 is matched, then the matching result of S_k will be recorded.
- 2) If $k \geq 2$, the verification engine will first check whether there is one matching record of S_{k-1} . If not, the verification engine will directly ignore the matching result of S_k . Otherwise, the verification engine will check if R_k can be matched starting from $pos_{e_{k-1}}+1$ and ending at $pos_{s_k}-1$. If R_k is successfully matched, the matching result of S_k will be recorded by the verification engine.
- 3) If $k = n$, since S_n is the last lsRE fragment of RE , the verification engine will further check if R_{n+1} is matched by T starting at $pos_{e_n}+1$. If R_{n+1} is matched successfully, it indicates that all fragments of RE have been matched by T continuously. In this case, RE will be reported to match the input text T .

As for how to perform the matching of lusRE fragments, three matching approaches are employed for three kinds of lusREs, which are listed below.

- **dot-MN** (“ $\{m,n\}$ ”): The first kind of lusREs are denoted as dot-MN, which means that it matches any character for m to n times ($0 \leq m \leq n$ and n can be infinity). To check the semantics of one dot-MN lusRE, the verification engine only needs to judge whether the interval of two lsRE fragment matching results is in (m, n) .




Fig. 5. FPGA-CPU architecture for XAV implementation.

- **CC-MN** (“ $[c_1c_2\dots c_k]\{m,n\}$ ”): The second kind of lusREs are denoted as CC-MN, which is a character class with counting constraints. The semantics of one CC-MN is to match a text with m to n characters in $[c_1c_2\dots c_k]$, where c_i ($1 \leq i \leq k$) is a literal character and $[c_1c_2\dots c_k]$ is a character set representing the character class. To check the semantics of one CC-MN, the verification engine first judges whether the interval of two lsRE fragment matching results is in (m, n) . Then, all characters between the two lsRE fragment matching results should be checked if in $[c_1c_2\dots c_k]$.
- **complex lusRE**: The third kind of lusREs are denoted as complex lusREs, which include all other lusREs except the first two kinds of lusREs. Since the semantics of one complex lusRE is much more complex, each complex lusRE is compiled into a DFA, which is denoted as **lusDFA** in this paper, to perform the matching.

V. IMPLEMENTATION VIA AN FPGA-CPU ARCHITECTURE

Since the matching logic of the xor filter and the anchor DFA engine is simple and suitable for hardware implementation. To achieve high matching performance, we use FPGA to implement the xor filter and the anchor DFA engine. While the logic of the verification engine is much more complex, which is suitable for software implementation in the CPU. Therefore, an FPGA-CPU architecture is designed to implement XAV in this paper. Through exploiting the massively parallel logic of FPGA, a high concurrent matching throughput is expected.

A. Architecture overview

The proposed FPGA-CPU architecture for XAV implementation is outlined in Fig.5. Firstly, the input packet stream is distributed to multiple **matching units**, where each matching unit comprises an xor filter and an anchor DFA engine. Each packet to be searched is then scanned by the xor filter in each matching unit. When some match occurs in the xor filter, the match position is reported to the anchor DFA in the same matching unit. The anchor DFA will start a matching thread at that position. If one lsRE match is found by the anchor DFA, the lsRE matching result is then reported to the CPU for further verification.

Note that when the CPU performs the verification of the semantics of CC-MN and complex lusREs, it needs to scan the packet content. Therefore, for those lsRE fragments that




Fig. 6. All anchor DFAs share M state transition tables.

will cause CC-MN or complex lusRE semantic verification, once a match occurs, the packet needs to be transmitted to the CPU. When a large proportion of traffic is required to be processed in the CPU, the CPU overhead will be too heavy to make the overall REM scheme feasible. However, for practical applications, the practical traffic rarely matches one rule. Besides, when performing regex decomposition, the lsREs with low pre-filtering effectiveness have been merged into neighboring lusREs. Therefore, only a small proportion of traffic needs to be sent to the CPU in our scheme, and the CPU overhead is small, which will be shown in the evaluation section.

B. Xor filter implementation

In our detailed implementation, each xor filter comprises one direct filter unit (DFU) and two xor filter units (XFU) as shown in Fig.5. The direct filter unit is essentially a bitmap of size 2^{16} , so it can be applied for matching ldREs with a length of 2. The two xor filter units are used for matching ldREs of length 4 and length 8 respectively. For ldREs with a length other than 2, 4, or 8, they will be cut to their nearest length in $\{2, 4, 8\}$ in the compilation procedure.

It is noted that the xor filter does not support the matching for ldREs of length 1. Since the matching probability for one ldRE of length 1 is at least $\frac{1}{256}$, which is too large to avoid the frequent activation of the anchor DFA engine.

C. Anchor DFA implementation

In each matching unit, the anchor DFA engine comprises a reverse DFA and a forward DFA. It is noticed that multiple forward DFAs generated in the compilation stage can be regarded as a forward DFA by merging the state transition tables when performing matching. Our implementation of the anchor DFA engine is as shown in Fig.6.

