

Algorithms for Parameterized String Matching with Mismatches

Apurba Saha*, Iftekhar Hakim Kaowsar*, Mahdi Hasnat Siyam*, M. Sohel Rahman*

Department of Computer Science and Engineering

Bangladesh University of Engineering and Technology (BUET)

Abstract. Two strings are considered to have parameterized matching when there exists a bijection of the parameterized alphabet onto itself such that it transforms one string to another. Parameterized matching has application in software duplication detection, image processing, and computational biology. We consider the problem for which a pattern p , a text t and a mismatch tolerance limit k is given and the goal is to find all positions in text t , for which pattern p , parameterized matches with $|p|$ length substrings of t with at most k mismatches. Our main result is an algorithm for this problem with $O(\alpha^2 n \log n + n \alpha^2 \sqrt{\alpha} \log(n\alpha))$ time complexity, where $n = |t|$ and $\alpha = |\Sigma|$ which is improving for $k = \tilde{\Omega}(|\Sigma|^{5/3})$ the algorithm by Hazay, Lewenstein and Sokol. We also present a hashing based probabilistic algorithm for this problem when $k = 1$ with $O(n \log n)$ time complexity, which we believe is algorithmically beautiful.

Keywords: parameterized matching, bipartite matching, fast fourier transform, hashing, segment tree

1. Introduction

In parameterized string matching setting, a string is assumed to contain both ‘fixed’ and ‘parameterized’ symbols. So, the underlying alphabet, Σ consists of two kinds of symbols: static symbols (s -symbols; belonging to the set Σ_s) and parameterized symbols (p -symbols; belonging to the set Σ_p). In what follows, unless otherwise specified, we will assume the strings in this setting. Given two strings, denoted as s and s' , a *parameterized match* or p -match for short between them exists, if there is a bijection between the alphabets thereof. More formally, two strings $s, s' \in \Sigma_s \cup \Sigma_p$, $|s| = |s'| = n$

*These authors contributed equally to this work

are said to p -match if a one-to-one function $\pi : \Sigma_s \cup \Sigma_p \rightarrow \Sigma_s \cup \Sigma_p$ exists that is identity on Σ_s and transforms s to s' . Extending this concept, we say that two strings with equal length p -match with mismatch tolerance k , if there is a p -match after discarding at most k indices. Now we can easily extend this idea to the classic (approximate) pattern matching setting (i.e., allowing mismatches) as follows. Given a text (string) t and a pattern (string) p , we need to find all locations of t where a p -match with pattern p exists, having mismatch tolerance k .

Apart from its inherent combinatorial beauty, parameterized matching problem has some interesting applications as well. For example, it is helpful to detect duplicate codes in large software systems. It has been motivated by the fact that programmers prefer to duplicate codes in large software systems. In order to avoid new bugs and revisions, they prefer to simply copy working section of a code written by someone else, while it is encouraged to understand the principles of working section of a code [1, 2]. It also has applications in computational biology and image processing. In image processing, colors can be mapped with presence of errors [3]. Furthermore, parameterized matching has been used in solving graph isomorphism [4].

Baker [5] first introduced the idea of parameterized pattern matching to detect source code duplication in a software. The problem of finding every occurrence of parameterized string over a text is solved by Baker using the p -suffix tree [6], which can be constructed in $O(|t|(|\Sigma_p| + \log(|\Sigma_s| + |\Sigma_p|)))$ time. Subsequently, Cole and Hariharan [7] improved the construction time of p -suffix tree to $O(|t|)$. Apostolico et al.[8] solved the parameterized string matching allowing mismatches problem when both t and p are run length encoded. Their algorithm runs in $O(|t| + (r_t \times r_p)\alpha(r_t)\log(r_t))$ time, where r_t and r_p denote the number of runs in the encodings for t and p respectively and α is the inverse of the Ackermann's function. Their solution would perform fast for binary strings or in general small number of alphabets. But it lags in alternate ordering of alphabets.

There is a decision variant of this problem, where, given k , the goal is to find at every position i of the given text t whether the pattern p p -matches at that position having a tolerance limit $\leq k$. Hazay et al. solved this decision variant in $O(|t|k^{1.5} + |p|k\log(|p|))$ time [3]. Their solution performs slower with large input of tolerance limit k .

In this paper we revisit the parameterized matching problem. We present two independent solutions for two cases – (a) For any value of the tolerance limit k ; (b) For tolerance limit 1 (i.e., $k = 1$). Our first solution is deterministic solution and runs in $O(|t||\Sigma|^2\sqrt{|\Sigma|}\log(|\Sigma| \cdot |t|))$ (Section 3). It is a slight improvement over the algorithm by Hazay et al. for $k = \Omega(|\Sigma|^{5/3})$. Note that, our solution does not depend on k and it can be easily parallelized. Our second solution (i.e. for the single mismatch case) is probabilistic and runs in $O(|t|\log(|t|))$ time (Section 4). This is a rolling-hash based solution and the collision probability is $\frac{(|t|\log(|t|))^2}{m_1 \times m_2}$, where m_1 and m_2 are the moduli used to hash input. Thus it is expected that this solution will work well in practice if large moduli are selected.

