

On Computing the Smallest Suffixient Set

Davide Cenzato^{1*}[0000-0002-0098-3620], Francisco Olivares^{2,3**}[0000-0001-7881-9794], and Nicola Prezza^{1*}[0000-0003-3553-4953]

¹ DAIS, Ca' Foscari University of Venice, Italy
{davide.cenzato,nicola.prezza}@unive.it

² Centre for Biotechnology and Bioengineering, Chile

³ Department of Computer Science, University of Chile, Chile
folivares@uchile.cl

Abstract. Let $T \in \Sigma^n$ be a text over alphabet Σ . A *sufficient set* $S \subseteq [n]$ for T is a set of positions such that, for every one-character right-extension $T[i, j]$ of every right-maximal substring $T[i, j - 1]$ of T , there exists $x \in S$ such that $T[i, j]$ is a suffix of $T[1, x]$. It was recently shown that, given a suffixient set of cardinality q and an oracle offering fast random access on T (for example, a straight-line program), there is a data structure of $O(q)$ words (on top of the oracle) that can quickly find all Maximal Exact Matches (MEMs) of any query pattern P in T with high probability. The paper introducing suffixient sets left open the problem of computing the smallest such set; in this paper, we solve this problem by describing a simple quadratic-time algorithm, a $O(n + \bar{r}|\Sigma|)$ -time algorithm running in compressed working space (\bar{r} is the number of runs in the Burrows-Wheeler transform of T reversed), and an optimal $O(n)$ -time algorithm computing the smallest suffixient set. We present an implementation of our compressed-space algorithm and show experimentally that it uses a small memory footprint on repetitive text collections.

Keywords: Suffixient sets · Right-maximal substrings · Text indexing · Compressed-space algorithms

1 Introduction

In [4], Depuydt et al. described a new compressed index based on the following principle. Let $T \in \Sigma^n$ be a text of length n . Choose a set $S \subseteq [n]$ such that, for every one-character right-extension $T[i, j]$ of every right-maximal substring $T[i, j - 1]$ of T , there exists $x \in S$ such that $T[i, j]$ is a suffix of $T[1, x]$ (α is said to be *right-maximal* if both $\alpha \cdot a$ and $\alpha \cdot b$ appear in T for some characters $a \neq b$ or if α is a suffix of T). The idea behind the index is that the set of prefixes $\{T[1, x] : x \in S\}$, together with random access on T , can be used to locate one

* Funded by the European Union (ERC, REGINDEX, 101039208). Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

** Funded by Ph.D Scholarship 21210579, ANID, Chile.

occurrence of any pattern P in T via the following strategy. Assuming that P occurs in T and that the prefix $P[1, j]$ is right-maximal in T : (i) we find one of the selected prefixes $T[1, x]$, for $x \in S$, suffixed by $P[1, j+1]$, and (ii) we right-extend the match by comparing $T[x+1, \dots]$ and $P[j+2, \dots]$. This way, we either match until the end of P or we find a mismatch $T[x+1+t] \neq P[j+2+t]$, for some $t \geq 0$. In the former case, we are done. In the latter case, we know that $P[j+1+t]$ is right-maximal in T so we can repeat steps (i) and (ii). Starting with the empty prefix of P , this procedure yields one occurrence of P in T and can be easily extended to return all Maximal Exact Matches (MEMs) of P in T . Depuydt et al. [4] called *suffixient* a set S with the property above outlined. They moreover exhibited a suffixient set of cardinality $2\bar{r}$, where \bar{r} is the number of runs in the Burrows-Wheeler transform of T reversed. To conclude, they observed that the set $\{T[1, x] : x \in S\}$ can be stored in $O(|S|)$ words of space using z-fast tries while supporting fast suffix searches (thereby supporting step (i)), and that the right-extension at step (ii) can be performed in logarithmic time and compressed space using a straight-line program of size g on T . As a result, they obtained an index of $O(\bar{r} + g)$ words able to efficiently locate all MEMs of P in T .

This new indexing strategy raises a natural question: how to compute the smallest suffixient set, of size χ ? Observe that χ is independent on the alphabet ordering, while \bar{r} is. Since re-ordering the alphabet may reduce asymptotically \bar{r} [1], from the bound $\chi \leq 2\bar{r}$ we immediately obtain that there exist string families on which $\chi = o(\bar{r})$. In other words, χ is a better repetitiveness measure than \bar{r} , even though the problem of determining whether χ is *reachable* (i.e. if $O(\chi)$ words are always sufficient to store the text) is still open. In this respect, Depuydt et al. [4] prove that any suffixient set is a string attractor [5], entailing in particular that T can be compressed in $O(\chi \log(n/\chi))$ words of space.

In this paper, we start by characterizing the smallest suffixient set. Our main contribution is to show that the smallest suffixient set can be computed efficiently. We describe three algorithms solving the problem, all based on the Burrows-Wheeler transform (BWT), the Longest Common Prefix array (LCP), and the Suffix Array (SA) of T reversed. The first algorithm runs in quadratic time and is conceptually very simple. The other two algorithms are optimizations of the first one. The second algorithm runs in $O(n + \bar{r}\sigma)$ time (which can be easily reduced to $O(n + \bar{r} \log \sigma)$) and requires only one pass on those three arrays. The third algorithm requires random access on those arrays and runs in optimal $O(n)$ time. While being slower, the one-pass property of the second algorithm makes it ideal to be combined with Prefix Free Parsing (PFP) [2], a technique able to stream those three arrays in compressed space. We show experimentally that this combination of PFP with our one-pass algorithm can quickly compute the smallest suffixient set in compressed space on repetitive text collections.

2 Preliminaries

Let Σ be a finite ordered alphabet of size σ . We use the following notation: $[i, j]$ for an interval indicating all values $\{i, i+1, \dots, j\}$ (if $j < i$, then $[i, j] = \emptyset$),

$[n]$ for $[1, n]$, $T = T[1, n]$ for a string T of length n over Σ , $T[i]$ for the i th character of T , $T[i, j]$ for the *substring* $T[i] \cdots T[j]$ of T , where $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, $|T|$ for the length of T , and ϵ for the empty string. We assume that T begins with an end-of-string character $T[1] = \$$ being smaller than all the other characters in Σ and appearing only in $T[1]$. We moreover assume $n = |T| \geq 2$, so T contains at least two distinct characters, and that $\sigma \leq n$, since the alphabet can always be re-mapped to $[n]$ without changing the solutions to the problems considered in this paper. A *run* for a string T is a maximal substring $T[i, j]$ containing only one distinct character; we denote by $\text{runs}(T)$ the number of runs of T . We refer to $T^{\text{rev}} = T[n]T[n-1] \cdots T[1]$ as the reverse of the string T .

A *right-maximal substring* (or *repeat*) $T[i, j]$ ($j \geq i - 1$) of a string $T[1, n]$ is a substring of T such that either $j = n$ or for which there exist at least two distinct characters $a, b \in \Sigma$ such that both $T[i, j] \cdot a$ and $T[i, j] \cdot b$ are substrings of T . Note that the empty string ϵ is right-maximal.

Given two strings T and S , we define the *lexicographic order* on Σ^* as follows: $S <_{\text{lex}} T$ if S is a proper prefix of T , or if there exists an index j s.t. $S[j] < T[j]$ and for all $i < j$, $S[i] = T[i]$. Given a $\$$ -terminated string $T = T[1, n]$, the *suffix array* of T , SA , is the permutation of $[n]$ such that $T[\text{SA}[i], n] <_{\text{lex}} T[\text{SA}[j], n]$ holds for any $1 \leq i < j \leq n$. The *longest common prefix* array of T , $\text{LCP}[2, n]$ is the length- $(n - 1)$ array (indexed from 2) such that $\text{LCP}[i]$ stores the length of the longest common prefix between $T[\text{SA}[i], n]$ and $T[\text{SA}[i - 1], n]$, for all $2 \leq i \leq n$. Given a set $B \subseteq [n]$, $\text{LCP}[B]$ indicates the set $\{\text{LCP}[i] : i \in B\}$.