For a large-scale rule-set containing thousands of regexes, the state transition table (STT) of the anchor DFA can consume a lot of memory. However, the memory resource is limited,

and allocating one copy of STT for the anchor DFA in each matching unit is infeasible. Fortunately, the anchor DFA in each matching unit is active only for a small part of the time. Hence, the N anchor DFAs in N matching units can share a total of M copies of STT ($M \leq N$)⁹ as shown in Fig.6. Each state transition query emitted from all anchor DFAs (including the forward DFAs and the reverse DFAs in all matching units) is transmitted to a query scheduler, which will finish the query with an idle STT copy and return the query result to the corresponding anchor DFA.

Through state transition table sharing, the number of STT copies can be greatly reduced. However, for rule-sets containing thousands of regexes, if no compression techniques are employed, a few STT copies will still occupy up to hundreds of megabytes of memory, which far exceeds the internal storage of current FPGAs or the storage of fast external SRAM. Therefore, compressing the STT of the anchor DFA is necessary. In our implementation, a hybrid STT compression scheme, which combines the perfect hashing method [48] and the bitmap encoding method [49], is utilized. Experiments show that the hybrid compression scheme can effectively reduce the memory cost of anchor DFA by up to 98%.

VI. EVALUATION

In this section, the proposed REM scheme, XAV, is comprehensively evaluated with both real and synthetic traffic and rule-sets.

A. Experimental settings

1) *Platform*: The experimental environment that evaluates the performance of XAV is shown in Fig.7. The compiler and the verification engine of XAV are implemented with C++ 11. Experiments are carried out using an x86 machine with 128 GB DRAM. The CPU of the machine is a 2.5 GHz Intel Xeon E5-2678 and the operating system is CentOS 7.5. The xor filter and anchor DFA matching are performed with Intel Stratix 10 SX850 FPGA. In our implementation, the FPGA frequency is 200 MHz. As for the FPGA resource utilization, 96% (807K/841K) logic elements and 75% (6519KB/8692KB) memory bits are utilized.

2) *Rule-sets*: Nine regex rule-sets from Regex [50] and ANMLZoo [51] benchmark suits are used in our evaluation. The nine regex rule-sets show different characteristics, which are shown in Table II. The scale and complexity of each rule-set are represented by the number of compiled NFA states and NFA transitions. From the table, the scale and complexity of rule-sets increase from top to bottom. *Bro217* rule-set is the smallest and simplest one, while *Snort* rule-set is the largest and most complex one.

3) *Traffic*: Two types of network traffic are used in evaluating the performance of XAV. The first type of traffic is 13.7 MB packets randomly generated and labeled as *Random*. The second type of traffic is realistic packets captured in a campus network¹⁰. Realistic traffic is divided into three parts and they

⁹In our detailed implementation, N is 64 and M is set to 6.

¹⁰The realistic network traffic was collected from volunteers, and the use of it has been approved by them.




Fig. 7. The experimental environment which evaluates the performance of XAV.

TABLE II
THE CHARACTERISTICS OF TEST RULE-SETS.

Rule-set	#Rules	Avg. length	#NFA states	#NFA transitions
Bro217	217	12.33	2864	6583
Ranges1	299	41.99	13338	19474
Ranges05	300	42.19	13261	18080
Dotstar03	300	40.29	13049	41977
Dotstar06	300	41.91	13721	65447
Dotstar09	299	40.98	13580	88103
PowerEN	2860	17.70	47492	239344
ClamAV	515	96.07	52040	1435257
Snort	3170	62.24	212731	1586731

are labeled as *Reality-1*, *Reality-2*, and *Reality-3*, respectively. The sizes of the three parts of realistic traffic are 160.5 MB, 70.2 MB, and 54.7 MB, respectively.

B. Compilation time

Table III shows the compilation time of XAV on test rule-sets. The compilation procedure of XAV comprises four stages: regex decomposition, xor filter compilation, anchor DFA compilation, and verification engine compilation. As shown in the table, XAV compiles rapidly on test rule-sets. For the first six small rule-sets, their total compilation time is almost less than 1 second. For the two medium-scale rule-sets, *PowerEN* and *ClamAV*, the compilation of XAV costs a total of only several seconds. For the largest rule-set, *Snort*, XAV can also finish the entire compilation in about 30 seconds.

Among the four XAV compilation stages, anchor DFA compilation costs most of the overall compilation time. The reason is that anchor DFA compilation involves the DFA construction process [52], which runs relatively slowly. Although verification engine compilation can also involve DFA construction for generating lusDFAs (DFAs for complex lusREs), it usually takes much less time for that the overall size of all lusDFAs is much smaller than the size of anchor DFA.

C. Spatial performance

Table IV lists the spatial data of XAV on test rule-sets.

The second column of the table shows the xor filter memory consumption of XAV. Since each entry in the xor filter consumes an average of only a few bits, the memory consumption

of the xor filter on each test rule-set is small and it varies from a few kilobytes to a dozen kilobytes.

