

Constant sensitivity on the CDAWGs

Rikuya Hamai¹, Hiroto Fujimaru¹, and Shunsuke Inenaga²

¹Department of Information Science and Technology, Kyushu University, Japan

²Department of Informatics, Kyushu University, Japan

Abstract

Compact directed acyclic word graphs (CDAWGs) [Blumer et al. 1987] are a fundamental data structure on strings with applications in text pattern searching, data compression, and pattern discovery. Intuitively, the CDAWG of a string T is obtained by merging isomorphic subtrees of the suffix tree [Weiner 1973] of the same string T , and thus CDAWGs are a compact indexing structure. In this paper, we investigate the sensitivity of CDAWGs when a single character edit operation is performed at an arbitrary position in T . We show that the size of the CDAWG after an edit operation on T is asymptotically at most 8 times larger than the original CDAWG before the edit.

1 Introduction

Compact directed acyclic word graphs (CDAWGs) [5] are a fundamental data structure on strings with applications in text pattern searching, data compression, and pattern discovery. Intuitively, the CDAWG of a string T (denoted $\text{CDAWG}(T)$) is a minimal partial DFA that is obtained by merging isomorphic subtrees of the suffix tree [25] of the same string T . CDAWGs permit pattern matching in optimal $O(m+occ)$ time for a pattern P of length m when P occurs occ times in T . In practice, CDAWGs enjoy applications in natural language processing [24] and in analysis of text generated by language models (LMs) [18]. In a more theoretical perspective, CDAWGs are used as a space-efficient data structure that allows for optimal-time detection of “unusual words” (such as minimal absent words (MAWs) [7] and minimal unique substrings (MUSs) [11]) from the input string [3, 15, 19].

A substring w of T which occurs at least twice in T is said to be a *maximal repeat* of T , if extending w to the left or to the right in T decreases the number of occurrences in T . It is known that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the internal nodes of $\text{CDAWG}(T)$ and the maximal repeats in T . Also, there is a one-to-one correspondence between the out-edges of the internal nodes of $\text{CDAWG}(T)$ and the right-extensions of the maximal repeats in T . Let e denote the size (i.e. the number of edges) of the CDAWG for the input string. It is known that $e \leq 2n - 2$ holds [5] for any strings of length n , and e can be much smaller for some highly repetitive strings: $e \in \Theta(\log n)$ holds for Fibonacci words, Standard Sturmian words, and Thue-Morse words of length n [22, 2, 20]. This contrasts to the suffix tree and the (uncompacted) directed acyclic word graph (DAWG) [4] each requiring $\Theta(n)$ space for any string of length n . CDAWGs can thus be regarded as a compressed text indexing structure which can be stored in $O(e)$ space [3, 12] without explicitly storing the string. In addition, a grammar compression of size $O(e)$ based on the CDAWG exists [3].

The *sensitivity* of string compressors, first proposed by Akagi et al. [1], measures how much a single-character-wise edit operation on the input string can increase the size of the compressed string, which is formalized as follows: Let C be a compression algorithm and let $C(T)$ denote the size of the output of C applied to the input string T . The worst-case *multiplicative sensitivity* of C is defined by

$$\max_{T \in \Sigma^n, T' \in \Sigma^{n'}} \{C(T')/C(T) : \text{ed}(T, T') = 1\},$$

where $\text{ed}(T, T')$ denotes the edit distance between T and T' , $n' = n$ for substitutions, $n' = n + 1$ for insertions, and $n' = n - 1$ for deletions. This is a natural measure for the robustness of compression algorithms in terms of errors and/or dynamic changes occurring in the input string. Such errors and dynamic changes are common in real-world scenario including DNA sequencing and versioned document maintenance.

Following the earlier work of Lagarde and Perifel [17] and Akagi et al. [1], string compressors and repetitiveness measures can be categorized into three classes:

(A) Stable: Those whose sensitivity is $O(1)$;

(B) Changeable: Those whose sensitivity is $\text{polylog}(n)$;

(C) Catastrophic: Those whose sensitivity is $O(n^c)$ with some constant $0 < c \leq 1$.

For instance, it is shown in [1] that Class (A) includes the substring complexity [16], the smallest macro scheme [23], the Lempel-Ziv 77 families [26, 23], and the smallest grammar [21, 6]. On the other hand, Class (B) includes run-length Burrows-Wheeler transform (RLBWT) [1, 9, 10], and the Lempel-Ziv 78 [27] belongs to Class (C) [17].

The focus of this present article is to analyze the sensitivity of CDAWGs. In case where the edit operation to the string T is performed at either end of T , then the multiplicative sensitivity of CDAWGs is known to be asymptotically at most 2, and it is tight [13, 8]. However, the general case with an arbitrary single-character-wise edit on T was not well understood for CDAWGs. In this paper, we prove that any edit operation at an arbitrary position on the string can increase the size of the CDAWG asymptotically *at most 8 times larger* than the original, implying that CDAWGs belong to Class (A). We emphasize that the only known upper bound for the sensitivity of CDAWGs is $O(n/\log n)$, which trivially follows since $e \in O(n)$ and $e \in \Omega(\log n)$ for any string of length n [5, 3]. Our technique for proving the constant sensitivity of CDAWGs is purely combinatorial, which involves new and original ideas that were not present in the special case of left/right-end edits [13, 8]. Also, all our arguments hold without a common sentinel symbol $\$$ at the right-end of strings.

Although the CDAWG size e is regarded as a weak string repetitiveness measure (as $e \in \Theta(n)$ for string $\mathbf{a}^{n-1}\mathbf{b}$ [5], and reversing the string can increase e by a factor of $O(\sqrt{n})$ [14] for some string), our result shows another virtue of CDAWGs being stable in terms of sensitivity and thus being robust against errors and edits. To our knowledge, CDAWGs are the first compressed indexing structure proven to achieve $O(1)$ multiplicative sensitivity.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Strings

Let Σ be an *alphabet* of size σ . An element of Σ^* is called a *string*. For a string $T \in \Sigma^*$, the length of T is denoted by $|T|$. The *empty string*, denoted by ε , is the string of length 0.

For any non-negative integer $n \geq 0$, let Σ^n denote the set of strings of length n . For any two strings S and T , let $\text{ed}(S, T)$ denote the edit distance between S and T . For any string T and a non-negative integer $\ell \geq 0$, let $\mathcal{K}(T, \ell) = \{S \mid \text{ed}(S, T) = \ell\}$.

For string $T = uvw$, u , v , and w are called a *prefix*, *substring*, and *suffix* of T , respectively. The sets of prefixes, substrings, and suffixes of string T are denoted by $\text{Prefix}(T)$, $\text{Substr}(T)$, and $\text{Suffix}(T)$, respectively. For a string T of length n , $T[i]$ denotes the i th character of T for $1 \leq i \leq n$, and $T[i..j] = T[i] \cdots T[j]$ denotes the substring of T that begins at position i and ends at position j on T for $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$.

2.2 Maximal substrings and maximal repeats

A substring $w \in \text{Substr}(T)$ of T is said to be *left-maximal* if (1) $w \in \text{Prefix}(T)$ or (2) there exist two distinct characters $a, b \in \Sigma$ such that $aw, bw \in \text{Substr}(T)$, and it is said to be *right-maximal* if (1) $w \in \text{Suffix}(T)$ or (2) there exist two distinct characters $a, b \in \Sigma$ such that $wa, wb \in \text{Substr}(T)$. These substrings w that occur at least twice in T are also called *left-maximal repeats* and *right-maximal repeats* in T , respectively.

