


Hamming Distance Oracle

Itai Boneh ✉ 

Reichman University and University of Haifa, Israel

Dvir Fried ✉ 

Bar Ilan University, Israel

Shay Golan ✉ 

Reichman University and University of Haifa, Israel

Matan Kraus ✉ 

Bar Ilan University, Israel

Abstract

In this paper, we present and study the *Hamming distance oracle problem*. In this problem, the task is to preprocess two strings S and T of lengths n and m , respectively, to obtain a data-structure that is able to answer queries regarding the Hamming distance between a substring of S and a substring of T .

For a constant size alphabet strings, we show that for every $x \leq nm$ there is a data structure with $\tilde{O}(nm/x)$ preprocess time and $O(x)$ query time. We also provide a combinatorial conditional lower bound, showing that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and $x \leq nm$ there is no data structure with query time $O(x)$ and preprocess time $O((\frac{nm}{x})^{1-\varepsilon})$ unless combinatorial fast matrix multiplication is possible.

For strings over general alphabet, we present a data structure with $\tilde{O}(nm/\sqrt{x})$ preprocess time and $O(x)$ query time for every $x \leq nm$.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Design and analysis of algorithms

Keywords and phrases Hamming distance, Fine-grained complexity, Data structure.

Funding *Itai Boneh*: supported by Israel Science Foundation grant 810/21.

Dvir Fried: supported by ISF grant no. 1926/19, by a BSF grant 2018364, and by an ERC grant MPM under the EU's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme (grant no. 683064).

Shay Golan: supported by Israel Science Foundation grant 810/21.

Matan Kraus: supported by the ISF grant no. 1926/19, by the BSF grant 2018364, and by the ERC grant MPM under the EU's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme (grant no. 683064).

1 Introduction

Given two strings S, T of the same length n , the hamming distance $\text{HD}(S, T)$ is the number of mismatches between S and T . Hamming distance is arguably the most basic and common measure of similarity between strings. The computational task of finding the Hamming distance of two given strings is trivial - it can be done in $O(n)$ time and nothing faster is possible.


In recent years, many classical string problems have been considered in the substring queries model. In this model, we are interested in preprocessing a string to obtain a data structure capable of efficiently answering queries regarding its substrings. A few examples of results in the substring queries model include finding the longest increasing subsequence of a substring [13], the longest common substring of two substrings [1], finding the period of a substring [11], and applying pattern matching [10, 12] and approximate pattern matching between substrings [4].

In this paper, we present the natural problem of constructing a *Hamming distance oracle*.

► **Problem 1 (Hamming Distance Oracle).** *Given two strings $S, T \in \Sigma^*$ of lengths n and m , respectively, preprocess a data-structure that supports the following query: For a length ℓ and two indices $i \in [n - \ell + 1]$ and $j \in [m - \ell + 1]$, compute $\text{HD}(S[i..i + \ell - 1], T[j..j + \ell - 1])$. The quality of the oracle is measured by its preprocessing time, and by its query time.*

For constant size alphabet strings, we show that for every $x \leq nm$ there is a data structure with $\tilde{O}(nm/x)$ preprocess time and $O(x)$ query time. We also provide a combinatorial conditional lower bound, showing that our trade-off is optimal for combinatorial algorithms.

For strings over general alphabet, we present a data structure with $\tilde{O}(nm/\sqrt{x})$ preprocess time and $O(x)$ query time for every $x \leq nm$. See Figure 1 for illustration.



■ **Figure 1** A summary of our results for $n = m$. the p -axis corresponds to the exponent of the preprocess time and the q -axis corresponds to the exponent of the query time. For example, we have a general upper bound of $\tilde{O}(n^{1.75})$ preprocess time and $O(\sqrt{n})$ query time. Note that the lower bound is combinatorial.

Related work. Charalampopoulos et. al [3] considered the problem of constructing an *Edit Distance Oracle*. That is, preprocess two input strings S and T to obtain a data structure that is able to compute the edit distance of two given substrings of S and T . Charalampopoulos

et al. [3] provided an optimal (up to sub-polynomial factors) data structure with $O(N^{1+o(1)})$ preprocess time and $O(\text{polylog}(n))$ query time with $N = |S| \cdot |T|$. It is quite surprising that the problem of constructing a Hamming distance oracle has not been considered, as Hamming distance is arguably more fundamental than edit distance.