The spatial data related to anchor DFA are listed in the third to fifth columns of Table IV. As anchor DFA has simplified regex semantics, it can avoid the DFA state explosion problem as stated in Section III-A. Consequently, the anchor DFA state number of each rule-set is close to the NFA state number listed in Table II. After state table compression, the anchor DFA memory consumption for the first six small rule-sets is dozens of kilobytes. While for the two medium-scale rule-set, *PowerEN* and *ClamAV*, the anchor DFA occupies a few hundred kilobytes of memory. For *Snort*, the largest test rule-set, the anchor DFA memory consumption can reach 1600 kilobytes. The compression ratio of the anchor DFA state table is from 0.011 to 0.019 for each rule-set, which means that state table compression helps reduce the memory consumption of anchor DFA by 98% to 99%.

Note that as the anchor DFA in each matching unit is active for only a small part of the time, multiple matching units can share one copy of anchor DFA STT (state transition table) as explained in Section V-C. In the implementation, an average of about every ten matching units is designed to share one anchor DFA STT. Therefore, the average anchor DFA memory consumption per matching unit is about $\frac{1}{10}$ that is listed in Table IV.

The spatial data related to the verification engine are listed in the sixth and seventh columns of Table IV. For all small test rule-sets and *PowerEN* rule-set, as no complex lusREs are generated in the regex decomposition stage, the state number of lusDFAs is zero and the memory consumption of the verification engine is small. When no lusDFAs are generated, the verification engine only mainly involves one mapping table recording the connection relations of each lsRE. Consequently, the memory consumption of the verification engine is small and only a few kilobytes of memory are required. For *ClamAV* and *Snort* rule-sets, as complex lusREs result in the generation of lusDFAs, the verification engine consumes much more memory. In order to perform fast verification within the CPU, no compression techniques are applied for lusDFA STT and each lusDFA state requires one kilobyte of memory. As *Snort* rule-set generates tens of thousands of lusDFA states, it requires up to tens of MB of memory for the verification engine. Compared with the memory consumption of at least hundreds of MB in most existing DFA-based REM schemes, XAV is believed to have shown excellent spatial performance.

D. Temporal performance

1) *Effectiveness of xor filter*: The xor filter hit ratio for each rule-set and each type of traffic is shown in Figure 8.

It can be seen from the figure that the xor filter has high prefiltering efficiency. The xor filter hit ratio is lower than 0.005 on all test rule-sets and all test traffic, which means that the xor filter helps reduce the number of anchor DFA matching threads by more than 99.5%. The figure also demonstrates that the xor filter hit ratio rises with the increase of rule-set scale and complexity. It is reasonable for that complex and large-scale rule-sets generate more lsRE fragments and therefore

TABLE III
THE COMPILATION TIME (SECONDS) OF XAV ON TEST RULE-SETS.

Rule-set	Regex decomposition	Xor filter compilation	Anchor DFA compilation	Verification engine compilation	Total
Bro217	0.006	0.003	0.159	7.13×10^{-5}	0.168
Ranges1	0.024	0.001	0.957	1.09×10^{-4}	0.982
Ranges05	0.025	0.001	0.976	9.75×10^{-5}	1.002
Dotstar03	0.024	0.002	0.940	1.57×10^{-4}	0.965
Dotstar06	0.025	0.002	0.929	2.12×10^{-4}	0.956
Dotstar09	0.026	0.002	0.936	3.51×10^{-4}	0.964
PowerEN	0.143	0.019	4.750	0.003	4.914
ClamAV	0.102	0.004	4.879	0.189	5.174
Snort	1.293	0.050	27.104	3.652	32.100

TABLE IV
THE SPATIAL PERFORMANCE OF XAV ON TEST RULE-SETS.

Rule-set	Xor filter		Anchor DFA		Verification engine	
	memory consumption (KB)	state number	memory consumption (KB)	compression ratio	lusDFA state number	memory consumption (KB)
Bro217	18.850	2302	24.775	0.016	0	1.680
Ranges1	8.405	10759	95.850	0.014	0	2.570
Ranges05	8.404	10724	88.240	0.013	0	2.578
Dotstar03	8.506	9804	88.220	0.014	0	3.273
Dotstar06	8.586	9692	87.261	0.014	0	3.969
Dotstar09	8.647	8900	81.614	0.014	0	4.656
PowerEN	14.435	38698	299.060	0.011	0	42.508
ClamAV	9.194	38078	431.008	0.018	761	768.555
Snort	12.646	135296	1601.953	0.019	35306	35447.742




Fig. 8. Xor filter hit ratio for each rule-set and each type of traffic.




Fig. 9. Ratio of anchor DFA matched bytes for each rule-set and each type of traffic.

more entries for the xor filter to match. It is also noted that the filtering effectiveness of the xor filter on random traffic is obviously higher than that on reality traffic.

2) *Anchor DFA matching overhead*: The anchor DFA matching overhead in XAV is represented by the ratio of the matching bytes of the anchor DFA to the total traffic. As shown in Figure 9, the ratio of anchor DFA matched bytes on each rule-set and each type of traffic is lower than 0.05, which is a quite small value and indicates that every 20 bytes of traffic can trigger at most one state transition for the anchor DFA. Consequently, as mentioned in Section V-C, about every ten matching units can share one copy of the anchor DFA STT, which is enough to make the anchor DFA not the performance bottleneck of XAV.

