

Minimizing speculation overhead in a parallel recognizer for regular texts

Angelo Borsotti
Politecnico di Milano
Milano, Italy
angelo.borsotti@mail.polimi.it

Stefano Crespi Reghizzi
Politecnico di Milano
Milano, Italy
CNR-EIIT
Milano, Italy
stefano.crespireghizzi@polimi.it

Luca Breveglieri
Politecnico di Milano
Milano, Italy
luca.breveglieri@polimi.it

Angelo Morzenti
Politecnico di Milano
Milano, Italy
angelo.morzenti@polimi.it

Abstract

Speculative data-parallel algorithms for language recognition have been widely experimented for various types of FA (DFA and NFA) automata, often derived from regular expressions. Such an algorithm cuts the input string into chunks, independently recognizes each chunk in parallel by means of identical FAs, and at last joins the chunk results and checks overall consistency. In chunk recognition, it is necessary to speculatively start the FAs in any state, thus causing an overhead that reduces the speedup over a serial algorithm. Existing data-parallel DFA-based recognizers suffer from the excessive number of starting states, and the NFA-based ones suffer from the number of nondeterministic transitions.

Our data-parallel algorithm is based on the new FA type called reduced interface DFA (RI-DFA), which minimizes the speculation overhead without incurring in the penalty of nondeterministic transitions or of impractically enlarged DFA machines. The algorithm is proved to be correct and theoretically efficient, because it combines the state-reduction of an NFA with the speed of deterministic transitions, thus improving on both DFA-based and NFA-based existing implementations. The practical applicability of the RI-DFA approach is confirmed by a quantitative comparison of the number of starting states for a large public benchmark of complex FAs. On multi-core computing architectures, the RI-DFA recognizer is much faster than the NFA-based one on all benchmarks, while it matches the DFA-based one on some benchmarks and performs much better on some others. The extra time cost to construct RI-DFA vs DFA is moderate and is compatible with a practical use.

Keywords: regular language recognition, data-parallel recognition algorithm, minimal speculation, speedup on multi-core architecture, multi-entry DFA, reduced-interface DFA

1 Introduction

The recognition of regular languages by a finite-state automaton (FA) is one of the most widely used basic algorithms, and has been extensively investigated to take advantage of parallel computing architectures. Parallel recognition algorithms exist in many versions optimized for different architectures, such as reconfigurable hardware (FPGA), SIMD and GPU accelerators, vectorial machines and multi-processor / multi-core machines. Here we present a new data-parallel algorithm based on a novel type of multi-entry DFA (deterministic FA) that is efficient in theory and performs well on commodity multi-core computers.

Theoretical challenge. The baseline is the classical speculative data-parallel algorithm (for short CSDPA), see, e.g., [10] for an early reference, [22] for theoretical and practical aspects, and [11] for code description. After splitting the input text into a number $c \geq 1$ of chunks, CSDPA operates in two phases. First, the *reach* phase processes in parallel each chunk by using the same *chunk automaton* (CA), and answers two questions: is the chunk a legal substring for the input language, and which pairs of starting and ending FA states are involved in substring recognition. Then, the *join* phase checks the consistency of the sets of state pairs, for any two adjacent chunks. The hot-spot is in the reach phase, which depends on the input length. The number $|Q|$ of CA states affects the recognition time, because a CA (except for the first one) does not know the last state that was reached by the upstream CA, and it is forced to start a speculative run in each state. Thus in the worst case, the number of transitions needed to parse a string of length $n \geq 1$, segmented into c chunks, is $O(n \times |Q|)$, instead of just $O(n)$ as in the serial recognition. Since the size $|Q|$ of the CA is often much larger than the number of available computing cores, a parallel recognizer may turn out to be slower than a serial one! The join phase is lighter and is typically serial, since it does not depend on n but only on c , with $c \ll n$.

We briefly discuss the state-of-the-art of some CSDPA variants. A DFA may incur in a very large speculation overhead. Researchers have also considered an NFA, since the number of states $|Q_N|$ can be made less than or equal to $|Q|$. The cardinality $|Q|$ of the minimal equivalent DFA is $O(2^{|Q_N|})$ in the worst case [20]. Unfortunately, NFA simulation is expensive: for instance the time complexity of the parallel algorithm [17] based on prefix-sum is $O(n^3 \times \log m)$, with m processors. In practice, the state reduction brought by an NFA does not pay in general. This is a finding of prior experimental studies on CSDPA using NFA, e.g., [5], and is also confirmed by our measurements (see Tab. 3). However, an NFA may offer advantages for some specific applications. For instance, it has been used for packet content scanning in the Snort intrusion detection system, see <http://www.snort.org>. Others, e.g., [28], have proposed to pre-process the DFA in order to select as initial the states that are likely to be successful over the input texts considered; the remaining states are left for serial execution in case of failure. We did not consider such an approach, as it depends on language statistics, while we aim at a good performance in general.

So far we have focused on the number of CA starting states, but also the whole state cardinality $|Q|$ may negatively impact on performance for very large CAs, which can cause too many cache misses [22]. For this, the use of NFA may be convenient also for a different reason: CA construction requires $RE \rightarrow DFA$ or $NFA \rightarrow DFA$ conversion algorithms that have exponential time-complexity in $|Q|$ and may be too slow for on-line use. In most other cases, it is fair to assume that the state transition cost does not depend on CA size.

Eventually, we mention the Simultaneous Finite Automata (SFA) algorithm, which completely avoids speculation at the cost of state explosion [25]; it is assessed in [5]. Given a deterministic CA where all the states are initial, the equivalent SFA is a much larger DFA, each state of which is characterized by a set of pairs (i, f) , where i and f are respectively the starting and arrival states of a run on the CA. Therefore, speculation disappears since the multiple parallel runs of the CA are mapped on the single run between two SFA states characterized by the corresponding sets of pairs (i, f) . The drawback is an explosion of the number of states, with the consequence that the SFA construction takes too long and recognition may suffer from cache misses. For an RE of moderate size, the construction can be thousand times slower than for a DFA [5]. Later research [14] is striving to reduce the construction time and state-transition costs.

Sum up: for data-parallel recognition on multi-core computers, the challenge is to curb the speculation overhead by reducing the number of CA initial states.

Theoretical contribution. We introduce a novel type of deterministic CA, called *reduced-interface* DFA (RI-DFA): it reduces the CA interface size down to the NFA size $|Q_N|$

and preserves determinism. The RI-DFA is a DFA with multiple initial states, a model considered in some theoretical papers. The earliest one, called *multi-entry finite automaton* (MEFA) [8], requires all states to be initial. It was later renamed MDFA, allowing the initial states to be a proper subset. Thus, RI-DFA is a special type of MDFA with new features targeted to parallel recognizers. To our knowledge, such a device is unknown in the theory (a series of theoretical studies on MDFAs is [6, 8, 12, 15, 23, 26]). We anticipate the construction of RI-DFA (Sect. 3) in Fig. 1. The construction starting from an NFA has the same complexity as that of a DFA. The minimal DFA, the NFA and the RI-DFA in Fig. 1




Figure 1. Top: NFA with the equivalent powerset DFA (minimal) and the new RI-DFA, over the alphabet Σ . The states acting as initial in the CA are in green. Bottom: transition counts for string $aabcbab$ divided in two chunks.

are equivalent. We compare their performance as CAs. All the states $\{0, 1, 2\}$ of the NFA and $\{0, 1, 01, 02\}$ of the DFA must be taken as initial. As expected, the NFA has fewer states: $3 = |Q_N| < |Q| = 4$ for DFA. The RI-DFA CA has five states, $Q_{RI-DFA} = \{0, 1, 2, 01, 02\}$, but only the states $\{0, 1, 2\}$ are initial, i.e., exactly those in Q_N . The graph of RI-DFA may look as the superimposition of the NFA and DFA graphs, but its definition is more subtle. Intuitively, it is obtained by starting in any NFA state, namely 0, 1 or 2,

and then jumping into the existing DFA states. Since states 0 and 1 are already present in DFA, their subgraphs in NFA and in RI-DFA are identical, and it remains to explain what happens starting in state 2. Since $2 \xrightarrow[\text{NFA}]{b} 1$, we draw the edge

$2 \xrightarrow[\text{RI-DFA}]{b} 1$. The remaining DFA states 01 and 02 are not initial for the CA, because they do not belong to the NFA.

