



Fully Dynamic LZ77 in Sublinear Time

Itai Boneh  

Reichman University and University of Haifa, Israel

Matan Kraus  

Bar Ilan University, Israel

Abstract

The Lempel-Ziv 77 (LZ77) factorization is a fundamental compression scheme widely used in text processing and data compression. While efficient static algorithms exist for computing LZ77, maintaining it dynamically remains a challenging problem. Recently, Bannai, Charalampopoulos, and Radoszewski introduced an algorithm that maintains the size of the LZ77 factorization of a dynamic text in $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n})$ per update. Their data structure works in the semi-dynamic model, where the only allowed updates are insertions at the end of the string or deletions from the start.

In contrast, we present an algorithm that operates in a significantly more general setting of arbitrary edit operations. Our algorithm maintains the size of the LZ77 factorization of a string undergoing symbol substitutions, deletions, and insertions in $\tilde{O}(n^{2/3})$ time per update. Additionally, our data structure supports random access to the LZ77 factorization in polylogarithmic time, providing enhanced functionality for dynamic text processing.

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

Keywords and phrases Text Algorithms, Lempel-Ziv 77, Dynamic Algorithms

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

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

1 Introduction

LZ77 [17] is an algorithm that partitions a string $S[1..n]$ into disjoint substrings, called *phrases*, as follows: The first phrase consists of the first character, $S[1]$. The starting index of the i th phrase is immediately after the ending index of the $(i - 1)$ th phrase. The phrase itself is the longest substring starting in this index that is not a leftmost-occurrence in S (or, if no such substring exists, simply a substring of length 1).

More formally, if the $(i - 1)$ th phrase is $S[a..b - 1]$, then the i th phrase is $S[b..b + r]$, where r is defined as $r = \max\{x \mid S[b..b + r] \text{ occurs in } S[1..b + r - 1]\} \cup \{0\}$.

The LZ77 factorization is reversible (provided each phrase is stored with some constant-size additional information) and is typically compact, meaning it consists of relatively few phrases when S contains many repetitions. This property makes LZ77 an effective compression scheme.

In practice, LZ77 is one of the most widely used compression algorithms, forming the foundation of 58 out of 210 compressors listed in the Large Text Compression Benchmark [16]. Its influence spans a diverse range of file formats, such as PNG, PDF, and ZIP, highlighting its versatility and efficiency. Moreover, LZ77 plays a crucial role in modern web infrastructure, being embedded in virtually all contemporary web browsers and servers [1].

The LZ77 factorization has recently garnered significant attention from the theory community, leading to the development of numerous algorithms aimed at optimizing various aspects of its computation. For instance, in recent years, breakthroughs have been made in computing the LZ77 factorization of a text in sub-linear time [15, 10], as well as in developing quantum algorithms for its computation [13].

In this work, we investigate the maintenance of the LZ77 factorization in dynamic settings. Specifically, we consider scenarios in which the input string S undergoes insertions, deletions, and symbol substitutions. Our objective is to maintain a data structure alongside S that allows access to its current LZ77 factorization at any point during the sequence of updates. The interface we provide for accessing the LZ77 factorization is exceptionally versatile and well-suited for dynamic applications: given an index i , the data structure can either report the LZ77 phrase that contains i in S or return the i th LZ77 phrase from the left in the factorization of S . All access queries are supported in poly-logarithmic time. For some previously studied applications (see [5], discussed below), a more limited notion of dynamic LZ77 maintenance suffices: after each update to S , only the current size of its LZ77 factorization is reported. Our data structure supports this functionality as well.

The problem of dynamic LZ77 maintenance has recently been considered by Bannai, Charalampopoulos, and Radoszewski [5]. In their work, they focus on a limited semi-dynamic setting where only symbol insertions at the end of the string and deletions from the beginning are permitted. In these settings, [5] provide an algorithm with amortized running time $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n})$ time¹, reporting the size of $LZ77(S)$ after every update.

Bannai, Charalampopoulos, and Radoszewski [5] motivate their study with the following problem: given a string S that is to be compressed, find the rotation S' of S (i.e., a string $S' = B \cdot A$ such that $S = A \cdot B$) that minimizes the size of the LZ77 factorization, $LZ77(S')$. A naive solution would involve computing the LZ77 factorization for every rotation of S , resulting in an $O(n^2)$ running time where $n = |S|$. However, if one has access to a semi-dynamic data structure with an update time of $O(u)$, the problem can be solved in $O(n \cdot u)$ time. This is achieved by initializing an empty data structure, inserting the symbols of S one by one, and then performing $|S|$ rotations—each rotation consisting of a deletion of the first symbol and an insertion of that symbol at the end. Since all rotations of S are generated in this manner, the LZ77 sizes for all rotations are reported in $O(n \cdot u)$ time.