3) *Verification engine overhead*: The burden of the verification engine on the CPU comes from two aspects: obtaining partial traffic packets from FPGA and matching partial traffic bytes. Figure 10 shows the ratio of packets needing to be transferred from FPGA to CPU on each rule-set and each type of traffic, and Figure 11 shows the ratio of traffic bytes needing to be matched by the verification engine.

From the two figures, for rule-sets *Bro217*, *Ranges1*, *Ranges05*, and *PowerEN*, the ratios of packets transferred and bytes matched by the verification engine are both zero, which indicates there is no verification overhead. The zero verification overhead for the four rule-sets is because each regex in these rule-sets is a lsRE itself and does not need




Fig. 10. Ratio of packets transferred from FPGA to CPU for each rule-set and each type of traffic.




Fig. 11. Ratio of bytes needing to be matched by the verification engine for each rule-set and each type of traffic.

to be decomposed. Therefore, the anchor DFA in XAV can perform the entire matching of each regex in these rule-sets and no verification is required.

For the other five rule-sets, the ratio of bytes transferred from FPGA to CPU and the ratio of bytes matched by the verification engine are all small. Even for the largest *Snort* rule-set and realistic traffic, the ratio of bytes transferred and the ratio of bytes matched by verification are lower than 0.04 and 0.01 respectively. To make the verification engine not the performance bottleneck of XAV, a few CPU cores are enough for the small verification overhead. In the evaluation of XAV, one to six CPU cores are sufficient to reach the maximum matching throughput for all rule-sets.

E. Comparison with existing REM schemes

1) *Comparison with commodity schemes*: In our evaluation, the regex matching performance of XAV is compared with that of two commodity schemes, Bluefield-2 [53] and Hyperscan [6]. Bluefield-2 is a data processing unit (DPU) launched by Nvidia, which can provide a variety of acceleration functions,




Fig. 12. Throughput comparison with commodity REM schemes on realistic traffic.

including accelerated regular expression matching. Hyperscan is the current most efficient software REM solution provided by Intel. The throughput comparison is shown in Figure 12.

In our implementation, with 64 matching units, XAV can achieve a maximum throughput of about 75 Gbps¹¹ on all rule-sets. In comparison, Bluefield-2 achieves 42 Gbps throughput for most rule-sets, but suffers performance degradation for *Snort* rule-set, on which the throughput is 26 Gbps. What is worse, hundreds of rules in *Snort* rule-set are not supported by the compiler of Bluefield-2. Although XAV has to extract string fragments from each regex rule to build the xor filter, only tens of *Snort* rules containing no string fragment are not supported by XAV. Therefore, it can be drawn that XAV achieves better matching throughput and supports more complex regex rules than Bluefield-2.

For small rule-sets, Hyperscan can achieve a matching throughput of several to even more than ten Gbps with a CPU core, which is an excellent performance for software REM schemes. However, with the rule-set complexity and scale increase, the matching throughput of Hyperscan drops significantly and is only 0.97 Gbps on *ClamAV* rule-set and 0.36 Gbps on *Snort* rule-set. As a software solution, the biggest advantage of Hyperscan is that it can support nearly all *Snort* rules for software-only agility. It is noted that in the matching throughput comparison on *Snort* rule-set, Hyperscan only compiles the *Snort* rules supported by XAV for fairness. If Hyperscan compiles all *Snort* rules, the matching performance of Hyperscan will downgrade remarkably to only tens of Mbps. Although XAV is less flexible than Hyperscan according to supporting as many complex regex rules as possible, XAV achieves much better regex matching performance than Hyperscan and therefore can help save a lot of CPU resources for kinds of network security applications. For small rule-sets, XAV can reduce the requirement of more than 80% CPU cores compared to Hyperscan. While for large rule-sets like *ClamAV* and *Snort*, XAV helps to offload more than 95% computation burden into FPGA.

¹¹The performance bottleneck lies in the transmission of packets through PCIe channels.

TABLE V
COMPARISON WITH FPGA-BASED SCHEMES ON *Snort* RULE-SET.

Scheme	Platform	Rule-set size	Compilation time	Throughput (Gbps)	Tput efficiency ($\frac{Gbps \cdot states}{\#LUT}$)	Tput efficiency ($\frac{Gbps \cdot states}{bytes}$)
Xie et al. [23], [24]	Xilinx Kintex	3379	~10 hours	4.16	~4.16	~0.21
Yant et al. [7]	Xilinx Virtex-5	565	hours scale	10.30	10.1	>0.77
Yant et al. [8]	Xilinx Virtex-7	34	N/A	141	~0.43	~0.34
Zhong et al. [9]	Intel Arria 10	3420	~7 minutes	6.33	2.97	0.23
XAV	Intel Stratix 10	3170	32 seconds	75	56.58	1.89

2) *Comparison with FPGA-based schemes*: Table V compares XAV to other FPGA-based schemes. The data for other FPGA-based schemes are gained from their papers. From the table, it shows that XAV has a significantly shorter compilation time than other FPGA-based schemes. The throughput efficiency metric shows that XAV provides the highest matching performance under the same hardware resource consumption. Compared to other FPGA-based schemes, XAV achieves throughput efficiency ranging from 2.5 to 19 times higher, according to the matching performance achieved per unit of logic/storage resources.