Thus, RI-DFA has fewer initial states than DFA and may perform fewer speculative transitions. The count of transitions for the cases DFA / NFA / RI-DFA is in Fig. 1, bottom, for the sample string *aabcab*, segmented in $c = 2$ chunks. The totals are 15, 14 and 9 for the DFA / NFA / RI-DFA. Such numbers approximately measure the overall work done by the recognizer. The serial DFA recognizer executes exactly $n = |aabcab| = 6$ transitions on the whole input, therefore the exceeding transitions in Fig. 1 measure the extra work due to speculation, which is thus minimal when using the RI-DFA as CA. In Sect. 4 such a finding is confirmed and is quantified for representative benchmarks.

Of course, the best saving in transition counts for RI-DFA would be obtained when the NFA is state-wise minimal. Unfortunately, no polynomial-time algorithms are known for NFA minimization [13, 21]. Therefore, we could not rely on minimal NFAs in our experiments, yet we obtained significant speedup thanks to our second theoretical advance. It partially compensates for the lack of NFA minimality, by means of a novel method for reducing RI-DFA initial states, by carefully exploiting the classic state-equivalence (a.k.a. undistinguishability) relation of DFAs. Notice that the minimization of DFA states does not apply to an RI-DFA, since merging undistinguishable states would produce a machine unsuitable as a CA. A careful application of the minimization algorithm is however possible (see Sect. 3.4), and in many cases the RI-DFA achieves a significantly better performance than the CSDPA based on DFA or NFA.

Eventually, it is important to say that the optimization based on RI-DFA is compatible with most other optimizations proposed for finite-state machines, and it would be interesting to experiment it in combination with the existing ones.

At last, there may be some concern that the higher complexity of the $\text{NFA} \rightarrow \text{RI-DFA}$ construction over the classical $\text{NFA} \rightarrow \text{DFA}$ transformation might penalize practical use. This is not the case, as we have found that for a large public collection of big NFAs the construction time is moderately higher and remains very acceptable for practical application.

Practical contribution. One may wonder about the need for a new parallel algorithm. Parallel recognition is needed when the text to recognize is large: the text is split into chunks on which recognition can be done in parallel. For the first chunk, the initial state of a CA is known and recognition is real-time. But for any successive chunk, the CA cannot await to know the final state(s) reached by the previous (upstream) CA, because that would imply serial execution. This means that all

CAs, but the first one, must start from every state, and at the end must discard the runs that do not start from a final state reached by the upstream CA. It is not sure that this is too big a penalty. In practice, previous experience has evidenced that in many real-world benchmarks most runs of a CA quickly terminate before reaching the chunk end. However, the fewer the CA starting states, the fewer the chunk recognitions, and the smaller the penalty caused by speculation. The classic CSDPA algorithm uses a DFA as CA, which must start in all the states. On the other hand, our RID algorithm uses the new type of FA (RI-DFA) that has fewer initial states, as many as the states of the NFA. Such a CA emulates, in a deterministic way, all the runs an NFA would do.

In Sect. 4.2 we compare the number of initial states of the NFAs, minimal DFAs and RI-DFAs, for a large number (over 1800) of big automata available in the public Ondrick benchmark. We so obtain a first assessment of the potential superiority of the RI-DFA technique: for 90% of the automata the number of states of the equivalent RI-DFA is significantly smaller than the number of states of the equivalent minimal DFA. In Sect. 4.4 we report the relative speed of the three CSDPA variants based on NFA, DFA and RI-DFA chunk automata, on a 64-core parallel computer. The data sets are three public benchmarks pertaining to biological data, network traffic system logs and string pattern matching in books, plus two synthetic benchmarks. We have implemented in the Java language the three variants of our algorithm, available on <https://zenodo.org/records/14219357>. The RI-DFA variant is faster than the NFA one in all cases; it performs as the DFA variant $\pm 10\%$ on two of the public benchmarks, and on long input it dominates the DFA variant in the remaining cases.

Paper organization. Sect. 2 recalls the classic speculative data-parallel algorithm (CSDPA) with its DFA and NFA variants. Sect. 3 presents the reduced-interface CA and its construction, proves correctness, and ends with an optimization for further reducing the initial states. Sect. 4 presents and discusses experimental results. It starts with the choice of benchmarks. Then it reports the reduction of the number of initial states for the Ondrick collection of automata. Eventually it reports the measurements of the count of state transitions and it ends with the speedup evaluation on a multi-core computer. Sect. 5 concludes and outlines future developments. Comparisons and references to related work are placed by a best fit criterion in all the sections.

2 Preliminaries on data-parallel recognition

We need to precisely describe the classic speculative algorithm CSDPA, following in particular [11], by means of standard concepts of automata theory. Our description is sufficiently general to fit, not only the classic case, but also the new development in Sect. 3. The input alphabet is Σ , the regular language is L , the input string is $x \in L$, of length

$|x| = n \geq 1$, and a segmentation of x into $c \geq 2$ chunks y_i is $x = y_1 y_2 \dots y_c$, with $y_i \in \Sigma^+$. We assume that language L is recognized by a given finite automaton A , with state set Q , alphabet Σ , state-transition graph δ , initial state q_0 and final state set F . Automaton A may be nondeterministic or deterministic, depending on the case considered.

Algorithm CSDPA is abstractly modeled by a recognition device consisting of a series $A_1 \dots A_c$ of $c \geq 2$ identical chunk automata (CA), called A_i , which are obtained from automaton A . A run starts in the initial state q_0 and accepts in the final states F . A generic CA A_i is as follows:

$$A_i = (Q, \Sigma, \delta^A, I_i^A, F_i^A)$$

where, as usual, Q is the state set, and $I_i^A = F_i^A = Q$ are the initial and final state sets, respectively. Notice that all states are both initial and final, with the optimization for the first CA where $I_1^A = \{q_0\}$. Then δ^A represents the state-transition graph, identical to that of the recognizer A of L . Depending on δ^A being a function or a binary relation, we call a CA deterministic or nondeterministic. Viewed in isolation, a CA A_i is a recognizer of all the substrings of L , and additionally it has the capability of recognizing whether a substring is a prefix or a suffix of L . A chunk y_i is accepted by A_i if it is consumed by at least one run in $\delta^A(q, y_i)$, for some state $q \in I_i^A$, denoted for brevity as $\delta^A(I_i^A, y_i)$.

The device operates *serially* if at any time only one of the CAs A_i is active, all the upstream CAs have successfully finished, and all the downstream CAs are awaiting. In *serial operation*, the CA A_1 processes chunk y_1 starting in state $I_1^A = \{q_0\}$, and passes to CA A_2 the set of *last active states* $LAS_1 = \delta^A(I_1^A, y_1)$ as those to start from. Similarly, each CA A_i , for each $2 \leq i \leq c$, is initialized with the states $I_i^A = LAS_{i-1}$ and passes (except for the last CA A_c) the set $LAS_i = \delta^A(I_i^A, y_i)$ to its next downstream CA A_{i+1} . The device accepts if the last set LAS contains a final state, i.e., $LAS_c \cap F \neq \emptyset$.

Here we focus on the computational load for recognizing the input string x , expressed as the total number of state transitions executed, since we may disregard the effort for checking the acceptance condition, which is independent of the input size. In serial operation, if the CA type is deterministic, the overall number of transitions is $\sum_{i=1}^c |y_i| = |x| = n$, and is independent of language L and of the CA size. On the other hand, if the CA type is nondeterministic, the number of transitions may exceed the length n and depends on the degree of nondeterminism of the CA, as well as on the input.

In *parallel operation*, all CAs start in parallel in the initial states $I_i^A = Q$, again with the optimization of I_1^A to $\{q_0\}$, and proceed to recognize the chunks. Each CA A_i , for each $1 \leq i \leq c$, returns also a partial mapping λ_i from the *possible initial states* (PIS) of A_i to the *possible last active states* (PLAS) of A_i . More precisely, a state pair (q, q') is in λ_i if it holds $q' \in \delta^A(q, y_i)$.

To complete parallel recognition, we need to *join* the mappings λ_i for all chunks. Such an operation does not depend on the string length n and for brevity we only describe serial join. For the first chunk, the possible initial state set is $PIS_1 = I_1^A = \{q_0\}$, the mapping is $q_0 \xrightarrow{\lambda_1} \delta^A(q_0, y_1)$, and consequently the possible last active states are $PLAS_1 = \lambda_1(PIS_1)$.