Let $\text{LeftM}(T)$ and $\text{RightM}(T)$ denote the sets of left-maximal and right-maximal substrings in T . Let $\text{M}(T) = \text{LeftM}(T) \cap \text{RightM}(T)$. The elements in $\text{M}(T)$ are called *maximal substrings* in T , and the elements in $\text{M}(T) \setminus \{T\}$ are called *maximal repeats* in T . A character $a \in \Sigma$ is said to be a *right-extension* of a maximal repeat w of T if $wa \in \text{Substr}(T)$.

For any substring w of a string T , we define its *left-representation* and *right-representation* by $\text{lexp}_T(w) = \alpha w$ and $\text{rexp}_T(w) = w\beta$, where $\alpha, \beta \in \Sigma^*$ are the shortest strings such that αw is left-maximal in T and $w\beta$ is right-maximal in T , respectively.

2.3 CDAWGs

The *compact directed acyclic word graph* (CDAWG) of a string T , denoted $\text{CDAWG}(T)$, is the minimal DFA that recognizes all substrings of T , in which each transition (edge) is labeled by a non-empty substring of T . $\text{CDAWG}(T)$ has a unique source that represents the empty string ε and a unique sink that represents T . All the other internal nodes represent the maximal repeats in T , namely, the set of the longest strings represented by the nodes of $\text{CDAWG}(T)$ are equal to $\text{M}(T)$. See Figure 1 for a concrete example of CDAWGs.

The *size* of $\text{CDAWG}(T)$ for a string T of length n is the number $\text{e}(T)$ of edges in $\text{CDAWG}(T)$, which is equal to the number of right-extensions of maximal repeats in T .

In what follows, we will identify maximal substrings with CDAWG nodes, and right-extensions of maximal repeats with CDAWG edges, respectively.

For each $x \in \text{M}(T)$, let $\text{d}_T(x)$ denote the number of out-edges of node x in $\text{CDAWG}(T)$. It is clear that $\text{e}(T) = \sum_{x \in \text{M}(T)} \text{d}_T(x)$.




Figure 1: Illustration for $\text{CDAWG}(T)$ of string $T = (ab)^2c(ab)^2d$. The longest strings represented by the nodes of $\text{CDAWG}(T)$ are the maximal substrings in $M(T) = \{\varepsilon, ab, (ab)^2, (ab)^2c(ab)^2d\}$.

2.4 Sensitivity of CDAWG size and our results

Using the measure e , we define the worst-case multiplicative *sensitivity* of the CDAWG with edit operations (resp. insertion, deletion, and substitution) by:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MS}_{\text{Ins}}(e, n) &= \max_{T \in \Sigma^n, T' \in \mathcal{K}(T, 1) \cap \Sigma^{n+1}} \{e(T')/e(T)\}, \\ \text{MS}_{\text{Del}}(e, n) &= \max_{T \in \Sigma^n, T' \in \mathcal{K}(T, 1) \cap \Sigma^{n-1}} \{e(T')/e(T)\}, \\ \text{MS}_{\text{Sub}}(e, n) &= \max_{T \in \Sigma^n, T' \in \mathcal{K}(T, 1) \cap \Sigma^n} \{e(T')/e(T)\}. \end{aligned}$$

We will prove the following:

Theorem 1. *For any string T of length n , $\text{MS}_{\text{Ins}}(e, n) \leq (8e+4)/e$, $\text{MS}_{\text{Del}}(e, n) \leq (8e+4)/e$, $\text{MS}_{\text{Sub}}(e, n) \leq (8e+4)/e$ hold, where $e = \sum_{x \in M(T)} d_T(x)$.*

Our proof for Theorem 1 handles all cases of insertions, deletions, and substitutions.

3 Occurrences of maximal repeats crossing the edited position

To present an upper bound for the sensitivity of CDAWG size, it is essential to consider new occurrences of maximal repeats that contain or touch the edited position i . In this section, we introduce several new definitions regarding those new occurrences of maximal repeats.

For ease of discussions, we sometimes identify an interval where a substring w occurs in T' with the substring w itself, when there is no risk of confusion.

3.1 Crossing occurrences

Definition 1. Let $x = T'[j..k]$ be a non-empty substring of T' that *touches or contains* the edited position i . That is, if the edit operation is insertion and substitution, (1) $k = i - 1$

(touching i from left), (2) $j \leq i \leq k$ (containing i), or (3) $j = i + 1$ (touching i from right). If the edit operation is deletion, (1) $k = i - 1$ (touching i from left), (2) $j \leq i - 1 \wedge i \leq k$ (containing i), or (3) $j = i$ (touching i from right). These occurrences of a substring x in T' are said to be *crossing occurrences* for the edited position i . We will call these occurrences simply as crossing occurrences of x .

We denote the left most crossing occurrence $T'[j'..k']$ of x as x_L . For x_L , we consider the following substrings P_{x_L} and S_{x_L} of T' (see Figure 2 for illustration):

In the case that the edit operation is insertion or substitution, let

$$P_{x_L} = \begin{cases} T'[j'..i] & \text{if } x_L \text{ touches } i \text{ from left or contains } i, \\ \varepsilon & \text{if } x_L \text{ touches } i \text{ from right,} \end{cases}$$

$$S_{x_L} = \begin{cases} \varepsilon & \text{if } x_L \text{ touches } i \text{ from left,} \\ T'[i..k'] & \text{if } x_L \text{ contains } i \text{ or touches } i \text{ from right.} \end{cases}$$

In the case that the edit operation is deletion, let

$$P_{x_L} = \begin{cases} T'[j'..i-1] & \text{if } x_L \text{ touches } i \text{ from left or contains } i, \\ \varepsilon & \text{if } x_L \text{ touches } i \text{ from right,} \end{cases}$$

$$S_{x_L} = \begin{cases} \varepsilon & \text{if } x_L \text{ touches } i \text{ from left,} \\ T'[i..k'] & \text{if } x_L \text{ contains } i \text{ or touches } i \text{ from right.} \end{cases}$$

We define the rightmost crossing occurrence x_R , together with P_{x_R} and S_{x_R} , analogously.




Figure 2: Illustration of x_L in T' for the case where x_L contains i , with insertion and substitution.

Definition 2. We categorize strings x that have crossing occurrence(s) in the edited string in T' into the five following types, depending on the properties of x :

Type (i): x has only one crossing occurrence of x in T' .

Type (ii):

1. x has two or more crossing occurrences of x in T' .
2. If all occurrences of x in T' are crossing occurrences of x in T' , then $x \notin \text{LeftM}(T')$ and $x \notin \text{RightM}(T')$.

Type (iii):

1. x has two or more crossing occurrences of x in T' .
2. If all occurrences of x in T' are crossing occurrences of x in T' , then $x \notin \text{LeftM}(T')$ and $x \in \text{RightM}(T')$.

Type (iv):

1. x has two or more crossing occurrences of x in T' .
2. If all occurrences of x in T' are crossing occurrences of x in T' , then $x \in \text{LeftM}(T')$ and $x \notin \text{RightM}(T')$.

Type (v)

1. x has two or more crossing occurrences of x in T' .
2. If all occurrences of x in T' are crossing occurrences of x in T' , then $x \in \text{M}(T')$.