The first two FPGA schemes in Table V are based on NFA. Since NFA needs to be mapped into specific FPGA logic for regex matching and the synthesis of FPGA circuits is quite time-consuming, the compilation time of the two FPGA NFA schemes is lengthy and can take several hours. The next two FPGA schemes and XAV are all based on DFA. As DFA can be updated by rewriting the internal memory in FPGA, the compilation of the latter three schemes can avoid the time-consuming FPGA circuit resynthesis. Consequently, the compilation time for rule-set updates of the latter three FPGA DFA schemes is significantly shorter than the first two FPGA NFA schemes. The third FPGA scheme [8] does not solve the state explosion problem of DFA, resulting in that it only supports small rule-sets of tens of regexes. Compared to the fourth FPGA scheme, because XAV better avoids the state explosion problem of DFA by utilizing anchor DFA, XAV generates much smaller DFA than the scheme proposed in [9]. As DFA compilation is also a time-consuming task [52], XAV takes much less time to complete the construction of smaller DFA.

Compared to other FPGA schemes, the much higher matching throughput efficiency achieved by XAV is mainly due to the use of the xor filter. Because each xor filter unit occupies very little memory and can prevent the majority of traffic from being matched by the latter stages, tens of xor filter units can be implemented in FPGA. Consequently, high matching throughput efficiency can be achieved in XAV.

VII. CONCLUSION

Regular expression matching plays a crucial role in various network security applications. High-performance regex matching has always been desired to help implement real-time packet checking. This paper proposes to use anchor DFA to tackle the state explosion problem of DFA, thereby supporting large-scale regex rule-sets. To achieve high matching performance, the xor filter and an extra verification stage are introduced to cooperate with anchor DFA. Consequently,

the proposed scheme is named XAV according to its three matching stages: xor filter, anchor DFA, and verification. Since the xor filter and anchor DFA have simple logic and are suitable for hardware implementation, an FPGA-CPU architecture is employed to implement XAV for high matching throughput. Our evaluation shows that XAV has fantastical space and temporal complexity. Compared to Bluefield-2 and Hyperscan, the FPGA-CPU implementation of XAV shows a much higher matching throughput of up to 75 Gbps for the large *Snort* rule-set. Compared to other FPGA-based schemes, XAV not only performs better in matching throughput but also consumes fewer hardware resources.

REFERENCES

- [1] Marco Spaziani Brunella, Giacomo Belocchi, Marco Bonola, Salvatore Pontarelli, Giuseppe Siracusano, Giuseppe Bianchi, Aniello Cammarano, Alessandro Palumbo, Luca Petrucci, and Roberto Bifulco. hxdp: Efficient software packet processing on fpga nics. *Communications of the ACM*, 65(8):92–100, 2022.
- [2] Tao Wang, Xiangrui Yang, Gianni Antichi, Anirudh Sivaraman, and Aurojit Panda. Isolation mechanisms for {High-Speed}{Packet-Processing} pipelines. In *19th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 22)*, pages 1289–1305, 2022.
- [3] C. Xu, S. Chen, J. Su, S. M. Yiu, and Lck Hui. A survey on regular expression matching for deep packet inspection: Applications, algorithms, and hardware platforms. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 18(4):2991–3029, 2016.
- [4] S. Kumar, B. Chandrasekaran, J. Turner, and G. Varghese. Curing regular expressions matching algorithms from insomnia, amnesia, and acalculia. In *Acm/ieee Symposium on Architecture for Networking & Communications Systems*, 2007.
- [5] R. Smith, C. Estan, S. Jha, and S. Kong. Deflating the big bang: Fast and scalable deep packet inspection with extended finite automata. In *ACM*, pages 207–218, 2008.
- [6] Xiang Wang, Yang Hong, Harry Chang, KyoungSoo Park, Geoff Langdale, Jiayu Hu, and Heqing Zhu. Hyperscan: a fast multi-pattern regex matcher for modern cpus. In *16th {USENIX} Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation ({NSDI} 19)*, pages 631–648, 2019.
- [7] Y. H. Yang and V. K. Prasanna. High-performance and compact architecture for regular expression matching on fpga. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, 61(7):1013–1025, 2012.
- [8] Jiajia Yang, Lei Jiang, Xu Bai, Huailiang Peng, and Qiong Dai. A high-performance round-robin regular expression matching architecture based on fpga. In *2018 IEEE Symposium on Computers and Communications (ISCC)*, pages 1–7. IEEE, 2018.
- [9] Jincheng Zhong, Shuhui Chen, and Biao Han. FPGA-CPU Architecture Accelerated Regular Expression Matching With Fast Preprocessing. *The Computer Journal*, 10 2022. bxac138.
- [10] Zhipeng Zhao, Hugo Sadok, Nirav Atre, James C Hoe, Vyas Sekar, and Justine Sherry. Achieving 100gbps intrusion prevention on a single server. In *14th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 20)*, pages 1083–1100, 2020.
- [11] Jian Chen, Xiaoyu Zhang, Tao Wang, Ying Zhang, Tao Chen, Jiajun Chen, Mingxu Xie, and Qiang Liu. Fidas: Fortifying the cloud via comprehensive fpga-based offloading for intrusion detection: Industrial product. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture*, ISCA '22, page 1029–1041, New York, NY, USA, 2022. Association for Computing Machinery.

