

Subsequence Pattern Matching with Segment Number Constraint

Yuki Yonemoto¹[0009-0008-5330-7256], Takuya Mieno²[0000-0003-2922-9434],
Shunsuke Inenaga¹[0000-0002-1833-010X], Ryo Yoshinaka³[0000-0002-5175-465X],
and Ayumi Shinohara³[0000-0002-4978-8316]

¹ Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan.

yonemoto.yuuki.240@s.kyushu-u.ac.jp inenaga.shunsuke.380@m.kyushu-u.ac.jp

² University of Electro-Communications, Chofu, Japan.

tmieno@uec.ac.jp

³ Tohoku University, Sendai, Japan.

{ryoshinaka,ayumis}@tohoku.ac.jp

Abstract. This paper is concerned with subsequences that consist of limited numbers of segments. We call a subsequence *f-segmental* if it is composed of f factors. More precisely, any string of the form $u_1 \dots u_f$ is an f -segmental subsequence of a string $v_0 u_1 v_1 \dots u_f v_f$. Since factors are 1-segmental subsequences, this relativizes the notions of factors and subsequences. This paper studies some basic problems concerning f -segmental subsequences: namely, the longest common (f_1, f_2) -segmental subsequence problem and the f -segmental subsequence matching problem. The former asks the longest string that is an f_i -segmental subsequence of two input strings T_i with $i = 1, 2$. The latter asks whether an input string P is an f -segmental subsequence of the other input string T . We present polynomial-time algorithms for those problems and show that the one for the f -segmental subsequence matching problem is optimal modulo sub-polynomial factors under the strong exponential-time hypothesis.

Keywords: longest common subsequence · subsequence pattern matching · conditional lower bound · dynamic programming.

1 Introduction

A subsequence of a string w is a string of the form $u = u_1 \dots u_k$ such that $w = v_0 u_1 v_1 \dots u_k v_k$ for some strings $v_0, u_1, \dots, u_k, v_k \in \Sigma^*$. Subsequences are one of the most fundamental concepts in computer science and mathematics: formal language theory, combinatorics of words, etc. and used in many areas like concurrency modeling, database theory, and bioinformatics among others (see, e.g., [17,15,8,13]). The problems involving the notion of subsequences in their central concern include the longest common subsequence (LCS) problem, subsequence pattern matching, episode matching, sequence alignment, and so on. Efficient algorithms and the theoretical complexities of those problems and their

variants have been studied intensively for a long period of time. Subsequence pattern matching can be efficiently solved using finite state automata [3]. The classical algorithm for the LCS problem is a very popular educative example with an effective dynamic programming technique and at the same time is a representative example of a problem for which a lower bound of the time complexity is known under the strong exponential-time hypothesis [1,2]. Other subsequence-related problems for which such a conditional lower bound is known are, for example, episode matching and (variants of) the edit distance problem [7,2].

Variations of constraints on subsequences have also been introduced and studied for more appropriate analyses of string data depending on expected applications. A representative constraint is concerned with the gaps v_1, \dots, v_{k-1} among segments u_1, \dots, u_k , which should be short enough so that the subsequence occurs within a short interval of the whole text [22,14]. The length constraints can be generalized to other types of properties [10,20]. Another type of favorable property of a subsequence is to be composed of segments of a certain length or longer. The similarity measures called LCS_k and $LCS_{\geq k}$ have been intensively studied [6,11,5,24]. Li et al. [19] introduced and discussed another variant of the LCS problem, where we must find an LCS u that is the concatenation of k common substrings u_1, \dots, u_k of input strings w and w' and an input integer k ; i.e., $w = v_0 u_1 v_1 \dots u_k v_k$ and $w' = v'_0 u_1 v'_1 \dots u_k v'_k$. Li et al. [18] and Banerjee et al. [4] further studied related problems.

In this paper, calling a subsequence $u_1 \dots u_k$ of a text $v_0 u_1 v_1 \dots u_f v_f$ *f-segmental*, we investigate basic problems other than the variant of the LCS problem studied in [19,18,4]. Clearly, every subsequence is *f-segmental* for some f and when f is small, they are “close” to factors, since every factor is a 1-segmental subsequence. In this sense, this notion appears quite natural and would be useful to investigate properties of subsequences close to substrings. For example, a substring P of T will remain an *f-segmental* subsequence with small f after a few characters are inserted into T . Longest common *f-segmental* subsequences are expected to demonstrate properties between the classical longest common factors and longest common subsequences.

Among several problems concerning subsequences, we investigate mainly two basic problems: namely, the longest common segmental subsequence problem and the segmental subsequence matching problem. The former asks the longest string that is an f_1 -segmental subsequence of T_1 and at the same time an f_2 -segmental subsequence of T_2 for two input strings T_1 and T_2 . Note that differently from the problem discussed [19,18,4], common subsequences of two strings do not have to have common segmentations. For example, **abcd** is a common (2, 3)-segmental subsequence of **ab**cd**** and **a**bc**d**. We present an algorithm solving the problem in $O(g_1 g_2 |T_1| |T_2|)$ time where $g_i = \min\{f_i, \max\{1, |T_i| - 2f_i\}\}$. The *f-segmental* subsequence matching problem asks whether an input string P is an *f-segmental* subsequence of the other input string T . We show that the problem can be solved in $O(|T||P|)$ time for $f \geq 3$, while it will be as cheap as $O(|T|)$ time for $f \leq 2$. In addition, we show that no algorithm solves the problem in $O((|T||P|)^{1-\epsilon})$ time in for any $\epsilon > 0$ for the general case under the strong

exponential-time hypothesis. Finally, we raise some open questions of interest, involving f -segmental subsequences.

