

# Efficient terabyte-scale text compression via stable local consistency and parallel grammar processing

Diego Díaz-Domínguez  

University of Helsinki, Finland

---

## Abstract

We present a highly parallelizable text compression algorithm that scales efficiently to terabyte-sized datasets. Our method builds on locally consistent grammars, a lightweight form of compression, combined with simple recompression techniques to achieve further space reductions. Locally consistent grammar algorithms are particularly suitable for scaling, as they need minimal satellite information to compact the text. We introduce a novel concept to enable parallelisation, *stable* local consistency. A grammar algorithm ALG is stable, if for any pattern  $P$  occurring in a collection  $\mathcal{T} = \{T_1, T_2, \dots, T_k\}$ , the instances  $\text{ALG}(T_1), \text{ALG}(T_2), \dots, \text{ALG}(T_k)$  *independently* produce cores for  $P$  with the same topology. In a locally consistent grammar, the core of  $P$  is a subset of nodes and edges in  $\mathcal{T}$ 's parse tree that remains the same in all the occurrences of  $P$ . This feature is important to achieve compression, but it only holds if ALG synchronises the parsing of the strings, for instance, by defining a common set of nonterminal symbols for them. Stability removes the need for synchronisation during the parsing phase. Consequently, we can run  $\text{ALG}(T_1), \text{ALG}(T_2), \dots, \text{ALG}(T_k)$  fully in parallel and then merge the resulting grammars into a single compressed output equivalent to  $\text{ALG}(\mathcal{T})$ . We implemented our ideas and tested them on massive datasets. Our results showed that our method could process a diverse collection of bacterial genomes (7.9 TB) in around nine hours, requiring 16 threads and 0.43 bits/symbol of working memory, producing a compressed representation 85 times smaller than the original input.

**2012 ACM Subject Classification** Theory of computation  $\rightarrow$  Data compression

**Keywords and phrases** Grammar compression, locally consistent parsing, hashing

**Digital Object Identifier** 10.4230/LIPIcs.CVIT.2016.23

## 1 Introduction

Dictionary-based text compression is essential for managing large collections of repetitive text. However, the exponential growth of data repositories has made it difficult for traditional compression methods to meet the increasing demands for efficiency.

Standard greedy methods like Lempel-Ziv (LZ) [20, 29] or grammar compression [16, 2] can achieve significant space reductions but often require extensive resources, limiting their practicality for large datasets. Tools like `gzip` and `zstd` provide resource-saving simplifications of LZ that offer acceptable trade-offs for smaller inputs but struggle with massive repositories.

Recent heuristics have been developed for large-scale applications. For instance, Deorowicz et al. [6] compress pangenomes by partitioning the strings and compressing similar segments together using `zstd`. Other approaches, Hunt et al. [14], reorder genomes to enhance LZ compression. Grammar algorithms like RePair [19] and SEQUITUR [23] achieve high compression ratios but quickly exceed available memory as the input grows. Gagie et al. [11] introduced a method using prefix-free parsing [1] to scale RePair for large inputs effectively.

Locally consistent grammars [12, 25, 3, 8, 17] is a non-greedy technique that performs rounds of locally consistent parsing [21, 28, 22, 15, 1, 3, 8] to compress a text. This approach segments a text  $T[1..n]$  based on sequence patterns, generating nearly identical phrases for matching substrings. The grammar algorithm assigns metasymbols to the phrases, stores this information in the grammar, and replaces the phrases in  $T$  with their metasymbols.



© Diego Díaz-Domínguez;  
licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY 4.0

42nd Conference on Very Important Topics (CVIT 2016).

Editors: John Q. Open and Joan R. Access; Article No. 23; pp. 23:1–23:18



Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics

LIPICs Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany

Then, it recursively applies another round of the same process and stops when  $T$  is fully compressed. Consequently, the areas of the grammar’s parse tree covering occurrences of a pattern  $P$  share nodes with the same topology and labels. This common area is the *core* of  $P$  [28]. Locally consistent grammars are simple to implement as, unlike greedy methods, they do not compute global information about  $T$ . They only need the information to break  $T$  consistently and record the grammar rules. This feature makes them suitable for large texts.

While it is possible to build from  $T$  a locally consistent grammar of size  $O(\delta \log \frac{n \log \sigma}{\delta \log n})$  in  $O(n)$  expected time [18, 17],  $\delta$  being the string complexity [27] and  $\sigma$  being  $T$ ’s alphabet, these techniques probably yield less impressive compression ratios in practice than LZ or RePair. However, simple recompression techniques can achieve further space reductions. In fact, Ochoa et al. [26] showed that any irreducible grammar can reach the  $k$ -th empirical entropy of a string. Therefore, a combined approach—using an initial locally consistent grammar followed by recompression—might offer efficient compression for large datasets.

Parallelising the grammar construction in massive collections is desirable to leverage multi-core architectures. Thus, given an input  $\mathcal{T} = \{T_a, T_b\}$ , an efficient solution would be to split  $\mathcal{T}$  into chunks, say  $\{T_a\}$  and  $\{T_b\}$ , compress the chunks individually, and merge the resulting (small) grammars  $\mathcal{G}_a$  and  $\mathcal{G}_b$ . However, ensuring the local consistency of the merged grammar is difficult if independent instances  $\text{ALG}(\{T_a\}) = \mathcal{G}_a$  and  $\text{ALG}(\{T_b\}) = \mathcal{G}_b$  process the chunks. Most locally consistent algorithms assign random fingerprints to the grammar symbols to perform the parsing. Thus, different symbols in  $\text{ALG}(\{T_a\})$  and  $\text{ALG}(\{T_b\})$  expanding to equal sequences of  $\mathcal{T}$  could have different signatures, thus producing an inconsistent parsing across the chunks. Therefore, new locally consistent schemes are necessary to make the parallelisation possible.

**Our contribution.** We present a highly parallelizable grammar compression method that scales to terabytes of data. Our framework consists of two operations. Let  $\mathcal{T} = \{T_1, T_2, \dots, T_k\}$  be a string collection and let  $\mathcal{H} = \{h^0, h^1, \dots, h^l\}$  be a set of hash functions. The operation  $\text{BUILDGRAM}(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{G}$  produces a locally consistent grammar generating strings in  $\mathcal{T}$ . Additionally, let  $\mathcal{T}_a$  and  $\mathcal{T}_b$  be two collections with  $\text{BUILDGRAM}(\mathcal{T}_a, \mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{G}_a$  and  $\text{BUILDGRAM}(\mathcal{T}_b, \mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{G}_b$ . The operation  $\text{MERGEGRAMS}(\mathcal{G}_a, \mathcal{G}_b)$  builds a locally consistent grammar  $\mathcal{G}_{ab}$  for the collection  $\mathcal{T}_{ab}$  that combines  $\mathcal{T}_a$  and  $\mathcal{T}_b$ .  $\text{BUILDGRAM}$  uses  $\mathcal{H}$  to induce a *stable* locally consistent parsing. The stable property means that  $\text{BUILDGRAM}(\mathcal{T}_a, \mathcal{H})$  and  $\text{BUILDGRAM}(\mathcal{T}_b, \mathcal{H})$  *independently* process each pattern  $P$  occurring in both  $\mathcal{T}_a$  and  $\mathcal{T}_b$  in the same way. Specifically,  $P$  yields cores in  $\mathcal{G}_a$  and  $\mathcal{G}_b$  with the same topology. The set  $\mathcal{H}$  assigns random fingerprints to the metasymbols of the grammar under construction to guide the locally consistent parsing. However, the fingerprint of a metasymbol  $X$  depends on the sequence of its expansion. This feature ensures that metasymbols from different grammars that expand to matching sequences get equal fingerprints.  $\text{MERGEGRAMS}(\mathcal{G}_a, \mathcal{G}_b)$  leverages the stable property to yield a grammar equivalent to that of  $\text{BUILDGRAM}(\mathcal{T}_{ab}, \mathcal{H})$ , which, in turn, allows us to parallelise the compression of large datasets. We show that  $\text{BUILDGRAM}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{H})$  runs in  $O(n)$  time w.h.p., where  $n$  is the number of symbols in  $\mathcal{T}$ , and uses  $O(G \log G)$  bits of working space,  $G$  being the grammar size. Similarly,  $\text{MERGEGRAMS}(\mathcal{G}_a, \mathcal{G}_b)$  runs in  $O(G_a + G_b)$  time and uses  $O(G_a \log g_a + G_b \log g_b)$  bits, with  $g_a$  and  $g_b$  being the number of symbols in  $\mathcal{G}_a$  and  $\mathcal{G}_b$  respectively. We implemented our methods and added a further layer of recompression to achieve extra reductions. Our experiments show our strategy can efficiently compress several terabytes of data.

## 2 Notation and basic concepts

We consider the RAM model of computation. Given an input of  $n$  symbols, we assume our procedures run in random-access memory, where the machine words use  $w = \Theta(\log n)$  bits and can be manipulated in constant time. We use the big- $O$  notation to denote time and space complexities, with the former expressed in bits. Further, we use the term  $\log$  to express the logarithms of base two. The terms MB, GB, and TB denote space measurements in powers of ten and MiB, GiB, and TiB denote measurements in powers of two.