2. Preliminaries

We follow the usual notations from the stringology literature. A string of length n , $s = s_1s_2\dots s_n$, is a sequence of characters drawn from an alphabet Σ . We use $s' = s_i s_{i+1} \dots s_{j=i+\ell-1}$ to denote a substring of length ℓ ; if $i = 1$ ($j = n$), then s' is a prefix (suffix) of s . Throughout this manuscript, we use t and p to denote text and pattern strings, respectively. The definitions of a parametrized string

and parametrized match or p -match for short are already given in the earlier section and hence are not repeated here. The following notations will be useful while we describe our solutions.

- $R = P \oplus Q$ refers to the multiplication of polynomial P and Q . Such operations can be implemented in $O(n \log n)$ time [9], where n is the degree of resulting polynomial.
- $mwm(G)$ refers to the size of maximum weighted matching in graph G .
- $prev_s(i)$ refers to the index of the most recent occurrence of s_i before the current index i . Here, $1 \leq prev_s(i) < i$. If it is the first occurrence of s_i , then $prev_s(i) = -1$.
- $next_s(i)$ refers to the index of the most recent occurrence of s_i after the current index i . Here, $i < next_s(i) \leq n$. If it is the last occurrence of s_i , then $next_s(i) = -1$.

We will be using an encoding technique for parameterized strings, proposed in [6, 10] as follows. This encoding will be helpful when we handle the restricted version of the problem when only a single mismatch is allowed. Let, $p = p_1 p_2 \dots p_n$ be the parameterized string of length n , then the encoded string $s = s_1 s_2 \dots s_n$, where

$$s_i = \begin{cases} p_i & \text{if } p_i \text{ is static symbol, } p_i \in \Sigma_s \\ 0 & \text{if } p_i \in \Sigma_p \text{ and it is the first occurrence of } p_i \\ i - j & \text{if } p_i \in \Sigma_p \text{ and } prev_s(i) = j \end{cases}$$

After encoding it is clear that two parameterized strings are identical if and only if their encoded strings are identical. So with this encoding parameterized string matching problem can be converted into static string matching problem.

We end this brief section with a formal definition of the problems we tackle in this paper.

Problem 1. Given a text t , a pattern p and a tolerance value k , determine for every $i \in [1, |t| - |p| + 1]$ whether there is a parameterized match between sub-string $t_i t_{i+1} \dots t_{i+|p|-1}$ and pattern p , having no more than k mismatches.

The restricted version of the problem when only a single mismatch is allowed is formally defined below.

Problem 2. Given a text t and a pattern p , determine for each $i \in [1, |t| - |p| + 1]$ whether there is a parameterized match between sub string $t_i t_{i+1} \dots t_{i+|p|-1}$ and pattern p , allowing at most one mismatch.

3. Parameterized Matching allowing Mismatches

Suppose, we are given two strings x and y of equal length ℓ . Clearly, if we can choose a subset of positions from $[1, \ell]$ of size at most k and discard those positions in both strings to get x' and y' respectively so that strings x' and y' have a p -match, then we are done.

Lemma 3.1. If one setting starting at i_1 requires some positions **of the text** to be discarded, another setting starting at i_2 may not require discarding those same positions in order to obtain the least number of mismatches. This lemma also applies to patterns.

Proof:

We will prove this for text by representing a counter-example.

Let $t = abcbbbaaca$, $p = deeeef$ and $k = 2$. We assume there are no static characters. Figure 1a shows the illustration when p is set at position $i = 1$ of the text. We see that we must discard 3rd and 6th position of the text (similarly, 3rd and 6th position of the pattern) to have a parameterized match. This is the only possible way. Whereas, when the p is placed at position $i = 6$ of the text, we must discard 10th and 11th position of the text (similarly, 5th and 6th position of the pattern). Figure 1b shows the illustration. \square





Figure 1: (a) Text $t = abcbbbaaca$ and pattern $p = deeeef$ have aligned at 1st position. Here $k = 2$ and possible way of matching has been shown. 3rd and 6th position have been discarded. (b) Same pattern has been aligned at 6th position. We see this time 5th and 6th have been discarded to have a parameterized match.

We will be constructing a bipartite graph and utilize the concept of maximum matching as can be seen from the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. Consider two strings x and y of equal length ℓ . We construct a weighted bipartite graph $G = (U \cup V, E)$ where $U = V = \Sigma_p$. The weight of the edge between $a \in U$ and $b \in V$ is the number of positions i such that $x_i = a$ and $y_i = b$. Then, a maximum matching in graph G corresponds to the minimum number of mismatch.

Proof:

Here, we are actually claiming that $\ell - mwm(G)$ is the minimum number of mismatch (say k'). Now, note that, $mwm(G)$ corresponds to a bijection B from $\Sigma_p \rightarrow \Sigma_p$, because, otherwise, some nodes would have been matched by two or more edges.

Now we first prove (by contradiction) that $\ell - mwm(G)$ can not be less than k' as follows. Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, $\ell - mwm(G) < k'$. This is equivalent to $mwm(G) > \ell - k'$. As ℓ is the length of both strings and k' is the minimum number of mismatch, $\ell - k'$ must be the maximum possible match (i.e., maximum possible number of positions which are not discarded to have a parameterized matching). If we preserve only those positions i in x and y such that there is a match between x_i and y_i taken in $mwm(G)$, we can make $\ell - k'$ larger. Hence, we found a contradiction.