2 Preliminaries

Let Σ be an alphabet. An element of Σ is called a character. An element of Σ^* is called a string. The empty string λ is the string of length 0. For any strings u and v , we denote by uv the concatenation of the strings. For any string u and a positive integer e , we define $u^0 = \lambda$ and $u^e = uu^{e-1}$. For a sequence u_1, \dots, u_k of strings, we define $\prod_{i=1}^k u_i = u_1 \cdots u_k$. For a string T , the length of T is denoted by $|T|$. If $T = xyz$ holds for some strings $x, y, z \in \Sigma^*$, then x , y , and z are called a prefix, a factor, a suffix of T , respectively. For an integer i with $1 \leq i \leq |T|$, the i th character of T is denoted by $T[i]$. For integers i, j with $1 \leq i \leq j \leq |T|$, the factor of T starting at position i and ending at position j is denoted by $T[i..j]$. For a non-empty finite set X of strings, define $\text{mxl}(S)$ to be the length of a longest element of X . If X is empty, let $\text{mxl}(X) = -\infty$. We say that string w is a (k -segmental) subsequence of T if $w = u_1 \cdots u_k$ and $T = v_0 u_1 v_1 \cdots v_{k-1} u_k v_k$ hold for some strings $u_1, \dots, u_k, v_0, \dots, v_k \in \Sigma^*$. Also, such factors u_1, \dots, u_k of T are called segments for w in T . The set of f -segmental subsequences of T is denoted by

$$\text{SubSeq}^{\leq f}(T) = \{ u_1 \cdots u_f \mid T = v_0 u_1 v_1 \cdots v_{f-1} u_f v_f \text{ for some } v_0, \dots, v_f \in \Sigma^* \}.$$

Note that we allow empty segments and thus $\text{SubSeq}^{\leq f}(T) \subseteq \text{SubSeq}^{\leq f+1}(T)$ for any $f \geq 0$ and $T \in \Sigma^*$. The set of subsequences is $\text{SubSeq}(T) = \bigcup_f \text{SubSeq}^{\leq f}(T) = \text{SubSeq}^{\leq \lceil |T|/2 \rceil}(T)$ and the set of factors is $\text{SubSeq}^{\leq 1}(T)$. Therefore, the notion of f -segmental subsequences generalizes factors and subsequences. For example, $\text{acdf} \in \text{SubSeq}^{\leq 3}(\text{abcdefg}) \setminus \text{SubSeq}^{\leq 2}(\text{abcdefg})$.

This paper is concerned with the generalization of the longest common factor/subsequence problem and the (subsequence) matching problem.

Problem 1 (SegLCS problem). Given two strings T_1 and T_2 and two natural numbers f_1 and f_2 , compute $\text{mxl}(\text{SubSeq}^{\leq f_1}(T_1) \cap \text{SubSeq}^{\leq f_2}(T_2))$.

Note that, this generalization is different from the longest k -CSS problem, another generalization by Li et al. [19,18]. The longest k -CSS problem seeks for a longest subsequence which has a common segmentation in two input strings. For example, the longest 2-CSS of $T_1 = \text{abcd}$ and $T_2 = \text{aebcd}$ is bc , while $\text{abcd} \in \text{SubSeq}^{\leq 2}(T_1) \cap \text{SubSeq}^{\leq 2}(T_2)$.

Problem 2 (SegSPM problem). Given two strings T and P and a natural number f , decide whether $P \in \text{SubSeq}^{\leq f}(T)$.

The function version of the above problem is formalized as follows.

Problem 3 (SegNum problem). Given two strings T and P , find the least number f such that $P \in \text{SubSeq}^{\leq f}(T)$ if $P \in \text{SubSeq}(T)$; otherwise, return NO.

3 Algorithm for the SegLCS Problem

This section shows the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *The SegLCS problem can be solved in $O(g_1 g_2 n_1 n_2)$ time for input T_1, T_2, f_1, f_2 , where $n_a = |T_a|$ and $g_a = \min\{f_a, \max\{\lceil |T_a|/2 \rceil - f_a, 1\}\}$ for $a = 1, 2$.*

Particularly when $f_1 = \lceil n_1/2 \rceil$ and $f_2 = \lceil n_2/2 \rceil$, the SegLCS problem is no different than the standard LCS problem and the time complexity of our algorithm becomes $O(n_1 n_2)$.

The basic idea for small segmentation numbers is quite straightforward. We maintain four four-dimensional dynamic programming tables, among which L_{BB} records the values $\text{mxl}(SubSeq^{\leq k_1}(T_1[1..i_1]) \cap SubSeq^{\leq k_2}(T_2[1..i_2]))$ for $0 \leq i_a \leq n_a$ and $0 \leq k_a \leq f_a$ with $a = 1, 2$. By definition, this gives the answer when $(i_1, i_2, k_1, k_2) = (n_1, n_2, f_1, f_2)$. When extending a current LCS candidate, we should pay attention on whether we start a new segment or extend the last segment. Define

$$SufSeq^{\leq f}(T) = \{u_1 \cdots u_f \mid T = v_0 u_1 v_1 \dots v_{f-1} u_f \text{ for some } v_0, \dots, v_{f-1} \in \Sigma^*\},$$

which is a subset of $SubSeq^{\leq f}(T)$, with the restriction that the last segment must be a suffix of T . Obviously, $SubSeq^{\leq f-1}(T) \subseteq SufSeq^{\leq f}(T) \subseteq SubSeq^{\leq f}(T)$. By maintaining the following four tables, one can compute the SegLCS problem.

$$\begin{aligned} L_{BB}[i_1, i_2, k_1, k_2] &= \text{mxl}(SubSeq^{\leq k_1}(T_1[1..i_1]) \cap SubSeq^{\leq k_2}(T_2[1..i_2])), \\ L_{BF}[i_1, i_2, k_1, k_2] &= \text{mxl}(SubSeq^{\leq k_1}(T_1[1..i_1]) \cap SufSeq^{\leq k_2}(T_2[1..i_2])), \\ L_{FB}[i_1, i_2, k_1, k_2] &= \text{mxl}(SufSeq^{\leq k_1}(T_1[1..i_1]) \cap SubSeq^{\leq k_2}(T_2[1..i_2])), \\ L_{FF}[i_1, i_2, k_1, k_2] &= \text{mxl}(SufSeq^{\leq k_1}(T_1[1..i_1]) \cap SufSeq^{\leq k_2}(T_2[1..i_2])). \end{aligned}$$

If any of i_1, i_2, k_1, k_2 is zero, then $L_*[i_1, i_2, k_1, k_2] = 0$ for all $*$ in $\{BB, BF, FB, FF\}$. One can easily compute $L_*[i_1, i_2, k_1, k_2]$ inductively for $i_1, i_2, k_1, k_2 > 0$.