### 2.1 Strings

A string  $T[1..n]$  is a sequence of  $n$  symbols over an alphabet  $\Sigma = \{1, 2, \dots, \sigma\}$ . We use  $T[j]$  to refer to the  $j$ th symbol in  $T$  from left to right, and  $T[a..b]$  to refer to the substring starting in  $T[a]$  and ending in  $T[b]$ . An equal-symbol run  $T[a..b] = s^c$  is a substring storing  $c$  consecutive copies of  $s \in \Sigma$ . The run is of maximum length when  $a = 1$  or  $T[a - 1] \neq s$ , and  $b = n$  or  $T[b + 1] \neq s$ . We assume by default that runs are of maximum length unless stated otherwise. Moreover,  $T \cdot T'$  indicates the concatenation of two strings  $T$  and  $T'$ .

We represent a collection of  $k$  strings as  $\mathcal{T} = \{T_1, T_2, \dots, T_k\}$ , and regard  $\mathcal{T}$  as a multiset. However, we assume the elements in  $\mathcal{T}$  follow an arbitrary order, with the subscript  $x \in [1..k]$  of  $T_x \in \mathcal{T}$  indicating that  $T_x$  is the  $x$ th member of  $\mathcal{T}$  in that order. Further, we use the operator  $|\mathcal{T}|$  to express the total number of symbols  $|\mathcal{T}| = \sum_{T_x \in \mathcal{T}} |T_x|$ . We use subscripts to differentiate string collections (e.g.,  $\mathcal{T}_a$  and  $\mathcal{T}_b$ ). The expression  $\mathcal{T}_{ab} = \mathcal{T}_a \circ \mathcal{T}_b$  denotes the combination of  $\mathcal{T}_a$  and  $\mathcal{T}_b$  into a new collection  $\mathcal{T}_{ab}$ . For technical convenience, we assume all input collections have the same constant-size alphabet  $\Sigma$ .

### 2.2 Grammar compression

Grammar compression consists in representing a string  $T[1..n] \in \Sigma^*$  as a small context-free grammar that generates only  $T$  [16, 2]. Formally, a grammar  $\mathcal{G} = \{\Sigma, V, \mathcal{R}, S\}$  is a tuple where  $\Sigma$  is the alphabet of  $T$  (the *terminals*),  $V$  is the set of *nonterminals*,  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq V \times (\Sigma \cup V)^*$  is the set of rewriting rules in the form  $X \rightarrow Q[1..q]$ . The symbol  $S \in V$  is the grammar's start symbol. Given two strings  $w_a = A \cdot X \cdot B, w_b = A \cdot Q[1..q] \cdot B \in (\Sigma \cup V)^*$ ,  $w_b$  rewrites  $w_a$  (denoted  $w_a \Rightarrow w_b$ ) if  $X \rightarrow Q[1..q]$  exists in  $\mathcal{R}$ . Further,  $w_a$  derives  $w_b$ , denoted  $w_a \Rightarrow^* w_b$ , if there is a sequence  $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_x$  such that  $u_1 = w_a, u_x = w_b$ , and  $u_j \Rightarrow u_{j+1}$  for  $1 \leq j < x$ . The string  $\text{exp}(X) \in \Sigma^*$  resulted from  $X \Rightarrow^* \text{exp}(X)$  is the *expansion* of  $X$ , with the decompression of  $T$  expressed as  $S \Rightarrow^* \text{exp}(S) = T$ . Compression algorithms ensure that every  $X \in V$  occurs only once as a left-hand side in  $\mathcal{R}$ . In this way, there is only one possible string  $\text{exp}(X)$  for each  $X$ . This type of grammar is referred to as straight-line. The sum of the length of the right-hand sides of  $\mathcal{R}$  is the grammar size.

The tree  $PT(X)$  representing  $X \Rightarrow^* \text{exp}(X)$  is the *parse tree* of  $X$ . Given the rule  $X \rightarrow Q[1..q]$ , the root of  $PT(X)$  is a node  $r$  labelled  $X$  that has  $q$  children, which are labelled from left to right with the symbols  $Q[1], Q[2], \dots, Q[q]$ , respectively. The  $j$ th child of  $r$ , labelled  $Q[j]$ , is a leaf if  $Q[j] \in \Sigma$ ; otherwise, it is an internal node whose subtree is recursively defined according to  $Q[j]$  and its rule in  $\mathcal{R}$ .

Recompression consists of capturing the remaining repetitions in the grammar. For instance, if  $XY \in V^*$  appears multiple times in the right-hand sides of  $\mathcal{R}$ , one can create a new rule  $Z \rightarrow XY$  and replace the occurrences of  $XY$  by  $Z$ . Run-length compression encapsulates each distinct equal-symbol  $X^\ell \in (\Sigma \cup V)$  appearing in the right-hand sides of  $\mathcal{R}$  as a constant-size rule  $X' \rightarrow (X, \ell)$ . Simplifying the grammar involves removing every

rule  $X \rightarrow Q[1..q]$  whose symbol  $X$  appears only once on the right-hand sides, replacing its occurrence with  $Q[1..q]$ .

### 2.3 Locally-consistent parsing and grammars

A *parsing* is a partition of a string  $T[1..n]$  into a sequence of phrases  $T = T[1..j_1 - 1]T[j_1..j_2 - 1] \cdots T[j_x..n]$ , where the indices  $j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_x$  are *breaks*. Let  $par(o, o') = T[j_y..j_{y+1} - 1]T[j_{y+1}..j_{y+2} - 1] \dots T[j_{y+u-1}..j_{y+u} - 1]$  denote the  $u$  phrases covering a substring  $T[o..o']$ , with  $o \in [j_y..j_{y+1})$  and  $o' \in [j_{y+u-1}, j_{y+u})$ . A parsing is *locally consistent* [4] iff, for any pair of equal substrings  $T[a..b] = T[a'..b']$ ,  $par(a, b)$  and  $par(a', b')$  have at most  $O(1)$  differences. One can achieve local consistency by designing a parsing algorithm that utilises  $T$ 's sequence to define the breaks. In this way,  $T[a..b]$  and  $T[a'..b']$  yield almost identical phrase sequences that differ only in the flanks where the context changes.

A locally consistent parsing scheme relevant to this work is that of Nong et al. [25]. They originally described their idea in the context of suffix array construction, but it has been shown that it is also locally consistent [8, 5]. They define a *type* for each position  $T[\ell]$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{L-type} &\iff T[\ell] > T[\ell + 1] \text{ or } T[\ell] = T[\ell + 1] \text{ and } T[\ell + 1] \text{ is L-type.} \\ \text{S-type} &\iff T[\ell] < T[\ell + 1] \text{ or } T[\ell] = T[\ell + 1] \text{ and } T[\ell + 1] \text{ is S-type.} \\ \text{LMS-type} &\iff T[\ell] \text{ is S-type and } T[\ell - 1] \text{ is L-type.} \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Their method scans  $T$  from right to left and sets a break at each LMS-type position.

One can create a grammar  $\mathcal{G} = \{\Sigma, V, \mathcal{R}, S\}$  that only generates  $T$  by applying successive rounds of locally consistent parsing. Different works present this idea slightly differently (see [28, 22, 15, 1, 3, 8]), but the procedure is similar: in every round  $i$ , the algorithm receives a string  $T^i$  as input ( $T^i = T$  with  $i = 1$ ) and carries out the following steps:

1. Break  $T^i$  into phrases using a locally consistent parsing.
2. Assign a nonterminal  $X$  to each distinct sequence  $Q[1..q]$  that is a phrase in  $T^i$ .
3. Store every  $X$  in  $V$  and its associated rule  $X \rightarrow Q[1..q]$  in  $\mathcal{R}$ .
4. Replace the phrases in  $T^i$  by their nonterminals to form the string  $T^{i+1}$  for  $i + 1$ .

The process finishes when  $T^i$  does not have more breaks, in which case it creates the rule  $S \rightarrow T^i$  for the start symbol and returns the resulting grammar  $\mathcal{G}$ . The phrases have length at least two, so the length of  $T^{i+1}$  is half the length of  $T^i$  in the worst case. Consequently, the algorithm incurs in  $O(\log n)$  rounds and runs in  $O(n)$  time, assuming the algorithm computes the breaks in linear time.

The output grammar  $\mathcal{G}$  is locally consistent because it compresses all the occurrences of a pattern  $P[1..m]$  largely in the same way. The first parsing round transform  $P$ 's occurrences to substrings in the form  $A^2[1..a^2] \cdot P^2[1..m^2] \cdot Z^2[1..z^2] \in V^*$ , where the superscripts indicate symbols in  $T^2$ . The prefix  $A^2[1..a^2]$  has  $O(1)$  variable nonterminals that change with the left context of  $P$ . Equivalently, the suffix  $Z^2[1..z^2]$  has  $O(1)$  variable nonterminals that change with the right context of  $P$ . However,  $P^2[1..m^2]$  remains the same in all occurrences. Then, in the second round, the processing of  $P^2[1..m^2]$  produces strings in the form  $A^3[1..a^3] \cdot P^3[1..m^3] \cdot Z^3[1..z^3]$  that recursively have the same structure. The substring  $P^i[1..m^i]$  remains non-empty during the first  $O(\log m)$  rounds. The union of all substrings  $P^i$ , with  $i = 1, \dots, O(\log m)$ , conform the core of  $P$  [28]. Figure 1 shows an example of a core.