Figure 3 illustrates the aforementioned five types of a string x when $x_L \notin \text{Prefix}(T')$ and $x_R \notin \text{Suffix}(T')$.




Figure 3: Illustration for the five cases of a string x when $x_L \notin \text{Prefix}(T')$ and $x_R \notin \text{Suffix}(T')$, where $a \neq c$ and $b \neq d$ for characters $a, b, c, d \in \Sigma$.

The reason why we only consider x_L and x_R is due to the periodicity for x . We remark that when x have multiple crossing occurrences which contain or touch the edited position i in T' , then the characters immediately before all crossing occurrences of x in T' except for x_L are the same and the characters immediately after all crossing occurrences of x in T' except for x_R are the same. Therefore, we do not need to consider all crossing occurrences of x in T' except for x_L and x_R to examine whether x is maximal in $\text{M}(T')$ or not.

3.2 New/Existing maximal repeats

In Definitions 3 and 4 below, we introduce \mathbf{N} and \mathbf{Q} which are respectively the sets of new maximal repeats and existing maximal repeats in T' , such that $\mathbf{N} \cup \mathbf{Q} = \text{M}(T') \setminus \{T'\}$. We then partition each of them into smaller subsets that are suitable for our needs.

Definition 3. Let $N = (M(T') \setminus M(T)) \setminus \{T'\}$ denote the set of new maximal repeats in T' . We divide N into the three following disjoint subsets:

$$\begin{aligned} N_1 &= N \cap \text{RightM}(T), \\ N_2 &= N \cap \text{LeftM}(T), \\ N_3 &= N \setminus (N_1 \cup N_2). \end{aligned}$$

Further, we divide N_3 into two disjoint subsets N_{3B} and N_{3A} as follows: N_{3B} is the set of strings $x \in N_3$ such that (1) x is of Type (v), and (2) there is no other right-extension of x in T' than the right-extension(s) of the crossing occurrence(s) of x , and $N_{3A} = N_3 \setminus N_{3B}$.

We note that the following properties hold for N_1, N_2 and N_3 by definition:

- $x \in N_1 \Rightarrow x \notin \text{LeftM}(T)$ because $x \notin M(T)$.
- $x \in N_2 \Rightarrow x \notin \text{RightM}(T)$ because $x \notin M(T)$.
- $x \in N_3 \Rightarrow x \notin \text{RightM}(T) \wedge x \notin \text{LeftM}(T)$.

Definition 4. Let $Q = (M(T') \cap M(T)) \setminus \{T'\}$ denote the set of existing maximal repeats in T' . We divide Q into the two following subsets:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1 &= \{x \in Q \mid d_{T'}(x) > d_T(x)\}, \\ Q_2 &= \{x \in Q \mid d_{T'}(x) \leq d_T(x)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Namely, Q_1 (resp. Q_2) is the set of existing nodes of the CDAWG for which the number of out-edges increase (resp. do not increase).

Example 1. Consider the string $T = \text{cabcbcdabcbadbcabcbcabcbcabcdabcbab}$ and the string $T' = \text{cabcbcdabca|bcabcbcabcbcabcbcabcdabcbab}$ obtained by deleting the character $T[13] = \mathbf{d}$ from T highlighted in bold. The edited position in T' is designated by a |. For instance, $\text{dabcbab} \in Q_1, \text{bcabc} \in Q_2, \text{abcabc} \in N_1, \text{abcabcbab} \in N_{3A}, \text{cabcbcdabcbab} \in N_{3B}$ (also see Figure 4).




Figure 4: Illustration for $T' = \text{cabcbcdabca|bcabcbcabcbcabcbcabcdabcbab}$ in Example 1 and the occurrences of $\text{abcabc} \in N_1$ and $\text{cabcbcdabcbab} \in N_{3B}$ in T' . The | symbol in T' exhibits the edit position. The solid line boxes exhibit the crossing occurrences of abcabc and cabcbcdabcbab in T' , and the dashed line boxes exhibit the non-crossing occurrences of them in T' .

Recall that $e = \sum_{x \in M(T)} d_T(x)$ denotes the number of edges in $\text{CDAWG}(T)$ before the edit. In the subsequent sections, we work on the three disjoint subsets $N_1 \cup N_{3A}$, $N_2 \cup Q$, and N_{3B} of $M(T')$, and show that $\sum_{x \in N_1 \cup N_{3A}} d_{T'}(x) \leq 3e + 2$ (Section 4), $\sum_{x \in N_2 \cup Q} d_{T'}(x) \leq 3e + 1$ (Section 5), and $\sum_{x \in N_{3B}} d_{T'}(x) \leq 2e$ (Section 6). All these immediately lead to Theorem 1 that upper bounds the number of edges in $\text{CDAWG}(T')$ after the edit to $8e + 4$.

4 Upper bound for total out-degrees of nodes w.r.t. $\mathbf{N}_1 \cup \mathbf{N}_{3A}$

In this section, we show an upper bound for the total out-degrees of the nodes corresponding to strings in $\mathbf{N}_1 \cup \mathbf{N}_{3A} \subseteq \mathbf{M}(T')$. Recall that $x \in \mathbf{N}_1 \cup \mathbf{N}_{3A}$ implies $x \notin \text{LeftM}(T)$.

We first describe useful properties of strings $x \in \mathbf{N}_1 \cup \mathbf{N}_{3A}$.

Lemma 1. *Any $x \in \mathbf{N}_1 \cup \mathbf{N}_{3A}$ occurs in T .*

Proof. In the case $x \in \mathbf{N}_1$, since $x \in \text{RightM}(T)$, x occurs in T .

Let us consider the case $x \in \mathbf{N}_{3A}$ that is of Type (i), (ii), (iii) or (iv). Since x is not of Type (v), if all occurrences of x in T' are crossing occurrences of x in T' , then $x \notin \mathbf{M}(T')$. Therefore, x occurs in T .

Let us consider the case $x \in \mathbf{N}_{3A}$ that is of Type (v). Due to the definition of \mathbf{N}_{3A} , there exists a distinct right-extension of x in T' other than the right-extension(s) of the crossing occurrence(s) of x . Therefore, there is a non-crossing occurrence of x in T' as shown in Figure 5, implying that x occurs in T . \square




Figure 5: Illustration for Lemma 1 where i is the edited position and a, b, c differ from each other.

Lemma 2. *For any $x \in \mathbf{N}_1 \cup \mathbf{N}_{3A}$ that is of Type (i), (ii) or (iii), there does not exist $y \in \mathbf{N}_1 \cup \mathbf{N}_{3A}$ such that $|y| > |x|$ and $S_{x_L} = S_{y_G}$, where $G \in \{L, R\}$.*

Proof. If x_L is a prefix of T' , then clearly there is no y satisfying $|y| > |x|$ and $S_{x_L} = S_{y_G}$. In what follows, we consider the case that x_L is not a prefix of T' .