Finally, it remains to show that $\ell - mwm(G)$ can not be greater than k' . Again, we do it by contradiction as follows. Let, for the sake of contradiction, $\ell - mwm(G) > k'$. This is equivalent to $mwm(G) < \ell - k'$. It means that we found another bijection $B' = \Sigma_p \rightarrow \Sigma_p$ that makes the maximum possible match larger, a contradiction. \square

Let us see an example of constructing the graph for two strings of equal length $x = abcaaeebbcd$ and $y = adbeeaaddac$. Figure 2 shows the graph. Edges of maximum matching has been thickened. In this graph, by definition, weight of the edge (u, v) will be the number of positions i such that $x_i = u$




Figure 2: Example of constructing matching graph with $x = abcaaeebbcd$ and $y = adbeeaaddac$. Weights of the edges (u, v) is the number position where u and v are aligned. Matched edges are thickened.

and $y_i = v$. For example, in positions $i \in \{2, 8, 9\}$ $x_i = b$ and $y_i = d$. Hence, edge (b, d) has a weight of 3. Maximum matching in this bipartite graph chooses edges $(a, e), (b, d), (c, b), (d, c), (e, a)$. It means that only positions $\{2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10\}$ will be preserved and positions $\{1, 11\}$ will be discarded. So, the minimum number of mismatch is 2.

For solving our problem, we can construct the graph G_i as described above for every position $i \in [1, |t| - |p| + 1]$ of the pattern p . If for a i we have $mwm(G_i) \leq k$, we can report that there is a parameterized matching for p in the corresponding window. Note that, we do not need to include static symbols here, as they can not be matched with a different symbol. If $a \in \Sigma_s$, we will simply add number of positions j where $x_j = y_j = a$.

We are now left with finding appropriate weights for the edges for every setting of the pattern and to do that efficiently. We use Fast Fourier Transform (FFT) for this purpose. Note that, there are $O(|\Sigma_p|^2)$ edges in each graph $G_i, i \in [1, |t| - |p| + 1]$ and number of graphs is $O(|t|)$. So, we can not do it faster than $O(|t| \times |\Sigma_p|^2)$ time. As will be clear later, time complexity of our approach will be $O(|t| \times |\Sigma_p|^2 \times \log |t|)$. In what follows, we focus on finding these weights employing FFT.

Now, to find out edge weights efficiently, we leverage polynomial multiplication. For each $a \in \Sigma$, we create a polynomial $P(a)$ ($Q(a)$) of x with degree $|t| - 1$ ($|p| - 1$) as follows (Equations 1 - 4):

$$P(a) = c_0 + c_1x + c_2x^2 + \dots + c_{|t|-1}x^{|t|-1} \quad (1)$$

Here, for each $i \in [0, |t| - 1]$,

$$c_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t_{i+1} = a \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

That is, $c_i = [t_{i+1} = a]$.

$$Q(a) = d_0 + d_1x + d_2x^2 + \dots + d_{|p|-1}x^{|p|-1} \quad (3)$$

Here, for each $i \in [0, |p| - 1]$,

$$d_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } p_{|p|-i} = a \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

That is, $d_i = [p_{|p|-i} = a]$. Now we have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.3. Let $a, b \in \Sigma_p$ and $R(a, b) = P(a) \oplus Q(b)$. Co-efficient of $x^{|p|+i}$ in R will be the weight of edge (a, b) in the graph G_{i+1} .

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Co-efficient of } x^{|p|+i} \text{ in } R(a, b) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{|t|-1} \sum_{k=0}^{|p|-1} c_j d_k [j + k = |p| + i] \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{|p|-1} \sum_{j=0}^{|t|-1} c_j d_k [j + k = |p| + i] \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{|p|-1} c_{|p|+i-k} d_k \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{|p|-1} [t_{|p|+i-k} = a] [p_{|p|-k} = b] \\
&= \sum_{k'=1}^{|p|} [t_{i+k'} = a] [p_{k'} = b] \\
&= \sum_{k'=1}^{|p|} [t_{i+k'} = a \wedge p_{k'} = b] \\
&= \text{weight of edge } (a, b) \text{ in the graph } G_{i+1}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the result follows. □

Intuitively, as we place the co-efficient of $P(a)$ walking forward in t and co-efficient of $Q(b)$ walking backward in p , co-efficient of $R(a, b)$ captures the number of positions where a faces b for the same setting. Similarly, if $a \in \Sigma_s$ (i.e., for static symbols), the co-efficient of $x^{|p|+i}$ in $R(a) = P(a) \oplus Q(a)$ will be the number of positions where the same static symbol a is aligned in the $(i + 1)$ -th setting.

We create $P(a)$ and $Q(a)$ for every $a \in \Sigma$. For every setting of pattern starting at i , we put weight in the matching graph G_i as described above. We can find the number of positions where the same static symbol has been aligned. We add it to $mwm(G_i)$. If the summation is at least $m - k$, we can obviously tell that there is parameterized matching starting at i . Finally, to multiply two polynomials $P(a)$ and $Q(b)$, we use FFT. A naive approach of polynomial multiplication would take $O(|t| \times |p|)$ time, whereas it will be $O(|t| \times \log |t|)$ with FFT.