- [12] K. Peng, S. Tang, C. Min, and Q. Dong. Chain-based dfa deflation for fast and scalable regular expression matching using tcam. In *Acm/ieee Seventh Symposium on Architectures for Networking & Communications Systems*, 2011.
- [13] E. Sadredini, R. Rahimi, M. Lenjani, M. Stan, and K. Skadron. Impala: Algorithm/architecture co-design for in-memory multi-stride pattern matching. In *2020 IEEE International Symposium on High Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)*, 2020.
- [14] K. Vinodh Kumar, S. Prithi, and K. Vinodha. Intelligent systems in latest dfa compression methods for dpc. In *Handbook of Research on Evolving Designs and Innovation in ICT and Intelligent Systems for Real-World Applications*, pages 129–146. IGI Global, 2022.
- [15] K. Kumar et al. Network intrusion detection system in latest dfa compression methods for deep packet scrutiny. In *Design, Applications, and Maintenance of Cyber-Physical Systems*, pages 219–243. IGI Global, 2021.
- [16] Lei Gong, Chao Wang, Haojun Xia, Xianglan Chen, Xi Li, and Xuehai Zhou. Enabling fast and memory-efficient acceleration for pattern matching workloads: The lightweight automata processing engine. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, 72(4):1011–1025, 2022.
- [17] S. Kumar, S. Dharmapurikar, F. Yu, P. Crowley, and J. Turner. Algorithms to accelerate multiple regular expressions matching for deep packet inspection. In *ACM*, pages 339–350, 2006.
- [18] M. Becchi and P. Crowley. A-dfa: A time- and space-efficient dfa compression algorithm for fast regular expression evaluation. *ACM Transactions on Architecture and Code Optimization*, 10(1):1–26, 2013.
- [19] R. Antonello, S. Fernandes, D. Sadok, J. Kelner, and Geza Szabo. Design and optimizations for efficient regular expression matching in dpi systems. *Computer Communications*, 61(may 1):103–120, 2015.
- [20] D. Ficara, S. Giordano, and G. Procissi. An improved dfa for fast regular expression matching. *Acm Sigcomm Computer Communication Review*, 38(5):29–40, 2008.
- [21] Mohammad Hashem Haghghat, Zhe Fu, and Jun Li. Hes: Highly efficient and scalable technique for matching regex patterns. In *Proceedings of the 2018 2nd High Performance Computing and Cluster Technologies Conference*, pages 69–78, 2018.
- [22] A. X. Liu and E. Norige. A de-compositional approach to regular expression matching for network security. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, PP(99):1–13, 2019.
- [23] Chunkun Bo, Vinh Dang, Ted Xie, Jack Wadden, Mircea Stan, and Kevin Skadron. Automata processing in reconfigurable architectures: In-the-cloud deployment, cross-platform evaluation, and fast symbol-only reconfiguration. *ACM Trans. Reconfigurable Technol. Syst.*, 12(2), may 2019.
- [24] T. Xie, V. Dang, J. Wadden, K. Skadron, and M. Stan. Reapr: Reconfigurable engine for automata processing. In *2017 27th International Conference on Field Programmable Logic and Applications (FPL)*, 2017.
- [25] C. H. Lin, C. T. Huang, C. P. Jiang, and S. C. Chang. Optimization of pattern matching circuits for regular expression on fpga. *IEEE Transactions on Very Large Scale Integration (VLSI) Systems*, 15(12):1303–1310, 2007.
- [26] Yhe Yang, W. Jiang, and V. K. Prasanna. Compact architecture for high-throughput regular expression matching on fpga. In *Proceedings of the 2008 ACM/IEEE Symposium on Architecture for Networking and Communications Systems, ANCS 2008, San Jose, California, USA, November 6-7, 2008*, 2008.
- [27] H. Nakahara, T. Sasao, and M. Matsuura. A regular expression matching circuit based on a modular non-deterministic finite automaton with multi-character transition. *Ieice Technical Report*, 2010.
- [28] N. Yamagaki, R. Sidhu, and S. Kamiya. High-speed regular expression matching engine using multi-character nfa. In *International Conference on Field Programmable Logic & Applications*, 2008.
- [29] T. T. Hieu and N. T. Tran. A memory efficient fpga-based pattern matching engine for stateful nids. In *Fifth International Conference on Ubiquitous & Future Networks*, 2013.
- [30] Shuhui Chen A and Rongxing Lu B. A regular expression matching engine with hybrid memories. *Computer Standards & Interfaces*, 36(5):880–888, 2014.
- [31] J. Yang, J. Lei, B. Xu, H. Peng, and Q. Dai. A high-performance round-robin regular expression matching architecture based on fpga. In *2018 IEEE Symposium on Computers and Communications (ISCC)*, 2018.
- [32] A. Bremler-Barr, D. Hay, and Y. Koral. Compactdfa: Generic state machine compression for scalable pattern matching. In *Infocom, IEEE*, 2010.