## 2.4 Hashing and string fingerprints

*Hashing* refers to the idea of using a function  $h : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow [m]$  to map elements in a universe  $\mathcal{U}$  to integers in a range  $[m] = \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$  uniformly at random. The function is *collision-free* if, for any pair  $x, y \in \mathcal{U}$ , their hash values (or fingerprints) are different  $h(x) \neq h(y)$ . Let  $[\sigma] = \{1, 2, \dots, \sigma\}$  be the universe,  $p > \sigma$  a prime number, and  $a \in [p]_+ = \{1, 2, \dots, p-1\}$  and  $b \in [p] = \{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}$  integers chosen uniformly at random. The formula  $h(x) = (ax + b) \bmod p$  is a collision-free function  $h : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow [p]$ . When the universe  $\mathcal{U}$  is large and only an unknown subset  $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{U}$  require fingerprints over a range  $[m]$  with  $|\mathcal{K}| < m \ll \mathcal{U}$ , the typical solution is to use a *universal* hash function. For any pair  $x, y \in \mathcal{U}$ , a universal hash function ensures that the collision probability is  $\Pr[h(x) = h(y)] = 1/m$ . One can make  $h : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow [m]$  universal by using the formula  $h(x) = ((ax + b) \bmod p) \bmod m$ , with  $p > |\mathcal{K}|$ .

It is possible to extend these ideas to compute fingerprints for a set  $\mathcal{K} \subset \Sigma^*$  of strings over an alphabet  $\Sigma = \{1, 2, \dots, \sigma\}$  as follows: pick a prime number  $p > \sigma$  and choose an integer  $c \in [p]_+$  uniformly at random. Then, build the degree  $q$  polynomial  $h(Q[1..q]) = (\sum_{i=1}^q Q[i] \cdot c^{i-1}) \bmod p$  over  $[p]$  and regard the symbols  $Q[1], Q[2], \dots, Q[q]$  in  $Q[1..q] \in \mathcal{U}$  as the polynomial's coefficients. Additionally, compose  $h$  with a universal hash function  $h' : [p] \rightarrow [m]$  to get a fingerprint in the desired range  $[m]$ . Specifically, let  $a, b, c \in [p]_+$  be three random seeds chosen uniformly at random. Then  $h'$  becomes

$$h'(Q[1..q]) = \left( \left( a \left( \sum_{i=1}^q Q[i] \cdot c^{i-1} \right) + b \right) \bmod p \right) \bmod m. \quad (2)$$

## 3 Our methods

### 3.1 The grammar model

We first introduce the features of the locally consistent grammar  $\mathcal{G} = \{\Sigma, V, \mathcal{R}, S\}$  we build with BUILDGRAM and MERGEGRAMS. Given a rule  $X \rightarrow Q[1..q] \in \mathcal{R}$ , the operator  $rhs(X)$  is an alias for the string  $Q[1..q]$ . As a special case, we use  $rhs(s) = s$  when  $s \in \Sigma$  is a terminal. The *level* of  $X$  is the number of edges in the path of  $PT(X)$  starting at its root and ending in a leaf. We say that  $\mathcal{G}$  is *fully balanced* because, for any  $X \in V \setminus \{S\}$ , every root-to-leaf path in  $PT(X)$  has the same number of edges. We extend the use of “level” for the rule  $X \rightarrow Q[1..q] \in \mathcal{R}$  associated with  $X$ . Throughout the paper, we indistinctly use the terms nonterminal and metasymbol to refer to  $X \in V$ .

The grammar  $\mathcal{G}$  we build is not straight-line (Section 2.2) as the start symbol  $S$  has multiple replacements  $S \rightarrow X_1 | X_2 | \dots | X_k$ , where each  $exp(X_x) = T_x \in \mathcal{T}$ . This situation occurs because our grammar algorithm independently compresses every  $T_x[1..n_x] \in \mathcal{T}$  to a nonterminal  $X_x \in V$ , where  $PT(X_x)$  has height  $O(\log n_x)$ . For simplicity, we encode  $S \rightarrow X_1 | X_2 | \dots | X_k$  as  $S \rightarrow C[1..k] = X_1 \cdot X_2 \cdot \dots \cdot X_k$ . We reserve  $C[1..k]$  to refer exclusively to the concatenated compressed strings. The symbol  $S$  is the only exception to the straight-line condition as any other nonterminal appears once as a left-hand side in  $\mathcal{R}$ .

Our definition of level does not apply to  $S$  because the symbols in  $C[1..k]$  can have different levels. Therefore, let  $l_{max}$  be the highest level among the symbols in  $C[1..k]$ . We set the level of  $S$  equal to  $l = l_{max} + 1$ , which we also regard as the height of  $\mathcal{G}$ .

We define the partitions  $\mathcal{R} = \{\mathcal{R}^1, \dots, \mathcal{R}^{l-1}\}$  and  $V = \{V^1, V^2, \dots, V^{l-1}\}$ , where every pair  $(\mathcal{R}^i, V^i)$  is the set of rules and nonterminals (respectively) with level  $i \in [1..l-1]$ . In each subset  $\mathcal{R}^i$ , the left-hand sides are symbols over the alphabet  $V^i$ , while the right-hand

sides are strings over  $V^{i-1}$ . Further, we consider  $V^0 = \Sigma$  to be the set of terminals. Notice that the distinct symbols of  $C[1..k]$  belong to different  $V^i$  if they have different levels.

### 3.2 Fingerprints for the grammar symbols

In this section, we describe the set  $\mathcal{H}$  of hash functions assigning fingerprints in BUILDGRAM. We will explain how this idea works in the next section, but here we will focus on creating  $\mathcal{H}$ .

We first create a function  $h^0$  that maps terminal symbols to integers in an arbitrary integer range. For this purpose, we pick random prime number  $p_0 > \sigma$  and two random integers  $a_0 \in [p_0]_+ = \{1, 2, \dots, p_0 - 1\}$  and  $b_0 \in [p_0] = \{0, 1, \dots, p_0 - 1\}$ , and define a collision-free function  $h^0 : \Sigma \rightarrow [p_0]$  (Section 2.4).

We create the function  $h^i$  for each subset  $V^i$  of  $\mathcal{G}$ , with  $1 \leq i < l$ . Let  $[m_{i-1}] = \{0, 1, \dots, m_{i-1} - 1\}$  be the integer range for the fingerprints emitted by  $h^{i-1}$  ( $m_{i-1} = p_0$  when  $h^{i-1} = h^0$ ). We choose a random prime number  $p_i > m_{i-1}$ , three integer values  $a_i, b_i, c_i \in [p_i]_+$ , and a new integer  $m_i$ . Now, given a symbol  $X \in V^i$  and its corresponding rule  $X \rightarrow Q[1..q] \in \mathcal{R}^i$ , we compute the fingerprint for  $X$  as

$$h^i(Q[1..q]) = \left( \left( a_i \left( \sum_{j=1}^q h^{i-1}(rhs(Q[j])) \cdot c_i^{j-1} \right) + b_i \right) \bmod p_i \right) \bmod m_i. \quad (3)$$

The function  $h^i(Q[1..q])$  computes a fingerprint for  $Q[1..q]$  using as input the sequence of fingerprints in  $h^{i-1}$  for  $rhs(Q[1]), rhs(Q[2]), \dots, rhs(Q[q])$ . This recursive operation implicitly traverses  $PT(X)$  but completely ignores the nonterminal values labelling  $PT(X)$ . As a result, the value that  $h^i$  assigns to  $Q[1..q]$  (or equivalently, to  $X$ ) depends on  $exp(X)$ , the functions  $h^0, h^1, \dots, h^i$ , and the topology of  $PT(X)$ . We will use this feature in Section 3.5 to define the concept of stable local consistency.

As mentioned, the cost of  $h^i(Q[1..q])$  is equivalent to a traversal over  $PT(X)$ , but we do not perform this traversal in practice. Our methods operate bottom-up over  $\mathcal{G}$ , so when we process the strings in  $\mathcal{R}^i$ , the fingerprints in  $h^{i-1}$  for  $V^{i-1}$  that we require to obtain the fingerprints in  $h^i$  are already available.

**Technical note.** Our technique requires a set  $\mathcal{H}$  with, at least, as many functions as the height of the tallest grammar we could ever manipulate. Nevertheless, knowing this information beforehand is impossible because it depends on the (unknown) length of the longest string we process at any time. We solve this issue by regarding  $\mathcal{H}$  as a semi-static set: we can not remove or modify functions already present, but we can append new ones. Thus, if we run out of functions in  $\mathcal{H}$  while creating a new grammar, we append new ones to the set. In any case, each  $h^i$  requires  $O(w)$  bits of space, and appending, say, 40 random functions uniformly at random should work for strings of length up to  $2^{40} - 1$ . This limit is enough for most practical scenarios. Another important aspect is the choice of  $m_i$  for each  $V^i$ . Ideally,  $m_i$  should always be greater than  $|V^i|$  to keep a low fingerprint collision probability. The convenient coincidence is that the length of  $V^i$  grows sublinearly in repetitive (and not so repetitive) collections. In our experiments (Section 4),  $|V^i|$  never exceeded 3.5 GiB. Therefore, values for  $m_i$  in the range  $[2^{32}..2^{40}]$  should work fine for hundred of TB.