Consider the same example of Figure 1, where $t = abcbbbaaaca$, $p = deeeef$ and $\Sigma = \{a, b, c, d, e, f\}$.

$$P(a) = 1 + x^6 + x^7 + x^8 + x^{10}$$

$$P(b) = x + x^3 + x^4 + x^5$$

$$P(c) = x^2 + x^9$$

$$P(d) = P(e) = P(f) = 0$$

$$Q(a) = Q(b) = Q(c) = 0$$

$$Q(d) = x^5$$

$$Q(e) = x + x^2 + x^3 + x^4$$

$$Q(f) = 1$$

Now, as examples, we show the computation of $R(a, e)$ and $R(c, e)$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} R(a, e) &= P(a) \oplus Q(e) \\ &= x + x^2 + x^3 + x^4 + x^7 + 2x^8 + 3x^9 + \\ &\quad 3x^{10} + 3x^{11} + 2x^{12} + x^{13} + x^{14} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} R(c, e) &= P(c) \oplus Q(e) \\ &= x^3 + x^4 + x^5 + x^6 + x^{10} + x^{11} + x^{12} + x^{13} \end{aligned}$$

We can easily verify (from $R(a, e)$) that a and e are aligned 0, 0, 1, 2, 3 and 3 times for pattern p aligned at position 1, 2, \dots , 6 respectively (Figure 1). Similarly, we can verify (from $R(c, e)$) that c and e are aligned 1, 1, 0, 0, 0 and 1 times for pattern p aligned at position 1, 2, \dots , 6 respectively (Figure 1). Algorithm 1 shows the steps to find all window positions with parameterized mismatch no greater than the given tolerance value, k . We are using FFT for polynomial multiplication in Lines 6 and 10.

The correctness of the algorithm follows from the detailed description above. We now focus on analyzing the algorithm. We require $O(|\Sigma|^2)$ polynomial multiplications, where each polynomial is size of $O(|t|)$. So, time complexity for all FFTs will be $O(|t| \times \log |t| \times |\Sigma|^2)$. We need to run maximum weighted bipartite matching $O(|t|)$ times. So, time complexity of all matching will be $O(|t| \times |\Sigma|^2 \times \sqrt{|\Sigma|} \times \log(|t| \times |\Sigma|))$, considering that we are using maximum weighted bipartite matching algorithm proposed by Gabow and Tarjan [11]. Hence, the time complexity of our proposed solution is $O(|t| \times |\Sigma|^2 \times \sqrt{|\Sigma|} \times \log(|t| \times |\Sigma|))$. We see that it is dominated by the bipartite matching part. Now recall that, we are building $|\Sigma|^2$ polynomials each of size $O(|t|)$. Furthermore, we are constructing $O(|t|)$ bipartite graphs of $|\Sigma_p|$ nodes and $|\Sigma_p|^2$ edges. So, memory complexity is $O(|t| \times |\Sigma|^2)$.

At this point a brief discussion is in order. Recall that, Apostolico et al.[8] solved this problem in $O(|t| + (r_t \times r_p)\alpha(r_t) \log(r_t))$ time complexity where r_t and r_p denote the number of runs in the encodings for t and p respectively and α is the inverse of the Ackermann's function. In the worst cases their solution runs in $O(|t|^2 \times \alpha(|t|) \times \log(r_t))$. For alphabets of constant size, the time complexity of

Algorithm 1: Algorithm to Solve Parameterized Matching with Any Number of Mismatches

Require: Text $t(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n)$, Pattern $p(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_m)$, k .

Ensure: All matching locations.

```

1: for  $a \in \Sigma$  do
2:   Construct polynomial  $P(a)$  and  $Q(a)$  from  $t$  and  $p$  respectively.
3: end for
4: for  $a \in \Sigma_p$  do
5:   for  $b \in \Sigma_p$  do
6:      $R(a, b) := P(a) \oplus Q(b)$ 
7:   end for
8: end for
9: for  $a \in \Sigma_s$  do
10:   $R(a, a) := P(a) \oplus Q(a)$ 
11: end for
12:  $output :=$  empty list
13: for  $i = 1 \dots n - m + 1$  do
14:   $U := \Sigma_P$ 
15:   $V := \Sigma_P$ 
16:   $E =$  empty list
17:  for  $a \in \Sigma_p$  do
18:    for  $b \in \Sigma_p$  do
19:       $w =$  co-efficient of  $x^{m+i-1}$  of  $R(a, b)$ 
20:       $E := E \cup (a, b, w)$ 
21:    end for
22:  end for
23:   $matching :=$  maximum-bipartite-weighted-matching  $(U \cup V, E)$ 
24:  for  $a \in \Sigma_s$  do
25:     $matching := matching +$  co-efficient of  $x^{m+i-1}$  of  $R(a, a)$ 
26:  end for
27:  if  $matching \geq m - k$  then
28:     $output := output \cup i$ 
29:  end if
30: end for
31: return  $output$ 

```

our solution is $O(|t| \times \log(|t|))$. So our proposed solution performs better in this regard. Additionally, the solution proposed by Hazay, Lewenstein and Sokol runs in $O(nk^{1.5} + mk \log m)$ time, where $n = |t|$ and $m = |p|$. Our algorithm improves it when $k = \tilde{\Omega}(|\Sigma|^{5/3})$.