Organization in Section 2 we present basic notations and definitions. In Section 3 we prove the stated upper bound (see Theorem 1). In Section 4 we prove the stated lower bounds (see Theorem 3).

2 Preliminaries

For $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote $[i..j] = \{k \in \mathbb{N} \mid i \leq k \leq j\}$ and $[i] = [1..i]$.

A string S of length $|S| = n$ over an alphabet Σ is a sequence of characters $S = S[1]S[2] \dots S[n]$. For $i, j \in [n]$, we call $S[i..j] = S[i]S[i+1] \dots S[j]$ a *substring* of S . If $i = 1$, $S[i..j]$ is a prefix of S , and if $j = |S|$, $S[i..j]$ is a suffix of S . Let S and T be two strings over an alphabet Σ . $S \cdot T$ is the concatenation of S and T .

For two strings S and T of the same length n , the Hamming distance [8] of S and T is defined as $\text{HD}(S, T) = |\{i \in [n] \mid S[i] \neq T[i]\}|$.

3 Hamming Distance Oracle

Here we introduce our upper bound for the Hamming Distance Oracle problem.

We first reduce Problem 1 to the problem of computing the Hamming distance of two *suffixes*. In order to do so, we slightly abuse the notation and define the Hamming distance between two strings of *different* lengths as follows: Let S and T be two strings of lengths n and m respectively, we define the Hamming distance between S and T to be the Hamming distance between their prefixes of length $\min\{n, m\}$. Formally, $\text{HD}(S, T) = \text{HD}(S[1..\min\{n, m\}], T[1..\min\{n, m\}])$.

► **Problem 2** (Suffixes Hamming Distance Oracle). *Given two strings $S, T \in \Sigma^*$ of lengths n and m , respectively, preprocess a data-structure that supports the following query: For two indices $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [m]$, compute $\text{HD}(S[i..n], T[j..m])$. The complexity of the oracle is measured by its preprocessing time, its query time, and its space usage.*

Due to the following fact, given an oracle for Problem 2, one can answer any query of Problem 1 by two queries to the oracle.

► **Fact 1.** *For every $i \in [n]$, $j \in [m]$ and $\ell \in [\min(n-i, m-j)]$, we have $\text{HD}(S[i..i+\ell-1], T[j..j+\ell-1]) = \text{HD}(S[i..n], T[j..m]) - \text{HD}(S[i+\ell..n], T[j+\ell..m])$.*

From now on we will focus on introducing an oracle for Problem 2. The running time of our oracle (see Theorem 1) depends on the complexity of the Text-to-Pattern Hamming distance problem. Let $T_{\text{HD}}(n, m, \Sigma)$ be the time complexity of computing the Text-to-Pattern Hamming Distance where n is the length of the text, m is the length of the pattern and both strings are over an alphabet Σ . Notice that for any alphabet Σ we have $T_{\text{HD}}(n, m, \Sigma) = O(|\Sigma| \cdot n \log m)$ using FFT (by Fischer and Paterson [6]). For general alphabet Σ we have $T_{\text{HD}}(n, m, \Sigma) = O(n\sqrt{m})$ randomized (by Chan et al. [2]) or $T_{\text{HD}}(n, m, \Sigma) = O(n\sqrt{m \log \log m})$ deterministic (by Jin and Xu [9]).

► **Theorem 1.** *Fix $x \geq 1$. Given two strings S, T over an alphabet Σ , such that $|S| = n$, $|T| = m$ and $m \leq n$. There exists a data structure for Problem 2 with a preprocessing time of $O(\frac{n}{x} \cdot T_{\text{HD}}(m, x, \Sigma))$, and a query time of $O(\min(m, x))$.*

Proof. We first present a simple dynamic programming algorithm, which prove the theorem for $x = 1$. We then show how we can compute only portion of the dynamic programming table, and then bound the time the data structure needs for answering a query.