### 3.3 Our grammar algorithm

Our procedure BUILDGRAM( $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{H}$ ) receives as input a collection  $\mathcal{T} = \{T_1, T_2, \dots, T_k\}$  of  $k$  strings and a set  $\mathcal{H}$  of hash functions, and returns a grammar  $\mathcal{G} = \{\Sigma, V, \mathcal{R}, S\}$  that only

generates strings in  $\mathcal{T}$ . We assume  $\mathcal{H}$  has at least  $\lceil \log n_{max} \rceil + 1$  elements (see Section 3.2), where  $n_{max}$  is the length of the longest string in  $\mathcal{T}$ .

BUILDGRAM employs the algorithm of Section 2.3 to obtain  $\mathcal{G}$ , which builds a locally consistent grammar from the text. This method applies successive rounds of locally consistent parsing until the input is fully compressed. We operate slightly differently: in each round  $i$ , we apply steps 1-4 of Section 2.3, breaking the strings of  $\mathcal{T}$  individually, but collapsing the resulting rules in one single grammar  $\mathcal{G}$ . We stop the rounds when  $\|\mathcal{T}^{i+1}\| = k$ , which means all the strings were compressed to sequences of length one.

Additionally, we parse the strings of  $\mathcal{T}^i$  (step 1 of the round) using a variant of the parsing of Nong et al. [24] (Section 2.3) that employs Equation 3 to randomise the sequences triggering breaks. We refer to this modification as RANDLMSPAR.

Let  $X, Y \in V^{i-1}$  be any pair of nonterminal symbols with the same level  $i-1$ . We define the partial order  $\prec$  as follows:

$$X \prec Y \iff \begin{cases} h^{i-1}(rhs(X)) < h^{i-1}(rhs(Y)) & \text{if } h^{i-1}(rhs(X)) \neq h^{i-1}(rhs(Y)), \\ \text{undefined} & \text{if } h^{i-1}(rhs(X)) = h^{i-1}(rhs(Y)). \end{cases}$$

Additionally, we define the equivalence relation:

$$X \sim Y \iff h^{i-1}(rhs(X)) = h^{i-1}(rhs(Y)),$$

to cover the cases when  $X = Y$  or  $X \neq Y$  and their fingerprints collide. Now, let  $T_j^i[\ell], T_j^i[\ell+1] \in V^{i-1}$  be two adjacent positions in some string  $T_j^i \in \mathcal{T}^i$  during round  $i$ . We redefine the types of Equation 1 for  $T_j^i[\ell]$  as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{L-type} &\iff T_j^i[\ell] \succ T_j^i[\ell+1] \text{ or } T_j^i[\ell] \sim T_j^i[\ell+1] \text{ and } T_j^i[\ell+1] \text{ is L-type.} \\ \text{S-type} &\iff T_j^i[\ell] \prec T_j^i[\ell+1] \text{ or } T_j^i[\ell] \sim T_j^i[\ell+1] \text{ and } T_j^i[\ell+1] \text{ is S-type.} \\ \text{LMS-type} &\iff T_j^i[\ell] \text{ is S-type and } T_j^i[\ell-1] \text{ is L-type.} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

We note that the types above are undefined for the suffix  $T_j^i[\ell..n_j] = s^c$  that is an equal-symbol run. This restriction, in turn, implies that  $T_j^i[\ell..n_j]$  can not have LMS-type positions (i.e., breaks). However, this aspect does not affect BUILDGRAM.

A substring  $T_j^i[\ell..r]$  is a phrase in RANDLMSPAR if the following two conditions hold: (i)  $\ell = 1$  or  $T_j^i[\ell]$  is LMS-type; and (ii)  $r = n_j$  or  $T_j^i[r+1]$  is LMS-type.

The classification of  $T_j^i[\ell]$  as LMS-type depends on the random partial order that  $\prec$  induces over  $V^{i-1}$ , namely, the alphabet of  $\mathcal{T}^i$ . This idea allows us to deal with adversarial inputs where the non-randomised parsing of Nong et al. does not perform well.

Once we partition the strings of  $\mathcal{T}^i$  and store its distinct phrases in a set  $\mathcal{S}$ , we assign metasymbols to the phrases (step 2 of the round). Let  $g^{i-1} = |\Sigma \cup V|$  be the number of symbols  $\mathcal{G}$  has when we begin round  $i$ . We assign the nonterminal  $X = g^{i-1} + o \in V^i$  to the  $o$ th string  $Q[1..q] \in \mathcal{S}$ . We remark that the order in which the strings appear in  $\mathcal{S}$  is arbitrary as it does not affect the properties of our method. We also add the corresponding rule  $X \rightarrow Q[1..q] \in \mathcal{R}^i$  to  $\mathcal{G}$ . The last step of the parsing round is to create  $\mathcal{T}^{i+1}$  by replacing the phrases in  $\mathcal{T}^i$  with their metasymbols in  $V^i$ .

After finishing the parsing rounds, we create the string  $C[1..k] = T_1^i \cdot T_2^i \cdot \dots \cdot T_k^i$  with the compressed strings. We then create the start symbol  $S \in V$  with the corresponding rule  $S \rightarrow C[1..k] \in \mathcal{R}$  and finish BUILDGRAM. Figure 2 depicts an example of BUILDGRAM.

### 3.4 Implementing the grammar algorithm

This section describes the practical aspects of BUILDGRAM. The most relevant consideration is how to compute the LMS-type positions of RANDLMSPAR during round  $i$ . This operation requires Equation 4 to obtain the types of the positions in  $T_j^i$ . Further, given two consecutive symbols  $T_j^i[\ell], T_j^i[\ell + 1] \in V^{i-1}$ , computing the type of  $T_j^i[\ell]$  involves knowing the relative  $<$  order of  $T_j^i[\ell]$  and  $T_j^i[\ell + 1]$ . We obtain this information by feeding  $rhs(T_j^i[j])$  and  $rhs(T_j^i[\ell + 1])$  to Equation 3. The problem is that Equation 3 decompresses  $T_j^i[\ell]$  and  $T_j^i[\ell + 1]$  from the partially-constructed  $\mathcal{G}$ , which adds a logarithmic penalty on the grammar construction. We avoid the decompression by keeping a vector  $F[1..\Sigma \cup V]$  that stores the fingerprints for the symbols we already have in  $\Sigma \cup V$ .

We begin BUILDGRAM by initializing a vector  $F[1..\sigma]$  where  $F[s] = h^0(s)$  stores the fingerprint of  $s \in \Sigma$ . Then, each round  $i$  keeps in  $F[T^i[\ell]]$  the fingerprint  $h^{i-1}(rhs(T^i[\ell]))$ .

After we finish the steps of round  $i$ , we append the fingerprints of  $V^i$  to the end of  $F$  to compute the types of  $\mathcal{T}^{i+1}$  in the next round  $i + 1$ . Thus, for every  $X \in V^i$ , we store  $F[X] = h^i(rhs(X))$ . We use the precomputed values in  $F$  to avoid decompressing  $X$  during the execution of  $h^i(rhs(X))$ . Let  $rhs(X) = Q[1..q]$  be the replacement for  $X$ . We modify Equation 3 as follows:

$$F[X] = h^i(Q[1..q], F) = \left( \left( a_i \left( \sum_{j=1}^q F[Q[j]] \cdot c_i^{j-1} \right) + b_i \right) \bmod p_i \right) \bmod m_i. \quad (5)$$

This operation is valid as the alphabet of  $Q[1..q]$  is  $V^{i-1}$ , and  $F$  already has its fingerprints.

► **Theorem 1.** *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a collection of  $k$  strings and  $|\mathcal{T}| = n$  symbols, where the longest string has length  $n_{max}$ . Additionally, let  $\mathcal{H}$  a set of hash functions with, at least,  $|\mathcal{H}| > \lceil \log n_{max} \rceil + 1$  elements. BUILDGRAM( $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{G}$ ) =  $\mathcal{G}$  runs in  $O(n)$  time w.h.p. and requires  $O(G \log w)$  bits of working space on top of  $\mathcal{T}$ , where  $G$  is the grammar size of  $\mathcal{G}$ .*

**Proof.** Computing the types of each  $T_x^i[1..n_x^i] \in \mathcal{T}^i$  takes  $O(n_x^i)$  time if we have the vector  $F$  with the precomputed fingerprints of  $V^{i-1}$ . Recording the phrases in a hash table takes  $O(n_x^i)$  w.h.p. Each phrase in  $T_x^i$  has length at least two, except  $O(1)$  phrases in the flanks, so  $T_x^{i+1}$  has length at least  $n_x^i/2$ . The algorithm runs until all the strings are compressed, which happens after  $O(\log n_{max})$  rounds, and the overall running time is then  $O(n)$ . The working space  $G \log G + g \log w + |\mathcal{H}|w = O(G \log w)$  accounts for the grammar under construction, the vector  $F$  storing the  $g = |\Sigma| + |V|$  fingerprints, and the hash functions in  $\mathcal{H}$ . ◀

### 3.5 Stable local consistency

The technique that BUILDGRAM employs (Equation 3) to parse  $\mathcal{T}$  induces a property that we call *stable local consistency*. Put simply, it means that, for any pattern  $P$ , its occurrences will be largely parsed in the same way in *all* the texts where it occurs.