3.1. Achieving faster runtime with parallelization

A significant side of our solution is that it can be parallelized to achieve a faster run-time for fixed text and pattern. In lines 6 and 10, we are multiplying two polynomials generated from a pair of symbols independently. For every distinct pair, this multiplication can be done in parallel. A further optimization can be achieved by transforming all $P(a)$ and $Q(a)$ to point-value form of polynomials in $O(|\Sigma| \times |t| \times \log |t|)$ time, then multiplying the point-value formed polynomials in parallel in linear time. Similarly, in line 23, we are finding the maximum bipartite weighted matching for all settings $i \in [1, |t| - |p| + 1]$ independently. All of these matchings can be run in parallel. So, if number of processors C increases upto $\min(|t| - |p| + 1, |\Sigma|^2)$, our runtime gets divided by C .

4. Parameterized Matching with Single Mismatch

In this section, we present a new algorithm for the parameterized pattern matching problem when a single mismatch is permitted between the strings being compared. However, unlike the (general) algorithm presented in the previous section, which is deterministic, this algorithm is a probabilistic hashing based algorithm that runs in $O(|t| \log |t|)$ time for a text t and pattern p .

We acknowledge that the algorithm proposed by Hazay, Lewenstein, and Sokol achieves a runtime of $O(|t| + |p| \log(|p|))$ for this case, which is asymptotically at least as efficient as our algorithm. Nevertheless, we believe our solution deserves a place here due to its intrinsic algorithmic beauty and its adaptability to a wide range of string problems.

In what follows, we will first consider an easier version of the problem where t and p are of equal length.

4.1. The equal-length case

We first convert the problem into a static string matching problem as follows. First, we obtain the encoded string (as defined in Section 2) of text t and pattern p , which we will call t' and p' , respectively. Then, we have the following two cases:

Case 1 If t' and p' are identical, they constitute a parameterized match without any mismatch. Thus, our problem is solved. Otherwise, we proceed to the next case.

Case 2 If t' and p' are not identical, they can still constitute a match, since we allow one mismatch. In this case, we find the first position where the mismatch occurs between t' and p' . Let i be the position, where $1 \leq i \leq |t'|$. Then, again we have the following two cases:

Case 2.A We discard position i , update the encoded strings t' and p' , and check if they constitute a valid match. If t' and p' are identical, then our problem is solved. Otherwise, we

proceed to the next case (i.e., Case 2.B). But before going to Case 2.B, we need to discuss how to discard position i and update t' and p' efficiently. We take the following steps.

1. Assign $t'_i = 0$ and $p'_i = 0$.
2. If $t_i \in \Sigma_p$ and $next_t(i) \neq -1$, then assign

$$t'_j = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } prev_t(i) = -1 \\ j - k & \text{if } prev_t(i) = k \end{cases}$$

where $j = next_t(i)$

3. If $p_i \in \Sigma_p$ and $next_p(i) \neq -1$, then assign

$$p'_j = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } prev_p(i) = -1 \\ j - k & \text{if } prev_p(i) = k \end{cases}$$

where $j = next_p(i)$

By performing the first step, we ensure that position i is not considered in the mismatch, and thus is counted as a match. The last two steps update the encoded text t' and the pattern p' so that they are consistent with the removal of position i .

Case 2.B In this case, we consider $t_i \in \Sigma_p$ and $p_i \in \Sigma_p$, otherwise there is no valid matching, and thus our problem is solved. Now, if t_i actually matches p_i , then we need to discard a previous occurrence of t_i or p_i where it is matched with another character. Let, $prev_t(i) = j_1$ and $prev_p(i) = j_2$. $j_1 = -1$ and $j_2 = -1$ is impossible because this implies $t'_i = p'_i = 0$ and therefore, they cannot be a mismatch position. Now, if $j_1 = -1$ and $j_2 \neq -1$ ($j_1 \neq -1$ and $j_2 = -1$), we discard position j_2 (j_1), update the encoded strings t' and p' , and check if they constitute a valid match. Finally, if $j_1 \neq -1$ and $j_2 \neq -1$ this implies $j_1 \neq j_2$ because i is the first mismatch position and we then cannot find a valid match because we have to discard at least two positions j_1 and j_2 .

Algorithm 2 shows all the steps for equal length parameterized string matching allowing a single mismatch. Since we can solve both cases described above in linear time, the algorithm runs in $O(|t|)$ time.

4.2. Extension to Any Length Strings

To efficiently solve the problem for each $i \in [1, |t| - |p| + 1]$, we use polynomial hashing of strings which is a probabilistic algorithm for string matching along with a segment tree data structure. The following steps outline our algorithm:

1. We first compute the encoded strings of text t and pattern p , denoted as t' and p' , respectively and compute the polynomial hashing array for pattern p' .
2. Then, we create a segment tree data structure for the polynomial hashing array of text t' to enable efficient updates to the hashing array. To check whether any two substrings, t'' of t' and

Algorithm 2: Equal Length Parameterized Pattern Matching with Single Mismatch

Require: Text t , Pattern p of length n .