Given a $\$$ -terminated string $T = T[1..n]$, the Burrows-Wheeler Transform of T [3], $\text{BWT}(T)$, is a permutation of the characters of T defined by concatenating the characters following the lexicographically-sorted suffixes of T . We indicate with \bar{r} the number of runs in $\text{BWT}(T^{\text{rev}})$. For example, if $T = \$\text{BANANA}$, $\text{BWT}(T^{\text{rev}}) = \text{BNN}\AAA , and $\bar{r} = 4$.

We say that position $1 < i \leq n$ is a *c-run break*, for $c \in \Sigma$, if $\text{BWT}[i-1, i] = ac$ or $\text{BWT}[i-1, i] = ca$, with $a \in \Sigma$ and $a \neq c$. Note that, if i is a *c-run break*, then it is also an *a-run break* for some $a \neq c$.

3 The Smallest Suffixient Set

We start from the definition of *suffixient set* [4]:

Definition 1 (Suffixient set [4]). *A set $S \subseteq [n]$ is suffixient for a string T if, for every one-character right-extension $T[i, j]$ ($j \geq i$) of every right-maximal string $T[i, j - 1]$, there exists $x \in S$ such that $T[i, j]$ is a suffix of $T[1, x]$.*

Next, we characterize the smallest suffixient set. We first define the concept of *supermaximal extensions* (Definition 2). Then, in Definition 3 we define a set (actually, a family of sets) \mathcal{S} containing all positions in T “capturing” all (and only the) supermaximal extensions of T . Finally, in Lemma 1 we prove that \mathcal{S} is a suffixient set of minimum cardinality.

Definition 2. We say that $T[i, j]$ (with $j \geq i$) is a supermaximal extension if $T[i, j - 1]$ is right-maximal and, for each right-maximal $T[i', j' - 1] \neq T[i, j - 1]$ (with $i' \leq j' < n$), $T[i, j]$ is not a suffix of $T[i', j']$.

The following definition depends on a particular total order $<_t$ on $[n]$. We use $<_t$ to break ties between equivalent candidate positions of the suffixient set, choosing the position of maximum rank according to $<_t$ in case of a tie. In order to make notation lighter, we do not parameterize the set on the particular tie-breaking strategy ($<_t$ will always be clear from the context).

Definition 3. Let $<_t$ be any total order on $[n]$. We define a set $\mathcal{S} \subseteq [n]$ as follows: $x \in \mathcal{S}$ if and only if there exists a supermaximal extension $T[i, j]$ such that (i) $T[i, j]$ is a suffix of $T[1, x]$, and (ii) for all prefixes $T[1, y]$ suffixed by $T[i, j]$, if $y \neq x$ then $y <_t x$.

In Appendix A we prove:

Lemma 1. For any tie-breaking strategy (total order) $<_t$, \mathcal{S} is a suffixient set of minimum cardinality for T .

From now on, we denote with $\chi = |\mathcal{S}|$ the cardinality of a suffixient set of minimum size. Note that, by Lemma 1, Definition 3 yields a suffixient set of cardinality χ for any tie-breaking strategy (total order) $<_t$.

4 Computing the smallest suffixient set

In this section, we present three algorithms for computing a suffixient set of smallest cardinality. We start in Subsection 4.1 by giving an “operative” version of Definition 3. This “operative” definition will automatically yield a simple quadratic-time algorithm for computing a smallest suffixient set. In the next subsections, we will optimize this algorithm and reach compressed working space (Subsection 4.2) and optimal linear time (Subsection 4.3).

4.1 A simple quadratic-time algorithm

For brevity, in the rest of the paper LCP, BWT, SA denote $\text{LCP}(T^{\text{rev}})$, $\text{BWT}(T^{\text{rev}})$, and $\text{SA}(T^{\text{rev}})$, respectively.

Definition 4. Given a position $i \in [n]$, we define $\text{box}(i) = [\ell, r]$ to be the maximal interval such that $i \in [\ell, r]$ and $\text{LCP}[j] \geq \text{LCP}[i]$ for all $j \in [\ell, r]$.

Example 1. See Figure 1: $\text{box}(10) = [3, 13]$ (shown with a blue box), because $\text{LCP}[3, 13] \geq \text{LCP}[10] = 1$, and $\text{box}(19) = [17, 20]$ (shown with an orange box).

Next, we define the set of c -run breaks in $\text{box}(i)$. Recall that when we say that i is a c -run break, we mean that either $\text{BWT}[i - 1, i] = ac$ or $\text{BWT}[i - 1, i] = ca$, for some $a \neq c$.

Definition 5. Given $i \in [n]$ and $c \in \Sigma$, we define

$$B_{i,c} = \{j : j \text{ is a } c\text{-run break in } \text{BWT}(T^{\text{rev}}) \text{ and } j \in \text{box}(i)\}.$$

Example 2. In Figure 1, we have $B_{10,A} = \{3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12\}$.

We indicate with $\text{text}(i) = n - \text{SA}[i] + 2$ the position in T corresponding to character $\text{BWT}[i]$, and with $\text{bwt}(j) = \text{SA}^{-1}[n + 2 - j]$ the inverse of function $\text{text}()$, i.e. the position in BWT corresponding to character $T[j]$.

The following property, which we prove in Appendix A, stands at the core of all our algorithms for computing a smallest suffixient set:

Lemma 2. *The following hold:*

1. Let i be a c -run break and $i' \in \{i, i - 1\}$ be such that $\text{BWT}[i'] = c$. Let $j' = \text{text}(i')$, and let $\ell = \text{LCP}[i]$. If $\ell = \max \text{LCP}[B_{i,c}]$, then the string $T[j' - \ell, j']$ is a supermaximal extension, and
2. conversely, for any supermaximal extension $\alpha \cdot c$ there exists an occurrence $\alpha \cdot c = T[j' - \ell, j']$ and a c -run break $i \in [n]$ such that $\text{BWT}[i] = c$, with $i' = \text{bwt}(j') \in \{i, i - 1\}$ and $\ell = \text{LCP}[i] = \max \text{LCP}[B_{i,c}]$.

Intuitively, Lemma 2 states that supermaximal extensions can be identified by looking at local maxima among c -run breaks contained in LCP ranges of the form $\text{LCP}[\text{box}(i)]$. Since, by Definition 3, supermaximal extensions are those characterizing suffixient sets of smallest cardinality, Lemma 2 gives us a tool for computing such a set using the arrays BWT , LCP , and SA . See Figure 1.

We immediately obtain a simple quadratic algorithm computing a suffixient set of smallest cardinality: see Algorithm 1. Note that, in Lemma 2, if $i'' \in B_{i,c}$ and $\text{LCP}[i''] = \text{LCP}[i]$, then $\text{box}(i) = \text{box}(i'')$. Since there could be multiple c -run breaks $i'' \in B_{i,c}$ such that $\text{LCP}[i''] = \text{LCP}[i]$, if $\text{LCP}[i] = \text{LCP}[i''] = \max \text{LCP}[B_{i,c}]$ then we have to break ties and insert only one of the corresponding text positions in the suffixient set. In Line 7 of Algorithm 1 we choose the largest such c -run break: as a matter of fact, this defines a particular tie-breaking strategy $<_t$ between positions $[n]$ (as required by Definition 3).

Computing BWT , LCP , and SA in Line 1 takes $O(n)$ time. Additionally, for each $i = 2, \dots, n$, Algorithm 1 computes the set $B_{i,c}$ in line 7 by scanning $\text{LCP}[\dots, i - 1, i, i + 1, \dots]$ in order to identify $\text{LCP}[\text{box}(i)]$ ($O(n)$ time for each such scan). It follows that the total running time is bounded by $O(n^2)$. Correctness follows immediately from Lemma 2, Definition 3, and Lemma 1.

4.2 A one-pass algorithm working in compressed space

In this section, we speed up the simple quadratic algorithm provided in the previous section. We will refer to this version as "one-pass" since it only requires one scan of the BWT , SA , and LCP arrays. The algorithm is summarized in Algorithms 2 and 3. See below for a description.