For every other chunk y_i , with $2 \leq i \leq c$, the set $PIS_i \subseteq I_i^A = Q$ contains all the states q such that $\delta^A(q, y_i)$ is defined, and is represented by the mapping λ_i such that for each $q \in PIS_i$ it holds $q \xrightarrow{\lambda_i} \delta^A(q, y_i)$. We intersect the possible initial states with the possible last states of the upstream CA and we apply the mapping, so as to obtain the possible last states:

$$PLAS_i = \lambda_i(PLAS_{i-1} \cap PIS_i) \quad \text{where } PIS_i = Q$$

The last CA accepts by condition $PLAS_c \cap F \neq \emptyset$, i.e., the possible last active states $PLAS_c$ include a final state.

An example that uses a deterministic CA is shown in Fig. 2. The values of sets PIS and PLAS for the two-chunk input string $bab \cdot aaa$ are listed. Notice that in the example the worst possible speculation overhead occurs, though this is not the case in general.




Figure 2. CSDPA device using DFA. In the CA (top right) all states are initial and final. To recognize the two-chunk input $bab \cdot aaa$, nine transitions are done; CA A_2 executes two 3-step runs scanning the entire chunk. The join phase (bottom) computes $PLAS_2$.

In parallel deterministic operation, the overall number of transitions is bounded by $T_D = \sum_{i=1}^c (|y_i| \times |I_i^A|) \leq n \times |Q|$, since each CA is a multi-entry machine and some runs may prematurely terminate in error [5, 16, 22]. The factor $|Q|$ is the *speculation cost*, caused by the need to speculate on the

starting states of CAs. In the nondeterministic case, the number of transitions T_N may be higher, similarly to the serial operation. The CSDPA scheme has inspired many implementations for various parallel computing architectures. Each CA is assigned a processing unit that serially executes the number $|Q|$ of runs imposed by speculation. As said, sometimes NFAs have been used as a more compact replacement to reduce speculation in particular benchmarks, but in general the benefits are null or even negative.

We present a new general technique to reduce the speculation cost by combining the size reduction of a nondeterministic machine with the speed of a deterministic one.

3 Reduced-interface device (RID)

Our *reduced-interface device* (RID) is based on a series of deterministic CAs as the classic device, but with one important difference. The CA initial states – here called *interface* states – are a typically smaller subset of the entire state set, since they exactly mirror the states of an NFA for language L . The possible last active states $PLAS_i$ reached by the $(i-1)$ -th CA are still mapped onto the possible initial states PIS_{i+1} of the i -th CA by an efficient *interface function*. In parallel operation, after all CAs have finished, the input is accepted by the join phase if all the interface mappings are consistent, similarly to the classic case. The RID is a new version of the CSDPA scheme based on DFA, and essentially all the optimizations proposed in past implementations remain possible.

3.1 Construction of the chunk automaton

We describe the construction of the CA, denoted B (instead of A), and of the chunk interface function, called *if*. The RID device is specified by the CA B , by the interface function *if*, and by the initial and final sets $\{q_0\}$ and F^{RID} . To construct the CA we start from an NFA N for language L . In practice such NFAs are available from benchmarks of automata or can be constructed from a benchmark of REs by means of a standard RE-to-NFA translator. We use the following FAs:

- NFA $N = (Q_N, \Sigma, \rho, q_0, F)$ has states $Q_N = \{q_0, \dots, q_{\ell-1}\}$, with $\ell \geq 1$, initial state q_0 , transition relation ρ and final states F .
- The *reduced-interface deterministic FA* (RI-DFA), denoted $B = (P, \Sigma, \delta^B, I^B, F^B)$, is a multi-entry machine derived from NFA N . Device B has states $P = \{\dots, p_i, \dots\}$, transition function δ^B , initial and final state sets I^B and F^B .

Our RI-DFA is a ME-DFA since the set I^B contains multiple initial states, i.e., a nondeterministic feature, but the transition graph is deterministic (δ^B is a function). The state sets Q_N of N and P of the CA B_i are different, the latter being larger (but it will be reduced in Sect. 3.4). Intuitively the RI-DFA can be obtained by applying the textbook-based powerset construction to the NFA, by enumerating all the subsets of NFA states Q_N and their transitions, determinizing and

removing those unreachable from a singleton state. Our construction is more refined, and proceeds incrementally:

- incrementally apply the NFA-to-DFA powerset algorithm for $|Q_N|$ times, each time with a singleton initial state:
 - $N(q_0) :=$ powerset machine for N with initial state q_0
 - $N(q_1) := N(q_0) \cup$ additional states and transitions reachable from q_1
 -
 - $N(q_{\ell-1}) := N(q_{\ell-2}) \cup$ additional states and transitions reachable from $q_{\ell-1}$
- the state set P is the union of states of $N(q_0) \dots N(q_{\ell-1})$
- the initial states of B are $I^B = \{\{q_0\}, \dots, \{q_{\ell-1}\}\} \equiv Q_N$
- for the RID, the initial state is $\{q_0\}$ and the final states F^{RID} are the union of the final states of $N(q_0) \dots N(q_{\ell-1})$

The construction is shown in Fig. 3 for the example of Fig. 1. Our construction NFA-to-RI-DFA is quite efficient (quantitative measurements are in Sect. 4).

The state set of RI-DFA includes (as initial) all the states of the given NFA N . The state set of RI-DFA and the one of the classic powerset DFA equivalent to N , are instead incomparable. In fact, the ℓ powerset applications in the construction above may create states absent when the NFA N is determinized in one shot by a single powerset application, and the opposite may also happen. Quite often in practice, the two devices share several states.

In Fig. 3, the powerset machines $N(0)$ and $N(1)$ are identical and have the state set $\{\{0\}, \{1\}, \{0, 1\}, \{0, 2\}\}$ (state names in the transition function are shortened). Machine $N(2)$ differs from the preceding one only by the state $\{2\}$ and the transition $\{2\} \xrightarrow{b} \{1\}$. Thus, the states of the RI-DFA are




Figure 3. Left: the given NFA N . Right: the RI-DFA B obtained by incrementally adding to $N(0)$ first $N(1)$ and then $N(2)$. The states (green) $I^B = \{\{0\}, \{1\}, \{2\}\}$ act as initial.

$P = \{\{0\}, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{0, 1\}, \{0, 2\}\}$ and comprise the *singleton* states $\{0\}, \{1\}$ and $\{2\}$, which act as initial, and the *aggregate* states $\{0, 1\}$ and $\{0, 2\}$. When the relation of an RI-DFA state to the NFA states represented is not needed, we prefer to denote a state as $p \in P$.

The number of CA initial states for RI-DFA is the same as for the CSDPA using nondeterministic CAs, and is typically smaller than for deterministic CAs. We anticipate that it can be further reduced (see Sect. 3.4).

3.2 Parallel operations and interface function

In parallel operation the RID behavior essentially conforms to the CSDPA scheme, and we only focus on the differences. All CAs B_i start in parallel. Each B_i scans its chunk y_i , for each initial state $p \in I_i^B \equiv Q_N$, and of course $I_1^B = \{q_0\}$. Upon termination, each B_i returns the partial mapping λ_i that, from each *possible initial state* (PIS) of B_i , gives the *possible last active states* (PLAS): a state pair (p, p') is in λ_i if it holds $p' = \delta^B(p, y_i)$.