Let D be a matrix of size $n \times m$ such that $D[i, j] = \text{HD}(S[i..n], T[j..m])$, i.e. the hamming distance of the i th suffix of S and the j th suffix of T . Then, the matrix D satisfies the following recursion:

$$D[i, j] = \begin{cases} \text{HD}(S[i], T[j]) & \text{if } i = n \vee j = m, \\ \text{HD}(S[i], T[j]) + D[i + 1, j + 1] & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Notice that by Equation (1) one can compute each value $D[i, j]$ in $O(1)$ time (assuming a right order of computation). Thus, filling the dynamic programming table takes $O(nm)$ time in total. Due to Fact 1, the table D completes the proof for $x = O(1)$.

We proceed to describe our construction for any $x \geq 1$.

Preprocessing. The data structure maintains a small portion of the table D : For each $i \in [1.. \lfloor \frac{n}{x} \rfloor]$, the algorithm computes and stores the $i \cdot x$'s row, i.e. for each $(i, j) \in [1.. \lfloor \frac{n}{x} \rfloor] \times [m]$ the data structure computes the cell $D[i \cdot x, j]$. Notice that (by Fact 1), the value of any cell $D[i, j]$ is the sum of the Hamming distance $\text{HD}(S[i..i + \ell - 1], T[j..j + \ell - 1])$ and $D[i + \ell, j + \ell]$ (if the indices of the cell are not in the table, we consider the cell value as 0). In particular,


$$\begin{aligned} D[i \cdot x, j] &= \text{HD}(S[i \cdot x..n], T[j..m]) \\ &= \text{HD}(S[i \cdot x..(i + 1)x - 1], T[j..j + x - 1]) + \text{HD}(S[(i + 1)x..n], T[j + x..m]) \\ &= \text{HD}(S[i \cdot x..(i + 1)x - 1], T[j..j + x - 1]) + D[(i + 1) \cdot x, j + x]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by computing the rows in decreasing order (and using cells from rows already computed), the data structure is able to compute each row with a single invocation of a text-to-pattern Hamming distance algorithm with text T and pattern $S[i \cdot x..(i + 1)x - 1]$. In every such invocation, the text's size is $|T| = m$, the pattern size is x , and the strings are over the same alphabet and therefore the running time per computed row is $T_{\text{HD}}(m, x, \Sigma)$. Thus, the preprocessing time is $O(\frac{n}{x} \cdot T_{\text{HD}}(m, x, \Sigma))$ as required.

Query. Without loss of generality, we focus on the case $x \leq m$, since otherwise one can answer a query in $O(m) \subseteq O(x)$ time naïvely by comparing up to m pairs of characters, even without preprocessing. Let a be the minimal integer multiply of x larger or equal to i . The algorithm first computes $\text{HD}(S[i..a - 1], T[j..a - 1])$ naïvely by comparing pairs of corresponding characters. Then the algorithm returns $\text{HD}(S[i..a - 1], T[j..a - 1]) + D[a, j + a - i]$. Since a is an integer multiple of x , we have that $D[a, j + a - i]$ is accessible in $O(1)$ time after the preprocessing (in the case where $(a, j + a - i)$ are outside the boundaries of the table, then $D[a, j + a - i] = 0$ and is also accessible in $O(1)$ time). Therefore the running time of the query is $O(a - i) = O(x)$. The correctness follows immediately from Fact 1 (see Figure 2). ◀

4 Lower Bound for the binary case of Hamming Distance Oracle

In this section we establish the hardness of Problem 1, at least for combinatorial algorithms. The lower bound is based on the known conjecture that combinatorial boolean matrix multiplication cannot be (polynomially) faster than the naïve algorithm.



■ **Figure 2** An example of a query. The grey rows are computed in the preprocess. In order to compute $\text{HD}(S[i..n], T[j..m])$, it is enough to compute $\text{HD}(S[i..i' - 1], T[j..j' - 1])$ naively and add $D(i', j')$.

► **Conjecture 2** (Combinatorial Matrix Multiplication, see [7]). *For any $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \varepsilon > 0$, there is no combinatorial algorithm for multiplying an $n^\alpha \times n^\beta$ matrix with an $n^\beta \times n^\gamma$ matrix in time $O((n^{\alpha+\beta+\gamma})^{1-\varepsilon})$.*¹

Based on Conjecture 2 we establish the hardness of Problem 1 even for binary alphabet as follows.