Now, we present an improvement on the naive algorithm particularly for the case where the segmentation number f_a is close to $n_a/2$ (but not larger than $\lceil n_a/2 \rceil$). Consider a factorization $(v_0, u_1, v_1, \dots, u_k, v_k)$ of $T = v_0 u_1 v_1 \cdots u_k v_k$ that witnesses $u_1 \cdots u_k \in SubSeq^{\leq f}(T)$ with $k \leq f$. To make the segmentation number k small, some of the factors u_i and v_i must be long enough. More formally, $u_1 \cdots u_k \in SubSeq^{\leq f}(T)$ if and only if $\mathcal{S}(v_0, u_1, \dots, u_k, v_k) \geq |T| - 2f$ for the score \mathcal{S} of the factorization defined by

$$\mathcal{S}(w_0, \dots, w_m) = |w_0| + \sum_{j=1}^m (|w_j| - 1).$$

When extracting a subsequence scanning T from left to right, instead of keeping track of the segmentation number k , we memorize the score of a factorization that yields the subsequence. Once the score of a factorization of a prefix of T

reaches $|T| - 2f$, any subsequence of the suffix may follow, so we do not have to compute the exact score any further. When the segmentation constraint f is close to $|T|/2$, the upper bound $|T| - 2f$ will be close to zero.

We remark that when the last segment is a suffix of T , i.e., $T = v_0 u_1 \cdots v_{k-1} u_k$, we have $\mathcal{S}(v_0, u_1, \dots, v_{k-1}, u_k) = |T| - 2k + 1$. This appears that we need a higher score than the previous case, where the factorization ends with v_k . But one also notices that, in this case, the score and the text length always have opposite parities. Therefore, if $\mathcal{S}(v_0, u_1, \dots, v_{k-1}, u_k) \geq |T| - 2f$, then $\mathcal{S}(v_0, u_1, \dots, v_{k-1}, u_k) \geq |T| - 2f + 1$. Hence, we can use the same score threshold $|T| - 2f$ for a factorization ending with the last segment u_k to judge whether the yielded subsequence is f -segmental.

Define

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{SubSeq}_{\geq \ell}(T) &= \{u_1 \cdots u_k \mid T = v_0 u_1 \cdots v_{k-1} u_k v_k \text{ for some } v_0 \in \Sigma^* \text{ and} \\ &\quad u_1, v_1, \dots, u_k, v_k \in \Sigma^+ \text{ with } \mathcal{S}(v_0, u_1, \dots, u_k, v_k) \geq \ell\}, \\ \overline{SufSeq}_{\geq \ell}(T) &= \{u_1 \cdots u_k \mid T = v_0 u_1 \cdots v_{k-1} u_k \text{ for some } v_0 \in \Sigma^* \text{ and} \\ &\quad u_1, v_1, \dots, u_k \in \Sigma^+ \text{ with } \mathcal{S}(v_0, u_1, \dots, v_{k-1}, u_k) \geq \ell\}. \end{aligned}$$

We remark that we disallow u_i and v_i with $i > 0$ to be empty in the definition above, differently from $SubSeq^{\leq k}$ and $SufSeq^{\leq k}$. In this way, the scores are always non-negative.

Depending on whether f_a is small or large, we use different types of dynamic programming tables. For $X_1, X_2 \in \{B, F, \overline{B}, \overline{F}\}$, we consider the tables $L_{X_1 X_2}$, which shall satisfy

$$L_{X_1 X_2}[i_1, i_2, p_1, p_2] = \text{mxl}(S_1(T_1[1..i_1]) \cap S_2(T_2[1..i_2]))$$

where

$$S_a = \begin{cases} \overline{SubSeq}^{\leq p_a} & \text{if } X_a = B, \\ \overline{SufSeq}^{\leq p_a} & \text{if } X_a = F, \\ \overline{SubSeq}_{\geq p_a} & \text{if } X_a = \overline{B}, \\ \overline{SufSeq}_{\geq p_a} & \text{if } X_a = \overline{F} \end{cases}$$

for $a = 1, 2$. If f_a is small, say $f_a \leq n_a/4$, we are interested only in $X_a \in \{B, F\}$ with $0 \leq i_a \leq n_a$ and $0 \leq p_a \leq f_a$; if f_a is large, say $f_a > n_a/4$, we are interested only in $X_a \in \{\overline{B}, \overline{F}\}$ with $0 \leq i_a \leq n_a$ and $0 \leq p_a \leq \max\{0, n_a - 2f_a\}$. For example, if f_1 is small and f_2 is large, then we construct the four tables $L_{B\overline{B}}, L_{B\overline{F}}, L_{F\overline{B}}, L_{F\overline{F}}$. The answer will be found as the maximum of the $(n_1, n_2, f_1, \max\{0, n_2 - 2f_2\})$ -entries of those tables. Hereafter, let $g_a = f_a$ if f_a is small, and $g_a = \max\{0, n_a - 2f_a\}$ if f_a is large. It remains to explain how to initialize and update those tables.