Join phase. All the consecutive mappings λ_i and λ_{i+1} are joined to check that at least one sequence of chunk runs is consistent. The RID join operation differs from the CSDPA one by the way it maps the set PLAS of a CA to the set PIS of the downstream CA, by using the *interface function* if next defined. The function argument is a subset $S \subseteq P$ of states and, for each state $p \in S$ with $p = \{\dots, q, \dots\}$, where $q \in Q_N$, the result $if(p)$ is the summation of the singleton states $\{q\}$ and is a subset of the initial set I^B . More precisely $if: \wp(P) \rightarrow \wp(I^B)$ with $if(PLAS) = \bigcup_{p \in PLAS} \{\{q\} \mid q \in p\}$, where $q \in Q_N$ is an NFA state. The reason for introducing this function if will become clear in Sect. 3.4. Then:

- For the first chunk, $PIS_1 = \{p_0\}$ with $p_0 = \{q_0\}$, the mapping is $p_0 \xrightarrow{\lambda_1} \delta^B(p_0, y_1)$, and for B_1 $PLAS_1 = \lambda_1(PIS_1)$.
- For every other chunk with $2 \leq i \leq c$, the set $PIS_i \subseteq I_i^B$ (now I_i^B is a subset of P) contains the initial states $p \in I_i^B$ such that $\delta^B(p, y_i)$ is defined, and is represented by the mapping λ_i such that for each $p \in PIS_i$ it holds $p \xrightarrow{\lambda_i} \delta^B(p, y_i)$. We obtain the set PLAS of B_i by intersecting set PIS_i with the upstream set $PLAS_{i-1}$ through the interface function: $PLAS_i = \lambda_i(if(PLAS_{i-1}) \cap PIS_i)$.
- RID recognizes the input if the last CA passes the acceptance condition: $PLAS_c \cap F^{RID} \neq \emptyset$, i.e., at least one of the possible last active states $PLAS_c$ is final for the RID.

The crucial differences with respect to the DFA-based device are that (i) device RID, through the interface function if , remaps the possible last active states PLAS of the upstream CA B_{i-1} onto the possible initial states PIS of the downstream CA B_i , and that (ii) set PIS is a subset of the set of the initial states I^B , which in turn is a (potentially much smaller) subset of the whole state set P of the CA.

A case with two chunks is shown in Fig. 4 for the example of Fig. 1. The input $aabcab$ is split into aab and cab . Processing aab computes $PLAS_1 = \{\{0, 2\}\}$ and $if(PLAS_1) = \{\{0\}, \{2\}\}$. The set of possible initial states for chunk cab is $PIS_2 = \{\{0\}, \{1\}\}$, therefore $if(PLAS_1) \cap PIS_2 = \{\{0\}\}$. Hence $PLAS_2 = \lambda_2(if(PLAS_1) \cap PIS_2) = \{\{0, 2\}\}$, which includes the final state $\{0, 2\}$, thus the input is accepted.

run / mapping of chunk 1:

$$\begin{aligned} \{0\} &\xrightarrow{a} \{1\} \xrightarrow{a} \{0, 1\} \xrightarrow{b} \{0, 2\} \\ \{0\} &\xrightarrow{\lambda_1} \{0, 2\} \end{aligned}$$

runs / mapping of chunk 2:

$$\begin{aligned} \{0\} &\xrightarrow{c} \{1\} \xrightarrow{a} \{0, 1\} \xrightarrow{b} \{0, 2\} \\ \{1\} &\xrightarrow{c} \{0\} \xrightarrow{a} \{1\} \xrightarrow{b} \{0, 2\} \\ \{0\} &\xrightarrow{\lambda_2} \{0, 2\} \quad \{1\} \xrightarrow{\lambda_2} \{0, 2\} \end{aligned}$$

chunk 1: $PLAS_1 = \{\{0, 2\}\}$ and $if(\{\{0, 2\}\}) = \{\{0\}, \{2\}\}$

chunk 2: $PIS_2 = \{\{0\}, \{1\}\}$ and $PLAS_2 = \{\{0, 2\}\}$, thus at last $PLAS_2 \cap F = \{\{0, 2\}\} \cap \{\{2\}, \{0, 2\}\} = \{\{0, 2\}\} \neq \emptyset$




Figure 4. NFA, runs of CAs B_1 and B_2 , and interface function if .

3.3 Correctness of the RID

Theorem 3.1 (Correctness). *The RID accepts the same language as the NFA N .*

We define some functions to be used in the proof of Th. 3.1. For the NFA $N = (Q_N, \Sigma, \rho, q_0, F)$, we extend the transition function $\rho: Q_N \times \Sigma \rightarrow \wp(Q_N)$ to all strings as $\rho^*: Q_N \times \Sigma^* \rightarrow \wp(Q_N)$ in the obvious way, i.e., $\rho^*(q, \varepsilon) = \{q\}$ and $\rho^*(q, x \cdot a) = \bigcup_{q' \in \rho^*(q, x)} \rho(q', a)$, and for simplicity we write ρ in place of ρ^* . Hence $\rho(q, x)$ denotes the set of states reached by NFA N from state q after reading string x . For any PLAS of a RID, we introduce the function Nst that returns the union of all the states (of N) present in some element $p \in P$ of PLAS, i.e., $Nst(PLAS) = \bigcup_{p \in PLAS} p$. For any set of states S , the function $sgl(S)$ returns the set of singletons that contain the elements of S , i.e., $sgl(S) = \{\{s\} \mid s \in S\}$.

Lemma 3.2. *The set of the states of the NFA N that are included in the elements of each set $PLAS_i$, is equal to the set of the states reached by N after reading $y_1 \dots y_i$, i.e., for all i with $1 \leq i \leq c$ it holds $Nst(PLAS_i) = \rho(q_0, y_1 \dots y_i)$.*

Proof. By induction on the chunk index i :

- For chunk y_1 , it holds $PLAS_1 = \delta^B(p_0, y_1) = \delta^B(\{q_0\}, y_1)$ and, by the definition of δ_B for RI-DFA, it follows that $Nst(PLAS_1) = \rho(q_0, y_1)$.
- For chunk y_i with $2 \leq i \leq c$, inductively assume that $Nst(PLAS_{i-1}) = \rho(q_0, y_1 \dots y_{i-1})$. Then it holds:

$$\begin{aligned} PIS_i &= \{\{q\} \mid \delta^B(\{q\}, y_i) \text{ is defined}\} \\ &= \{\{q\} \mid \rho(q, y_i) \neq \emptyset\} \end{aligned}$$

and it follows:

$$\begin{aligned} if(PLAS_{i-1}) &= \bigcup_{p \in PLAS_{i-1}} \{\{q\} \mid q \in p\} \\ &= sgl(Nst(PLAS_{i-1})) \\ &= sgl(\rho(q_0, y_1 \dots y_{i-1})) \end{aligned}$$

by the inductive assumption. Hence $if(PLAS_{i-1}) \cap PIS_i = sgl(\rho(q_0, y_1 \dots y_{i-1})) \cap \{q \mid \rho(q, y_i) \neq \emptyset\}$. Thus:

$$PLAS_i = \lambda_i(if(PLAS_{i-1}) \cap PIS_i) \\ = \{\delta^B(\{q\}, y_i) \mid \{q\} \in (if(PLAS_{i-1}) \cap PIS_i)\}$$

from which $Nst(PLAS_i)$ is equal to:

$$Nst(PLAS_i) = \left\{ q \mid \begin{array}{l} \exists q' (q' \in \rho(q_0, y_1 \dots y_{i-1}) \\ \wedge q \in \rho(q', y_i)) \end{array} \right\} \\ = \{q \mid q \in \rho(q_0, y_1 \dots y_i)\} \\ = \rho(q_0, y_1 \dots y_i)$$

□

Lemma 3.3. *The acceptance condition of RID holds if and only if the acceptance condition of NFA N holds, that is: $PLAS_c \cap F^{RID} \neq \emptyset \iff \rho(q_0, y_1 \dots y_c) \cap F \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. We prove the two implications, by using Lemma 3.2:

- $PLAS_c \cap F^{RID} \neq \emptyset \implies \rho(q_0, y_1 \dots y_c) \cap F \neq \emptyset$. In fact, if $PLAS_c \cap F^{RID} \neq \emptyset$, some element of $PLAS_c$ includes a final state of NFA N , and so does $Nst(PLAS_c)$, thus $Nst(PLAS_c) \cap F \neq \emptyset$. From Le. 3.2, $Nst(PLAS_c) = \rho(q_0, y_1 \dots y_c)$, hence $\rho(q_0, y_1 \dots y_c) \cap F \neq \emptyset$.
- $\rho(q_0, y_1 \dots y_c) \cap F \neq \emptyset \implies PLAS_c \cap F^{RID} \neq \emptyset$. Again from Le. 3.2, $\rho(q_0, y_1 \dots y_c) = Nst(PLAS_c)$, hence if $\rho(q_0, y_1 \dots y_c)$ includes a final state of NFA N , some element of $PLAS_c$ also includes a final state of NFA N , i.e., it is an element of F^{RID} , thus $PLAS_c \cap F^{RID} \neq \emptyset$.

□

Th. 3.1 follows immediately from the equivalence of the acceptance conditions of RID and NFA N stated in Lemma 3.3.