Ensure: **TRUE** if there is a parameterized match allowing at most one mismatch, **FALSE** otherwise.

```

1:  $t' \leftarrow \text{ENCODE}(t)$  {Obtain the encoded string of  $t$ }
2:  $p' \leftarrow \text{ENCODE}(p)$  {Obtain the encoded string of  $p$ }
3: if  $t' = p'$  then
4:   return TRUE {Parameterized match without any mismatch}
5: else
6:    $i \leftarrow \text{FirstMismatchPosition}(t', p')$  {Find the first mismatch position}
7:    $t', p' \leftarrow \text{DiscardPosition}(t', p', i)$  {Discard position  $i$  and update  $t'$  and  $p'$ }
8:   if  $t' = p'$  then
9:     return TRUE {Parameterized match after discarding position  $i$ }
10:  end if
11:   $j_1, j_2 \leftarrow \text{PreviousOccurrences}(t, p, i)$  {Find previous occurrences of  $t_i$  and  $p_i$ }
12:  if  $j_1 = -1$  and  $j_2 \neq -1$  then
13:     $t', p' \leftarrow \text{DiscardPosition}(t', p', j_2)$  {Discard position  $j_2$  and update  $t'$  and  $p'$ }
14:    if  $t' = p'$  then
15:      return TRUE {Parameterized match after discarding position  $j_2$ }
16:    end if
17:  else if  $j_1 \neq -1$  and  $j_2 = -1$  then
18:     $t', p' \leftarrow \text{DiscardPosition}(t', p', j_1)$  {Discard position  $j_1$  and update  $t'$  and  $p'$ }
19:    if  $t' = p'$  then
20:      return TRUE {Parameterized match after discarding position  $j_1$ }
21:    end if
22:  end if
23:  return FALSE {No valid parameterized match}
24: end if

```

p'' of p' match, we can obtain the hash value of p'' in $O(1)$ time and the same of t'' in $O(\log |t'|)$ time and simply check whether the values are equal or not. The $O(\log |t'|)$ factor in the latter case comes from querying the segment tree data structure for text t' .

3. We now iterate over i from 1 to $|t'| - |p'| + 1$ and for each i , compute whether there exists a parameterized match between the substring $t_i t_{i+1} \dots t_{i+|p|-1}$ and pattern p , allowing at most one mismatch. At position i , we will consider the segment tree hash values for the encoded text t' to be consistent with text t for $t_i t_{i+1} \dots t_{|t|}$. Therefore, we can use our previous algorithm for equal length strings. However, the only challenge is to efficiently find the first position of mismatch.
4. We now iterate over i from 1 to $|t'| - |p'| + 1$ and for each i , compute whether there exists a parameterized match between the substring $t_i t_{i+1} \dots t_{i+|p|-1}$ and pattern p , allowing at most one mismatch. At position i , we will consider the segment tree hash values for the encoded text t' to be consistent with text t for $t_i t_{i+1} \dots t_{|t|}$. Therefore, we can use our previous algorithm for equal length strings. Now, to find the first position of the mismatch efficiently we simply apply a binary search on h_s and h_t . This works, because, the polynomial hashing arrays h_s and h_t must differ at the position where s and t differ. Thus, the first position of a mismatch can be found in $O(\log(|p|) \times \log(|t|))$ time for each i . The first $O(\log(|p|))$ factor comes from binary search and the second $O(\log(|t|))$ factor comes from the query for the hash value in the segment tree.
5. We will perform the final step of the algorithm to ensure that the segment tree hash values for the encoded text t' remain consistent with the text t for $t_i t_{i+1} \dots t_{|t|}$ during the transition from $i - 1$ to i . We will consider the following two cases:
 - (a) If $next_t(i - 1) = -1$, then the values are already consistent, and no further action is required.
 - (b) If $next_t(i - 1) = j$ where $i - 1 < j \leq |t|$, then we need to update $t'_j = 0$ in the segment tree. This is because we are no longer considering position $i - 1$, so $next_t(i - 1)$ becomes the first occurrence of t_{i-1} in the remaining part of the text $t_i t_{i+1} \dots t_{|t|}$.

The overall time complexity of this algorithm is $O(|t| + (|t| - |p| + 1) \times \log(|p|) \times \log(|t|)) \approx O(|t| \log^2(|t|))$.