For a contrary, suppose that for $x \in \mathbf{N}_1 \cup \mathbf{N}_{3A}$ that is of Type (i), (ii) or (iii), there exists $y \in \mathbf{N}_1 \cup \mathbf{N}_{3A}$ such that $|y| > |x|$ and $S_{x_L} = S_{y_G}$, where $G \in \{L, R\}$. See also Figure 6. Let a be the character immediately before x_L . Since x is of Type (i), (ii) or (iii), every crossing occurrence of x in T' is immediately preceded by a . Because $x \in \mathbf{M}(T')$, it holds that $x \in \text{Prefix}(T')$, or there is a distinct character $b \in \Sigma \setminus \{a\}$ such that bx occurs in T' . This implies that there is a non-crossing occurrence of x in T' , which is as a prefix of T or is immediately preceded by b in T . By Lemma 1, y occurs in T , and thus ax that is a suffix of y also occurs in T . Hence $x \in \text{LeftM}(T)$, however, this contradicts that $x \notin \text{LeftM}(T)$. \square

Lemma 3. *For any $x \in \mathbf{N}_1 \cup \mathbf{N}_{3A}$ that is of Type (iv) or (v), there do not exist $y, z \in \mathbf{N}_1 \cup \mathbf{N}_{3A}$ with $|y| > |x|$ and $|z| > |x|$ satisfying $S_{x_L} = S_{y_G}$ and $S_{x_R} = S_{z_F}$ simultaneously, where $G, F \in \{L, R\}$.*

Proof. If x_L is a prefix of T' , then clearly there is no y satisfying $|y| > |x|$ and $S_{x_L} = S_{y_G}$. In what follows, we consider the case that x_L is not a prefix of T' .




Figure 6: Illustration for Lemma 2: impossible occurrences of x and y with $S_{x_L} = S_{y_G}$.

For a contrary, suppose that for $x \in \mathbf{N}_1 \cup \mathbf{N}_{3A}$ that is of Type (iv) or (v), there exist $y, z \in \mathbf{N}_1 \cup \mathbf{N}_{3A}$ with $|y| > |x|$ and $|z| > |x|$ such that $S_{x_L} = S_{y_G}$ and $S_{x_R} = S_{z_F}$ at the same time, where $G, F \in \{L, R\}$. Let the character immediately before x_L and the character immediately before x_R be a and c ($a \neq c$), respectively. By Lemma 1, y and z occur in T , and thus ax that is a suffix of y and cx that is a suffix of z both occur in T . Therefore, $x \in \text{LeftM}(T)$, however, this contradicts that $x \notin \text{LeftM}(T)$. \square

4.1 Correspondence between $\mathbf{N}_1 \cup \mathbf{N}_{3A}$ and $\mathbf{M}(T)$

For any $x \in \mathbf{N}_1 \cup \mathbf{N}_{3A}$ that is of Type (i), (ii) or (iii), we associate x with S_{x_L} . For any $x \in \mathbf{N}_1 \cup \mathbf{N}_{3A}$ that is of Type (iv) or (v), if there does not exist $y \in \mathbf{N}_1 \cup \mathbf{N}_{3A}$ such that $|y| > |x|$ and $S_{x_L} = S_{y_G}$ with $G \in \{L, R\}$, we associate x with S_{x_L} , and otherwise we associate x with S_{x_R} .

By Lemma 2 and Lemma 3, each $x \in \mathbf{N}_1 \cup \mathbf{N}_{3A}$ can be associated to a distinct string S_{x_G} with $G \in \{L, R\}$. Note however that S_{x_G} may not be maximal in T . Thus we introduce a function U that bridges each $x \in \mathbf{N}_1 \cup \mathbf{N}_{3A}$ to a distinct maximal substring in T .

Definition 5. For any $x \in \mathbf{N}_1 \cup \mathbf{N}_{3A}$, let $U(x) = \text{lexp}_T(S_{x_G})$ (see Figure 7).

By Lemma 1, x occurs in T and thus its suffix S_{x_G} also occurs in T . Hence $U(x) = \text{lexp}_T(S_{x_G})$ is well defined.




Figure 7: Illustration for $U(x)$ ($a \neq b$).

Lemma 4. For any $x \in \mathbf{N}_1 \cup \mathbf{N}_{3A}$, $U(x) \in \mathbf{M}(T)$.

Proof. By Definition 5, $U(x) = \text{lexp}_T(S_{x_G}) \in \text{LeftM}(T)$. Therefore, it suffices for us to prove $U(x) \in \text{RightM}(T)$. From now on, we consider the four following cases:

Case (a) $x \in \mathbf{N}_1$: In this case, $x \in \text{RightM}(T)$, therefore S_{x_G} that is a suffix of x also satisfies $S_{x_G} \in \text{RightM}(T)$. Hence, $U(x) = \text{lexp}_T(S_{x_G}) \in \text{RightM}(T)$.

Case (b) $x \in \mathbf{N}_{3A}$ and x is of Type (i), (ii) or (iv): Let the character immediately after all crossing occurrences of x in T' be a . There exists xb ($b \neq a$) in T' or $x \in \text{Suffix}(T')$ because $x \in \mathbf{M}(T')$. Since the character immediately after all crossing occurrences of x in T' is a , then there exists xb ($b \neq a$) or $x \in \text{Suffix}(T)$ in T . Hence, $S_{x_G} \in \text{RightM}(T)$ since the character immediately after S_{x_G} is a . Thus, $U(x) = \text{lexp}_T(S_{x_G}) \in \text{RightM}(T)$.

Case (c) $x \in \mathbf{N}_{3A}$ and x is of Type (iii): Since x is of Type (iii), we associate x with S_{x_L} . Because x is of Type (iii) and S_{x_L} is a suffix of a S_{x_R} , $S_{x_G} \in \text{RightM}(T)$ holds. Thus, $U(x) = \text{lexp}_T(S_{x_G}) \in \text{RightM}(T)$.

Case (d) $x \in \mathbf{N}_{3A}$ and x is of Type (v): Let the character immediately after S_{x_G} be a . Since there exists a distinct right-extension of x in T' other than the right-extension(s) of the crossing occurrence(s) of x , there exists xb ($b \neq a$) in T . Therefore, $S_{x_G} \in \text{RightM}(T)$. Thus, $U(x) = \text{lexp}_T(S_{x_G}) \in \text{RightM}(T)$.

Consequently, we have $U(x) \in \mathbf{M}(T)$. □

The next lemma states the uniqueness of $U(x)$.

Lemma 5. *For any $x, y \in \mathbf{N}_1 \cup \mathbf{N}_{3A}$ with $x \neq y$, $U(x) \neq U(y)$.*

Proof. Suppose that there exist $x, y \in \mathbf{N}_1 \cup \mathbf{N}_{3A}$ such that $x \neq y$ and $U(x) = U(y)$. Let x and y correspond to S_{x_G} and S_{y_F} , respectively, where $G, F \in \{L, R\}$. Let $U(x) = AS_{x_G}$, $U(y) = BS_{y_F}$ ($A, B \in \text{Substr}(T)$), and assume without loss of generality that $|S_{x_G}| < |S_{y_F}|$. Then $|A| > |B|$ because $U(x) = U(y)$. Since $U(y) = BS_{y_F} \in \mathbf{M}(T)$ by Lemma 4, and since BS_{x_G} is a prefix of BS_{y_F} (see Figure 8), we have $BS_{x_G} \in \text{LeftM}(T)$. This contradicts $\text{lexp}_T(S_{x_G}) = AS_{x_G}$. □




Figure 8: Illustration for the proof of Lemma 5, where $U(x) = U(y)$.

4.2 Upper bound w.r.t. $\mathbf{N}_1 \cup \mathbf{N}_{3A}$

Lemma 6. $\sum_{x \in \mathbf{N}_1 \cup \mathbf{N}_{3A}} d_{T'}(x) \leq 3e + 2$.