Initialization. For $i_1 = 0$ or $i_2 = 0$, let $L_{X_1 X_2}[i_1, i_2, p_1, p_2] = \min\{q_1, q_2\}$ where

$$q_a = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } X_a = B \text{ or } X_a = F \wedge p_a > 0 \text{ or } X_a = \overline{B} \wedge p_a \leq i_a, \\ -\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for $a = 1, 2$. This is justified by the fact that for any $p \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &\in \text{SubSeq}^{\leq p}(\lambda) \cap \text{SufSeq}^{\leq 1+p}(\lambda) \cap \overline{\text{SubSeq}}_{\geq p}(T[1..p]), \\ \lambda &\notin \text{SufSeq}^{\leq 0}(\lambda) \cup \overline{\text{SufSeq}}_{\geq p}(\lambda) \cup \overline{\text{SubSeq}}_{\geq 1+p}(T[1..p]). \end{aligned}$$

Recurrence relations. The algorithm recursively compute $L_{X_1 X_2}[i_1, i_2, p_1, p_2]$ for $0 \leq p_a \leq g_a$ and $0 < i_a \leq n_a$.

Suppose $T_1[i_1] \neq T_2[i_2]$. In this case, any common subsequence u of $T_1[1..i_1]$ and $T_2[1..i_2]$ is a common subsequence of $T_1[1..i_1 - 1]$ and $T_2[1..i_2]$ or $T_1[1..i_1]$ and $T_2[1..i_2 - 1]$. Every subsequence u of $T[1..i - 1]$ is that of $T[1..i]$, where it may be classified with different parameters. Notice that

- if $u \in \text{SubSeq}^{\leq k}(T[1..i - 1])$ or $u \in \text{SufSeq}^{\leq k}(T[1..i - 1])$,
then $u \in \text{SubSeq}^{\leq k}(T[1..i])$ and $u \in \text{SufSeq}^{\leq k+1}(T[1..i])$;
- if $u \in \overline{\text{SubSeq}}_{\geq \ell}(T[1..i - 1])$, then $u \in \overline{\text{SubSeq}}_{\geq \ell+1}(T[1..i])$;
- if $u \in \overline{\text{SufSeq}}_{\geq \ell}(T[1..i - 1])$, then $u \in \overline{\text{SubSeq}}_{\geq \ell}(T[1..i])$.

The converse of the above observation holds provided that the last character $T[i]$ of $T[1..i]$ is not used in u . Say, $u \in \overline{\text{SubSeq}}_{\geq \ell}(T[1..i])$ implies $u \in \overline{\text{SubSeq}}_{\geq \ell-1}(T[1..i - 1])$ or $u \in \overline{\text{SufSeq}}_{\geq \ell}(T[1..i - 1])$ for $\ell \geq 1$. On the other hand, the definition of $\overline{\text{SufSeq}}_{\geq \ell}(T[1..i])$ requires to use the last character $T[i]$ in its member subsequences. Based on this argument, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} L_{X_1 X_2}[i_1, i_2, p_1, p_2] &= \max(\{L_{X_1 Y_2}[i_1, i_2 - 1, p_1, p_2 - q] \mid (Y_2, q) \in \Phi(X_2, p_2)\} \\ &\quad \cup \{L_{Y_1 X_2}[i_1 - 1, i_2, p_1 - q, p_2] \mid (Y_1, q) \in \Phi(X_1, p_1)\}) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(B, p) &= \{(B, p), (F, p)\}, & \Phi(F, p) &= \begin{cases} \{(B, p-1), (F, p-1)\} & \text{if } p > 0, \\ \emptyset & \text{if } p = 0, \end{cases} \\ \Phi(\overline{B}, p) &= \begin{cases} \{(\overline{B}, p-1), (\overline{F}, p)\} & \text{if } p > 0, \\ \{(\overline{B}, p), (\overline{F}, p)\} & \text{if } p = 0, \end{cases} & \Phi(\overline{F}, p) &= \emptyset. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose $T_1[i_1] = T_2[i_2]$. In this case, a common subsequence u of $T_1[1..i_1]$ and $T_2[1..i_2]$ may use the last characters of $T_1[1..i_1]$ and $T_2[1..i_2]$, and $u[1..|u|-1]$ is a common subsequence of $T_1[1..i_1 - 1]$ and $T_2[1..i_2 - 1]$.

Observe that for $u = u'T[i]$,

- if $u' \in \text{SubSeq}^{\leq k}(T[1..i - 1])$,
then $u \in \text{SubSeq}^{\leq k+1}(T[1..i])$ and $u \in \text{SufSeq}^{\leq k+1}(T[1..i])$;
- if $u' \in \text{SufSeq}^{\leq k}(T[1..i - 1])$,
then $u \in \text{SubSeq}^{\leq k}(T[1..i])$ and $u \in \text{SufSeq}^{\leq k}(T[1..i])$;
- if $u' \in \overline{\text{SubSeq}}_{\geq \ell}(T[1..i - 1])$, then $u \in \overline{\text{SufSeq}}_{\geq \ell}(T[1..i])$;
- if $u' \in \overline{\text{SufSeq}}_{\geq \ell}(T[1..i - 1])$, then $u \in \overline{\text{SufSeq}}_{\geq \ell+1}(T[1..i])$.

Since the longest common subsequence does not necessarily use the last matching characters of $T_1[1..i_1]$ and $T_2[1..i_2]$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} L_{X_1 X_2}[i_1, i_2, p_1, p_2] = \max \{ & L_{X_1 Y_2}[i_1, i_2 - 1, p_1, p_2 - q] \mid (Y_2, q) \in \Phi(X_2, p_2) \} \\ & \cup \{ L_{Y_1 X_2}[i_1 - 1, i_2, p_1 - q, p_2] \mid (Y_1, q) \in \Phi(X_1, p_1) \} \\ & \cup \{ 1 + L_{Y_1 Y_2}[i_1 - 1, i_2 - 1, p_1 - q_1, p_2 - q_2] \mid \\ & (Y_1, q_1) \in \Psi(X_1, p_1) \text{ and } (Y_2, q_2) \in \Psi(X_2, p_2) \} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(\mathbf{B}, p) &= \begin{cases} \{(\mathbf{B}, p - 1), (\mathbf{F}, p - 1)\} & \text{if } p > 0, \\ \emptyset & \text{if } p = 0, \end{cases} \\ \Psi(\mathbf{F}, p) &= \begin{cases} \{(\mathbf{B}, p - 1), (\mathbf{F}, p)\} & \text{if } p > 0, \\ \emptyset & \text{if } p = 0, \end{cases} \\ \Psi(\overline{\mathbf{B}}, p) &= \emptyset, \\ \Psi(\overline{\mathbf{F}}, p) &= \begin{cases} \{(\overline{\mathbf{B}}, p), (\overline{\mathbf{F}}, p - 1)\} & \text{if } p > 0, \\ \{(\overline{\mathbf{B}}, p), (\overline{\mathbf{F}}, p)\} & \text{if } p = 0. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