► **Definition 2.** *Stable local consistency: let ALG be an algorithm producing a locally consistent grammar. Additionally, let  $P[1..m]$  be a pattern occurring in an arbitrary number of text collections. ALG is stable iff, for any pair of distinct texts  $\mathcal{T}_a \neq \mathcal{T}_b$ , the instances  $ALG(\mathcal{T}_a) = \mathcal{G}_a$  and  $ALG(\mathcal{T}_b) = \mathcal{G}_b$  independently produce a core for  $P$  (Section 3.3) with identical tree topology and different nonterminal labels. The term “independently” means that  $ALG(\mathcal{T}_a)$  does not use information about  $\mathcal{G}_b$  in its execution, and vice-versa.*



Definition 2 holds as long as we process  $\mathcal{T}_a$  and  $\mathcal{T}_b$  with the same set  $\mathcal{H}$ . The result is undefined if, for instance, we build  $\text{BUILDGRAM}(\mathcal{T}_a, \mathcal{H}_a) = \mathcal{G}_a$ , and  $\text{BUILDGRAM}(\mathcal{T}_b, \mathcal{H}_b) = \mathcal{G}_b$ , with  $\mathcal{H}_a \neq \mathcal{H}_b$ . The stable property allows us to efficiently merge  $\mathcal{G}_a$  and  $\mathcal{G}_b$  to produce a locally consistent grammar  $\mathcal{G}_{ap}$  generating strings in  $\mathcal{T}_{ab} = \mathcal{T}_a \circ \mathcal{T}_b$ . In principle, this task would require any pattern  $P$  occurring in both  $\mathcal{T}_a$  and  $\mathcal{T}_b$  to have the same core, but this property partially holds due to the stable condition of  $\mathcal{G}_a$  and  $\mathcal{G}_b$ . Therefore, we only have to identify the core of  $P$  in  $\mathcal{G}_a$  and  $\mathcal{G}_b$  and assign them a common set of nonterminals.

Merging grammars is also beneficial for cases when  $\mathcal{T}_{ab}$  already exists and needs to be compressed efficiently. We simply split  $\mathcal{T}_{ab}$  into chunks, say  $\mathcal{T}_a$  and  $\mathcal{T}_b$ , run  $\text{BUILDGRAM}$  independently on each chunk, and finally merge the chunks. The grammar resulting from the merge is equivalent to the one we obtain with  $\text{BUILDGRAM}(\mathcal{T}_{ab}, \mathcal{H})$ . Namely, they have identical parse tree topologies and the same number of rules and nonterminals. However, equal nonterminal in different grammars might expand to distinct sequences over  $\Sigma^*$ . We note that this inconsistency does not affect the compressibility.

### 3.6 Merging grammars

We now present our algorithm to merge different grammars. Let  $\mathcal{T}_a = \{T_{a1}, T_{a2}, \dots, T_{ak}\}$  and  $\mathcal{T}_b = \{T_{b1}, T_{b2}, \dots, T_{bk'}\}$  be two string collections, with  $n_a$  and  $n_b$  being the lengths of the longest strings in  $\mathcal{T}_a$  and  $\mathcal{T}_b$ , respectively, and  $\mathcal{T}_{ab} = \{T_{a1}, \dots, T_{ak}\} \circ \{T_{b1}, \dots, T_{bk'}\}$  being their union. Further, let  $\mathcal{G}_a = \text{BUILDGRAM}(\mathcal{T}_a, \mathcal{H})$  and  $\mathcal{G}_b = \text{BUILDGRAM}(\mathcal{T}_b, \mathcal{H})$  be grammars that only generate strings in  $\mathcal{T}_a$  and  $\mathcal{T}_b$ , respectively. We assume both were constructed using the same hash set  $\mathcal{H} = \{h^0, h^1, \dots, h^l\}$ , with  $l \geq 1 + \lceil \log \max(n_a, n_b) \rceil$  (see Section 3.2). The instance  $\text{MERGEGRAMS}(\mathcal{G}_a, \mathcal{G}_b)$  returns a locally consistent grammar  $\mathcal{G}_{ab}$  that only generates strings in  $\mathcal{T}_{ab}$ , and that is equivalent to the output of  $\text{BUILDGRAM}(\mathcal{T}_{ab}, \mathcal{H})$ .

The merge consists of making  $\mathcal{G}_a$  to absorb the content that is unique to  $\mathcal{G}_b$ . Specifically, we discard rules from  $\mathcal{G}_b$  whose expansions occur in  $\mathcal{T}_a$ , and for those expanding to sequences not in  $\mathcal{T}_a$ , we add them as fresh rules in  $\mathcal{G}_a$ . Finally, we concatenate the compressed strings  $C_a[1..k_a]$  and  $C_b[1..k_b]$  as one single sequence  $C_{ab} = C_a[1..k_a] \cdot C_b[1..k_b]$ .

We will introduce some notation before explaining our algorithm in more detail. For the grammar  $\mathcal{G}_a$ , let  $\mathcal{R}_a$  be its set of rules, let  $V_a$  be its set of nonterminals, and let  $l_a$  be its height. The symbols  $\mathcal{R}_b$ ,  $V_b$ , and  $l_b$  denote equivalent information for  $\mathcal{G}_b$ . We consider the partitions  $\mathcal{R}_a = \{\mathcal{R}_a^1, \mathcal{R}_a^2, \dots, \mathcal{R}_a^{l_a-1}\}$  and  $V_a = \{V_a^1, V_a^2, \dots, V_a^{l_a-1}\}$ , where every pair  $(\mathcal{R}_a^i, V_a^i)$  is the set of rules and nonterminals (respectively) that  $\text{BUILDGRAM}(\mathcal{T}_a, \mathcal{H})$  produced during the parsing round  $i \in [1..l_a - 1]$ . We define the equivalent partitions  $\mathcal{R}_b = \{\mathcal{R}_b^1, \mathcal{R}_b^2, \dots, \mathcal{R}_b^{l_b-1}\}$  and  $V_b = \{V_b^1, V_b^2, \dots, V_b^{l_b-1}\}$  for  $\mathcal{G}_b$ . Notice that  $l_a$  and  $l_b$  can be different but  $l_a, l_b \leq |\mathcal{H}| - 1$ . Finally, we define  $S_a \rightarrow C_a[1..k_a]$  as the rule for the start symbol in  $\mathcal{G}_a$  (respectively,  $S_b \rightarrow C_b[1..k_b]$  for  $\mathcal{G}_b$ ).  $S_a \rightarrow C_a[1..k_a]$  has grammar level  $l_a$ , while  $S_b \rightarrow C_b[1..k_b]$  has grammar level  $l_b$ .

### 3.7 The merge algorithm

$\text{MERGEGRAMS}$  works in rounds that process the grammar levels  $1, 2, \dots, \max(l_a, l_b) - 1$  in increasing order. In each round  $i$ , we keep the invariant that the right-hand sides of  $\mathcal{R}_a^i$  and  $\mathcal{R}_b^i$  are comparable. That is, strings  $Q_a[1..q_a] = Q_b[1..q_b]$ , with  $X_a \rightarrow Q_a[1..q_a] \in \mathcal{R}_a^i$  and  $X_b \rightarrow Q_b[1..q_b] \in \mathcal{R}_b^i$ , expand to equal sequences over  $\Sigma$ . When  $i = 1$ , the invariant holds as the right-hand sides of  $\mathcal{R}_a^1$  and  $\mathcal{R}_b^1$  are over  $\Sigma$ , which is the same for  $\mathcal{T}_a$  and  $\mathcal{T}_b$  (Section 2.1).

We begin the algorithm by initialising a vector  $L_a[0..l_a]$  that marks level offsets in  $\mathcal{G}_a$ . Specifically, each  $L_a[i]$ , with  $i \in [1..l_a]$ , stores the number of symbols in  $\Sigma \cup V_a$  with level at

most  $i - 1$ . Thus,  $L_a[0] = 0$  because there are no symbols with level  $-1$ , and  $L_a[1] = |\Sigma|$  because there are  $|\Sigma|$  symbols with level 0. For  $i > 1$ , it holds  $L_a[i] = |\Sigma| + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} |V^j|$ . We create an equivalent vector  $L_b$  for  $\mathcal{G}_b$ . We also initialize a set of vectors  $E_1, E_2, \dots, E_{l_b}$  such that every  $E_i \subseteq [1..k_b]$  contains the indexes of  $C_b[1..k_b]$  storing symbols with level  $i$ .