Proof. Let $U(x) = \text{lexp}_T(S_{x_G})$, where $G \in \{L, R\}$. Since S_{x_G} is a suffix of x , $d_T(x) \leq d_T(U(x))$. Since there are at most two distinct characters immediately after the crossing occurrences of x , $d_{T'}(x) \leq d_T(U(x)) + 2$. For $U(x) \neq T$, we have $d_T(U(x)) \geq 1$. Thus $d_{T'}(x) \leq d_T(U(x)) + 2 \leq 3d_T(U(x))$. For $U(x) = T$, we have $d_T(U(x)) = 0$. Thus $d_{T'}(x) \leq 2$. By using Lemma 5 and summing up these, we get $\sum_{x \in \mathbf{N}_1 \cup \mathbf{N}_{3A}} d_{T'}(x) \leq \sum_{x \in \mathbf{N}_1 \cup \mathbf{N}_{3A}} 3d_T(U(x)) + 2 \leq 3e + 2$. □

5 Upper bound for total out-degrees of nodes w.r.t. $\mathbf{N}_2 \cup \mathbf{Q}$

In this section, we show an upper bound for the total out-degrees of nodes corresponding to strings that are elements of $\mathbf{N}_2 \cup \mathbf{Q} \subseteq \mathbf{M}(T')$.

We first present properties of the strings in $\mathbf{N}_2 \cup \mathbf{Q}$. In particular, we focus on the strings in $\mathbf{N}_2 \cup \mathbf{Q}_1$, as the strings in \mathbf{Q}_2 are less important and can be handled in a trivial manner.

Lemma 7. *Any $x \in \mathbf{N}_2 \cup \mathbf{Q}_1$ occurs in T .*

Proof. Since $x \in \mathbf{N}_2 \cup \mathbf{Q}_1$, $x \in \text{LeftM}(T)$. Thus $x \in \mathbf{N}_2 \cup \mathbf{Q}_1$ occurs in T . \square

Lemma 8. *For any $x \in \mathbf{N}_2 \cup \mathbf{Q}_1$ that is of Type (i), (ii) or (iv), there does not exist $y \in \mathbf{N}_2 \cup \mathbf{Q}_1$ such that $|y| > |x|$ and $P_{x_G} = P_{y_F}$, where $G, F \in \{L, R\}$.*

Proof. The case that $x \in \mathbf{N}_2$ follows from a symmetrical argument to Lemma 2, in which y may belong to \mathbf{N}_2 or \mathbf{Q}_1 . Let us consider the case that $x \in \mathbf{Q}_1$. Suppose that for $x \in \mathbf{Q}_1$ which is of Type (i), (ii) or (iv), there is $y \in \mathbf{N}_2 \cup \mathbf{Q}_1$ such that $|y| > |x|$ and $P_{x_G} = P_{y_F}$, where $G, F \in \{L, R\}$. If x_R is a suffix of T' , then there is no y such that $|y| > |x|$ and $P_{x_G} = P_{y_F}$. From now on consider the case that x_R is not a suffix of T' . Let b be the character immediately after x_G . Then, since x is of Type (i), (ii) or (iv), character b immediately follows every crossing occurrence of x in T' . Note that xb is a prefix of y . Due to Lemma 7, y occurs in T , implying xb also occurs in T . Thus the number of right-extensions of x in T' is no more than the number of right-extensions of x in T . However, this contradicts $x \in \mathbf{Q}_1$. \square

Lemma 9. *For any $x \in \mathbf{N}_2 \cup \mathbf{Q}_1$ that is of Type (iii) or (v), there do not exist $y, z \in \mathbf{N}_2 \cup \mathbf{Q}_1$ with $|y| > |x|$ and $|z| > |x|$ satisfying $P_{x_L} = P_{y_G}$ and $P_{x_R} = P_{z_F}$ simultaneously, where $G, F \in \{L, R\}$.*

Proof. If x_R is a suffix of T' , then clearly there is no z satisfying $|z| > |x|$ and $P_{x_R} = P_{z_F}$. In what follows, we consider the case that x_R is not a suffix of T' .

Suppose that for $x \in \mathbf{N}_2 \cup \mathbf{Q}_1$ which is of Type (iii) or (v), there exist $y, z \in \mathbf{N}_2 \cup \mathbf{Q}_1$ with $|y| > |x|$, $|z| > |x|$ that satisfy $P_{x_L} = P_{y_G}$ and $P_{x_R} = P_{z_F}$ at the same time, where $G, F \in \{L, R\}$. Let b and d ($b \neq d$) be the character immediately after x_L in T' and the character immediately after x_R in T' , respectively. By Lemma 7, y and z occur in T , and hence xb that is a prefix of y and xd that is a prefix of z also occur in T . Therefore, $x \in \text{RightM}(T)$. However, if $x \in \mathbf{N}_2(T)$, this contradicts $x \notin \text{RightM}(T)$. Also, if $x \in \mathbf{Q}_1$, the number of right-extensions of x in T' do not increase from the number of right-extensions of x in T . However, this contradicts $x \in \mathbf{Q}_1$. \square

5.1 Correspondence between $\mathbf{N}_2 \cup \mathbf{Q}_1$ and $\text{M}(T)$

For any $x \in \mathbf{N}_2 \cup \mathbf{Q}_1$ that is of Type (i), (ii) or (iv), then we associate x with both P_{x_L} and P_{x_R} . For any $x \in \mathbf{N}_2 \cup \mathbf{Q}_1$ that is of Type (iii) or (v),

- if there exists $y \in \mathbf{N}_2 \cup \mathbf{Q}_1$ with $|y| > |x|$ such that $P_{x_R} = P_{y_G}$ where $G \in \{L, R\}$, then we associate x with P_{x_L} (see Figure 9);
- if there exists $y \in \mathbf{N}_2 \cup \mathbf{Q}_1$ with $|y| > |x|$ such that $P_{x_L} = P_{y_G}$ where $G \in \{L, R\}$, then we associate x with P_{x_R} (see Figure 10);
- otherwise, we associate x with both P_{x_L} and P_{x_R} .




Figure 9: When there exists $y \in \mathbf{N}_2 \cup \mathbf{Q}_1$ with $|y| > |x|$ such that $P_{x_R} = P_{y_G}$, where $G \in \{L, R\}$.




Figure 10: When there exists $y \in \mathbb{N}_2 \cup \mathbb{Q}_1$ with $|y| > |x|$ such that $P_{x_L} = P_{y_G}$, where $G \in \{L, R\}$.

By Lemmas 8 and 9, each $x \in \mathbb{N}_2 \cup \mathbb{Q}_1$ corresponds to a distinct string P_{x_G} , where $G \in \{L, R\}$. Below, for each $x \in \mathbb{N}_2 \cup \mathbb{Q}_1$, we define $H(x)$ and $I(x)$ to which x corresponds:

Definition 6. For each $x \in \mathbb{N}_2 \cup \mathbb{Q}_1$ associated to P_{x_L} , let $H(x) = \text{rexp}_T(P_{x_L})$. For each $x \in \mathbb{N}_2 \cup \mathbb{Q}_1$ associated to P_{x_R} , let $I(x) = \text{rexp}_T(P_{x_R})$. See Figure 11. When there is only one crossing occurrence of x (i.e. $x_L = x_R$), only $H(x)$ is defined as above and $I(x)$ is undefined.