4 Algorithm for the SegSPM/SegNum Problem

The SegSPM problem can be reduced to the SegLCS problem: $P \in \text{SubSeq}^{\leq f}(T)$ if and only if $\text{mxl}(\text{SubSeq}^{\leq 1}(P) \cap \text{SubSeq}^{\leq f}(T)) = |P|$. This gives an $O(f|T||P|)$ -time algorithm for the SegSPM problem. The problem of course can be reduced to its function version, the SegNum problem. This section gives $O(|T||P|)$ -time algorithms for the SegNum problem.

4.1 $O(|T||P|)$ -time Algorithms for the SegNum Problem

We present two algorithms for the SegNum problem. Roughly speaking, one is based on counting the gaps v_i and the other counts segments u_i when extracting a subsequence $u_1 \dots u_k$ from $v_0 u_1 v_1 \dots u_k v_k$.

Counting gaps Shapira and Storer considered Problem 3 in the context of *generalized edit distance problems* with block deletions, and proposed an $O(|T|^2|P|)$ -time algorithm (Algorithm 2 of [21]). However, there is a room for improvements in their algorithm, e.g., employing a standard memorization technique in function `during_deletion` appears to provide $|T|$ times speedup. On the other hand, Problem 3 can be seen as a special case of the global alignment with *affine gap penalty*, where the *gap open penalty* equals 1, the *gap extension penalty* equals 0, and any gap in P is prohibited. Our algorithm below is inspired by alignment algorithms with affine gap penalties [22,14,15,8,13].

Theorem 2. *The SegNum problem can be solved in $O(|T||P|)$ time.*

Proof. By definition of $SubSeq^{\leq f}(T)$, if $P \in SubSeq^{\leq f}(T)$ holds, P is obtained by deleting (1) a (possibly empty) prefix of T , (2) a (possibly empty) suffix of T , and (3) at most $f - 1$ non-empty factors of T that are neither prefix nor suffix from T . The smallest such number f can be computed as $f = d + 1$, where d is the minimum number of *edit operations* to obtain P from T by (i) deleting a prefix y that changes yx into x with cost 0, (ii) deleting a suffix y that changes xy into x with cost 0, and (iii) deleting a string y that changes xyz into xz with cost 1, where $x, y, z \in \Sigma^+$. Thus, the standard dynamic programming algorithm [23] can be applied, by designing the cost function properly as follows. Both the *substitution* and *insertion* operations cost ∞ to be prohibited. The *block deletion* of y costs 0 if y is either prefix or suffix, and costs 1 otherwise. Precisely, we can compute the smallest cost d as follows. We utilize two tables D and E of size $n \times m$, where $n = |T|$ and $m = |P|$. The value $D[i, j]$ indicates the edit distance between $T[1..i]$ and $P[1..j]$ ending with deletions of characters of T , and the value $E[i, j]$ gives the edit distance between $T[1..i]$ and $P[1..j]$, both assuming that the deletion of a suffix of T costs 1 instead of 0. These two tables are linked by the following recurrence relations.

$$\begin{aligned} D[i, 0] &= E[i, 0] = 0 && \text{for } 0 \leq i \leq n, \\ D[0, j] &= E[0, j] = \infty && \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq m. \\ D[i, j] &= \min\{D[i-1, j], E[i-1, j] + 1\}, \text{ and} \\ E[i, j] &= \begin{cases} \min\{E[i-1, j-1], D[i, j]\} & (T[i] = P[j]) \\ D[i, j] & (T[i] \neq P[j]) \end{cases} \\ &\text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n \text{ and } 0 \leq j \leq m. \end{aligned}$$

The smallest cost d is given by $\min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{E[i, m]\}$, because we allow to delete a suffix of T with cost 0. If $d = \infty$, it means that $P \notin SubSeq(T)$.

The total running time is $O(|T||P|)$. □

Counting segments Another way of solving the SegNum problem is based on the functions $SubSeq^{\leq k}$ and $SufSeq^{\leq k}$ like the algorithm proposed in Section 3. Define

$$\begin{aligned} K_B[i, j] &= \min(\{k \mid P[1..j] \in SubSeq^{\leq k}(T[1..i])\} \cup \{\infty\}), \\ K_F[i, j] &= \min(\{k \mid P[1..j] \in SufSeq^{\leq k}(T[1..i])\} \cup \{\infty\}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $0 \leq K_F[i, j] - K_B[i, j] \leq 1$. The final answer will be $K_B[n, m]$. The table is initialized by $K_B[i, 0] = 0$ and $K_F[i, 0] = 1$ for all i and $K_B[0, j] = K_F[0, j] = \infty$ for all $j > 0$. Then for $i, j > 0$, if $T[i] \neq P[j]$,

$$\begin{aligned} K_B[i, j] &= K_B[i-1, j], \\ K_F[i, j] &= K_B[i-1, j] + 1, \end{aligned}$$

Table 1. The three arrays lpf , lsf , and $llpf$ for $T = \text{baacababbabcaacaabcb}$ and $P = \text{abbabaca}$. In $llpf$, the **bold type** emphasizes the values that are greater than their left neighbors.

i	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
T	b	a	a	c	a	b	a	b	b	a	b	c	a	a	c	a	a	b	c	b	a
lpf	0	1	1	0	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	1	0	1	1	2	0	0	1
$llpf$	0	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
lsf	0	1	3	2	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	1	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	1

and if $T[i] = P[j]$,

$$K_B[i, j] = \min\{K_B[i - 1, j], K_F[i - 1, j - 1]\},$$

$$K_F[i, j] = \min\{K_B[i - 1, j] + 1, K_F[i - 1, j - 1]\}.$$

The algorithm runs in $O(|T||P|)$ time.