► **Theorem 3** (Lower bound). *Let O be a combinatorial oracle for Problem 1 for strings over an alphabet Σ with $|\Sigma| \geq 2$. Let $p(n, m)$ and $q(n, m)$ be the preprocessing and query time of O , respectively. Then there is no $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $p(n, m) \cdot q(n, m) = O((nm)^{1-\varepsilon})$, unless Conjecture 2 is false.*

Proof. As mentioned in Section 1, our reduction is based on idea attributed to Ely Porat and Piotr Indyk [5] that was later generalized by Gawrychowski and Uznanski [7].

Assume by contradiction that there exists some $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $p(n, m) \cdot q(n, m) = O((nm)^{1-\varepsilon})$. Let $x = q(n, m) \cdot (nm)^{\varepsilon/2}$ and note that $q(n, m) = \frac{x}{(nm)^{\varepsilon/2}}$. Let A and B be two boolean matrices of sizes $\frac{n}{x} \times x$ and $x \times \frac{m}{x}$, respectively. The idea is to create a string S representing the rows of A and a string T representing the columns of B . We transform each row of A and each column of B such that the Hamming distance between the row's string and the column's string indicates the boolean product of the corresponding row and column. We first show a construction using ternary alphabet, and then explain how one can convert it into binary alphabet.

Encoding. We define encoding of values into characters, which is as follows:

- each 1 is encoded by the character '1'.

¹ [7] stated the running time as $O(n^{\alpha+\beta+\gamma-\varepsilon})$. It can be easily shown that our statement is equivalent.

- each 0 from A is encoded by the character ' x '.
- each 0 from B is encoded by the character ' y '.

For each $i \in [\frac{n}{x}]$ the algorithm encodes the i th row of A as A_i , and for each $j \in [\frac{m}{x}]$ the algorithm encodes the j th column of B as B_j . Then S is the concatenation of A 's rows (i.e. $S = A_1 \cdot A_2 \cdot \dots \cdot A_{n/x}$), and T is the concatenation of B 's columns ($T = B_1 \cdot B_2 \cdot \dots \cdot B_{m/x}$). The resulted strings S and T has length of n and m (respectively), and then the algorithm creates the Hamming Distance Oracle data structure O of S and T .

In order to explain how the algorithm computes the boolean product AB using queries on S and T , we introduce the following observation.

► **Lemma 4.** $(AB)_{ij} = 1 \iff \text{HD}(A_i, B_j) < x$

Proof. $(AB)_{ij} = 1$ if and only if there exists some $k \in [x]$ such that $A[i, k] = 1 = B[k, j]$. That means that both $A[i, k]$ and $B[k, j]$ were encoded by the character ' 1 ', and $\text{HD}(A[i, k], B[k, j]) = 0$. This implies that for A_i and B_j there is a match in at least one index, and therefore $\text{HD}(A_i, B_j) < x$. All the transitions are bidirectional, so the proof is complete. ◀

To prove the hardness for binary alphabet one can find binary encoding for each symbol in $\{1, x, y\}$ that preserves the mismatches: for each $a \neq b \in \{1, x, y\}$ we can encode a and b such that $\text{HD}(E(a), E(b)) = k$ for some positive integer $k = O(1)$, and then check if the distance between A_i and B_j is strictly less than $k \cdot x$. An example for such encoding is ' 011 ', ' 101 ', ' 110 '. For this encoding, it holds that the Hamming distance of any two different words is 2.

Due to Lemma 4 and the discussion above, the algorithm would query the data structure for each entry of AB if $\text{HD}(A_i, B_j) < 2x$ and fill in the matrix AB accordingly.

The correctness comes directly from Lemma 4. Thus, using the oracle O , one can compute the boolean matrix product AB in $O(p(n, m) + \frac{nm}{x^2}q(n, m))$ time.