$H(x)$ (resp. $I(x)$) is undefined for any $x \in \mathbb{N}_2 \cup \mathbb{Q}_1$ that is *not* associated to P_{x_L} (resp. P_{x_R}).

By Lemma 7 every $x \in \mathbb{N}_2 \cup \mathbb{Q}_1$ occurs in T , and thus $H(x)$ and $I(x)$ are well defined when x is associated to P_{x_L} and P_{x_R} , respectively.




Figure 11: Illustration for $H(x)$ and $I(x)$ ($a \neq b, c \neq d$).

Lemma 10. For any $x \in \mathbb{N}_2 \cup \mathbb{Q}_1$, $H(x) \in \text{M}(T)$ if $H(x)$ is defined, and $I(x) \in \text{M}(T)$ if $I(x)$ is defined.

Proof. By Definition 6, $H(x), I(x) \in \text{RightM}(T)$. Therefore, it suffices for us to prove $H(x), I(x) \in \text{LeftM}(T)$. For any $x \in \mathbb{N}_2 \cup \mathbb{Q}_1$, $x \in \text{LeftM}(T)$. Since P_{x_G} ($G \in \{L, R\}$) is a prefix of x , we have $P_{x_G} \in \text{LeftM}(T)$. Hence $H(x), I(x) \in \text{LeftM}(T)$ holds. \square

Lemma 11. For any $x, y \in \mathbb{N}_1 \cup \mathbb{N}_{3A}$ with $x \neq y$, let \mathcal{L} be a list of $H(x), I(x), H(y), I(y)$ which are defined. Then the elements in \mathcal{L} differ from each other.

Proof. By a symmetrical argument to Lemma 5. \square

5.2 Upper bound w.r.t. $\mathbb{N}_2 \cup \mathbb{Q}$

Lemma 12. $\sum_{x \in \mathbb{N}_2 \cup \mathbb{Q}} d_{T'}(x) \leq 3e + 2$.

Proof. Below, we consider all the four possible cases depending on whether $x \in \mathbb{N}_2$ or $x \in \mathbb{Q}_1$, and whether $H(x), I(x) \neq T$.

When $x \in \mathbb{N}_2$ and $H(x), I(x) \neq T$:

- First, we consider the case that x is associated with both $H(x)$ and $I(x)$. Since $x \in \mathbf{N}_2$, then $x \notin \text{RightM}(T)$. Therefore, the number of characters that are immediately after x in T is at most one. Moreover, there are at most two distinct characters immediately after the crossing occurrences of x . Hence, there are at most three distinct characters immediately after x in T' , namely we have

$$\mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) \leq 3. \quad (1)$$

In addition, since $H(x), I(x) \neq T$, it holds that $\mathbf{d}_T(H(x)), \mathbf{d}_T(I(x)) \geq 1$. By Inequality 1, we get $\mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) \leq 3 \leq \mathbf{d}_T(H(x)) + \mathbf{d}_T(I(x)) + 1 \leq 2\mathbf{d}_T(H(x)) + 2\mathbf{d}_T(I(x))$.

- Second, we consider the case that x is associated with only one of $H(x)$ or $I(x)$.
 - Assume that we associate x with $H(x)$. Since $x \in \mathbf{N}_2$, then $x \notin \text{RightM}(T)$. Therefore, the number of characters immediately after x in T is at most one. In this case, we do not associate x with $I(x)$, hence, x has only one crossing occurrence or there exists $y \in \mathbf{N}_2 \cup \mathbf{Q}_1$ such that $|y| > |x|$ and $P_{x_R} = P_{y_G}$ where $G \in \{L, R\}$. When x has only one crossing occurrence, there are at most one character immediately after the crossing occurrence of x . When there exists $y \in \mathbf{N}_2 \cup \mathbf{Q}_1$ such that $|y| > |x|$ and $P_{x_R} = P_{y_G}$ where $G \in \{L, R\}$, then such y occurs in T due to Lemma 7. Therefore, although there are at most two distinct characters immediately after the crossing occurrences of x , one of them is the character immediately after x in T as shown in Figure 12. Hence, we have

$$\mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) \leq 2. \quad (2)$$

In addition, since $H(x) \neq T$, then $\mathbf{d}_T(H(x)) \geq 1$ holds. By Inequality 2, we get $\mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) \leq 2 \leq \mathbf{d}_T(H(x)) + 1 \leq 2\mathbf{d}_T(H(x))$.

- Let us assume that we associate x with $I(x)$. In the same way as we associate x with $H(x)$, we get $\mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) \leq 2 \leq \mathbf{d}_T(I(x)) + 1 \leq 2\mathbf{d}_T(I(x))$.




Figure 12: xa occurs in T , where a is the character immediately after the crossing occurrence x_R .

When $x \in \mathbf{N}_2$ and $H(x) = T$ or $I(x) = T$:

- Let $H(x) = T$. Now that $H(x)$ is defined, x is associated with $H(x)$.
 - First, we consider the case that we associate x with both $H(x)$ and $I(x)$. In the same way as in Inequality 1, we get $\mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) \leq 3$. In addition, since $H(x) = T$ and Lemma 11 holds, $I(x) \neq T$ and thus $\mathbf{d}_T(I(x)) \geq 1$ holds. Hence, we have $\mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) \leq 3 \leq \mathbf{d}_T(I(x)) + 2 \leq 2\mathbf{d}_T(I(x)) + 2 \leq 2\mathbf{d}_T(H(x)) + 2\mathbf{d}_T(I(x)) + 2$.

– Second, we consider the case that we only associate x with $H(x)$. Since $H(x) = T$, $\mathbf{d}_T(H(x)) = 0$ holds. In the same way as in Inequality 2, we get $\mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) \leq 2$. Thus, we have $\mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) \leq 2 \leq 2\mathbf{d}_T(H(x)) + 2$.

- Let $I(x) = T$. Now that $I(x)$ is defined, x is associated with $I(x)$. In the same way as in the case for $H(x) = T$, we get $\mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) \leq 3 \leq \mathbf{d}_T(H(x)) + 2 \leq 2\mathbf{d}_T(H(x)) + 2 \leq 2\mathbf{d}_T(H(x)) + 2\mathbf{d}_T(I(x)) + 2$ in the case that we associate x with both $H(x)$ and $I(x)$, and we get $\mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) \leq 2 \leq 2\mathbf{d}_T(I(x)) + 2$ in the case that we only associate x with $I(x)$.

When $x \in \mathbf{Q}_1$ and $H(x), I(x) \neq T$: Here, we analyze $\mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) - \mathbf{d}_T(x)$ since $x \in \mathbf{Q}_1$.

- First, we consider the case that we associate x with both $H(x)$ and $I(x)$. There are at most two distinct characters immediately after the crossing occurrences of x . Hence,

$$\mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) - \mathbf{d}_T(x) \leq 2. \quad (3)$$

In addition, since $H(x), I(x) \neq T$, then $\mathbf{d}_T(H(x)), \mathbf{d}_T(I(x)) \geq 1$ holds. By Inequality 3, we get $\mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) - \mathbf{d}_T(x) \leq 2 \leq \mathbf{d}_T(H(x)) + \mathbf{d}_T(I(x)) \leq \mathbf{d}_T(H(x)) + \mathbf{d}_T(I(x))$.