3.4 Further reduction of the interface

The program used in our experimentation (see Sect. 4) implements the RID by using an RI-DFA as chunk automaton, with an additional optimization of the machine constructed in Sect. 3.1 to further reduce the interface size. This is achieved by downgrading from initial to non-initial some states the role of which as initial can be taken by another initial state. We explain our minimization, and at the end we discuss how the resulting automaton is related with the minimal NFAs and with other types of NFAs of small size.

A natural but naive idea is to apply to RI-DFA the standard so-called state-partition algorithm for converting a DFA to the equivalent DFA with minimal number of states. It is well known that each state corresponds to a class of equivalence for the so-called Nerode relation, a.k.a. language-equivalence relation: two states are language-equivalent if they recognize the same language. To compute the equivalence classes, the well-known algorithm, omitted for brevity, partitions the states into the maximal classes of undistinguishable states. Our use of the state-partition algorithm significantly differs from the usual applications. In fact the partition algorithm

is intended for deterministic machines, while RI-DFA has a nondeterministic choice for the first transition. This notwithstanding, the language-equivalence relation can be extended to an RI-DFA machine, since from each state, including the initial ones, the out-going transitions are deterministic.

We show on the example in Fig. 5 how to use the equivalence classes to reduce the number of initial states. Consider the RI-DFA B in Fig. 5, bottom. Each state p_i is decorated with the set of states of NFA N , e.g., state p_4 has the states 0 and 3 of N . The four states p_0, p_1, p_2 and p_3 , which correspond to the initial states of N , are singletons. Two non-trivial language-equivalent classes are computed by the state-partition algorithm: $\alpha = \{p_1, p_3\}$ and $\beta = \{p_4, p_5, p_7\}$. The former is a subset of the initial state set, while the latter is not, and for our purposes we only need to consider class α , which we call an *initial-state* equivalence class. Now, the conventional state-minimization algorithm would coalesce the classes α and β into two respective states, yet we do not need to do so, as we do not care to reduce the total number of states, but just the initial ones. It is simpler to arbitrarily pick one of the states of the initial-state equivalence class $\alpha = \{p_1, p_3\}$, and to downgrade the remaining state(s) as non-initial. In Fig. 5, we choose p_1 and downgrade p_3 as non-initial, thus reducing the initial states (enclosed in the dashed box) from 4 to 3. We say that state p_3 delegates to state p_1 its role as initial. The state transition graph is unchanged. At the same time, the content of state p_1 has to be updated from 1 to 13 (not shown in the figure) to record that, if the upstream CA admits state 3 as last possible, then the current CA should start (also) in state 3.

To explain more visually why downgrading with delegation is preferable to merging equivalent initial states, in Fig. 6 we sketch the simplest possible case. Fig. 6a shows a fragment of a RI-DFA machine B (constructed as in Sect. 3.1). Fig. 6b shows the machine B_{min} that delegates the initial role of state $\{q_2\}$ to state $\{q_1\}$, but does not pay the cost of merging $\{q_1\}$ with $\{q_2\}$ and consequently p_1 with p_2 . On the contrary, the machine in Fig. 6c loses determinism after merging the two initial states and cannot be used as an efficient CA, unless also the remaining equivalent states are merged. This for sure adds a cost to the CA construction, without guaranteeing any performance gain for the recognizer.

As said, the minimization algorithm transforms an RI-DFA B into a machine of the same type, denoted B_{min} , identical to B except that one or more initial states of B are no longer such. In the example, state p_3 has turned non-initial, while state p_1 has taken on the role of p_3 as initial, i.e., its content has become 13 instead of 1. In order to use B_{min} as CA, the RID interface function (defined in Sect. 3.2) is adjusted:

$$if_{min}(PLAS) = \left\{ p \in I^{B_{min}} \mid \begin{array}{l} \exists \{q\} \in if(PLAS) \text{ such that} \\ \{q\} = p \text{ or } \{q\} \text{ delegates to } p \end{array} \right\}$$




Figure 5. Interface minimization of an RI-DFA. Top: NFA N . Bottom: RI-DFA with initial states p_0 , p_1 , p_2 and p_3 (in green). States p_1 and p_3 are undistinguishable and p_3 (arbitrarily chosen) is downgraded from initial, thus reducing the initial set to $\{p_0, p_1, p_2\}$ (dashed box). The content of state p_1 is updated to 13, to adjust the interface function if .

We sketch the proof that the device, denoted RID_{min} , is correct, by using the minimized CAs $B_{min,1} \dots B_{min,c}$ and the adjusted function if for the join phase, see the equation above.

The runs speculatively executed by B_{min} do not include those that start from the states of $I^B \setminus I^{B_{min}}$, i.e., those from states that were downgraded from initial to non-initial. However, the interface function if_{min} maps all such downgraded states, possibly included in the set PLAS, to the initial states of $I^{B_{min}}$ that are their delegates, hence are language-equivalent by construction. Therefore, no RID run useful for acceptance is lost in the RID_{min} and no new accepting run is introduced, hence the devices RID and RID_{min} are equivalent.

For any given chunk y_i , we figure out how many transitions are saved by the CA $B_{min,i}$. Let $I^B \setminus I^{B_{min}}$ be the set of states downgraded from initial to non-initial. Then any run of B_i that starts in a downgraded state is entirely avoided by $B_{min,i}$. For the RID of Fig. 5, and the chunks $y_1 = caa$ and $y_2 = aab$, we have the five runs below:

$$\begin{array}{l}
 p_0 \xrightarrow{c} p_3 \xrightarrow{a} p_7 \xrightarrow{a} p_5 \quad p_0 \xrightarrow{a} p_1 \xrightarrow{a} p_4 \xrightarrow{b} p_6 \quad p_1 \xrightarrow{a} p_4 \xrightarrow{a} p_7 \xrightarrow{b} p_6 \\
 p_2 \rightarrow \dagger \text{ (exits)} \quad p_3 \xrightarrow{a} p_7 \xrightarrow{a} p_4 \xrightarrow{b} p_6
 \end{array}$$

The last run of chunk 2 does not occur with RID_{min} . Notice that $PLAS_1 = \{p_5\} = \{\{0, 1, 3\}\}$, state $\{3\}$ is downgraded to non-initial and its delegate is state $\{1\}$, thus $if_{min}(PLAS_1) = \{\{0\}, \{1\}\}$. A natural question is how the CA constructed by using the initial state reduction procedure in Fig. 5 compares with the CA that would be obtained by the same procedure starting from a state-minimal NFA. Th. 3.4 is immediate to

Table 1. Benchmarks – public benchmarks are starred.

| <i>name</i> | <i>n. of NFAs</i> | <i>n. of states</i> | <i>max text length</i> |
|---|-------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| bigdata | 1 | 5 | 13 Mbyte |
| a simple synthetic NFA from a short regular expression | | | |
| fasta* | 1 | 29 | 765 Kbyte |
| biometric data consisting of various DNA sequences | | | |
| https://open.oregonstate.edu/computationalbiology/chapter/patterns-regular-expressions | | | |
| traffic* | 1 | 101 | 11 Mbyte |
| system log file of network traffic | | | |
| https://zenodo.org/record/5789064#.ZCHHQ9LP0eM | | | |
| bible* | 1 | 16 | 4 Mbyte |
| HTML manuscript of The Holy Bible | | | |
| https://www.glicrittini.it/dchiesa/bibbia_cei08/indice.htm | | | |
| regexp | a series | $k + 1 \geq 1$ | 6 Mbyte |
| series of NFAs, the DFAs of which grow exponentially, from the well-known REs $(a b)^* a (a b)^k$ with parameter $k \geq 0$ | | | |
| Ondrik* | 1084 | 2490 (avg) | none |
| large collection of NFAs that have different purposes | | | |
| https://github.com/ondrik/automata-benchmarks?tab=readme-ov-file | | | |


prove by contradiction. It implies that applying initial-state reduction to the RI-DFA of a minimal NFA is useless.