Each round of merge  $i$  works as follows. We first initialise an empty vector  $M_b[1..|V_b^i|]$  that we will later use to update the right-hand sides of  $\mathcal{R}_b^{i+1}$ . Then, we scan the right-hand sides of  $\mathcal{R}_a^i$ , and for each rule  $X_a \rightarrow Q_a[1..q_a]$ , we replace  $X_a = X_a - L_a[i]$  and every symbol  $Q_a[j] = Q_a[j] - L_a[i - 1]$ , with  $j \in [1..q_a]$ . The change of  $X_a$  to  $r = X_a - L_a[i]$  is out of convenience. In a later stage of the algorithm, if we see  $X_a$  in the right-hand sides of  $\mathcal{R}_a^{i+1}$ , we can unequivocally locate its rule  $X_a \rightarrow Q_a[1..q_a]$  by visiting the  $r$ th element of  $\mathcal{R}_a^i$ . This arrangement allows us to append fresh elements to  $V_a^i$  and  $\mathcal{R}_a^i$  while maintaining the validity of the symbols in the right-hand sides of  $\mathcal{R}_a^{i+1}$ , whose alphabet is  $V_a^i$ .

The next step is to initialize a hash table  $H_a$  and insert in it every modified rule  $X_a \rightarrow Q[1..q_q] \in \mathcal{R}_a^i$  as a key-value pair  $(Q_a[1..q_a], X_a)$ . Then, we check which right-hand sides in  $\mathcal{R}_b^i$  occur as keys in  $H_a$ . Recall that, when  $i = 1$ , the strings in  $\mathcal{R}_a^i$  are already comparable with the keys in  $H_a$  because they are over  $\Sigma$  and the subtraction of  $L_a[i - 1 = 0]$  does not change their values. For  $i > 1$ , we make those strings comparable during the previous round  $i - 1$ . If the string  $Q_b[1..q_b]$  of a rule  $X_b \rightarrow Q_b[1..q_b]$  occurs in  $H_a$  as a key, we extract the associated value  $X_a$  from the hash table. On the other hand, if  $Q_b[1..q_b]$  does not exist in  $H_a$ , we create a fresh symbol  $X_a = |V_a^i| + 1$  and set  $V_a^i = V_a^i \cup \{X_a\}$ . Subsequently, we record the new rule  $X_a \rightarrow Q_b[1..q_b]$  in  $\mathcal{R}_a^i$  and store  $M[X_b - L_b[i]] = X_a$ . Once we process  $\mathcal{R}_b^i$ , we scan the right-hand sides of  $\mathcal{R}_b^{i+1}$  and use  $M$  to update their symbols. We also scan the vector  $E^i$ , and for each index  $C_b[j]$ , with  $j \in E^i$ , we update its value as  $C_b[j] = M[C_b[j] - L_b[j]]$ . Now, we discard  $\mathcal{R}_b^i$  and continue to the next merge round  $i + 1$ .

When we finish round  $i$ , the right-hand sides of  $\mathcal{R}^{i+1}$  are over  $[1..|V_a^i|]$ , and the right-hand sides of  $\mathcal{R}_a^{i+1}$  will be over  $[1..|V_a^i|]$  after we update their values with  $L_a$ . These modifications will make both strings sets comparable, and our invariant will hold for  $i + 1$ .

After  $\min(l_a, l_b) - 1$  rounds of merge, one of the input grammars will run out of levels. The remaining rounds will continue to operate similarly, except that now they will skip the creation and query of  $H_a$ , and will insert new rules directly into  $\mathcal{R}_a^i$  (if any). After we finish the rounds, we concatenate the compressed strings to form a new sequence  $C_{ab}[1..k_a + k_b] = C_a[1..k_a] \cdot C_b[1..k_b]$  and update the starting rule  $S_a \rightarrow C_{ab}[1..k_a + k_b]$ . The last step of MERGEGRAMS is to modify the symbols in  $\mathcal{G}_a$ . For that purpose, we recompute the offsets of  $L_a$  (the content of each  $V_a^i$  could have changed after the rounds), and for every level- $i$  rule  $X_a \rightarrow Q_a[1..q_a]$ , we set  $X_a = X_a + L_a[i]$  and  $Q_a[j] = Q_a[j] + L_a[i - 1]$ , with  $j \in [1..q_a]$ . Finally, we return  $\mathcal{G}_a$  and we are done. We depict an example of MERGEGRAMS in Figure 3.

► **Theorem 3.** *Let  $\mathcal{G}_a$  (respectively,  $\mathcal{G}_b$ ) be a locally consistent grammar generating strings in a collection  $\mathcal{T}_a$  of  $k_a$  strings (respectively, a collection  $\mathcal{T}_b$  with  $k_b$  strings). The size of  $\mathcal{G}_a$  is  $G_a$  and the size of  $\mathcal{G}_b$  is  $G_b$ . Similarly, let  $g_a = |\Sigma| + |V_a|$  (respectively,  $g_b = |\Sigma| + |V_b|$ ) be the number of grammar symbols (respectively,  $g_b = |\Sigma| + |V_b|$ ).  $\text{MERGEGRAMS}(\mathcal{G}_a, \mathcal{G}_b) = \mathcal{G}_{ab}$  builds a locally consistent grammar generating strings in  $\mathcal{T}_{ab} = \mathcal{T}_a \circ \mathcal{T}_b$  in  $O(G_a + G_b)$  time w.h.p. and  $O(G_a \log g_a + G_b \log g_b)$  bits of space*

**Proof.** We can obtain  $L_a$  and  $L_b$  in one scan of the nonterminal sets, which takes  $O(g_a + g_b)$  time. It is also possible to obtain the sets  $E_1, E_2, \dots, E_{l_b}$  in  $O(G_b)$  time. Now, let  $G_a^i$  (respectively,  $G_b^i$ ) be the number symbols in the right-hand sides of  $\mathcal{R}_a^i$  (respectively,  $\mathcal{R}_b^i$ ). Filling the hash table  $H_a$  requires a linear scan of  $\mathcal{R}_a^i$ , which runs in  $O(G_a^i)$  time w.h.p. On the other hand, scanning  $\mathcal{R}_b^i$  and querying its right-hand sides in  $H_a$  takes  $O(G_b^i)$  time w.h.p. Further, modifying the right-hand sides of  $\mathcal{R}_b^{i+1}$  with  $M$  takes  $O(G_b^{i+1})$  time. If we transfer

Dataset	Alphabet	Number of strings	Shortest string	Longest string	Number of symbols
ATB	5	$3.2 \times 10^8$	200	$5.2 \times 10^6$	$7.9 \times 10^{12}$
HUM	15	$1.8 \times 10^7$	24	$9.2 \times 10^8$	$3.5 \times 10^{12}$
COVID	15	$9.0 \times 10^6$	19	$3.1 \times 10^4$	$2.7 \times 10^{11}$
ECOLI	5	$2.0 \times 10^6$	200	$1.7 \times 10^6$	$4.1 \times 10^{10}$

■ **Table 1** Statistics of the datasets.

the cost of updating  $\mathcal{R}^{i+1}$  to the next round  $i + 1$ , then executing merge round  $i$  takes  $O(G_a^i + G_b^i)$  time w.h.p. Now, let  $g_a^i = |V_a^i|$  and  $g_b^i = |V_b^i|$  be the number of level- $i$  symbols. We require  $G_a^i \log g_a^{i-1} + G_b^i \log g_b^{i-1}$  bits to encode  $\mathcal{R}_a^i$  and  $\mathcal{R}_b^i$ ,  $O(G_a^i \log g_a^{i-1})$  bits for  $H_a$ , and  $g_b^i \log g_b^i$  bits for  $M$ . This cost overall amounts to  $O(G_a^i \log g_a^{i-1} + G_b^i \log g_b^{i-1})$  bits for round  $i$ . As  $G_a = k_a + |\Sigma| + \sum_{j=1}^{l_a-1} G_a^j$  and  $G_b = k_b + |\Sigma| + \sum_{j=1}^{l_b-1} G_b^j$ , then MERGEGRAMS runs in  $O(G_a + G_b)$  time w.h.p and uses  $O(G_a \log g_a + G_b \log g_b)$  bits of space. ◀

## 4 Experiments

We implemented BUILDGRAM and MERGEGRAMS in a tool called LCG. The source code is in C++, and it is available at <https://github.com/ddiazdom/lcg>. We support multi-threading in LCG by using MERGEGRAMS as a subroutine of BUILDGRAM. We describe the details of this idea in Section A. After LCG finishes the construction of the locally consistent grammar, it run-length compresses the grammar and subsequently simplifies it by removing unique nonterminals. The space usage of the final grammar includes the  $G \lceil \log G \rceil$  bits for the rules,  $g \log G$  bits for pointers to the right-hand sides of  $\mathcal{R}$ , and  $k \log G$  bits for a vector  $O$  storing pointers to the compressed strings. After recompressing the grammar, each compressed string becomes a substring in  $C[1..k]$ , and  $O$  stores the position of this substring. We compared LCG against other tools that compress strings:

- **zstd**<sup>1</sup>: a tool using a simplified version of LZ that then encodes the output using Huffman [13] and ANS [10]. It is fast and achieves high compression ratios in practice.
- **agc**<sup>2</sup>: a compressor tailored for highly-similar genomic sequences by Deorowicz et al. [6]. It breaks the strings into segments and groups the segments into blocks according to sequence similarity. Each block is then compressed using **zstd**.
- **RePair**<sup>3</sup>: a popular grammar compression algorithm by Larsson and Moffat [19] that recursively replaces the most common symbol pair in the text.
- **BigRePair**<sup>4</sup>: a variant of the RePair by Gagie et al. [11] that scales the compression of big datasets by using prefix-free parsing [1].