- Second, we consider the case that we associate x with only one of $H(x)$ or $I(x)$. Here, let us assume that we associate x with $H(x)$. In this case, we do not associate x with $I(x)$, hence, x has only one crossing occurrence or there exists $y \in \mathbf{N}_2 \cup \mathbf{Q}_1$ such that $|y| > |x|$ and $P_{x_R} = P_{y_G}$ where $G \in \{L, R\}$. When x has only one crossing occurrence, there are at most one character immediately after the crossing occurrence of x . When there exists $y \in \mathbf{N}_2 \cup \mathbf{Q}_1$ such that $|y| > |x|$ and $P_{x_R} = P_{y_G}$ where $G \in \{L, R\}$, then such y occurs in T due to Lemma 7. Therefore, although there are at most two distinct characters immediately after the crossing occurrences of x , one of them is the character immediately after x in T as shown in Figure 12. Hence, we have

$$\mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) - \mathbf{d}_T(x) \leq 1. \quad (4)$$

In addition, since $H(x) \neq T$, then $\mathbf{d}_T(H(x)) \geq 1$ holds. By Inequality 4, we get $\mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) - \mathbf{d}_T(x) \leq 1 \leq \mathbf{d}_T(H(x))$. In the case that we associate x with $I(x)$, in the same way as we associate x with $H(x)$, we get $\mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) - \mathbf{d}_T(x) \leq 1 \leq \mathbf{d}_T(I(x))$.

When $x \in \mathbf{Q}_1$ and $H(x) = T$ or $I(x) = T$: Here, we analyze $\mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) - \mathbf{d}_T(x)$ since $x \in \mathbf{Q}_1$.

- Let $H(x) = T$. Since $H(x)$ is defined, x is associated with $H(x)$.
 - First, let us consider the case that we associate x with both $H(x)$ and $I(x)$. In the same way as in Inequality 3, we get $\mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) - \mathbf{d}_T(x) \leq 2$. In addition, since $H(x) = T$ and Lemma 11 holds, $I(x) \neq T$ and thus $\mathbf{d}_T(I(x)) \geq 1$ holds. Hence $\mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) - \mathbf{d}_T(x) \leq 2 \leq \mathbf{d}_T(I(x)) + 1 \leq \mathbf{d}_T(H(x)) + \mathbf{d}_T(I(x)) + 1$.
 - Second, let us consider the case that we only associate x with $H(x)$. Since $H(x) = T$, $\mathbf{d}_T(H(x)) = 0$ holds. In the same way as in Inequality 4, we get $\mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) - \mathbf{d}_T(x) \leq 1$. Thus, we have $\mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) - \mathbf{d}_T(x) \leq 1 \leq \mathbf{d}_T(H(x)) + 1$.
- Let $I(x) = T$. Since $I(x)$ is defined, x is associated with $I(x)$. In the same way as in the case for $H(x) = T$, we get $\mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) - \mathbf{d}_T(x) \leq 2 \leq \mathbf{d}_T(H(x)) + 1 \leq \mathbf{d}_T(H(x)) + \mathbf{d}_T(I(x)) + 1$ in the case that we associate x with both $H(x)$ and $I(x)$, and we get $\mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) - \mathbf{d}_T(x) \leq 1 \leq \mathbf{d}_T(I(x)) + 1$ in the case that we only associate x with $I(x)$.

Table 1: Upper bounds for each case of Lemma 12.

	When $H(x) \neq T \wedge I(x) \neq T$	When $H(x) = T \vee I(x) = T$
$\mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) - \mathbf{d}_T(x)$ ($x \in \mathbf{Q}_1$)	$\leq \mathbf{d}_T(H(x)) + \mathbf{d}_T(I(x))$	$\leq \mathbf{d}_T(H(x)) + \mathbf{d}_T(I(x)) + 1$
$\mathbf{d}_{T'}(x)$ ($x \in \mathbf{N}_2$)	$\leq 2(\mathbf{d}_T(H(x)) + \mathbf{d}_T(I(x)))$	$\leq 2(\mathbf{d}_T(H(x)) + \mathbf{d}_T(I(x))) + 2$

Wrapping up: Table 1 summarizes the bounds obtained above. For simplicity, let $\mathbf{d}_T(I(x)) = 0$ when $I(x)$ is undefined, and let $\mathbf{d}_T(H(x)) = 0$ when $H(x)$ is undefined. Note that this does not affect our upper bound analysis, since no maximal repeats in T' are associated to the undefined $H(x)$'s and $I(x)$'s. By Lemma 11, there is at most one string x such that $H(x) = T$ or $I(x) = T$. Thus, by using Lemma 11 and summing up the values in Table 1, we obtain $\sum_{x \in \mathbf{N}_2} \mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) + \sum_{x \in \mathbf{Q}_1} (\mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) - \mathbf{d}_T(x)) \leq 2e + 2$. Also, since the number of out-edges of $x \in \mathbf{Q}_2$ does not increase, we get $\sum_{x \in \mathbf{Q}_2} \mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) + \sum_{x \in \mathbf{Q}_1} \mathbf{d}_T(x) \leq \sum_{x \in \mathbf{Q}_2} \mathbf{d}_T(x) + \sum_{x \in \mathbf{Q}_1} \mathbf{d}_T(x) \leq \sum_{x \in \mathbf{Q}} \mathbf{d}_T(x) \leq \sum_{x \in \mathbf{M}(T)} \mathbf{d}_T(x) = e$. By adding $\sum_{x \in \mathbf{N}_2} \mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) + \sum_{x \in \mathbf{Q}_1} (\mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) - \mathbf{d}_T(x)) \leq 2e + 2$, we get $\sum_{x \in \mathbf{N}_2 \cup \mathbf{Q}} \mathbf{d}_{T'}(x) \leq 3e + 2$. \square

6 Upper bound for total out-degrees of nodes w.r.t. \mathbf{N}_{3B}

In this section, we show an upper bound for the total out-degrees of nodes corresponding to strings that are elements of $\mathbf{N}_{3B} \subseteq \mathbf{M}(T')$.

We first describe useful properties of strings $x \in \mathbf{N}_{3B}$.

Definition 7. For any $x \in \mathbf{N}_{3B}$, let J_x be the string that is obtained by removing P_{x_R} and S_{x_L} from x , namely $x = P_{x_R} J_x S_{x_L}$.

Note that, by the definition of Type (v), each $x \in \mathbf{N}_{3B}$ has two or more crossing occurrences in T' . Hence J_x always exists (possibly the empty string). See Figures 13 and 14.




Figure 13: Illustration for J_x in case of insertions and substitutions.




Figure 14: Illustration for J_x in case of deletions.

Lemma 13. For any $x, y \in \mathbf{N}_{3B}$ with $x \neq y$, $J_x \neq J_y$.

Proof. For a contrary, suppose that there exist $x, y \in \mathbf{N}_{3B}$ such that $x \neq y$ and $J_x = J_y$. Since x is of Type (v), the characters immediately after x_L and x_R are different and let

a, b ($a \neq b$) be these characters, respectively. If $|S_{x_L}| < |S_{y_L}|$, then both $S_{x_L}a$ and $S_{x_L}b$ must be prefixes of S_{y_L} (see Figures 15 and 16), which contradicts that $a \neq b$. The other case where $|S_{x_L}| > |S_{y_L}|$ also leads to a contradiction. Hence $S_{x_L} = S_{y_L}$. Also, $P_{x_R} = P_{y_R}$ follows in a symmetric manner. These imply $x = y$, which is a contradiction. \square




Figure 15: Illustration for Lemma 13 in case of insertions and substitutions, where $J_x = J_y$.