$T^{rev} = \text{AGAAATAATAGTATAATAA\$}$

right-max. string (α)	right-extension (a)	suffixient set ($n - SA[i] + 2$)	SA[i]	LCP[i]	BWT[i]	Suffixes	i
			20	0	A	\$	1
			19	0	A	A\$	2
			18	1	T	AA\$	3
		3	15	2	G	AAATAATAGTATAATAA\$	4
		4	14	2	T	AATAA\$	5
		5	13	4	A	AATAATAGTATAATAA\$	6
AA	G	7	7	4	T	AATAGTATAATAA\$	7
AATAA	T	7	7	1	\$	AGAAATAATAGTATAATAA\$	8
AATAA	A	18	18	2	T	AGTATAATAA\$	9
GA	T	12	12	1	A	ATAA\$	10
ATAATA	T	9	9	4	T	ATAATAA\$	11
ATAATA	A	17	17	6	A	ATAATAGTATAATAA\$	12
AT	A	13	13	3	A	ATAGTATAATAA\$	13
AT	G	10	10	2	A	GAAATAATAGTATAATAA\$	14
			11	1	A	GTATAATAA\$	15
			17	0	A	TAA\$	16
			14	3	A	TAATAA\$	17
			6	5	A	TAATAGTATAATAA\$	18
			9	2	A	TAGTATAATAA\$	19
			12	2	G	TATAATAA\$	20

Fig. 1. The figure shows how to construct a smallest suffixient set \mathcal{S} for a string $T[1, n]$ with $n = 20$ following Lemma 2. To the left of the black arrows: all supermaximal extensions $\alpha \cdot a$ of T and their selected ending positions in T , forming a suffixient set. To the right of the black arrows: SA, LCP, BWT and the sorted suffixes of T^{rev} . In column SA[i], we highlight in red all positions that are selected to be included in \mathcal{S} . In columns Suffixes and BWT[i], we highlight in green the (reverses of) the supermaximal extensions of T . Black arrows show how the selected SA positions are converted to positions in T using the formula $n - SA[i] + 2$. How to identify positions of \mathcal{S} : for each c -run break i , we decide if the two ranks $i' \in \{i - 1, i\}$ should contribute to \mathcal{S} (i.e. if they correspond to a supermaximal extension) as described in Lemma 2. For brevity, we show this decisional procedure only on two run breaks. Consider the A-run break at position $i = 10$ (highlighted in blue in column i). The blue box depicts the corresponding LCP interval, $LCP[box(10)] = LCP[3, 13]$. We observe that in $[3, 13]$ there are other A-run breaks i'' , such that $LCP[i''] > LCP[10]$: those are $i'' = 6, 7, 11, 12$. We conclude that text position $n - SA[10] + 2 = 6$ should not be included in \mathcal{S} . Consider now the A-run break $i = 20$, highlighted in orange in column i . Position $i' = 20 - 1 = 19$ is such that $BWT[i'] = A$. The orange box depicts the corresponding LCP interval, $LCP[box(20)] = LCP[17, 20]$. In this case, there is no other A-run break in $[17, 20]$ with an LCP value larger than $LCP[20] = 2$. We therefore insert text position $n - SA[i'] + 2 = n - SA[19] + 2 = 13$ in \mathcal{S} . Notice that $i = 20$ is also a G-run break; repeating the above reasoning, one can verify that position $i' = 20$ is indeed associated with the supermaximal extension $AT \cdot G$ ending in text position 10.

Observe that Algorithm 1 runs in quadratic time due to the fact that it needs to scan $LCP[box(i)]$ for each run break i , and those boxes overlap. Intuitively, Algorithm 2 avoids this inefficiency by storing information about local LCP maxima on c -run breaks (for each $c \in \Sigma$) in a data structure R (Line 3). Intuitively, this allows us to detect if a previous box $box(j)$, with $j < i$, ends in

Algorithm 1: Quadratic algorithm to compute a smallest suffixient set

```

input : A string  $T[1, n] \in \Sigma^n$ 
output: A suffixient set  $\mathcal{S}$  of smallest cardinality for  $T$ .
1 BWT  $\leftarrow$  BWT( $T^{\text{rev}}$ ); LCP  $\leftarrow$  LCP( $T^{\text{rev}}$ ); SA  $\leftarrow$  SA( $T^{\text{rev}}$ );
2  $\mathcal{S} \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
3 for  $i = 2, \dots, n$  do
4   if BWT[ $i - 1$ ]  $\neq$  BWT[ $i$ ] then
5     for  $i' \in \{i - 1, i\}$  do
6        $c \leftarrow$  BWT[ $i'$ ]; /*  $i$  is a  $c$ -run break */
7       if  $i = \max\{i'' : i'' \in B_{i,c} \wedge \text{LCP}[i''] = \max \text{LCP}[B_{i,c}]\}$  then
8          $\mathcal{S} \leftarrow \mathcal{S} \cup \{n - \text{SA}[i'] + 2\}$ 
9       end
10    end
11  end
12 end
13 return  $\mathcal{S}$ ;

```

position i by simply checking if $\text{LCP}[j]$ drops below the current LCP maxima associated with each character c .

Assume we scanned the arrays BWT, SA, and LCP up to position i . R is a map associating each $c \in \Sigma$ with information related with some c -run break $j \leq i$ corresponding to a candidate supermaximal extension $\alpha \cdot c$. Each entry $R[c] = (\text{len}, \text{pos}, \text{active})$ is composed of three values: $R[c].\text{len} = \text{LCP}[j]$ (i.e., the length of the right-maximal string α), $R[c].\text{pos} = \text{text}(j') = n - \text{SA}[j'] - 2$, where $j' \in \{j - 1, j\}$ is such that $\text{BWT}[j'] = c$ (i.e. the position of the last character of the supermaximal extension $\alpha \cdot c$ in T), and a boolean flag $R[c].\text{active}$ which is set to *true* if and only if $R[c].\text{len}$ is the maximum value in $\text{LCP}[B_{j,c} \cap [i]]$ (breaking ties by smaller j : we keep the first encountered such maximum). Depending on the value of flag *active*, we will distinguish between *active* and *inactive candidates*.

Example 3. See Figure 1 and assume we scanned BWT up to position $j = 4$. The candidate associated with letter T is $R[\text{T}] = (2, 3, \text{true})$, where $R[\text{T}].\text{len} = \text{LCP}[4] = 2$. This candidate is active since $\text{LCP}[4]$ is the largest value in $\text{LCP}[B_{4,\text{T}} \cap [4]] = \{2\}$. When processing position $j = 6$, we find another T-run break. Here we update $R[\text{T}] = (5, 7, \text{true})$ since $6 \in B_{4,\text{T}} \cap [6]$, and $5 = \text{LCP}[6] > \text{LCP}[4]$.

Algorithm 2 works as follows. We scan the BWT left-to-right: $\text{BWT}[2], \dots, \text{BWT}[i]$ (for $i = 2, \dots, n$). For $c \in \Sigma$, let $j < i$ be the c -run break whose information is stored in $R[c]$, i.e. such that $\text{LCP}[j] = R[c].\text{len}$. If $\text{LCP}[i] < R[c].\text{len}$, then $i \notin \text{box}(j)$. But then, if $R[c].\text{active} = \text{true}$, position $R[c].\text{pos}$ must belong to the output set so we have to insert it in \mathcal{S} . We also set $R[c].\text{active} = \text{false}$ in order to record that the maximum in $\text{LCP}[B_{j,c}]$ has been found (if $R[c].\text{active}$ is already equal to *false*, \mathcal{S} does not need to be updated since the maximum in $\text{LCP}[B_{j,c}]$ had already been found). Observe that these operations, performed by the call to $\text{eval}(\Sigma, m, R, \mathcal{S})$ (lines 8,17) (see below for the meaning of variable