Theorem 3.4 (Minimality). *Let N be an NFA and N_{min} be one of the state-minimal equivalent machines. Let B and C be the RI-DFAs constructed by the procedure in Sect. 3.1 starting from N and N_{min} , respectively. Let B_{min} be the RI-DFA constructed from B by the procedure in Fig. 5. For any NFA N , the number of initial states in C is less than or equal to the number of initial states in B_{min} .*


4 Experimentation results

To evaluate the parallel recognition algorithm (Sect. 3), we implemented it as a Java software tool that is available on the public site <https://zenodo.org/records/14219357>, and we ran an experimentation campaign. First we outline the software architecture, then we report measurements to show the reduction of the number of initial CA states achieved by RI-DFA vs the DFA and NFA variants for a large FA collection, the reduction of the number of transitions executed by RI-DFA CAs vs the same variants, and eventually the speedup of RID vs the same two variants on a multi-core computer. At last we report the RI-DFA construction times, which show that the extra cost over the DFA construction is moderate and does not jeopardize practical application.


The tool is coded in Java (rel. 19) and includes: a *generator* of the RI-DFA automaton from either an RE or an FA, a *parallel recognizer* for recognizing user supplied texts, and a *test driver* to measure performance. The *generator* supports: RE-to-NFA and NFA-to-DFA conversions, DFA minimization and RI-DFA construction, including interface minimization. The *parallel recognizer* supports the CSDPA variants that use NFA / DFA / RI-DFA as CA. Parallel execution is based on the Java Thread model, which builds on Linux



(a) Fragment of a non-minimal RI-DFA B (the machine constructed in Sect. 3.1), where we assume states $\{q_1\}$ and $\{q_2\}$ to be initial and Nerode-equivalent and consequently also $p_1 \equiv p_2$.



(b) Our minimal RI-DFA B_{min} . Notice that states q_1 and q_2 are left separate, as well as states p_1 and p_2 , but state q_1 is delegated the initial role.



(c) If states q_1 and q_2 were merged, but states p_1 and p_2 were left separate, then the RI-DFA would become nondeterministic. For the RI-DFA to remain deterministic, also states p_1 and p_2 should be merged, which for efficiency we prefer not to do.

Figure 6. The reduction of the number of RI-DFA initial states is achieved by downgrading a state to non-initial rather than merging it with the equivalent states.

thread. Each thread of the algorithm, i.e., each CA_i , is a Java thread. The recognizer reads the text and sets all the chunk boundaries. Then it runs a thread for each chunk, which prepares the information for the join phase. Upon completion of all CAs, the algorithm joins their results (see Sect. 3.2).

To run the threads in parallel, the tool creates a thread pool and runs it by means of an *Executor-Service* method, which waits for the termination of all the threads in a pool and collects their results. This method serializes the reach and join phases, which is the only synchronization requirement. Thus each thread can perform its job at full speed without the penalty of any waiting time. All the accesses to CAs and to chunks are read-only. For brevity we do not discuss low-level optimizations for balancing the thread work, since those are neutral w.r.t. the relative speeds of the threads, and since here

we do not report absolute execution times. The join phase is serial, not being worthy of parallelization.

4.1 Benchmarks

Choosing data-sets for evaluating FA tools is notoriously difficult and subjected to the risk of introducing application bias caused by the very disparate characteristics of the languages typical of each application area, see e.g., [27], where the problem is discussed and a benchmark suite is proposed for a specific range of applications / architectures. Our choice is obviously oriented towards the assessment of the advantages, if any, of the RI-DFA variant over the other two classic ones. This can be articulated into the following questions: how significant is the reduction over CSDPA for (1) the number of CA initial states, (2) the number of CA state transitions, and (3) the execution time on multi-core architectures. Clearly, for (1) it suffices a collection of FAs, while for (2) and (3) we also need a set of input texts for each FA. The measurements for (1), (2) and (3) are respectively presented in Sect.s 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4, and are summarized at the end. The benchmarks used and their relevant features are listed in Tab. 1.

Table 2. Distribution of Ondrik machines with respect to the number of initial states. The leftmost column lists the intervals of width 0.1 from 0.5 to 1.4. Column NFA: number of machines such that the ratio of the number of NFA states over the number of DFA states falls in the interval. Column RI-DFA: number of machines such that the ratio of the number of RI-DFA initial states over the number of DFA states falls in the interval.

| <i>interval</i> < 1 | <i>column</i> NFA | <i>column</i> RI-DFA |
|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| 0.5-0.6 | 110 | 636 |
| 0.6-0.7 | 677 | 355 |
| 0.7-0.8 | 173 | 34 |
| 0.8-0.9 | 60 | 40 |
| 0.9-1.0 | 25 | 19 |
| <i>subtotal</i> | 1045 (96.4%) | 1084 (100%) |
| <i>interval</i> > 1 | | |
| 1.0-1.1 | 19 | none |
| 1.1-1.2 | 16 | none |
| 1.2-1.3 | 3 | none |
| 1.3-1.4 | 1 | none |
| <i>subtotal</i> | 39 (3.6%) | none |

Ondrik is a collection of large FAs originating from various applications, such as system modeling and formal verification, without texts. The other data-sets contain one NFA, parametric for *regex*, and six texts of increasing length up to the value in column 4 (of Tab. 1). Data-sets *bigdata* and *regex* are synthetic. The NFA of *regex* causes an exponential explosion in the equivalent minimal DFA. For *bible*, we described the titles of the HTML h3 subsections by an RE, thus modeling the file as a long text where some instances

of the RE occur. In *traffic* a large NFA, obtained from an RE describing *syslog* traces, is applied to a log file of network traffic records.


4.2 Results on interface minimality

The RI-DFA in Fig. 1 has fewer initial states than the minimal DFA, and we address two important questions: how frequently this happens and how large the state reduction is. Tab. 2 compares the sizes of the NFA and minimal DFA against the number of initial states of the RI-DFA for all the FAs in Ondrick, the sizes of which (on the average 2490 states) are much larger than for the other benchmarks. Column 3 (of Tab. 2) shows that all RI-DFAs have fewer initial states than their equivalent DFAs, thus confirming that the frequency of cases that may benefit from the RI-DFA approach is very high. The top value 636 in row 1 says that for more than half of the collection, the reduction of initial states is in the range 0.5-0.6. Remember that the classic DFA-based variant uses all the DFA states as initial, and that starting chunk recognition from fewer states reduces speculation. Column 2 shows that 96.4% of the FAs have smaller size than the minimal DFAs, but does not say whether such nondeterministic FAs are minimal. In the Conclusion (Sect. 5), we discuss how to materialize the potential gain from NFA.


4.3 Results on speculation overhead

For the five benchmarks in Sect. 4.1 that have attached texts, we measured the number of transitions. In fact, the number of transitions executed by the CAs is almost directly related to the speedup for text recognition, to be later reported. In Fig. 7 we show the number of transitions made by the three recognizer variants. For brevity, we reproduce only the results for texts divided in 32 chunks, which is the mid value between 1 (serial execution) and 64, the number of cores available on our computing platform. For each benchmark the ratio of transition numbers for DFA vs RI-DFA and NFA vs RI-DFA is plotted in colours red and blue, respectively. We found that these two ratios are close to $1 \pm 10\%$ for group *bigdata*, *fasta* and *traffic* (the pictures are omitted as uninformative), while the ratios are $\gg 1$ for group *bible* and *regexp*. Let the two groups be nicknamed *even* and *winning*, respectively. The winning cases are plotted in Figs. 7a and 7b. Notice their almost independence of the text length in the interval plotted. For instance, for *bible* the DFA / RI-DFA ratio falls between 8 and 9.

We discuss the difference between the even and winning groups: the NFA of, say, *bigdata* is far from minimal, being obtained via a basic RE-to-NFA conversion from a randomly generated RE [3]. On the other hand, the NFA of *regexp* is a classic case of DFA state explosion. The low sensitivity of the ratios to text length is presumably explained by the statistics of short-lived runs, which stop after just a few transitions.



(a) Ratio of DFA (red) and NFA (blue) vs RI-DFA for *bible*.



(b) Ratio of DFA (red) and NFA (blue) vs RI-DFA for *regexp*.

Figure 7. Transition ratio for benchmarks *bible* and *regexp*.