4.3. Improving the Runtime

The main bottleneck of our solution lies in finding the first position of a mismatch for each $i \in [1, |t| - |p| + 1]$ which involves a binary search and a segment tree query in each iteration of a binary search. However, we can eliminate the binary search and determine the position by descending the segment tree as follows. Recall that a segment tree is a binary tree where each non-leaf node has two children. A node representing the segment $[\ell \dots r]$ has a left child representing the segment $[\ell \dots mid]$ and a right child representing the segment $[mid + 1 \dots r]$, where $mid = \lfloor \frac{\ell+r}{2} \rfloor$. In our solution, each non-leaf node stores the sum of the hash values of its left and right children. We compare the hash

value of the left child ($[\ell \dots mid]$) with the hash value of the pattern substring $p_\ell p_{\ell+1} \dots p_{mid}$. If the hash values are equal, it indicates that the first mismatch position is in the right child segment $[mid + 1 \dots r]$; otherwise, it is in the left child segment $[\ell \dots mid]$. We continue to descend the segment tree accordingly until we reach a leaf node, which represents the first mismatch position. By using this property, we can eliminate the binary search completely and perform a descending traversal of the segment tree to efficiently determine the first mismatch position in $O(\log(|t|))$ time for each position $i \in [1, |t| - |p| + 1]$, thereby shaving a $\log |t|$ factor off from the overall running time. The total running time thus improves to $O(|t| \log |t|)$.

Algorithm 3 takes as input a segment tree T , the text segment range $[\ell, r]$, and the pattern p . It recursively descends the segment tree to find the first mismatch position between the text segment and the pattern. The algorithm returns the first mismatch position. Algorithm 4 presents all the steps for parameterized string matching, allowing for a single mismatch.

Algorithm 3: Find First Mismatch Position

Require: Segment tree T , Text segment range $[\ell, r]$, Pattern p .

Ensure: First mismatch position.

```

1: if  $\ell = r$  then
2:   return  $\ell$  {Leaf node represents the first mismatch position}
3: end if
4:  $m \leftarrow \lfloor \frac{\ell+r}{2} \rfloor$  {Midpoint of the segment}
5:  $leftHash \leftarrow \text{HashValue}(T[\text{leftChild}])$  {Hash value of the left child segment}
6:  $patternHash \leftarrow \text{HashValue}(p[\ell \dots m])$  {Hash value of the pattern substring}
7: if  $leftHash = patternHash$  then
8:   return  $\text{FindFirstMismatchPosition}(T, [m + 1, r], p)$  {First mismatch is in the right child}
9: else
10:  return  $\text{FindFirstMismatchPosition}(T, [\ell, m], p)$  {First mismatch is in the left child}
11: end if

```

4.4. Collision Probability Analysis

In this section, we analyze the collision probability (i.e., the probability that two different strings have the same hash value) of the algorithm presented in the previous section. The probability of two separate strings colliding given a prime modulus m in polynomial rolling hash is $\approx 1/m$ [12]. For larger prime values of m , this characteristic ensures a low probability of collisions. But if we compare a string s with c different strings, then the collision probability is $\approx \frac{c}{m}$.

In our algorithm, we hash the text and pattern strings using polynomial rolling hash. The number of comparisons between the text t and the pattern p for a fixed position i is approximately $\log(|t|)$. Taking into account all positions $i \in [1, |t| - |p| + 1]$, the total number of hash comparisons between the text t and the pattern p is approximately $(|t| - |p| + 1) \times \log(|t|)$, which simplifies to approximately $|t| \log(|t|)$. Therefore, for a fixed prime modulus m , the probability that our algorithm produces an incorrect result is approximately $\frac{|t| \log(|t|)}{m}$.

Algorithm 4: Parameterized Pattern Matching with Single Mismatch**Require:** Text t of length n , Pattern p of length m .**Ensure:** List $matches$ containing *True* or *False* for each $i \in [1, n - m + 1]$.

```

1:  $t' \leftarrow \text{ENCODE}(t)$ 
2:  $p' \leftarrow \text{ENCODE}(p)$ 
3:  $hash_p \leftarrow \text{ComputeHashArray}(p')$  {Build the polynomial hashing array for  $p'$ }
4:  $segmentTree \leftarrow \text{BuildSegmentTree}(t')$  {Build segment tree over hashes for  $t'$ }
5:  $matches \leftarrow$  empty list
6: for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $n - m + 1$  do
7:   if  $hash(t'_i t'_{i+1} \dots t'_{i+m-1}) = hash(p')$  then
8:      $matches[i] \leftarrow \text{True}$  {Exact match without any mismatch}
9:   else
10:     $j \leftarrow \text{FindFirstMismatchPosition}(segmentTree, [i, i + m - 1], p')$ 
11:     $t', p' \leftarrow \text{DiscardPosition}(t', p', j)$ 
12:    if  $t' = p'$  then
13:       $matches[i] \leftarrow \text{TRUE}$  {Parameterized match after discarding position  $j$ }
14:    else
15:       $j_1, j_2 \leftarrow \text{PreviousOccurrences}(t, p, j)$  {Find previous occurrences of  $t_j$  and  $p_j$ }
16:      if  $j_1 = -1$  and  $j_2 \neq -1$  then
17:         $t', p' \leftarrow \text{DiscardPosition}(t', p', j_2)$  {Discard position  $j_2$  and update  $t'$  and  $p'$ }
18:        if  $t' = p'$  then
19:           $matches[i] \leftarrow \text{TRUE}$  {Parameterized match after discarding position  $j_2$ }
20:        end if
21:      else if  $j_1 \neq -1$  and  $j_2 = -1$  then
22:         $t', p' \leftarrow \text{DiscardPosition}(t', p', j_1)$  {Discard position  $j_1$  and update  $t'$  and  $p'$ }
23:        if  $t' = p'$  then
24:           $matches[i] \leftarrow \text{TRUE}$  {Parameterized match after discarding position  $j_1$ }
25:        end if
26:      end if
27:       $matches[i] \leftarrow \text{FALSE}$  {No valid parameterized match}
28:    end if
29:  end if
30:  if  $i < n - m + 1$  and  $\text{next}_t(i - 1) \neq -1$  then
31:     $j \leftarrow \text{next}_t(i - 1)$ 
32:     $\text{UpdateSegmentTree}(segmentTree, j, 0)$  {Update segment tree for  $t'$ }
33:  end if
34: end for
35: return  $matches$ 