We considered four massive string collections for the experiments. **HUM**: all the human genome assemblies available in NCBI<sup>5</sup> up to August 27, 2024. This collection has 1,270 assemblies and is 3.46 TB in size. **ATB**: release 2.0 of the AllTheBacteria dataset from Hunt

<sup>1</sup> <https://github.com/facebook/zstd>

<sup>2</sup> <https://github.com/refresh-bio/agc>

<sup>3</sup> <https://users.dcc.uchile.cl/~gnavarro/software/repair.tgz>

<sup>4</sup> <https://gitlab.com/manzai/bigrepair>

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/datasets/genome/?taxon=9606>

Tool	Compression ratio plain/compressed				Compression speed MB/seconds				Working memory bits/symbol			
	ATB	HUM	COVID	ECOLI	ATB	HUM	COVID	ECOLI	ATB	HUM	COVID	ECOLI
LCG	<b>85.26</b>	135.54	328.10	104.33	<b>232.26</b>	<b>244.73</b>	<b>506.44</b>	<b>270.88</b>	0.43	0.29	0.36	2.04
agc	-	<b>144.90</b>	237.93	34.74	-	120.42	53.71	13.58	-	0.15	0.18	1.41
zstd	58.19	4.72	344.99	90.11	95.51	27.21	442.79	104.63	<b>0.004</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>0.69</b>
RePair	-	-	<b>778.62</b>	<b>166.76</b>	-	-	1.89	2.85	-	-	30.63	99.92
BigRePair	-	-	586.12	128.71	-	-	47.89	22.84	-	-	2.28	5.90

■ **Table 2** Performance of the competitor tools. The best result of each column is in bold. Cells with a dash are experiments that we could not perform.

et al. [14]. It contains 1,932,812 curated genome assemblies from different bacteria and archaea. ECOLI: a subset of ATB with 8,000 assemblies of the E. coli genome, totalling 40.6 GB. COVID: all the assemblies available in NCBI for SARS-CoV-2 up to November 5, 2024. This collection has 8,989,016 genomes and a size of 267.4 GB.

The datasets were in FASTA format, and we preprocessed them as follows: we set all the characters to uppercase, removed new lines inside the strings, and stored the sequences in one-string-per-line format. The tool `agc` requires the input to be in FASTA format, so we created copies of the preprocessed datasets containing small FASTA headers. We only used these copies with `agc`. Table 1 presents information about the datasets.

We also investigated the effectiveness of our parallel strategy. For that purpose, we ran LCG with HUM varying the number of threads from four to 24 (Figure 4). We also report the contribution of each compression step to the total running time (Figure 5).

The tools LCG, `agc`, `zstd`, and `BigRePair` support multithreading, so we used 16 threads in each. `RePair` does not support multithreading, and due to time constraints, we did not run the other tools with one thread. For `zstd`, we used compression level 15 and a window size of 2 GiB. The tool does not allow longer windows with compression level  $\geq 15$ .

We did not test HUM and ATB with `RePair` because the resource consumption would have exceeded the capacities of our machine. Further, `BigRePair` crashed with HUM and ATB due to a hash collision error. Finally, we did not run `agc` with ATB due to time constraints. We conducted the experiments on a machine with AlmaLinux 8.4, 3 TiB of RAM, and processor Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU E7-8890 v4 @ 2.20GHz, with 192 cores. We summarise our results in Table 2.

## 4.1 Results and discussion

Our tool LCG achieved 1.46 times more compression than `zstd` in ATB (a ratio of 85.26 versus 58.19, respectively), at the time it was 2.43 times faster (232.26 MB/seconds in LCG versus 95.51 MB/seconds in `zstd`). However, regarding working memory, `zstd` was far more efficient, with LCG requiring 108 times more RAM. Interestingly, `zstd` achieved a high compression ratio despite using a relatively short window for LZ compression (2 GiB). We believe this result is due to the order of the strings. Hunt et al. [14] already preprocessed ATB to place similar strings close to each other. Consequently, in an scenario where the strings are in random order, `zstd` would have probably achieved a much worse compression ratio. We remark that grammar-based methods (LCG, `RePair`, and `BigRePair`) do not have this limitation. However, LCG was the only grammar-based tool able to process ATB.

In the dataset HUM, `agc` achieved the best compression ratio, 144.90 versus 135.54 of LCG and 4.72 of `zstd`. However, the compression ratio of LCG is competitive with that of `agc`. On the other hand, LCG is the fastest tool in HUM, with a speed of 244.73 MB/seconds

versus 120.42 and 27.21 MB/seconds of `agc` and `zstd`, respectively. As before, `zstd` is the most memory-efficient method, using 0.01 bits/symbol versus 0.29 of `LCG` and 0.15 of `agc`. The excellent performance of `zstd` in terms of RAM usage is probably due to the cap of 2 GiB on the length of the LZ window when using high compression levels, regardless of the input size. Consequently, larger and more repetitive collections require fewer bits per symbol to be compressed. This trend is evident in the rightmost section of row three in Table 2. On the other hand, the 2-GiB cap is an important limitation for datasets where repetitiveness is more spread, like in `HUM`. This length for the LZ window is too short for humans, which is probably why `zstd` performed poorly in terms of compression in the dataset. A human assembly is around 3 GB in size, and it is not particularly repetitive. Therefore, it would be necessary to run `zstd` with a window of 15 GB or more to span multiple assemblies.

`RePair` achieved the best compression ratio in `COVID` (778.62), followed by `BigRePair` with 586.12, and finally `LCG` and `agc`, with 328.10 and 237.93, respectively. We observed that `agc` obtained the worst result for compression. A possible explanation is that its heuristic rearranged repetitive patterns that were originally close to each other. It is likely that `agc` can obtain better compression by tuning its parameters. However, choosing suitable values without information about the input is difficult. `RePair` achieved significant space reductions at the cost of using a considerable amount of resources. Compared to other tools, the slowdown factor in speed was 267.95 for `LCG`, 234.28 for `zstd`, 28.42 for `agc`, and 25.34 for `BigRePair`. In terms of working memory, it used 30.63 bits per symbol, which is 13.43 times more than `BigRePair`, 85.08 times more than `LCG`, 170.16 times more than `agc`, and 306.3 times more than `zstd`. The results in `ECOLI` were similar, with `RePair` achieving the best compression ratio, `LCG` being the fastest, and `zstd` being the most memory-efficient.

Our experiments on the effectiveness of parallelisation in `LCG` (Figure 4) showed that the running time decreases steadily with the number of threads, while the RAM usage remains stable until 16 threads. Further, the cost of recompressing the grammar (Figure 5) is negligible compared to the cost of `BUILDGRAM`. On average, run-length compression accounts for 1.94% of the running time in `LCG`, while simplifying the rules represents 5.18%.

## 5 Conclusions and further work

We presented a highly parallelizable grammar compressor that processes texts at high speeds and has a relatively low memory footprint while achieving high compression ratios. To our knowledge, `LGG` is the only grammar-based tool scaling to terabytes of data without crashing or exhausting computational resources. Furthermore, our simple strategy captures repetitions across various scenarios, making it more robust than other widely spread compression heuristics. We remark that, although we do not implement any greedy technique, we achieve substantial space reductions. This result shows that, in practice, any algorithm detecting repetitive patterns can perform well. Future work could explore integrating greedy methods atop the `LCG` grammar to achieve further space reductions. Additionally, incorporating layers of statistical encoding, such as arithmetic or Huffman coding, could enhance compression performance. Another promising direction is leveraging `LCG` as an intermediate step to compute the LZ parse or the `RePair` grammar. However, we have prioritised using `LCG` to scale other string processing tasks in massive collections. It has been shown in the literature that one can efficiently operate over locally consistent grammars to compute the Burrows-Wheeler transform [7] or maximal exact matches [9]. The main bottleneck in those cases is not operating over the grammar but computing it from the text. Combining our compression scheme with those methods could enable the processing of strings to an unprecedented scale.