Table 3. Time speedup for RI-DFA vs DFA / NFA with 58 threads on a shared-memory 64-core computer. Ratio of the number of transitions of DFA and NFA vs RI-DFA. Figures are for max text size.

| bench. | time speedup | | transition ratio | | text |
|----------------|--|--|--|--|------|
| | $\frac{\text{time DFA}}{\text{time RI-DFA}}$ | $\frac{\text{time NFA}}{\text{time RI-DFA}}$ | $\frac{\text{trans. DFA}}{\text{trans. RI-DFA}}$ | $\frac{\text{trans. NFA}}{\text{trans. RI-DFA}}$ | |
| bigdata | 1.01 | 73.24 | 1.00 | 1.99 | 13.1 |
| fasta | 0.94 | 38.85 | 1.00 | 26.26 | 0.76 |
| traffic | 0.97 | 109.56 | 1.00 | 1.74 | 11.2 |
| bible | 3.07 | 84.23 | 8.73 | 4.19 | 4 |
| regexp | 6.31 | 56.56 | 126.99 | 14.68 | 6 |

(Mbyte)

4.4 Results for parallel recognition

For parallel execution, we report the speedup of the RI-DFA variant over the other two. We only present comparative time performance evaluations, because absolute times are not at issue here and can be measured by replicating the artifact codes, available on <https://zenodo.org/records/14219357>. Our computing platform is a shared-memory multi-core Dell PowerEdge R7425 server featuring two AMD EPYC 7551 64-bit CPUs, each with 32 cores (ISA x64), for a total of $2 \times 32 = 64$ identical cores running at a 2.0 GHz clock frequency. Each core has a an L1 cache memory of 96 Kbyte (64K for instructions and 32K for data) and an L2 cache memory of 512 KByte. Each CPU (with 32 cores) has an L3 cache memory of 64 Mbyte, shared across its 32 cores. The platform has a main memory of 512 GByte, shared across all 64 cores. The OS is Debian GNU/Linux 6.1.0-13-amd64, with an SMP

6.1.551-x86-64 kernel; the `PREEMPT_DYNAMIC` option is enabled. The same level of compilation optimization was consistently used, and during the measurement campaign the platform was running exclusively our parallel parser, so that the measurements are not affected by external factors.

For each text, the reach phase launches $c = 2, 10, 18, \dots, 66$ concurrent threads, one per chunk. Since the number of cores is 64, we can reasonably assume that each thread runs on one core (with the minor exception of case $c = 66$) until termination. To exclude I/O time, the texts are initially loaded into memory and then are processed. We measured, for the same benchmarks as in Sect. 4.2, the recognition time as a function of two independent variables: text length and number of threads. We select here a representative sample of our measures. In all cases the reach phase takes the longer time, while the join phase accounts for less than 1% of the total.


Even and winning benchmarks. The experiment confirms the partition (see Sect. 4.3) into the groups of even and winning benchmarks, as shown in the summary Tab. 3, where the transition ratios are reproduced and compared with speedups. The speedups over the DFA variant are > 1 in three cases and barely < 1 in two. The RI-DFA variant matches always the DFA one and dominates by far the NFA variant. In the winning group, the speedup vs DFA is over 3 for *bible* and over 6 for *regexp*. The latter typifies the ideal conditions for top RI-DFA performance: a state-minimal NFA such that the equivalent minimal DFA has an exponential blow-up of states.

Sensitivity to chunk number and text length. Fig. 8 contains a finer analysis of speedup for the winning group. The impact of chunk number (coincident in this experiment with the number of cores) is visible in Fig.s 8a and 8b. The speedup vs DFA decreases when the text of fixed length is cut into more (shorter) chunks, because the overhead of chunk management becomes relevant for short chunks. The opposite effect is shown in Fig.s 8c and 8d, where the speedup vs DFA increases with text length with a fixed number of chunks.


4.5 Results for construction time

The construction from NFA to RI-DFA is more complex than from NFA to DFA. On a simple laptop, for the whole Ondrik collection (see Tab. 2) of 1.084 NFAs, the former takes 2.994 s, the latter takes 146 s, and their time ratio $2.944 / 146$ is about 20. For the Ondrik collection, the total numbers of states of the given NFAs, and of the constructed DFAs and RI-DFAs, are 2.699.411, 1.485.483 and 6.753.792, respectively.


We argue that this construction cost is much less than what is expected from a worst-case theoretical analysis. The average number of states of the NFAs of the Ondrik collection is $|Q|_{avg} = 2.699.411 / 1.084 = 2.490, 2$. In principle, our $NFA \rightarrow RI-DFA$ construction computes one powerset per each NFA state, while $NFA \rightarrow DFA$ computes just one, say at a cost C . But in reality, each successive powerset computation in $NFA \rightarrow RI-DFA$ creates fewer and fewer states, so




(a) Speedup of RI-DFA vs DFA for *bible* with 4 Mbyte text.



(b) Speedup of RI-DFA vs DFA for *regexp* with 6 Mbyte text.



(c) Speedup of RI-DFA vs DFA for *bible* with 58 threads.



(d) Speedup of RI-DFA vs DFA for *regexp* with 58 threads.

Figure 8. Speedup for benchmarks *bible* and *regexp*.

that the overall cost is much less than the product $|Q|_{avg} \times C$. In fact, the measured time ratio is only 20, so that the actual individual (i.e., per NFA) cost is $20 \times C$. This is much lower than the theoretical worst-case estimation $2.490 \times C$ obtained by taking the average NFA size $|Q|_{avg}$.

To sum up, although our construction computes one powerset per each NFA state, in reality each powerset execution is just incremental, thus the time ratio of $NFA \rightarrow RI-DFA$ over $NFA \rightarrow DFA$ for the large Ondrik collection of big NFAs is about 20, i.e., about 1 / 100 of the theoretical worst cost. This is perfectly compatible with practical use.

We disregard instead the cost of state minimization, which is done only once at the end of both constructions, thus having a negligible overhead.

5 Conclusion and future work

We have introduced a novel chunk automaton RI-DFA, which can be easily constructed from an NFA. We have proved its correctness, and we have shown that it minimizes the speculation overhead and improves the performance of regular language recognition by means of a data-parallel algorithm CSDPA on multi-core architectures. The main facts follow:

1. The RI-DFA variant is faster than the DFA variant for the *winner* benchmarks, and is equally fast within 10% for the others. It is always much faster than the NFA variant.
2. The speedup of RI-DFA vs DFA grows roughly linearly with the text length in the range considered, provided that enough computing cores are available.
3. The optimal speedup occurs when the language is such that its NFA is much smaller than its minimal DFA.
4. A large collection of big automata meets statement (3).
5. The cost to construct the RI-DFA is moderate.

As a consequence of statements (1), (2) and (3), it is not uncommon that for very long texts, or in case of DFA state explosion, the DFA-based variant fails or takes too long to run to completion, while the RI-DFA variant succeeds.

Although our benchmarks are not representative of any specific application domain, they are not biased to the advantage of the RI-DFA approach. Therefore, the above facts are very likely to be confirmed by other benchmarks. Future experimentation will be needed to precisely identify the language patterns that may mostly benefit from our approach.

Last but not least, the optimization based on the RI-DFA is compatible with most existing ones, in particular with state-convergence, state speculation exploiting look-back, and even higher order speculation, as described in [24]. Therefore, it should be a useful addition for future parallel finite-state machine implementations.

Minimality of source automata. Of course, an issue for a successful application is the availability of small and possibly minimal NFAs that define the languages to be recognized. In the following, NFA denotes the given automaton, DFA_{min} the minimal equivalent DFA, and NFA_{min} arbitrarily one of the minimal-state FAs equivalent to NFA (transition minimization is not relevant for speculation reduction). We know from Th. 3.4 that the minimal initial state set is obtained if RI-DFA is generated from NFA_{min} , which is quite rarely possible in practice.

The simpler languages can be defined by hand as REs (without any guarantee of minimality) and are converted to NFA by standard algorithms, such as GMY [19]. The result may be much larger than NFA_{min} , yet improvements are possible: using existing more sophisticated RE-to-NFA converters

(see, e.g., [7] and its references), and optimizing the RE prior to its use in a converter (see again, e.g., [7]).

For more complex languages, e.g., those occurring in model checking or formal verification, the NFAs are typically generated by a program, and their level of minimization is often unknown. Unfortunately NFA minimization is difficult: it is PSPACE-hard [21], and the problem cannot even be approximated within a factor of $O(n)$ unless $P \equiv PSPACE$ [9]. Many papers have focused on efficient heuristic algorithms for minimization that often, but not always, produce a minimal machine. We refer to some recent papers [1, 2, 4, 18], where more references are available. It would be interesting to see how such heuristics perform on collections of practically relevant NFAs, both in terms of construction time and approximation to the minimum, and whether such NFAs pay off in terms of RI-DFA performance. All this is left for future investigation.