Algorithm 2: One-pass algorithm

```

input : A string  $T[1..n]$  over a finite alphabet  $\Sigma$ .
output: A suffixient set  $\mathcal{S}$  of smallest cardinality for  $T$ .
1  $\mathcal{S} \leftarrow \emptyset$ ; /* initialize the empty suffixient set  $\mathcal{S}$  */
2  $\text{BWT} \leftarrow \text{BWT}(T^{\text{rev}})$ ;  $\text{LCP} \leftarrow \text{LCP}(T^{\text{rev}})$ ;  $\text{SA} \leftarrow \text{SA}(T^{\text{rev}})$ ;
3  $R[1, \sigma] \leftarrow ((-1, 0, \text{false}), \dots, (-1, 0, \text{false}))$ ; /* LCP local maxima */
4  $m \leftarrow \infty$ ; /* LCP minimum inside current BWT run */
5 for  $i = 2, \dots, n$  do
6    $m \leftarrow \min\{m, \text{LCP}[i]\}$ ;
7   if  $\text{BWT}[i] \neq \text{BWT}[i-1]$  then
8      $\text{eval}(\Sigma, m, R, \mathcal{S})$ ;
9     for  $i' \in \{i-1, i\}$  do
10      if  $\text{LCP}[i] > R[\text{BWT}[i']].\text{len}$  then
11         $R[\text{BWT}[i']] \leftarrow (\text{LCP}[i], n - \text{SA}[i'] + 2, \text{true})$ ;
12      end
13    end
14     $m \leftarrow \infty$ ;
15  end
16 end
17  $\text{eval}(\Sigma, -1, R, \mathcal{S})$ ; /* evaluate last active candidates */
18 return  $\mathcal{S}$ ;

```

m), have to be repeated for each $c \in \Sigma$; however, since i can possibly replace the candidate in $R[c]$ only if i is a c -run break, we can avoid calling $\text{eval}(\cdot)$ inside equal-letter BWT runs as follows: we compute the minimum LCP value m inside LCP intervals corresponding to BWT equal-letter runs (line 6), and perform the check $m < R[c].\text{len}$ for each $c \in \Sigma$ by calling procedure $\text{eval}(\Sigma, m, R, \mathcal{S})$ (costing time $O(\sigma)$) only when the current position i is a run break. This ultimately reduces the algorithm's running time from $O(n \cdot \sigma)$ to $O(n + \bar{r} \cdot \sigma)$.

On the other hand, if i is a c -run break and $\text{LCP}[i] > R[c].\text{len}$, then $i \in B_{j,c} \cap [i]$ and $R[c].\text{len}$ is not a local maximum in $\text{LCP}[B_{j,c}]$ (line 10). In this case, we have to replace the candidate stored in $R[c]$ with the information associated with the new candidate i : letting $i' \in \{i-1, i\}$ be such that $\text{BWT}[i'] = c$, we replace $R[c] \leftarrow (\text{LCP}[i], n - \text{SA}[i'] + 2, \text{true})$ (line 11).

Example 4. Continuing Example 3. When processing the T-run break $j = 7$, we see that $\text{LCP}[7] < R[\text{T}].\text{len}$. Thus, we reached the end of $\text{box}(6) = [6, 6]$, where $\max \text{LCP}[B_{6,\text{T}}] = R[\text{T}].\text{len} = 5$, and insert $R[\text{T}].\text{pos}$ in \mathcal{S} . Next, we update $R[\text{T}] = (4, 0, \text{false})$. On $j = 8$, we again update $R[\text{T}] = (1, 0, \text{false})$. Finally, on $j = 9$, we get $\text{LCP}[9] > R[\text{T}].\text{len}$ since $\text{box}(6)$ and $\text{box}(9)$ are now disjoint. We update $R[\text{T}] = (\text{LCP}[9], 12, \text{true})$ to the active state.

We obtain (see Appendix A for a more detailed proof):

Lemma 3. *Given a text $T[1, n]$ over alphabet of size σ , Algorithm 2 computes the smallest suffixient set \mathcal{S} in $O(n + \bar{r} \cdot \sigma)$ time and $O(n)$ words of space.*

Algorithm 3: Procedure $eval(C, l, R, \mathcal{S})$

input : A set of characters C , a LCP value l , the candidate's list R and the suffixient set \mathcal{S} .
output: The updated suffixient set \mathcal{S} .

```

1 foreach  $c \in C$  do
2   if  $l < R[c].len$  then
3     if  $R[c].active$  then
4        $\mathcal{S} \leftarrow \mathcal{S} \cup \{R[c].pos\}$ ;
5     end
6      $R[c] \leftarrow \{l, 0, false\}$ ;
7   end
8 end

```

Observe that in Algorithm 3 (procedure $eval(\cdot)$), only entries such that $l < R[c].len$ are possibly modified. This suggests that R could be sorted in order to speed up operations. Indeed, it turns out that R can be replaced with a data structure based on dynamic partial sums, such that operation $eval(\Sigma, m, R, \mathcal{S})$ at Line 8 of Algorithm 2 costs amortized time $O(\log \sigma)$. With this modification, Algorithm 2 runs in $O(n + \bar{r} \log \sigma)$ time. We do not enter into the details of this solution, since (i) in the next section we will present an optimal $O(n)$ -time solution, and (ii) our one-pass algorithm is mainly of practical interest (see also next paragraph) and in practice the map R fits in cache (σ is small).

One-pass algorithm in compressed space One important feature of our algorithm is that we only need one scan of the BWT, SA, and LCP to compute \mathcal{S} . This means that our algorithm also works in the streaming scenario where these arrays are provided one element at a time, from first to last. We now show that this feature can be exploited to run the algorithm in compressed working space.

Prefix-free parsing (PFP) is a technique introduced by Boucher et al. [2] to ease the computational burden of computing the BWT of large and repetitive texts. Briefly, with one linear-time scan, PFP divides the input T into overlapping segments, called *phrases*, of variable length, which are then used to construct what is referred to as the *dictionary* D and *parse* P of the text. Then, with a separate linear-time algorithm, the BWT of T is directly computed from D and P ; thus using space proportional to the combined size of the two data structures. In [6,7], it was shown how to modify PFP in order to compute also the SA and the LCP arrays. This version streams the three arrays BWT, LCP, and SA in $O(|D| + |P|)$ compressed space, from their first to last entry; this is sufficient for running Algorithm 2 in compressed space, without affecting its running time. The only major change consists in modifying PFP to compute the dictionary and parse of T^{rev} instead of T . This can actually be achieved very easily with a left-to-right scan of T ; see Appendix B.1 for more details. In Section 5 we present an implementation of this PFP-based algorithm.

4.3 Linear-time algorithm

In this section, we further speed up the one-pass algorithm provided in the previous section and achieve linear time. Our new algorithm is summarized in Algorithm 4.

As previously discussed, in Algorithm 2, for the one-character extension of every BWT equal-letter $\text{BWT}[i^*, i] = cc \dots ccx$ (with $x \neq c$) we run procedure *eval* (Algorithm 3) to check if $\min \text{LCP}[i^* + 1, i]$ drops below the current LCP maxima associated to y -run breaks, for all $y \in \Sigma$. In the end, this step charges an additional $O(\bar{r}\sigma)$ term (which we mentioned can be reduced to $O(\bar{r} \log \sigma)$ by using opportune data structures). Intuitively, Algorithm 4 avoids this cost by calling the *eval* procedure only on the two candidates $R[c']$, where $c' \in \text{BWT}[i-1, i]$. We achieve this by introducing a new vector $\text{LF}[1, \sigma]$ updated on-the-fly, implementing the *LF-mapping* property of the Burrows-Wheeler transform. More formally: assume we have scanned the BWT up to the c -run break i , and let $i' \in \{i-1, i\}$ be such that $\text{BWT}[i'] = c$. Then, LF is such that $\text{LF}[\text{BWT}[i']] = \text{LF}[c] = j$, with $\text{SA}[j] = \text{SA}[i'] + 1$. In other words, $\text{BWT}[j]$ is the character preceding $\text{BWT}[i']$ in T^{rev} . Our linear-time algorithm is based on the following idea. Assume for simplicity that i is not the first c -run break. Let $i^* < i$ be the largest integer such that i^* is a c -run break as well (i.e. i^* is the c -run break immediately preceding i). As in Algorithm 2, our new Algorithm 4 stores in entry $R[c].\text{len}$ the value $R[c].\text{len} = \text{LCP}[i^*]$. By Lemma 2, we have to discover if $i \in B_{i^*, c}$; if this is the case, then we compare $\text{LCP}[i]$ and $\text{LCP}[i^*]$ and decide if $\text{LCP}[i]$ is the new maximum in $B_{i^*, c} \cap [i]$ (i.e. $\text{LCP}[i] > \text{LCP}[i^*]$) or if the local maximum among c -run breaks in $B_{i^*, c} \cap [i]$ had already been found (i.e. $\text{LCP}[i] \leq \text{LCP}[i^*]$). If, on the other hand, $i \notin B_{i^*, c}$, then we insert in \mathcal{S} the local maximum $R[c].\text{pos}$ relative to $B_{i^*, c}$ if and only if $R[c].\text{active} = \text{true}$ (if $R[c].\text{active} = \text{false}$, then the sufficient position corresponding to the local maximum of $B_{i^*, c}$ had already been stored in \mathcal{S}).