4.2 $O(|T| + |P|)$ -time Algorithm for the SegSPM Problem with $f = 2$

We show that a faster algorithm for the SegSPM problem is possible when the segment number constraint f is at most two. If $f = 1$, the problem is nothing more than the standard exact pattern matching, so that it can be solved in $O(|T| + |P|)$ time with $O(1)$ space [12,9]. Here, we focus on the case where $f = 2$.

Theorem 3. *For fixed $f = 2$, the SegSPM problem can be decided in $O(|T| + |P|)$ time with $O(|P|)$ space.*

For a text T of length n and a pattern P of length m , we define three arrays of size n as follows:

$$lpf[i] = \max\{l \mid P[1..l] = T[i - l + 1..i]\},$$

$$lsf[i] = \max\{l \mid P[m - l + 1..m] = T[i..i + l - 1]\},$$

$$llpf[i] = \max\{lpf[j] \mid j \leq i\}, \quad \text{for each } 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

The value $lpf[i]$ (resp. $lsf[i]$) represents the length of the longest prefix (resp. suffix) of P , whose occurrence ends (resp. begins) at position i in T . Table 1 shows an example.

We can easily verify the next lemma.

Lemma 1. *The following three conditions are equivalent.*

- (1) $P \in \text{SubSeq}^{\leq 2}(T)$.
- (2) $lpf[i] + lsf[j] \geq |P|$ for some $1 \leq i < j \leq n$.
- (3) $llpf[i] + lsf[i + 1] \geq |P|$ for some $1 \leq i < n$.

We now show a sketch of the proof of Theorem 3. At first, we remark that by using the Knuth-Morris-Pratt (KMP) automaton [16] for P , we can compute all values of lpf from left to right in $O(n)$ time with $O(m)$ space. Symmetrically, lsf can be computed from right to left, by KMP automaton for the reverse of P . Moreover, $llpf$ is easily obtained from lpf .

After constructing these two KMP automata, our algorithm consists of the following two phases. The first phase computes both lpf and $llpf$ from left to right. In the second phase, as soon as computing lsf at each position i from right to left, we check the condition (3) in Lemma 1. If the condition is satisfied, report it and terminate immediately. Otherwise, at the end, we conclude that $P \notin SubSeq^{\leq 2}(T)$. The total running time is $O(n + m)$. However, the space requirement looks like $O(n)$ due to the three arrays. We reduce it to $O(m)$ as follows. In the second phase, the array lsf actually does not need to be memorize, because each value is used only once to check the condition. In the first phase, lpf is just used to compute $llpf$, so that we only need $llpf$ for the second phase. Moreover, remark that the values in $llpf$ are non-decreasing and range from 0 to m . Thus, we memorize only pairs of the value $llpf[i]$ and the position i at which $llpf[i - 1] < llpf[i]$ holds. (See Table 1, where these values are in bold.) It fits in $O(m)$ space.

5 Conditional Lower Bound on the SegSPM Problem

In this section, we argue that it seems difficult to significantly improve the time efficiency of the algorithms for the SegSPM problem presented in the previous section, though the problem is solved in linear time when $f \leq 2$, under the well-known conjecture called *SETH*.

Problem 4 (k-SAT problem). Given a propositional logic formula of conjunctive normal form which has at most k literals in each clause, decide whether there exists an interpretation that satisfies the input formula.

Conjecture 1 (The Strong Exponential-Time Hypothesis; SETH).

For any $\epsilon > 0$, the k -SAT problem cannot be solved in $2^{(1-\epsilon)n}$ time, where n is the number of variables, for all $k \geq 3$.

Bille et al. [7] have shown a conditional lower bound on the complexity of *Episode Matching*.

Problem 5 (Episode Matching). Given two strings T and P , compute a shortest factor S of T such that $P \in SubSeq(S)$.

Theorem 4 ([7]). *For any $\epsilon > 0$ and any $\alpha \leq 1$, Episode Matching on binary strings T and P with $|P| \in \Theta(|T|^\alpha)$ cannot be solved in $O((|T||P|)^{1-\epsilon})$ time, unless SETH is false.*

This section proves a conditional lower bound on the complexity of the SegSPM problem by a reduction from Episode Matching. We use Theorem 4 with $\alpha = 1$. The proof by Bille et al. implies that only deciding whether a desired factor has a certain length is already as hard.

Corollary 1. *For any $\epsilon > 0$, given binary strings T and P with $|P| \in \Theta(|T|)$ and an integer $k \in \mathbb{N}$, one cannot decide whether there is a factor S of T such that $|S| \leq k$ and $P \in \text{SubSeq}(S)$ in $O(|T|^{2-\epsilon})$ time, unless *SETH* is false.*

We show the following theorem using Corollary 1.

Theorem 5. *For any $\epsilon > 0$, no algorithm solves the *SegSPM/SegNum* problem over an alphabet of size three in $O((|T||P|)^{1-\epsilon})$ time, unless *SETH* fails.*

Proof. Let T and P be instance strings of Episode Matching over $\{0, 1\}$ with $|T| = n$ and $|P| = m \in \Theta(n)$. Define two strings over $\{0, 1, \$\}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} T' &= (\$)^{2n-2} \$^2 T[1] \$^2 T[2] \$^2 \dots \$^2 T[n] \$^2 (0\$)^{2n-2}, \\ P' &= \$^{2n} P \$^{2n} \end{aligned}$$

(see Example 1 below). Clearly $|T'|, |P'| \in \Theta(n)$. By Corollary 1, it is enough to show that T has a factor of length k subsuming P as a subsequence if and only if $P' \in \text{SubSeq}^{\leq f}(T')$ where $f = 3n + m + k - 4$.