- [33] C. R. Meiners, J. Patel, E. Norige, E. Torng, and A. X. Liu. Fast regular expression matching using small tcams for network intrusion detection and prevention systems. In *Usenix Conference on Security*, 2010.
- [34] P. Dlugosch, D. Brown, P. Glendenning, M. Leventhal, and H. Noyes. An efficient and scalable semiconductor architecture for parallel automata processing. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel & Distributed Systems*, 25(12):3088–3098, 2014.
- [35] A. Subramanian, J. Wang, Erm Balasubramanian, D. Blaauw, and R. Das. Cache automaton. In *the 50th Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium*, 2017.
- [36] Michela Becchi, Mark Franklin, and Patrick Crowley. A workload for evaluating deep packet inspection architectures. In *2008 IEEE International Symposium on Workload Characterization*, pages 79–89. IEEE, 2008.
- [37] A. X. Liu and E. Norige. A de-compositional approach to regular expression matching for network security. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, PP(99):1–13, 2019.
- [38] Michela Becchi and Patrick Crowley. A hybrid finite automaton for practical deep packet inspection. In *Proceedings of the 2007 ACM CoNEXT conference*, pages 1–12, 2007.
- [39] Chengcheng Xu, Shuhui Chen, Jinshu Su, Siu-Ming Yiu, and Lucas CK Hui. A survey on regular expression matching for deep packet inspection: Applications, algorithms, and hardware platforms. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 18(4):2991–3029, 2016.
- [40] Mohammad Hashem Haghghat and Jun Li. Toward fast regex pattern matching using simple patterns. In *2018 IEEE 24th International Conference on Parallel and Distributed Systems (ICPADS)*, pages 662–670. IEEE, 2018.
- [41] Byungkwon Choi, Jongwook Chae, Muhammad Jamsheed, Kyoungsoo Park, and Dongsu Han. {DFC}: Accelerating string pattern matching for network applications. In *13th {USENIX} Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation ({NSDI} 16)*, pages 551–565, 2016.
- [42] Alfred V Aho and Margaret J Corasick. Efficient string matching: an aid to bibliographic search. *Communications of the ACM*, 18(6):333–340, 1975.
- [43] Marc Norton. Optimizing pattern matching for intrusion detection. *Sourcefire, Inc., Columbia, MD*, 2004.
- [44] Sun Wu and Udi Manber. Fast text searching: allowing errors. *Communications of the ACM*, 35(10):83–91, 1992.
- [45] Iulian Moraru and David G Andersen. Exact pattern matching with feed-forward bloom filters. *Journal of Experimental Algorithmics (JEA)*, 17:3–1, 2012.
- [46] Charalampos Stylianopoulos, Magnus Almgren, Olaf Landsiedel, and Marina Papatriantafyllou. Multiple pattern matching for network security applications: Acceleration through vectorization. *Journal of Parallel and Distributed Computing*, 137:34–52, 2020.
- [47] T. M. Graf and D. Lemire. Xor filters: Faster and smaller than bloom and cuckoo filters. *Journal of Experimental Algorithmics*, 25(1):1–16, 2020.
- [48] C. H. Lin, J. C. Li, C. H. Liu, and S. C. Chang. Perfect hashing based parallel algorithms for multiple string matching on graphic processing units. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel & Distributed Systems*, PP(9):1–1, 2017.
- [49] N. Tuck. Deterministic memory-efficient string matching algorithms for intrusion detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Infocom Conference, 2004*, 2004.
- [50] M. Becchi, M. Franklin, and P. Crowley. A workload for evaluating deep packet inspection architectures. In *IEEE International Symposium on Workload Characterization*, 2010.
- [51] J. Wadden, V. Dang, N. Brunelle, T. T. Li, D. Guo, E. Sadredini, K. Wang, C. Bo, G. Robins, and M. Stan. Anmlzoo: a benchmark suite for exploring bottlenecks in automata processing engines and architectures. In *IEEE International Symposium on Workload Characterization*, pages 1–12, 2016.
- [52] Jincheng Zhong and Shuhui Chen. Accelerating dfa construction based on hierarchical merging. In *2019 IEEE 5th International Conference on Computer and Communications (ICCC)*, pages 1360–1365. IEEE, 2019.
- [53] Idan Burstein. Nvidia data center processing unit (dpu) architecture. *2021 IEEE Hot Chips 33 Symposium (HCS)*, pages 1–20, 2021.
- [54] John E. Hopcroft, Rajeev Motwani, and Jeffrey D. Ullman. *Introduction to Automata Theory, Languages, and Computation, 3rd Edition*. Addison-Wesley, 1979.
- [55] Ken Thompson. Programming techniques: Regular expression search algorithm. *Communications of the ACM*, 11(6):419–422, 1968.
- [56] John Hopcroft. An $n \log n$ algorithm for minimizing states in a finite automaton. *Theory of machines and computations*, 1971.