```

To further improve collision resistance, a technique known as double hashing [13] can be used. Double hashing involves using two different hash moduli to generate the hash value. Using two independent hash moduli, the collision probability can be further reduced to $\frac{(|t| \log(|t|))^2}{m_1 \times m_2}$, where m_1 and m_2 are the moduli used to hash input. This approach improves the algorithm's probability to tackle potential collisions but increases the runtime of the algorithm because it needs to compute the hash function twice. We remark that, although collisions are theoretically possible due to the finite hash space, they are substantially less likely due to the chosen hash function, the prime modulus, and the double hashing technique. This is also evident from the experiments conducted as reported in the following section.

4.5. Experimental Results

We conducted some quick experiments by varying the modulo value across a range of small to large values for both single and double hashing techniques. In particular, for 10000 runs we generated random texts and patterns of size 10000 and 10 respectively on English (lower case) alphabet with a goal to determine the number of times our algorithm produced incorrect results by comparing them against the deterministic algorithm from Section 3. Tables 1 and 2 reports the results. As expected, as the modulo value increases, the collision (drastically) reduces resulting in reduced number of incorrect results; for high values, this quickly become zero, even quicker for double hashing.

Table 1: Number of incorrect results for different *modulo* in single hashing

Modulo	Number of incorrect results
1019	1310
100517	8
1000000009	0

Table 2: Number of incorrect results for different *modulo* in double hashing

Modulo 1	Modulo 2	Number of incorrect results
1019	1613	1
100517	101467	0
1000000009	1000001887	0

5. Conclusions

In this paper, we have revisited the parameterized string matching problem that allows fixed mismatch tolerance. We addressed two cases: one for any mismatch limit and another for a single mismatch.

For any number of mismatches, our run time depends on $|\Sigma|$ and unrelated to k . Future works can be done on the co-relation of the polynomial multiplications and bipartite matchings calculation done independently in this paper. Furthermore, in this paper, we have not used the fact that total sum of non-zero co-efficients in the formed polynomials is in $O(|t|)$ and total sum of weights in a built graph in $O(|t|)$. These facts can be brought in to have further improvements. For single mismatch, we developed a probabilistic hashing approach. We ensured a low probability of false positive matches by using double hashing. Attempting to solve the general case using the approach for single mismatch appears to have exponential running time, as new case arises for each mismatch position. Further investigation may be conducted along this line.

References

- [1] Mendivelso J, Thankachan SV, Pinzón Y. A brief history of parameterized matching problems. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 2020. **274**:103–115.
- [2] Fredriksson K, Mozgovoy M. Efficient parameterized string matching. *Information Processing Letters*, 2006. **100**(3):91–96.
- [3] Hazay C, Lewenstein M, Sokol D. Approximate parameterized matching. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)*, 2007. **3**(3):29–es.
- [4] Mendivelso J, Kim S, Elnikety S, He Y, Hwang Sw, Pinzón Y. Solving graph isomorphism using parameterized matching. In: String Processing and Information Retrieval: 20th International Symposium, SPIRE 2013, Jerusalem, Israel, October 7-9, 2013, Proceedings 20. Springer, 2013 pp. 230–242.
- [5] Baker BS. A program for identifying duplicated code. *Computing Science and Statistics*, 1993. pp. 49–49.
- [6] Baker BS. Parameterized pattern matching: Algorithms and applications. *Journal of computer and system sciences*, 1996. **52**(1):28–42.
- [7] Cole R, Hariharan R. Faster suffix tree construction with missing suffix links. In: Proceedings of the thirty-second annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing. 2000 pp. 407–415.
- [8] Apostolico A, Erdős PL, Lewenstein M. Parameterized matching with mismatches. *Journal of Discrete Algorithms*, 2007. **5**(1):135–140.
- [9] Brigham EO. The fast Fourier transform and its applications. Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1988.
- [10] Ganguly A, Shah R, Thankachan SV. pBWT: Achieving succinct data structures for parameterized pattern matching and related problems. In: Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms. SIAM, 2017 pp. 397–407.
- [11] Gabow HN, Tarjan RE. Faster scaling algorithms for network problems. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 1989. **18**(5):1013–1036.
- [12] Karp RM, Rabin MO. Efficient randomized pattern-matching algorithms. *IBM journal of research and development*, 1987. **31**(2):249–260.
- [13] Singh M, Garg D. Choosing best hashing strategies and hash functions. In: 2009 IEEE International Advance Computing Conference. IEEE, 2009 pp. 50–55.