## References

- 1 Christina Boucher, Travis Gagie, Alan Kuhnle, Ben Langmead, Giovanni Manzini, and Taher Mun. Prefix-free parsing for building big BWTs. *Algorithms for Molecular Biology*, 14:1–15, 2019.
- 2 Moses Charikar, Eric Lehman, Ding Liu, Rina Panigrahy, Manoj Prabhakaran, Amit Sahai, and Abhi Shelat. The smallest grammar problem. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 51(7):2554–2576, 2005.
- 3 Anders Roy Christiansen, Mikko Berggren Ettienné, Tomasz Kociumaka, Gonzalo Navarro, and Nicola Prezza. Optimal-time dictionary-compressed indexes. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)*, 17(1):1–39, 2020.
- 4 Richard Cole and Uzi Vishkin. Deterministic coin tossing and accelerating cascades: micro and macro techniques for designing parallel algorithms. In *Proc. 18th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 206–219, 1986.
- 5 Jin-Jie Deng, Wing-Kai Hon, Dominik Köppl, and Kunihiko Sadakane. FM-indexing grammars induced by suffix sorting for long patterns. In *Proc. 22nd Data Compression Conference (DCC)*, pages 63–72. IEEE, 2022.
- 6 Sebastian Deorowicz, Agnieszka Danek, and Heng Li. AGC: compact representation of assembled genomes with fast queries and updates. *Bioinformatics*, 39(3):btad097, 2023.
- 7 Diego Díaz-Domínguez and Gonzalo Navarro. Efficient construction of the BWT for repetitive text using string compression. *Information and Computation*, 294:105088, 2023.
- 8 Diego Díaz-Domínguez, Gonzalo Navarro, and Alejandro Pacheco. An LMS-based grammar self-index with local consistency properties. In *Proc. 28th International Symposium on String Processing and Information Retrieval (SPIRE)*, pages 100–113, 2021.
- 9 Diego Díaz-Domínguez and Leena Salmela. Computing all-vs-all MEMs in grammar-compressed text. In *International Symposium on String Processing and Information Retrieval*, pages 157–170. Springer, 2023.
- 10 Jarek Duda. Asymmetric numeral systems: entropy coding combining speed of huffman coding with compression rate of arithmetic coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1311.2540*, 2013.
- 11 Travis Gagie, Tomohiro I, Giovanni Manzini, Gonzalo Navarro, Hiroshi Sakamoto, and Yoshimasa Takabatake. Rpair: Rescaling RePair with rsync. In *Proc. 26th International Symposium on String Processing and Information Retrieval (SPIRE)*, pages 35–44, 2019.
- 12 Paweł Gawrychowski, Adam Karczmarz, Tomasz Kociumaka, Jakub Łacki, and Piotr Sankowski. Optimal dynamic strings. In *Proc. 29th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1509–1528, 2018.
- 13 David A. Huffman. A method for the construction of minimum-redundancy codes. *Proceedings of the IRE*, 40(9):1098–1101, 1952.
- 14 Martin Hunt, Leandro Lima, Wei Shen, John Lees, and Zamin Iqbal. AllTheBacteria—all bacterial genomes assembled, available and searchable, 2024. bioRxiv preprint. doi: 10.1101/2024.03.08.584059.
- 15 Artur Jeż. A really simple approximation of smallest grammar. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 616:141–150, 2016.
- 16 John C. Kieffer and En Hui Yang. Grammar-based codes: a new class of universal lossless source codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 46(3):737–754, 2000.
- 17 Tomasz Kociumaka, Gonzalo Navarro, and Francisco Olivares. Near-optimal search time in  $\delta$ -optimal space, and vice versa. *Algorithmica*, 86(4):1031–1056, 2024.
- 18 Tomasz Kociumaka, Gonzalo Navarro, and Nicola Prezza. Toward a definitive compressibility measure for repetitive sequences. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 69(4):2074–2092, 2022.
- 19 N. Jesper Larsson and Alistair Moffat. Off-line dictionary-based compression. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 88(11):1722–1732, 2000.
- 20 Abraham Lempel and Jacob Ziv. On the complexity of finite sequences. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 22(1):75–81, 1976.

- 21 Kurt Mehlhorn, Rajamani Sundar, and Christian Uhrig. Maintaining dynamic sequences under equality tests in polylogarithmic time. *Algorithmica*, 17:183–198, 1997.
- 22 S. Muthukrishnan and Süleyman Cenk Sahinalp. Approximate nearest neighbors and sequence comparison with block operations. In *Proc of 32nd Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 416–424, 2000.
- 23 Craig G. Nevill-Manning and Ian H. Witten. Compression and explanation using hierarchical grammars. *The Computer Journal*, 40(2\_and\_3):103–116, 1997.
- 24 Ge Nong. Practical linear-time  $O(1)$ -workspace suffix sorting for constant alphabets. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*, 31(3):1–15, 2013.
- 25 Daniel Saad Nogueira Nunes, Felipe A. Louza, Simon Gog, Mauricio Ayala-Rincón, and Gonzalo Navarro. A grammar compression algorithm based on induced suffix sorting. In *Proc. 28th Data Compression Conference (DCC)*, pages 42–51, 2018.
- 26 Carlos Ochoa and Gonzalo Navarro. RePair and all irreducible grammars are upper bounded by high-order empirical entropy. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 65(5):3160–3164, 2018.
- 27 Sofya Raskhodnikova, Dana Ron, Ronitt Rubinfeld, and Adam Smith. Sublinear algorithms for approximating string compressibility. *Algorithmica*, 65:685–709, 2013.
- 28 Süleyman Cenk Sahinalp and Uzi Vishkin. Symmetry breaking for suffix tree construction. In *Proc. 26th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 300–309, 1994.
- 29 Jacob Ziv and Abraham Lempel. A universal algorithm for sequential data compression. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 23(3):337–343, 1977.


## **A** Implementation details

LCG receives as input a string collection  $\mathcal{T}$ , the number  $t$  of allowed working threads, and a threshold  $p$  indicating the (approximate) amount of working memory the tool can use. The algorithm begins by initialising an empty grammar  $\mathcal{G}$ . Then, an I/O thread scans  $\mathcal{T}$  from the disk and loads  $t$  chunks into  $t$  different buffers of up to 200 MB each. The I/O thread inserts the buffers into a queue  $Q_i$  as it fills them, and simultaneously, the working threads try to retrieve the buffers from  $Q_i$  to process their content using BUILDGRAM. When a working thread finishes processing a buffer, it inserts the buffer into another  $Q_o$  that stores the available buffers that the I/O thread can reuse to load new chunks of  $\mathcal{T}$ . Every working thread has a local grammar that slowly grows as the thread reads more chunks. When the combined memory usage of the working threads exceeds  $p$ , LCG collapses all the grammars in  $\mathcal{G}$  using MERGEGRAMS and flushes the buffers. Now, when a worker thread reads a new buffer, it inserts in its local grammar only those phrases that are not in  $\mathcal{G}$ , and for those phrases that are in  $\mathcal{G}$ , it reuses its nonterminals when parsing the chunk’s content. The cycle of parsing and merging continues until LCG consumes all the strings in  $\mathcal{T}$ . We implemented the set of hash functions  $\mathcal{H}$  using the hash library `xxHash`<sup>6</sup>. LCG also implements a mechanism to control the number of pages from  $\mathcal{T}$  that the OS can put in the cache. The purpose is to avoid polluting the page cache, especially with massive inputs, and to remove performance bias generated by reading  $\mathcal{T}$ ’s pages from the cache instead of the disk. Specifically, we advise the OS to flush the last pages of  $\mathcal{T}$  from the cache each 1 GB.


<sup>6</sup> <https://github.com/Cyan4973/xxHash>








**Figure 3** Example of MERGEGRAMS with two grammars  $\mathcal{G}_a$  and  $\mathcal{G}_b$  generating the strings  $T_a = \text{agtagtagtgtagtaggagatcggag}$  and  $T_b = \text{agtagtagtgtagtaggtcag}$ , respectively. The instances  $\text{BUILDGRAM}(T_a, \mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{G}_a$  and  $\text{BUILDGRAM}(T_b, \mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{G}_b$  built the grammars independently using the same hash set  $\mathcal{H}$ . As the parsing is stable, the substrings  $T_a[1..19] = T_b[1..19] = \text{agtagtagtgtagtaggag}$  have cores with the same topology in  $\mathcal{G}_a$  and  $\mathcal{G}_b$ . The dashed boxes in the top area show this situation. The nonterminal values reflect the relative positions inside the grammar levels. Thus, the left-hand side of  $2 \rightarrow 524$  is 2 because that rule is the second one in level two. On the other hand, the occurrence of 2 in 524 references the second rule of level one. In the first merge round, MERGEGRAMS checks which right-hand sides in level one of  $\mathcal{G}_b$  are also right-hand sides in level one of  $\mathcal{G}_a$  (dashed lines). Only  $\text{tc}$  is not in  $\mathcal{G}_a$ , so the algorithm appends it at the end of level one in  $\mathcal{G}_a$  (bottom left side) and assigns it a fresh metasymbol. Subsequently, it discards level one in  $\mathcal{G}_b$  and updates the right-hand sides of level two in  $\mathcal{G}_b$  according to their corresponding metasymbols in  $\mathcal{G}_a$ . The rule  $1 \rightarrow 11431$  becomes  $1 \rightarrow 22342$  and  $2 \rightarrow 524$  becomes  $2 \rightarrow 163$  (bottom right side). For instance, the symbol 5 becomes 1 in the right-hand side of the level-two rule  $2 \rightarrow 524$  because the level-one rule  $5 \rightarrow \text{agg}$  in  $\mathcal{G}_b$  (top right side) matches  $1 \rightarrow \text{agg}$  in  $\mathcal{G}_a$  (bottom left side). Once it finishes the update, MERGEGRAMS goes to the next round and operates recursively.



**Figure 4** Performance of LPG relative to the number of working threads.



■ **Figure 5** Breakdown of the running time for the different compression steps of LCG.