Recall that $p(n, m) \cdot q(n, m) = O((nm)^{1-\epsilon})$ and $q(n, m) = \frac{x}{(nm)^{\epsilon/2}}$. Thus, we get that

$$p(n, m) = O((nm)^{1-\epsilon}/q(n, m)) = O((nm)^{1-\epsilon/2}/x) = O\left(\left(\frac{nm}{x}\right)^{1-\epsilon/2}\right).$$

Moreover,

$$\frac{nm}{x^2}q(n, m) = \frac{nm}{x^2} \frac{x}{(nm)^{\epsilon/2}} = \frac{nm}{x} \frac{1}{(nm)^{\epsilon/2}} = \frac{(nm)^{1-\epsilon/2}}{x} = O\left(\left(\frac{nm}{x}\right)^{1-\epsilon/2}\right).$$

Thus, the time for computing the product AB using the oracle O is $O\left(\left(\frac{nm}{x}\right)^{1-\epsilon/2}\right)$, which contradicts Conjecture 2 that suggests that no algorithm can compute AB in $O\left(\left(\frac{nm}{x}\right)^{1-\epsilon'}\right)$ time. ◀

References

- 1 Amihod Amir, Panagiotis Charalampopoulos, Solon P Pissis, and Jakub Radoszewski. Dynamic and internal longest common substring. *Algorithmica*, 82(12):3707–3743, 2020.
- 2 Timothy M. Chan, Ce Jin, Virginia Vassilevska Williams, and Yinzhan Xu. Faster algorithms for text-to-pattern hamming distances. In *64th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2023, Santa Cruz, CA, USA, November 6-9, 2023*, pages 2188–2203. IEEE, 2023. doi:10.1109/FOCS57990.2023.00136.

- 3 Panagiotis Charalampopoulos, Pawel Gawrychowski, Shay Mozes, and Oren Weimann. An almost optimal edit distance oracle. In Nikhil Bansal, Emanuela Merelli, and James Worrell, editors, *48th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2021, July 12-16, 2021, Glasgow, Scotland (Virtual Conference)*, volume 198 of *LIPICs*, pages 48:1–48:20. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.ICALP.2021.48>, doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ICALP.2021.48.
- 4 Panagiotis Charalampopoulos, Tomasz Kociumaka, and Philip Wellnitz. Faster approximate pattern matching: A unified approach. In *2020 IEEE 61st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 978–989. IEEE, 2020.
- 5 Raphaël Clifford. Matrix multiplication and pattern matching under Hamming norm. URL: <https://web.archive.org/web/20160818144748/http://www.cs.bris.ac.uk/Research/Algorithms/events/BAD09/BAD09/Talks/BAD09-Hammingnotes.pdf>, 2009.
- 6 Michael J Fischer and Michael S Paterson. String-matching and other products. 1974.
- 7 Pawel Gawrychowski and Przemyslaw Uznanski. Towards unified approximate pattern matching for hamming and l_1 distance. In Ioannis Chatzigiannakis, Christos Kaklamanis, Dániel Marx, and Donald Sannella, editors, *45th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2018, July 9-13, 2018, Prague, Czech Republic*, volume 107 of *LIPICs*, pages 62:1–62:13. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2018. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.ICALP.2018.62>, doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ICALP.2018.62.
- 8 Richard W Hamming. Error detecting and error correcting codes. *The Bell system technical journal*, 29(2):147–160, 1950.
- 9 Ce Jin and Yinzhan Xu. Shaving logs via large sieve inequality: Faster algorithms for sparse convolution and more, 2024. [arXiv:2403.20326](https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.20326).
- 10 Orgad Keller, Tsvi Kopelowitz, Shir Landau Feibish, and Moshe Lewenstein. Generalized substring compression. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 525:42–54, 2014.
- 11 Tomasz Kociumaka, Jakub Radoszewski, Wojciech Rytter, and Tomasz Waleń. Efficient data structures for the factor periodicity problem. In *String Processing and Information Retrieval: 19th International Symposium, SPIRE 2012, Cartagena de Indias, Colombia, October 21-25, 2012. Proceedings 19*, pages 284–294. Springer, 2012.
- 12 Tomasz Kociumaka, Jakub Radoszewski, Wojciech Rytter, and Tomasz Waleń. Internal pattern matching queries in a text and applications. In *Proceedings of the twenty-sixth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 532–551. SIAM, 2014.
- 13 Alexander Tiskin. Semi-local string comparison: Algorithmic techniques and applications. *Mathematics in Computer Science*, 1:571–603, 2008.