Figure 16: Illustration for Lemma 13 in case of deletions, where $J_x = J_y$.

6.1 Correspondence between \mathbf{N}_{3B} and $\mathbf{M}(T)$

For any $x \in \mathbf{N}_{3B}$, we associate x with J_x . For any $x \in \mathbf{N}_{3B}$ we define $K(x)$ to which x corresponds, by using J_x , as follows:

Definition 8. For any $x \in \mathbf{N}_{3B}$, let $K(x) = \text{lexp}_T(\text{rexp}_T(J_x)) = \text{rexp}_T(\text{lexp}_T(J_x))$ (see also Figure 17 for illustration).

We note that $K(x)$ is well defined since J_x is a substring of T .




Figure 17: Illustration for Definition 8, where $a \neq b$ and $c \neq d$.

Lemma 14. For any $x, y \in \mathbb{N}_{3B}$ with $x \neq y$, $K(x) \neq K(y)$.

Proof. Suppose that there exist $x, y \in \mathbb{N}_{3B}$ such that $x \neq y$ and $K(x) = K(y)$, and without loss of generality that $|J_x| \leq |J_y|$. Then, J_x occurs at least twice in J_y . Therefore, $K(x) \neq K(y)$, however, this is a contradiction. \square

6.2 Upper bound w.r.t. \mathbb{N}_{3B}

Lemma 15. $\sum_{x \in \mathbb{N}_{3B}} d_{T'}(x) \leq 2e$.

Proof. By the definition of \mathbb{N}_{3B} , there is no other right-extension of x in T' than the right-extension(s) of the crossing occurrence(s) of x . Thus there are at most two distinct characters immediately after x in T' . Since $K(x)$ occurs at least twice in T , $d_T(K(x)) \geq 1$. Hence, we get $d_{T'}(x) \leq 2 \leq 2d_T(K(x))$. Therefore, we have $\sum_{x \in \mathbb{N}_{3B}} d_{T'}(x) \leq 2e$ by Lemma 14. \square

7 Conclusions

This paper proved that the worst-case multiplicative sensitivity of CDAWGs is asymptotically at most 8. Our analysis is based fully on new combinatorial properties of maximal repeats and their right-extensions, that are incidental to an edit operation on the strings. The only known lower bound for the multiplicative sensitivity of CDAWGs is asymptotically 2 [8]. It is intriguing future work to close the gap between these upper bound and lower bound.

References

- [1] T. Akagi, M. Funakoshi, and S. Inenaga. Sensitivity of string compressors and repetitiveness measures. *Information and Computation*, 291:104999, 2023.
- [2] P. Baturo, M. Piatkowski, and W. Rytter. Usefulness of directed acyclic subword graphs in problems related to Standard Sturmian Words. *Int. J. Found. Comput. Sci.*, 20(6):1005–1023, 2009.
- [3] D. Belazzougui and F. Cunial. Fast label extraction in the CDAWG. In *SPIRE 2017*, pages 161–175, 2017.
- [4] A. Blumer, J. Blumer, D. Haussler, A. Ehrenfeucht, M. Chen, and J. Seiferas. The smallest automation recognizing the subwords of a text. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 40:31–55, 1985.
- [5] A. Blumer, J. Blumer, D. Haussler, R. McConnell, and A. Ehrenfeucht. Complete inverted files for efficient text retrieval and analysis. *Journal of the ACM*, 34(3):578–595, 1987.

- [6] M. Charikar, E. Lehman, D. Liu, R. Panigrahy, M. Prabhakaran, A. Sahai, and A. Shelat. The smallest grammar problem. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 51(7):2554–2576, 2005.
- [7] M. Crochemore, F. Mignosi, and A. Restivo. Automata and forbidden words. *Information Processing Letters*, 67(3):111–117, 1998.
- [8] H. Fujimaru, Y. Nakashima, and S. Inenaga. Tight bounds for the sensitivity of CDAWGs with left-end edits. *Acta Informatica*, 62(12), 2025.
- [9] S. Giuliani, S. Inenaga, Z. Lipták, N. Prezza, M. Sciortino, and A. Toffanello. Novel results on the number of runs of the Burrows-Wheeler-transform. In *SOFSEM*, pages 249–262, 2021.
- [10] S. Giuliani, S. Inenaga, Z. Lipták, G. Romana, M. Sciortino, and C. Urbina. Bit catastrophes for the Burrows-Wheeler transform. In *DLT 2023*, volume 13911 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 86–99, 2023.
- [11] L. Ilie and W. F. Smyth. Minimum unique substrings and maximum repeats. *Fundamenta Informaticae*, 110(1-4):183–195, 2011.
- [12] S. Inenaga. Linear-size suffix tries and linear-size CDAWGs simplified and improved. *Acta Informatica*, 61(4):445–468, 2024.
- [13] S. Inenaga, H. Hoshino, A. Shinohara, M. Takeda, S. Arikawa, G. Mauri, and G. Pavese. On-line construction of compact directed acyclic word graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 146(2):156–179, 2005.
- [14] S. Inenaga and D. Kosolobov. Relating left and right extensions of maximal repeats. *CoRR*, abs/2410.15958, 2024.
- [15] S. Inenaga, T. Mieno, H. Arimura, M. Funakoshi, and Y. Fujishige. Computing minimal absent words and extended bispecial factors with CDAWG space. In *IWOCA 2024*, volume 14764 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 327–340, 2024.
- [16] T. Kociumaka, G. Navarro, and N. Prezza. Toward a definitive compressibility measure for repetitive sequences. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 69(4):2074–2092, 2023.
- [17] G. Lagarde and S. Perifel. Lempel-Ziv: a “one-bit catastrophe” but not a tragedy. In *SODA*, pages 1478–1495, 2018.
- [18] W. Merrill, N. A. Smith, and Y. Elazar. Evaluating n-gram novelty of language models using Rusty-DAWG. In *EMNLP 2024*, pages 14459–14473, 2024.
- [19] T. Mieno and S. Inenaga. Space-efficient online computation of string net occurrences. *CoRR*, abs/2411.12160, 2024. Accepted for CPM 2025.
- [20] J. Radoszewski and W. Rytter. On the structure of compacted subword graphs of Thue-Morse words and their applications. *J. Discrete Algorithms*, 11:15–24, 2012.
- [21] W. Rytter. Application of Lempel-Ziv factorization to the approximation of grammar-based compression. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 302(1-3):211–222, 2003.

- [22] W. Rytter. The structure of subword graphs and suffix trees of Fibonacci words. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 363(2):211–223, 2006.
- [23] J. A. Storer and T. G. Szymanski. Data compression via textual substitution. *J. ACM*, 29(4):928–951, 1982.
- [24] M. Takeda, T. Matsumoto, T. Fukuda, and I. Nanri. Discovering characteristic expressions from literary works: a new text analysis method beyond n-gram statistics and KWIC. In *Discovery Science 2000*, pages 112–126, 2000.
- [25] P. Weiner. Linear pattern matching algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 14th Annual Symposium on Switching and Automata Theory*, pages 1–11, 1973.
- [26] J. Ziv and A. Lempel. A universal algorithm for sequential data compression. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 23(3):337–343, 1977.
- [27] J. Ziv and A. Lempel. Compression of individual sequences via variable-rate coding. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 24(5):530–536, 1978.