Suppose $P \in \text{SubSeq}(T[i..j])$ where $j - i + 1 = k$. Then, $\$^2 P \2 is an m -segmental subsequence of $S = \$^2 T[i] \$^2 \dots \$^2 T[j] \2 in T' , where the first and the last segments have length three and the others consist of single characters. Outside S , T' has $n - k$ occurrences of $\2 , to which one can align $\2 in the prefix and the suffix $\$(0\$)^{2n-2}$ of P' . This gives $n - k$ segments. Each of the remaining $(4n - 4) - 2(n - k) = 2(n + k - 2)$ occurrences of $\$$ in P' is aligned with those in the prefix $(\$0)^{2n-2}$ and the suffix $(0\$)^{2n-2}$ of T' . In total, we have $P' \in \text{SubSeq}^{\leq f}(T')$ for $f = m + (n - k) + 2(n + k - 2) = 3n + m + k - 4$.

Suppose $P' \in \text{SubSeq}^{\leq f}(T')$. Since P is preceded by $2n$ occurrences of $\$$ in P' , $P[1]$ cannot be aligned to any occurrence of 0 in the prefix $(\$0)^{2n-2}$ of T' , which has only $2n - 2$ occurrences of $\$$. Similarly $P[m]$ cannot be aligned to any 0 in the suffix $(0\$)^{2n-2}$ of T' . So, there must be i and j such that $P[1]$ and $P[m]$ are aligned at $T[i]$ and $T[j]$, respectively. Obviously, $P \in \text{SubSeq}(T[i..j])$. That is, T has a factor of length $j - i + 1$ that subsumes P as a subsequence. Here, we require m segments to align P with $T[i] \$^2 \dots \$^2 T[j]$ in T' . Let us consider how $\$$'s in P' can be aligned with T' . They cannot be aligned with any of the occurrences of $\2 between $T[i]$ and $T[j]$. The occurrence of $\2 immediately before and after P can be put into the segments of $P[1]$ and $P[m]$, respectively. This does not require additional segments. Now T' has $n - j + i - 1$ occurrences of $\2 . To make the segmentation number as low as possible, we must make each segment as long as possible. Thus, we should align as many occurrences of $\$$ in P' as possible with those $n - j + i - 1$ occurrences of $\2 , which gives $n - j + i - 1$ segments, and this leaves $4n - 4 - 2(n - j + i - 1)$ occurrences of $\$$ in P' . Those remaining occurrences each will constitute single segments. Thus, in total, we have $m + 4n - 4 - (n - j + i - 1) = m + 3n + j - i - 3$ segments at minimum. Since this number is at most $f = 3n + m + k - 4$, the length of $T[i..j]$ is bounded by $j - i + 1 \leq f - (m + 3n - 4) = k$. \square

Example 1. Consider $T = 0101$ of length $n = 4$ and $P = 00$ of length $m = 2$, where P is a subsequence of the factor $T[1..3]$ of length $k = 3$ of T . The proof of Theorem 5 constructs

$$T' = (0)^6 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 1 0, \\ P' = 1 1 0 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1.$$

which can be aligned as

$$T' = 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0, \\ P' = 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1,$$

where the segmentation number is $f = 13 = 3n + m + k - 4$.

6 Discussions

In this paper, we have studied some basic problems concerning f -segmental subsequences. While the literature already studied a generalization of the LCS problem for f -segmental subsequences and its variants [19,18,4], we have introduced yet another generalization of the LCS problem, as well as the f -segmental subsequence pattern matching problem, and presented dynamic programming algorithms for those problems. Although the latter can be solved in linear time for $f \leq 2$, the quadratic time complexity is shown to be unavoidable under the strong exponential-time hypothesis. Below, we raise a few open questions related to the properties of f -segmental subsequences among many possible research directions.

- Is it possible to decide whether $P \in \text{SubSeq}^{\leq f}(T)$ for fixed $f \geq 3$ more efficiently than $O(mn)$ time? Our proof of the conditional lower bound uses $f \in \Theta(m)$. Thus, for example, an $O(fn)$ -time algorithm is not refuted by Theorem 5.
- Does the conditional lower bound on the time complexity of the SegSPM problem (Theorem 5) hold for binary alphabets? We are somewhat optimistic on this question. Using a similar technique by Bille et al. [7, Theorem 1], one may be able to reduce the alphabet size, where we might need to use a direct reduction from the orthogonal vector problem, from which Bille et al. have shown the conditional lower bound on episode matching.
- Can we enumerate “minimal occurrences” of P in T as subsequences with at most f segments as in the episode matching?
- Can we bound the size of *subsequence DFAs* for the SegSPM problem? Can we efficiently construct such DFAs? One can see that a DFA accepting exactly $\text{SubSeq}^{\leq f}(T)$ requires $\Theta(f|T|)$ states when $T = (\mathbf{ab})^n$ and $f \leq n/2$, but we do not know if there are any texts for which DFAs require more states than $\Theta(f|T|)$.
- Is it possible to efficiently construct an indexing structure for T on which one can efficiently decide whether P is an f -segmental subsequence of T ? The above observation on the DFA size bound does not necessarily refute a possibility of a more elaborated indexing structure of size $O(|T|)$.

Acknowledgments. The authors would like to thank Dr. Daniel Gibney for generously providing us with a copy of his unpublished coauthored paper [4].