In order to discover if $i \in B_{i^*, c}$, we distinguish two cases.

(i) If $\text{BWT}[i-1] = c$ then, since i^* is the previous c -run break, it must be the case that $\text{BWT}[i^* - 1, i^*, \dots, i-1, i] = ycc \dots ccx$, for some $x \neq c$ and $y \neq c$. It follows that $i \in B_{i^*, c}$ if and only if $\min \text{LCP}[i^*, i] \geq R[c].\text{len} = \text{LCP}[i^*]$. Algorithm 4 computes $\min \text{LCP}[i^*, i]$ analogously as Algorithm 2, i.e. by updating a variable m storing the minimum LCP inside intervals corresponding to BWT equal-letter runs.

(ii) If, on the other hand, $\text{BWT}[i-1] = x \neq c$, then since i^* is the previous c -run break, it must be that $\text{BWT}[i^* - 1, i^*, \dots, i-1, i] = cy \dots xc$, for some $x \neq c$ and $y \neq c$ (and there are no other occurrences of c between $\text{BWT}[i^* - 1]$ and $\text{BWT}[i]$). As in the previous case, the goal is to compute $\min \text{LCP}[i^*, i]$. We achieve this by using the LF array. Due to the way the array LF is defined and constructed, we know that $\min \text{LCP}[i^*, i] = \text{LCP}[\text{LF}[c]] - 1$. As a result, we have that $i \in B_{i^*, c}$ if and only if $\text{LCP}[\text{LF}[c]] - 1 \geq R[c].\text{len} = \text{LCP}[i^*]$.

In Appendix A we provide all the details behind the above intuition and prove:

Lemma 4. *Given a text $T[1, n]$ over Σ , Algorithm 4 computes the smallest suffixient set \mathcal{S} in $O(n)$ time and $O(n)$ words of space.*

5 Experimental results

We implemented the one-pass and linear-time algorithms in C++ and made them publicly available at <https://github.com/regindex/suffixient>. The one-pass algorithm uses Prefix Free Parsing (PFP) as discussed in Section 4.2 and runs in compressed working space. We divide our experimental evaluation into two parts: first, we empirically study the new repetitiveness measure χ by comparing it with \bar{r} using different alphabet orderings; then, we assess the performance of our PFP-based one-pass algorithm on massive genomics datasets (see Appendix C.1 for more details on the experimental setup). We do not provide comparisons with our linear-time algorithm since the necessary data structures would not fit in the internal memory for such large datasets.

The repetitiveness measure χ In this experiment, we used nine biological datasets divided into two corpora. The first corpus contains six datasets containing DNA sequences from the Pizza&Chilli collection⁴, while the second contains three datasets made by concatenating genomic sequences of different types. The three datasets of the second corpus are formed by 3,600 *SARS-CoV-2* assembled viral genomes, 220 *Salmonella enterica* assembled bacterial genomes, and 17 copies of the human *Chromosome 19*, respectively. We downloaded data from different sources: the viral genomes from the COVID-19 Data Portal⁵, the bacterial genomes from NCBI⁶, while the Chromosome 19 sequences belong to the 1,000 Genome project⁷. All datasets were filtered in order to keep only nucleotide characters A, C, G, T, in addition to the string terminator \$. As a consequence, the alphabet size in our experiments was $\sigma = 5$.

We compared the behavior of our new measure χ with the well-known measure \bar{r} : the number of equal-letter runs in the BWT of the reversed text. Since, unlike χ , measure \bar{r} depends on a specific alphabet ordering, we explicitly computed \bar{r} for all $(\sigma - 1)! = 24$ possible orderings (character \$ is always required to be the lexicographically-smallest one). Table 1 shows our results. Among all possible alphabet orderings, we only show the default one $A < C < G < T$, and the ones yielding the largest and smallest \bar{r} .

We observe that, in practice, χ is very close to (and always smaller than) \bar{r} under any alphabet ordering; notice that theory only predicts $\chi \leq 2\bar{r}$ (see [4] and the end of Section 4.1). In this experiment, the minimum of \bar{r} was always between 1.13 (dna) and 1.33 (Influenza) times larger than χ . We also observe that, while the alphabet ordering does not have a big influence on \bar{r} , the default alphabet ordering never yields the smallest \bar{r} . This suggests experimentally that

⁴ <https://pizzachili.dcc.uchile.cl>

⁵ <https://www.covid19dataportal.org>

⁶ <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/assembly/?term=Salmonella+enterica>

⁷ <https://github.com/koepl/phon>

Algorithm 4: Linear-time algorithm

```

input : A string  $T[1..n]$  over a finite alphabet  $\Sigma$ .
output: A smallest suffixient set for  $T$ .
1  $S \leftarrow \emptyset$ ; /* initialize the empty suffixient set  $S$  */
2  $\text{BWT} \leftarrow \text{BWT}(T^{\text{rev}})$ ;  $\text{LCP} \leftarrow \text{LCP}(T^{\text{rev}})$ ;  $\text{SA} \leftarrow \text{SA}(T^{\text{rev}})$ ;
3  $R[1, \sigma] \leftarrow ((-1, 0, \text{false}), \dots, (-1, 0, \text{false}))$ ; /* LCP local maxima */
4  $\text{LF}[1, \sigma] \leftarrow (0, \dots, 0)$ ; /* LF mapping */
5  $m \leftarrow \infty$ ; /* LCP minimum inside current BWT run */
6 for all  $c = 2, \dots, \sigma$ :  $\text{LF}[c] \leftarrow \text{LF}[c-1] + \text{occ}(T, c-1)$ ;
7  $\text{LF}[\text{BWT}[1]] \leftarrow \text{LF}[\text{BWT}[1]] + 1$ ;
8 for  $i = 2, \dots, n$  do
9    $\text{LF}[\text{BWT}[i]] \leftarrow \text{LF}[\text{BWT}[i]] + 1$ ;
10   $m \leftarrow \min\{m, \text{LCP}[i]\}$ ;
11  if  $\text{BWT}[i] \neq \text{BWT}[i-1]$  then
12    for  $i' \in \{i-1, i\}$  do
13      if  $i' = i-1$  then  $\text{eval}(\{\text{BWT}[i']\}, m, R, S)$ ;
14      else if  $R[\text{BWT}[i']].\text{len} \neq -1$  then
15         $\text{eval}(\{\text{BWT}[i']\}, \text{LCP}[\text{LF}[\text{BWT}[i']]] - 1, R, S)$ ;
16      end
17      if  $\text{LCP}[i] > R[\text{BWT}[i']].\text{len}$  then
18         $R[\text{BWT}[i']] \leftarrow (\text{LCP}[i], n - \text{SA}[i'] + 2, \text{true})$ ;
19      end
20    end
21     $m \leftarrow \infty$ ;
22  end
23 end
24  $\text{eval}(\Sigma, -1, R, S)$ ; /* evaluate last active candidates */
25 return  $S$ ;

```

corpus	dataset	dataset length	χ	default \bar{r}	min. \bar{r}	max. \bar{r}
Pizza&Chili	Cere	428,111,842	9,945,553	11,556,075	11,512,279	11,578,575
	E. Coli	112,682,447	13,126,726	15,041,926	14,974,687	15,043,686
	Influenza	154,795,431	2,234,085	3,015,173	2,979,820	3,023,774
	Para	412,279,605	13,399,378	15,581,823	15,475,176	15,635,533
	dna	403,919,018	215,201,641	243,480,086	243,179,189	243,574,132
	dna.001.1	104,857,499	1,414,711	1,717,155	1,715,622	1,718,418
biological	Chrom. 19	1,005,131,693	28,224,334	32,442,979	32,355,166	32,457,646
	Salmonella	1,043,921,849	19,071,791	22,408,284	22,255,198	22,417,175
	SarsCov2	949,959,504	1,068,951	1,351,234	1,347,182	1,352,671

Table 1. Summary of the results on the nine datasets. From left to right, we report the corpus name, the dataset name, the dataset length (number of characters), the size of the smallest suffixient set (χ), and the number of runs of the BWT of the reversed text (\bar{r}) for three different alphabet ordering: the default lexicographic order, and the two orderings leading to the minimum and maximum \bar{r} .