TABLE VI
THE COMMON METACHARACTERS IN REGEXES

Metacharacter	Semantics	Example
.	any single character	"a.b" matches "aab", "abb" and "acb", etc
[]	any single character in square brackets	"[ab]" matches "a" or "b"
[^]	any single character not in square brackets	"[^ab]" matches any character other than "a" and "b"
*	match the previous character any number of times	"a*b" matches "b", "ab", and "aab", etc
+	match the previous character once or more times	"a+b" matches "ab", "aab", etc
{m,}	the previous element is repeated at least m times	"a{2,}" matches "aa", "aaa", and "aaaa", etc
{m,n}	the previous element is repeated m to n times	"a{2,4}" matches "aa", "aaa", and "aaaa"
	match the preceding element or the following element	"a b" matches "a" or "b"
^	match the start position of one string	"^a" matches the strings start with "a"
\$	match the end position of one string	"a\$" matches the strings end with "a"

APPENDIX PRELIMINARIES

In this section, the background knowledge about regular expressions and finite state automata is introduced.

A. Regular expressions

A regex is a sequence of characters that define a search pattern, namely languages or a string set. Each character in a regex is either a general character or a metacharacter. Each metacharacter has a special meaning. For example, metacharacter "." means to match any character, and metacharacter "*" means to match a character any number of times. Table VI lists some common metacharacters used in regexes.

B. Finite state automata

Regexes are usually first compiled into a finite state automaton for matching. It is theoretically proved that regexes and finite state automata are mathematically equivalent [54]. For any regex r , there is always a finite automaton \mathcal{A} whose semantics are the same as r ; on the contrary, for any finite automaton \mathcal{A} , there is always a regex r whose semantics are the same as \mathcal{A} .

Nondeterministic Finite Automaton (NFA) and Deterministic Finite Automaton (DFA) are the two most common automata applied for regex matching. Using the classical Thompson algorithm [55], a set of regexes can be compiled into an NFA. Furthermore, through the subset construction algorithm [54], an NFA can be converted to a DFA. To eliminate redundant states, one DFA is usually minimized using the minimization algorithm [56].

NFA and DFA can both be represented by a five-tuple $(\mathcal{Q}, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, \mathcal{F})$, which is interpreted as follows:

- \mathcal{Q} : A finite set of states representing the state space of the automaton.
- Σ : A finite set of input symbols (usually 256 ASCII characters).
- δ : The state transition function($\mathcal{Q} \times \Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$), indicating how the state transitions are performed for each input character.
- q_0 : An initial state representing the state in which the automaton starts to match. ($q_0 \in \mathcal{Q}$)
- \mathcal{F} : The set of matching/accepting states. It indicates that rule matching occurs when jumping to these states in the automaton. ($\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{Q}$)

TABLE VII
COMPARISON BETWEEN NFA AND DFA

Automaton	Time complexity	Space complexity
NFA	$O(mn^2)$	$O(mn)$
DFA	$O(1)$	$O(2^{mn})$

Taking one DFA as an example to clarify the matching process of one automaton. Let the input text to be matched be $c_0c_1c_2\dots c_p$. To begin with, the DFA starts from the initial state q_0 , which is called the current active state. For the first character c_0 , the state transition function δ is invoked to get the next active state, which is supposed as $q_1 = \delta(q_0, c_0)$. Then, the DFA reads the next character c_1 , and consults the next active state, $q_2 = \delta(q_1, c_0)$. The process is repeated until the end of the input text. Assume that the DFA visits a sequence of states, $q_0q_1\dots q_p$ during the whole matching process. If q_p is in the accepting state set \mathcal{F} , it indicates that the DFA accepts the input text. Otherwise, the input text is rejected by the DFA.

The matching procedure of NFA is similar to DFA. The only difference lies in that in the matching process of one NFA, there can be multiple current active states, and each state can transit to multiple states through the state transition function δ .

C. NFA vs DFA

Table VII lists the comparison between NFA and DFA according to the worst-case time complexity and space complexity. In general, employing either NFA or DFA is difficult to realize efficient regex matching for large-scale and complex rule-sets.

NFA usually has a simpler structure than DFA. Theoretical analysis has shown that for a regex with length n , NFA has a linear space complexity of $O(n)$. However, multiple states may be activated simultaneously in NFA. In the worst case, all states in NFA are active, and each state may jump to all other states. Therefore, for a regex of length n , the worst-case time complexity for matching each input character is $O(n^2)$. Compiling m regexes into an NFA, the space complexity increases linearly to $O(mn)$, and the worst-case time complexity rises up to $O(mn^2)$, which indicates a low matching performance.

In contrast, since there is always one active state in DFA and only one state transition is required per input character, DFA has a low time complexity of $O(1)$. The low

time complexity indicates that DFA has a huge advantage in matching performance compared to NFA. However, the excellent temporal performance of DFA comes at the cost of huge space consumption. The subset construction algorithm actually traverses all possible state combinations in NFA and transforms each state combination into a new state in DFA. Therefore, for a regex of length n , the worst-case space complexity of DFA is as high as $O(2^n)$. For m regexes, the worst-case space complexity of DFA increases dramatically to $O(2^{mn})$. When compiling a large-scale and complex rule-set into a DFA, the required space usually exceeds the upper limit of the compiler's physical memory. In this case, the state explosion of DFA occurs.