This work was supported in part by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP23H04381, JP24K20734 (TM), JP20H05964, JP23K24808, JP23K18466 (SI), JP18K11150, JP20H05703, JP23K11325, JP24H00697, JP24K14827 (RY), and JP21K11745 (AS).

References

1. Abboud, A., Backurs, A., Williams, V.V.: Tight hardness results for LCS and other sequence similarity measures. In: Guruswami, V. (ed.) IEEE 56th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2015, Berkeley, CA, USA, 17-20 October, 2015. pp. 59–78. IEEE Computer Society (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2015.14>
2. Backurs, A., Indyk, P.: Edit distance cannot be computed in strongly subquadratic time (unless SETH is false). In: Servedio, R.A., Rubinfeld, R. (eds.) Proceedings of the Forty-Seventh Annual ACM on Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2015, Portland, OR, USA, June 14-17, 2015. pp. 51–58. ACM (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2746539.2746612>
3. Baeza-Yates, R.A.: Searching subsequences. *Theoretical Computer Science* **78**(2), 363 – 376 (1991). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975\(91\)90358-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(91)90358-9)
4. Banerjee, A., Gibney, D., Thankachan, S.V.: Longest common substring with gaps and related problems. In: Proc. of The European Symposium on Algorithms 2024 (to appear)
5. Benson, G., Levy, A., Maimoni, S., Noifeld, D., Shalom, B.R.: LCSk: A refined similarity measure. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **638**, 11–26 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TCS.2015.11.026>
6. Benson, G., Levy, A., Shalom, B.R.: Longest common subsequence in k length substrings. In: Brisaboa, N.R., Pedreira, O., Zezula, P. (eds.) Similarity Search and Applications - 6th International Conference, SISAP 2013, A Coruña, Spain, October 2-4, 2013, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 8199, pp. 257–265. Springer (2013). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-41062-8_26
7. Bille, P., Gørtz, I.L., Mozes, S., Steiner, T.A., Weimann, O.: The fine-grained complexity of episode matching. In: 33rd Annual Symposium on Combinatorial Pattern Matching, CPM 2022. LIPIcs, vol. 223, pp. 4:1–4:12 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICCS.CPM.2022.4>
8. Crochemore, M., Hancart, C., Lecroq, T.: *Algorithms on Strings*. Cambridge University Press (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511546853>
9. Crochemore, M., Perrin, D.: Two-way string-matching. *J. ACM* **38**(3), 650–674 (1991)
10. Day, J.D., Kosche, M., Manea, F., Schmid, M.L.: Subsequences with gap constraints: Complexity bounds for matching and analysis problems. In: Bae, S.W., Park, H. (eds.) 33rd International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation, ISAAC 2022, December 19-21, 2022, Seoul, Korea. LIPIcs, vol. 248, pp. 64:1–64:18. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2022). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICCS.ISAAC.2022.64>
11. Deorowicz, S., Grabowski, S.: Efficient algorithms for the longest common subsequence in k -length substrings. *Inf. Process. Lett.* **114**(11), 634–638 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IPL.2014.05.009>

12. Galil, Z., Seiferas, J.: Time-space-optimal string matching. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* **26**(3), 280–294 (1983)
13. Giancarlo, R., Hannenhalli, S.: Guest editors' introduction to the special section on algorithms in bioinformatics. *IEEE ACM Trans. Comput. Biol. Bioinform.* **5**(4), 482–483 (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1109/TCBB.2008.116>
14. Gotoh, O.: An improved algorithm for matching biological sequences. *Journal of Molecular Biology* **162**(3), 705–708 (1982). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-2836\(82\)90398-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-2836(82)90398-9)
15. Gusfield, D.: *Algorithms on Strings, Trees, and Sequences - Computer Science and Computational Biology*. Cambridge University Press (1997). <https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511574931>
16. Knuth, D.E., Morris, Jr., J.H., Pratt, V.R.: Fast pattern matching in strings. *SIAM Journal on Computing* **6**(2), 323–350 (1977). <https://doi.org/10.1137/0206024>
17. Kosche, M., Koß, T., Manea, F., Siemer, S.: Combinatorial algorithms for subsequence matching: A survey. In: Bordihn, H., Horváth, G., Vaszil, G. (eds.) *Proceedings 12th International Workshop on Non-Classical Models of Automata and Applications, NCMA 2022, Debrecen, Hungary, August 26-27, 2022*. EPTCS, vol. 367, pp. 11–27 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.367.2>
18. Li, T., Jiang, H., Cui, X., Feng, H., Zhu, D.: Longest order-consistent and number-limited common substrings (2024), <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4724959>
19. Li, T., Zhu, D., Jiang, H., Feng, H., Cui, X.: Longest k -tuple common sub-strings. In: Adjero, D.A., Long, Q., Shi, X.M., Guo, F., Hu, X., Aluru, S., Narasimhan, G., Wang, J., Kang, M., Mondal, A., Liu, J. (eds.) *IEEE International Conference on Bioinformatics and Biomedicine, BIBM 2022*. pp. 63–66. IEEE (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1109/BIBM55620.2022.9995199>
20. Manea, F., Richardsen, J., Schmid, M.L.: Subsequences with generalised gap constraints: Upper and lower complexity bounds. *CoRR* **abs/2404.10497** (2024). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2404.10497>
21. Shapira, D., Storer, J.A.: Edit distance with block deletions. *Algorithms* **4**(1), 40–60 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.3390/A4010040>
22. Smith, T., Waterman, M.: Identification of common molecular subsequences. *Journal of Molecular Biology* **147**(1), 195–197 (1981). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-2836\(81\)90087-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-2836(81)90087-5)
23. Wagner, R.A., Fischer, M.J.: The string-to-string correction problem. *J. ACM* **21**(1), 168–173 (1974). <https://doi.org/10.1145/321796.321811>
24. Zhu, D., Wang, L., Wang, T., Wang, X.: A space efficient algorithm for the longest common subsequence in k -length substrings. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **687**, 79–92 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TCS.2017.05.015>