χ is a better repetitiveness measure than \bar{r} , since it is not affected by the alphabet order (while always being close to \bar{r}).

Smallest suffixient set of massive datasets In this experiment, we tested our PFP-based one-pass algorithm on two large genomic datasets: the first dataset is formed by 1,000 human Chromosome 19 copies (59GB), while the second contains 2,005,773 Sars-CoV-2 viral sequences (60GB). Both input and output were streamed from/to disk, keeping in RAM only the PFP data structures. In both cases, our algorithm performed very well with a maximum resident set size of 20.6 GB and 29.5 GB and a wall clock time of 55:55 (min:sec) and 2:16:48 (h:min:sec), respectively.

References

1. Bentley, J.W., Gibney, D., Thankachan, S.V.: On the complexity of BWT-runs minimization via alphabet reordering. In: Proceedings of the 28th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA 2020). LIPIcs, vol. 173, pp. 15:1–15:13 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICSA.2020.15>
2. Boucher, C., Gagie, T., Kuhnle, A., Langmead, B., Manzini, G., Mun, T.: Prefix-free parsing for building big BWTs. *Algorithms Mol. Biol.* **14**(1), 13:1–13:15 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1186/S13015-019-0148-5>
3. Burrows, M., Wheeler, D.J.: A block sorting lossless data compression algorithm. Tech. Rep. 124, Digital Equipment Corporation (1994)
4. Depuydt, L., Gagie, T., Langmead, B., Manzini, G., Prezza, N.: Suffixient sets (2024), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.01359>
5. Kempa, D., Prezza, N.: At the roots of dictionary compression: string attractors. In: Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC 2018). p. 827–840. STOC 2018, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3188745.3188814>
6. Kuhnle, A., Mun, T., Boucher, C., Gagie, T., Langmead, B., Manzini, G.: Efficient construction of a complete index for pan-genomics read alignment. *J. Comput. Biol.* **27**(4), 500–513 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1089/CMB.2019.0309>
7. Rossi, M., Oliva, M., Langmead, B., Gagie, T., Boucher, C.: MONI: A pangenomic index for finding maximal exact matches. *J. Comput. Biol.* **29**(2), 169–187 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1089/CMB.2021.0290>

A Deferred proofs

Lemma 1. *For any tie-breaking strategy (total order) $<_t$, \mathcal{S} is a suffixient set of minimum cardinality for T .*

Proof. To see that \mathcal{S} is suffixient, consider any right-maximal substring $T[i, j-1]$ ($i \leq j \leq n$). We want to prove that there exists $x \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $T[i, j]$ is a suffix of $T[1, x]$. Let $T[1, x]$ be a prefix of T being suffixed by $T[i, j]$, breaking ties (on its endpoint x) by $<_t$. If $T[i, j]$ is a supermaximal extension, then by Definition 3 it holds $x \in \mathcal{S}$ and we are done. Otherwise, let $T[i', j'] \neq T[i, j]$ be a one-character extension of a right-maximal string $T[i', j'-1]$ such that $T[i, j]$ is a suffix of $T[i', j']$. Without loss of generality, let $T[i', j']$ be the string of maximum length $|T[i', j']| = j' - i' + 1$ with this property. Observe that there cannot be a right-extension $T[i'', j''] \neq T[i', j']$ of a right-maximal string $T[i'', j''-1]$ such that $T[i', j']$ is a suffix of $T[i'', j'']$, otherwise $T[i, j]$ would be a suffix of $T[i'', j'']$ and $|T[i'', j'']| > |T[i', j']|$, contradicting the fact that $T[i', j']$ is the longest such string. It follows that $T[i', j']$ is a supermaximal extension. Let $T[1, y]$ be a prefix of T being suffixed by $T[i', j']$, breaking ties (on y) by $<_t$. Then, by Definition 3, $y \in \mathcal{S}$. Also in this case we are done, since $T[i, j]$ suffixes $T[i', j']$ and $T[i', j']$ suffixes $T[1, y]$, so by transitivity of the suffix relation, $T[i, j]$ suffixes $T[1, y]$.

To see that \mathcal{S} is of minimum cardinality, let S be a suffixient set. We prove $|\mathcal{S}| \leq |S|$ by exhibiting an injective function from \mathcal{S} to S .

Let $SE \subseteq \Sigma^+$ be the set of all supermaximal extensions. By definition of supermaximal extension, note that any prefix $T[1, j]$ can be suffixed by at most *one* supermaximal extension $T[i, j]$: assume, for a contradiction, that $T[1, j]$ is suffixed by two distinct supermaximal extensions $T[i, j] \neq T[i', j]$. Without loss of generality, $i' < i$. But then, $T[i, j]$ is a suffix of $T[i', j]$, hence $T[i, j]$ cannot be a supermaximal extension, a contradiction.

We first define a relation $h : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow SE$ mapping every $x \in \mathcal{S}$ to a supermaximal extension $h(x) = T[i, j]$ such that $T[i, j]$ is a suffix of $T[1, x]$. From the observation above, there is at most one such string $T[i, j]$. From Definition 3, there exists one such $T[i, j]$. We conclude that h is a function. We now prove that h is injective.

To see that h is injective, assume for a contradiction $h(x) = h(y)$ for some $x \neq y$ with $x, y \in \mathcal{S}$. Let $h(x) = h(y) = T[i, j]$. By Definition 3, there exists a supermaximal extension $T[i_x, x]$ such that $T[1, x]$ is the prefix of T being suffixed by $T[i_x, x]$ with largest endpoint x , according to the total order $<_t$. Following the same reasoning on position y , we can associate an analogous supermaximal extension $T[i_y, y]$ to y . On the other hand, by the definition of h , also string $h(x) = h(y) = T[i, j]$ is a supermaximal extension that suffixes both $T[1, x]$ and $T[1, y]$. Since $T[i, j]$ and $T[i_x, x]$ are supermaximal extensions that suffix $T[1, x]$ and (as proved above) there can exist at most one supermaximal extensions suffixing $T[1, x]$, we conclude that $T[i, j] = T[i_x, x]$. Similarly, we conclude $T[i, j] = T[i_y, y]$, hence $T[i_x, x] = T[i_y, y]$. We obtained a contradiction, since Definition 3 requires both $x <_t y$ and $y <_t x$ and $<_t$ is a total order. We conclude that h is an injective function.

Next, we define a relation $g : SE \rightarrow S$ from the set SE of supermaximal extensions to positions in S . For any supermaximal extension $T[i, j] \in SE$, we define $g(T[i, j]) = x$ to be the largest element of S (according to the standard order between integers) such that $T[1, x]$ is suffixed by $T[i, j]$. Such a position must exist since S is a suffixient set, so g is a function. To see that g is also injective, assume for a contradiction $g(T[i, j]) = g(T[i', j']) = x$, for $T[i, j] \neq T[i', j']$ (both supermaximal extensions). By the definition of g , both $T[i, j]$ and $T[i', j']$ are suffixes of $T[1, x]$. But then, since $T[i, j] \neq T[i', j']$, either $T[i, j]$ is a suffix of $T[i', j']$ (so $T[i, j]$ is not a supermaximal extension) or the other way round (so $T[i', j']$ is not a supermaximal extension). In both cases we get a contradiction, so we conclude that g is injective.