At present, our initial-state reduction algorithm (Sect. 3.4) is quite capable of reducing speculation overhead, and avoids the cost and uncertainty of NFA minimization algorithms.

Acknowledgments

To Stefano Zanero and Filippo Carloni for referring us to several RE benchmarks.

References

- [1] Christian Bianchini, Alberto Policriti, Brian Riccardi, and Riccardo Romanello. 2024. Incremental NFA minimization. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 1004 (2024), 114621. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TCS.2024.114621>
- [2] Johanna Björklund and Lock Cleophas. 2021. Aggregation-based minimization of finite state automata. *Acta Informatica* 58, 3 (2021), 177–194. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S00236-019-00363-5>
- [3] Angelo Borsotti, Luca Breveglieri, Stefano Crespi-Reghizzi, and Angelo Morzenti. 2019. A Benchmark Production Tool for Regular Expressions. In *Implementation and Application of Automata - 24th International Conference, CIAA 2019, Košice, Slovakia, July 22-25, 2019, Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 11601)*, Michal Hospodár and Galina Jirásková (Eds.). Springer, 95–107. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-23679-3_8
- [4] Janusz A. Brzozowski and Hellis Tamm. 2013. Minimal Nondeterministic Finite Automata and Atoms of Regular Languages. *CoRR* abs/1301.5585 (2013). arXiv:1301.5585 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1301.5585>
- [5] Zhe Fu, Zhi Liu, and Jun Li. 2017. Efficient parallelization of regular expression matching for deep inspection. In *26th International Conference on Computer Communication and Networks, ICCCN 2017, Vancouver, BC, Canada, July 31 - Aug. 3, 2017*. IEEE, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCCN.2017.8038377>
- [6] Zvi Galil and Janos Simon. 1976. A Note on Multiple-Entry Finite Automata. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* 12, 3 (1976), 350–351. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-0000\(76\)80006-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-0000(76)80006-2)
- [7] Pedro García, Damián López, José Ruiz, and Gloria Inés Alvarez. 2011. From regular expressions to smaller NFAs. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 412, 41 (2011), 5802–5807. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TCS.2011.05.058>
- [8] Arthur Gill and Lawrence T. Kou. 1974. Multiple-entry finite automata. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* 9, 1 (1974), 1–19. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-0000\(74\)80034-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-0000(74)80034-6)
- [9] Gregor Gramlich and Georg Schnitger. 2007. Minimizing nfa's and regular expressions. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* 73, 6 (2007), 908–923. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JCSS.2006.11.002>
- [10] W. Daniel Hillis and Guy L. Steele Jr. 1986. Data parallel algorithms. *Commun. ACM* 29, 12 (1986), 1170–1183. <https://doi.org/10.1145/7902.7903>
- [11] Jan Holub and Stanislav Stekr. 2009. On parallel implementations of deterministic finite automata. In *Implementation and Application of Automata - 14th International Conference, CIAA 2009, Sydney, Australia, July 14-17, 2009. Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 5642)*, Sebastian Maneth (Ed.). Springer, 54–64. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-02979-0_9
- [12] Markus Holzer, Kai Salomaa, and Sheng Yu. 2001. On the State Complexity of k-Entry Deterministic Finite Automata. *J. Autom. Lang. Comb.* 6, 4 (2001), 453–466. <https://doi.org/10.25596/JALC-2001-453>
- [13] Tao Jiang and Bala Ravikumar. 1993. Minimal NFA Problems are Hard. *SIAM J. Comput.* 22, 6 (1993), 1117–1141. <https://doi.org/10.1137/0222067>
- [14] Minyoung Jung, Jinwoo Park, Johann Blieberger, and Bernd Burgstaller. 2017. Parallel Construction of Simultaneous Deterministic Finite Automata on Shared-Memory Multicores. In *46th International Conference on Parallel Processing, ICPP 2017, Bristol, United Kingdom, August 14-17, 2017*. IEEE Computer Society, 271–281. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICPP.2017.36>
- [15] Martin Kappes. 2000. Descriptive Complexity of Deterministic Finite Automata with Multiple Initial States. *J. Autom. Lang. Comb.* 5, 3 (2000), 269–278. <https://doi.org/10.25596/JALC-2000-269>
- [16] Yousun Ko, Minyoung Jung, Yo-Sub Han, and Bernd Burgstaller. 2014. A speculative parallel DFA membership test for multicore SIMD and cloud computing environments. *Int. J. Parallel Program.* 42, 3 (2014), 456–489. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10766-013-0258-5>
- [17] Richard E. Ladner and Michael J. Fischer. 1980. Parallel Prefix Computation. *J. ACM* 27, 4 (1980), 831–838. <https://doi.org/10.1145/322217.322232>
- [18] Sylvain Lombardy and Jacques Sakarovitch. 2022. Morphisms and Minimisation of Weighted Automata. *Fundam. Informaticae* 186, 1–4 (2022), 195–218. <https://doi.org/10.3233/FI-222126>
- [19] R. McNaughton and H. Yamada. 1960. Regular expressions and state graphs for automata. *IRE Trans. Electronic Computers* 9, 1 (1960), 39–47. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TEC.1960.5221603>
- [20] Albert R. Meyer and Michael J. Fischer. 1971. Economy of Description by Automata, Grammars, and Formal Systems. In *12th Annual Symposium on Switching and Automata Theory, East Lansing, Michigan, USA, October 13-15, 1971*. IEEE Computer Society, 188–191. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SWAT.1971.11>
- [21] Albert R. Meyer and Larry J. Stockmeyer. 1972. The Equivalence Problem for Regular Expressions with Squaring Requires Exponential Space. In *13th Annual Symposium on Switching and Automata Theory, College Park, Maryland, USA, October 25-27, 1972*. IEEE Computer Society, 125–129. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SWAT.1972.29>
- [22] Todd Mytkowicz, Madanlal Musuvathi, and Wolfram Schulte. 2014. Data-parallel finite-state machines. In *Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, ASPLOS 2014, Salt Lake City, UT, USA, March 1-5, 2014*, Rajeev Balasubramanian, Al Davis, and Sarita V. Adve (Eds.). ACM, 529–542. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2541940.2541988>
- [23] Alexandros Palioudakis, Kai Salomaa, and Selim G. Akl. 2013. Finite Nondeterminism vs. DFAs with Multiple Initial States. In *Descriptive Complexity of Formal Systems - 15th International Workshop, DCFS 2013, London, ON, Canada, July 22-25, 2013. Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 8031)*, Helmut Jürgensen and Rogério Reis (Eds.). Springer, 229–240. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-39310-5_22
- [24] Junqiao Qiu, Xiaofan Sun, Amir Hossein Nodehi Sabet, and Zhijia Zhao. 2021. Scalable FSM parallelization via path fusion and higher-order speculation. *Proceedings of the 26th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems* (2021). <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:229384260>
- [25] Ryoma Sin'ya, Kiminori Matsuzaki, and Masataka Sassa. 2013. Simultaneous Finite Automata: An Efficient Data-Parallel Model for Regular Expression Matching. In *42nd International Conference on Parallel Processing, ICPP 2013, Lyon, France, October 1-4, 2013*. IEEE Computer Society, 220–229. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICPP.2013.31>
- [26] Paulo A. S. Veloso and Arthur Gill. 1979. Some Remarks on Multiple-Entry Finite Automata. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* 18, 3 (1979), 304–306. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0000\(79\)90038-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0000(79)90038-2)
- [27] Jack Wadden, Vinh Dang, Nathan Brunelle, Tommy Tracy II, Deyuan Guo, Elaheh Sadredini, Ke Wang, Chunkun Bo, Gabriel Robins, Mircea Stan, and Kevin Skadron. 2016. ANMLzoo: a benchmark suite for exploring bottlenecks in automata processing engines and architectures. In *2016 IEEE International Symposium on Workload Characterization, IISWC 2016, Providence, RI, USA, September 25-27, 2016*. IEEE Computer Society, 105–166. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IISWC.2016.7581271>
- [28] Yi-Hua E. Yang and Viktor K. Prasanna. 2011. Space-time tradeoff in regular expression matching with semi-deterministic finite automata. In *2011 Proceedings IEEE INFOCOM*. 1853–1861. <https://doi.org/10.1109/INFOCOM.2011.5934986>