We conclude the proof by observing that $g \circ h : S \rightarrow S$ is the composition of two injective functions and is therefore injective. \square

Lemma 2. *The following hold:*

1. *Let i be a c -run break and $i' \in \{i, i - 1\}$ be such that $\text{BWT}[i'] = c$. Let $j' = \text{text}(i')$, and let $\ell = \text{LCP}[i]$. If $\ell = \max \text{LCP}[B_{i,c}]$, then the string $T[j' - \ell, j']$ is a supermaximal extension, and*
2. *conversely, for any supermaximal extension $\alpha \cdot c$ there exists an occurrence $\alpha \cdot c = T[j' - \ell, j']$ and a c -run break $i \in [n]$ such that $\text{BWT}[i'] = c$, with $i' = \text{bwt}(j') \in \{i, i - 1\}$ and $\ell = \text{LCP}[i] = \max \text{LCP}[B_{i,c}]$.*

Proof. (1) Let i be a c -run break. Let $i', i'' \in \{i, i - 1\}$ be such that $\text{BWT}[i'] = c$ and $\text{BWT}[i''] = a \neq c$. Let $j' = \text{text}(i')$ and $j'' = \text{text}(i'')$. Let moreover $\ell = \text{LCP}[i]$, and assume $\ell = \max \text{LCP}[B_{i,c}]$.

Note that $T[j' - \ell, j' - 1]$ is right-maximal: $\ell = \text{LCP}[i]$ implies that $T[j' - \ell, j' - 1] = T[j'' - \ell, j'' - 1]$ and, by definition of i', i'', j' , and j'' we have that $T[j'] = \text{BWT}[i'] \neq \text{BWT}[i''] = T[j'']$.

Assume, for a contradiction, that $T[j' - \ell, j']$ is not a supermaximal extension. Then, since $T[j' - \ell, j' - 1]$ is right-maximal, it must be the case that $T[j' - \ell, j']$ is a suffix of some string $T[\hat{j} - \hat{\ell}, \hat{j}]$ with $\hat{\ell} > \ell$ and such that $T[\hat{j} - \hat{\ell}, \hat{j} - 1]$ is right-maximal. Let $\hat{i} = \text{bwt}(\hat{j})$. Since $T[j' - \ell, j']$ is a suffix of $T[\hat{j} - \hat{\ell}, \hat{j}]$ we have that $T[j' - \ell, j' - 1]$ is a suffix of $T[\hat{j} - \hat{\ell}, \hat{j} - 1]$, hence it must be the case that $\hat{i} \in \text{box}(i)$. Since $T[\hat{j} - \hat{\ell}, \hat{j} - 1]$ is right-maximal and $T[\hat{j}] = c$, without loss of generality we can assume that $\hat{i} \in \{k - 1, k\}$, where k is a c -run break (such a c -run break must exist in $\text{box}(i)$) and $\text{LCP}[k] \geq \hat{\ell}$. In particular, $k \in \text{box}(i)$. Then, $\text{LCP}[k] \geq \hat{\ell} > \ell$ and $k \in \text{box}(i)$ yield $\max \text{LCP}[B_{i,c}] \geq \hat{\ell} > \ell$, a contradiction.

(2) Let $T[j' - \ell, j']$ be a supermaximal extension and let $c = T[j']$. Let $i' = \text{bwt}(j')$. Since $T[j' - \ell, j' - 1]$ is right-maximal, we can assume without loss of generality that either $\text{BWT}[i'] \neq \text{BWT}[i' - 1]$ or $\text{BWT}[i'] \neq \text{BWT}[i' + 1]$. Let therefore $i' \in \{i, i - 1\}$, where i is a c -run break. By definition of $T[j' - \ell, j']$, it holds $\ell = \text{LCP}[i]$ (because $T[j' - \ell, j' - 1]$ is the longest right-maximal string suffixing $T[1, j' - 1]$). We need to prove that $\ell = \max \text{LCP}[B_{i,c}]$. Assume, for a contradiction, that $\ell < \hat{\ell} = \max \text{LCP}[B_{i,c}]$. This means that there exists a supermaximal extension $T[\hat{j} - \hat{\ell}, \hat{j}]$ with (i) $T[\hat{j}] = c$, (ii) $\hat{i} \in \{k - 1, k\}$, where

$\hat{i} = \text{bwt}(\hat{j})$ and $k \in B_{i,c}$ is a c -run break in $\text{box}(i)$, and (iii) $\text{LCP}[k] = \hat{\ell}$. But then, since $k \in \text{box}(i)$ and $T[\hat{j} - \hat{\ell}, \hat{j} - 1]$ is a right-maximal string of length $\hat{\ell} > \ell$, we have that $T[j' - \ell, j' - 1]$ is a (proper) suffix of $T[\hat{j} - \hat{\ell}, \hat{j} - 1]$. This fact and $T[\hat{j}] = c$ contradict the fact that $T[j' - \ell, j']$ is a supermaximal extension. \square

Lemma 3. *Given a text $T[1, n]$ over alphabet of size σ , Algorithm 2 computes the smallest sufficient set \mathcal{S} in $O(n + \bar{r} \cdot \sigma)$ time and $O(n)$ words of space.*

Proof. Algorithm 2 scans the BWT, LCP, and SA exactly once and, for each run-break, checks if any of the σ candidates is a supermaximal extension using Algorithm 3. Since Algorithm 3 performs a constant number of operations for each $c \in \Sigma$, the whole algorithm runs in $O(n + \bar{r} \cdot \sigma)$ time. In addition, the only supplementary data structure we need is R , which takes $O(\sigma)$ words of space; thus if $\sigma < n$, altogether, we take $O(n)$ words of space.

We prove the correctness of Algorithm 2 by showing it computes the same output of Algorithm 1. In particular, given \mathcal{S}' , the output of Algorithm 2, and \mathcal{S} , the output of Algorithm 1, we show that given any value $s = n - \text{SA}[i] + 2$, where $i \in [n]$, (1) $s \in \mathcal{S} \implies s \in \mathcal{S}'$ and (2) $s \notin \mathcal{S} \implies s \notin \mathcal{S}'$.

(1) let $(n - \text{SA}[i'] + 2) \in \mathcal{S}$, where i is a c -run break, such that $i' \in \{i - 1, i\}$ and $\text{BWT}[i'] = c$. By Lemma 2, it follows that $\max \text{LCP}[B_{i,c}] = \text{LCP}[i]$. Assume we scanned the BWT up to position i , there are three cases: i' is the position of the first occurrence of c in the BWT, or there exists another c -run break at position $j < i$, such that either $i \in B_{j,c}$ and $\text{LCP}[i] > \text{LCP}[j]$, or $\text{box}(i) \cap \text{box}(j) = \emptyset$. For all these three cases, $\text{LCP}[i] > R[c].\text{len}$; thus, i is set as the new active c candidate in R (lines 10-12). Now, if i' is the position of the last occurrence of c in the BWT, $R[c].\text{pos}$ is inserted in \mathcal{S} at the end of the algorithm (line 17); otherwise, let $\text{box}(i) = [b, e]$, where $b \leq i \leq e$, we have $\forall s \in \text{LCP}[b, e], s \geq \text{LCP}[i]$ and no $j' \in [i + 1, b]$ is a c -run break such that $\text{LCP}[j'] > \text{LCP}[i]$. Thus, $R[c]$ is not updated until we scan $\text{LCP}[e + 1]$. At this point, $R[c].\text{len} > \text{LCP}[e + 1]$ and since $R[c]$ is an active candidate; thus, Algorithm 2 insert $R[c].\text{pos} = (n - \text{SA}[i] + 2)$ in \mathcal{S}' (Algorithm 3, line 4).

(2) now let $(n - \text{SA}[i'] + 2) \notin \mathcal{S}$, it follows by Lemma 2, that $\exists j \in B_{i,c}$ such that $\text{LCP}[j] > \text{LCP}[i]$ (for simplicity we consider the smallest j). Assume we scanned the BWT up to position i ; we need to consider two cases: (i) $j > i$ and (ii) $j < i$. (i) If $j > i$, let $R[c].\text{len} = \text{LCP}[i]$, then $\forall l \in \text{LCP}[i + 1, j], l \geq R[c].\text{len}$; thus, $(n - \text{SA}[i'] + 2)$ is not inserted in \mathcal{S} (lines 2-6, Algorithm 3) until position j . Here, we get $\text{LCP}[j] > R[c].\text{len}$ and, update $R[c].\text{pos} = (n - \text{SA}[j'] + 2)$ (lines 10-12), where $j' \in \{j - 1, j\}$ and $\text{BWT}[j'] = c$. Due to this, $(n - \text{SA}[i'] + 2)$ is dropped and not inserted in \mathcal{S}' . (ii) If $j < i$, then $\exists l \in \text{LCP}[j + 1, i], l < \text{LCP}[j]$; thus when we read l , $R[c]$ is updated to the inactive state (line 6, Algorithm 3). However, since $\forall s \in B_{i,c} \cap [j + 1, i], \text{LCP}[s] < \text{LCP}[j]$ it means that $R[c]$ is never updated to the active state for any position in $[j + 1, i]$ (we skip lines 10-12), so also in this case $(n - \text{SA}[i'] + 2)$ is not inserted in \mathcal{S}' .

Lemma 4. *Given a text $T[1, n]$ over Σ , Algorithm 4 computes the smallest suffix set \mathcal{S} in $O(n)$ time and $O(n)$ words of space.*

Proof. Algorithm 4 scans the BWT exactly once and, for each position of it, performs $O(1)$ accesses to the SA and the LCP and calls Algorithm 3 at most once for each run break. Since Algorithm 3 performs a constant number of operations and the LF -mapping array can be computed in $O(n)$ time, the whole algorithm runs in $O(n)$ time. In addition, the only supplementary data structure we need is R , which consumes $O(\sigma)$ words of space; thus, altogether, we take $O(n + \sigma)$ words of space. Since we assumed $\sigma \leq n$, the space consumption of Algorithm 4 is $O(n)$ words.

We prove the correctness of Algorithm 4 by showing it computes the same output as the output computed by Algorithm 1. In particular, given \mathcal{S}' , the output of Algorithm 4, and \mathcal{S} , the output of Algorithm 1, we show that for any value $s = n - \text{SA}[i] + 2$, where $i \in [n]$, (1) $s \in \mathcal{S} \implies s \in \mathcal{S}'$ and (2) $s \notin \mathcal{S} \implies s \notin \mathcal{S}'$.

(1) let $(n - \text{SA}[i'] + 2) \in \mathcal{S}$, where i is a c -run break, such that $i' \in \{i - 1, i\}$ and $\text{BWT}[i'] = c$. By Lemma 2, we have $\max \text{LCP}[B_{i,c}] = \text{LCP}[i]$. Assume we have scanned the BWT up to position i . There are three cases: i' is the position of the first occurrence of c in the BWT, or there exists another c -run break at position $j < i$, such that either $i \in B_{j,c}$ or $\text{box}(i) \cap \text{box}(j) = \emptyset$. In all three cases, since $(n - \text{SA}[i'] + 2) \in \mathcal{S}$, we have $\text{LCP}[i] > R[c].\text{len}$; thus, i is set as the new active c candidate in R (lines 17-19). If i' is the position of the last occurrence of $\text{BWT}[i']$, since $R[c].\text{active} = \text{true}$, after traversing the whole BWT, Algorithm 4 inserts $R[c].\text{pos} = (n - \text{SA}[i] + 2)$ in \mathcal{S}' (line 4, Algorithm 3). Otherwise, let $i < k'$ be the position of the next occurrence of c in the BWT, such that $k' \in \{k - 1, k\}$. Due to $\max \text{LCP}[B_{i,c}] = \text{LCP}[i]$, it must hold $\text{LCP}[k] < \text{LCP}[i]$ or $k \notin \text{box}(i)$. Here either, $\text{BWT}[i - 1, k'] = xcc\dots ccy$ where $x \neq c$ and $y \neq c$; thus, $\exists l \in \text{LCP}[i + 1, k']$ such that $l < R[c].\text{len}$, or $\text{LCP}[\text{LF}[c]] - 1 < R[c].\text{len}$. Again, since $R[c].\text{active} = \text{true}$, then Algorithm 4 insert $R[c].\text{pos} = (n - \text{SA}[i] + 2)$ in \mathcal{S}' (line 4, Algorithm 3).

(2) now let $(n - \text{SA}[i'] + 2) \notin \mathcal{S}$, this means that $\exists j \in B_{i,c}$ such that $\text{LCP}[j] > \text{LCP}[i]$ and j is a c -run break. We need to consider two cases: (i) $j > i$ and (ii) $j < i$. (i) If $j > i$, $\forall l \in \text{LCP}[i + 1, j]$, $l \geq \text{LCP}[i]$, which implies $\text{LCP}[\text{LF}[c]] - 1 \geq \text{LCP}[i]$ for all c -run breaks in $[i + 1, j]$; thus, we never update $R[c]$ to the inactive state (lines 2-6, Algorithm 3) until we scan position j . Here, we get $\text{LCP}[j] > R[c].\text{len}$ and update $R[c].\text{pos} = (n - \text{SA}[j] + 2)$ (lines 17-19), where $j' \in \{j - 1, j\}$ and $\text{BWT}[j'] = c$. Due to this, $(n - \text{SA}[i'] + 2)$ is dropped and not inserted in \mathcal{S}' . (ii) If $j < i$, then $\exists l \in [j + 1, i]$ such that $\text{LCP}[\text{LF}[c]] - 1 < R[c].\text{len}$ or $\text{LCP}[l] < \text{LCP}[i]$; thus, when we read l , $R[c]$ is updated to the inactive state (line 6, Algorithm 3). However, since $\forall s \in B_{i,c} \cap [j + 1, i]$, $\text{LCP}[s] < \text{LCP}[j]$ it means that $R[c]$ is never updated to the active state for any position in $[j + 1, i]$ (we skip lines 17-19), so also in this case $(n - \text{SA}[i'] + 2)$ is not inserted in \mathcal{S}' . \square

B Deferred material for Section 4

B.1 Details on the one-pass algorithm in compressed space

Our one-pass algorithm can run in compressed space by using PFP algorithm to read the BWT, LCP and SA vectors, in one pass from the first to the last position. The only major adaptation we need consists of modifying PFP to compute the dictionary and parse of T^{rev} instead of T . Assuming the scenario where we read T from a stream, we have two options: (1) reading the whole stream and inverting T explicitly before running PFP, (2) or adapting the PFP algorithm to compute the dictionary and parse of T^{rev} even if reading T . While the first option is not feasible for large inputs since it requires $O(n)$ space, we depict how to implement (2).

PFP uses a rolling hash function to identify a set of small substrings of length w called *trigger strings*, which are then used to identify the phrases. In particular, it selects a trigger string $T[i, i+w]$ if its Karp-Rabin fingerprint $F(T[i, i+w]) = \sum_{j=1}^w (T[i+j-1] \cdot \sigma^{w-j}) \bmod q$ is congruent 0 modulo a parameter p . The key idea consists of inverting the way we compute and update the fingerprints to identify the trigger strings of T^{rev} while reading T . In particular, we define a new hash function $F'(T[i, i+w]) = \sum_{j=1}^w (T[i+j-1] \cdot \sigma^{j-1}) \bmod q$, and given a new character $T[i+w+1]$, we update the fingerprint with the following operations on $F'(T[i, i+w])$: subtract $T[i] \cdot \sigma^0$, divide by σ , and finally sum $T[i+w+1] \cdot \sigma^{w-1}$.

C Deferred material for Section 5

C.1 Details on the experimental setup

We ran all experiments in Section 5 on a workstation with Intel(R) Xeon(R) W-2245 CPU @ 3.90GHz with 8 cores and 128 gigabytes of RAM running Ubuntu 18.04 LTS 64-bit. We recorded the runtime and memory usage of our software using the wall clock time and maximum resident set size from `/usr/bin/time`.

As for the experiments on our one-pass algorithm working in compressed space, since we did not yet implement the changes needed to compute the dictionary and parse of T^{rev} (see Section B.1), we inverted the input texts T explicitly before running PFP. We employed the PFP implementation provided in the `pscan.cpp` file contained in Big-BWT (<https://github.com/alshai/Big-BWT>) and ran it using 16 threads. Last, since there are no competitors, we ran our software on two large biological datasets to show it is practical in a real scenario.