Although the semi-dynamic setting studied in [5] is well-motivated, a more natural and general approach to developing dynamic string algorithms is to consider the fully dynamic model, where the string undergoes insertions, deletions, and substitutions. Recent work on dynamic strings in the fully dynamic model (and in some cases, even stronger models) includes Substring equality queries [12], Longest Common Factor Maintenance [4, 7], Approximate Pattern Matching [9], maintenance of all periodic substrings [3], maintenance of Suffix Arrays and Inverted Suffix Arrays [14], Edit Distance computation [8], and Dynamic Time Warping Computation [6]. Building on the ongoing progress in developing fully dynamic algorithms for classical string problems and drawing inspiration from [5]’s exploration of LZ77 in dynamic settings, we investigate the complexity of maintaining the LZ77 factorization of a dynamic string.

1.1 Our Contribution

We present a fully dynamic data structure that supports access to the LZ77 factorization of a dynamic string S . We present the following interface for querying the LZ77 factorization of a string S .

1. $\text{SelectPhrase}_S(i)$: given an index i , report the i ’th LZ77 phrase $S[a..b]$ in the factorization of S represented by a and b .

¹ Throughout the paper, we use the \tilde{O} notation to ignore multiplicative poly-logarithmic factors of n , i.e. $\tilde{O}(f(*)) = O(f(*)) \cdot \log^c n$ for some constant c where n is the length of the input.

2. $\text{ContainingPhrase}_S(i)$: given an index i , report the LZ77 phrase $S[a..b]$ in the factorization of S such that $i \in [a..b]$.
3. $\text{LZLength}_S(i)$ get the length of the LZ77 factorization of $S[1..i]$.

Collectively, we call SelectPhrase , ContainingPhrase , and LZLength as *LZ77 queries*. The paper is dedicated to providing the following data structure for dynamic LZ77.

► **Theorem 1.** *There is a data structure that maintains a dynamic string that undergoes insertions, deletions, and substitutions and supports LZ77 queries in $\tilde{O}(1)$ time.*

The data structure can be constructed for a string of length n in $\tilde{O}(n)$ time, and the update time of the data structure is $\tilde{O}(n^{2/3})$.

2 Preliminaries

Integers Notations. We use range notation to denote consecutive ranges of integers. For integers i, j denote $[i..j] = \{i, i+1, \dots, j\}$ and $[i..j) = [i..j - 1]$. Denote $[i] = [1..i]$ (if $j < i$, $[i..j] = \emptyset$). We sometimes deal with arithmetic progressions of integers. We represent a set $A = \{a, a+p, a+2p, \dots, b = a+p \cdot (|A| - 1)\}$ by the triplet (a, b, d) . We call d the difference of the arithmetic progression (a, b, d) .

Strings. For a string $S = s[1], s[2], s[3], \dots, s[n]$, we denote a substring $s[i], s[i+1], \dots, s[j]$ as $S[i..j]$. We say that $S[i..j]$ is a substring that starts at index i and ends at index j . We call a substring that starts at index 1 a prefix of S , and a substring that ends at index n a suffix of S . We denote the reversed string of S as $S^R = s[n], s[n-1], \dots, s[1]$. For a pattern P , we denote $\text{Occ}_S(P) = \{i \mid S[i..i+|P|-1] = P\}$. We call an index $i \in \text{Occ}_S(P)$ an occurrence of P in i , and say that P occurs in S if $\text{Occ}_S(P) \neq \emptyset$.

For two strings S and T , the length of longest common prefix of S and T is denoted by $\text{LCP}(S, T) = \max\{\ell \mid S[1..\ell] = T[1..\ell]\}$. The length of the longest common suffix of S and T is denoted by $\text{LCS}(S, T) = \text{LCP}(S^R, T^R)$.

For a string S and two indices $i, j \in [|S|]$, we denote $\text{LCP}_S(i, j) = \text{LCP}(S[i..n], S[j..n])$ and $\text{LCS}_S(i, j) = \text{LCS}(S[1..i], S[1..j])$.

We say that an integer p is a period of S if $S[i] = S[i+p]$ for every $i \in [1..n-p]$. We say that p is the period of S , denoted as $\text{per}(S)$ if it is the minimal period of S . We say that S is periodic if $\text{per}(S) \leq \frac{n}{2}$. Otherwise, S is aperiodic.

The following is a well-known fact regarding strings and periodicity. It follows directly from the periodicity lemma ([11]).

► **Fact 2.** *Let $T[1..n]$ be a string and $P[1..m]$ be a string with period $\text{per}(P) = p$. Let $i < j$ be two consecutive occurrences of P in T . It must hold that either $j - i = p$, or $j - i \geq \frac{m}{2}$. In particular, if P is aperiodic then $j - i \geq \frac{m}{2}$.*

trees. For a node v in a tree T , we denote as $\text{depth}(v, T)$ the number of edges in the unique path from v to the root of T .

Given a node v and an integer k , the k -th ancestor of v , denoted $\text{LevelAncestor}_T(v, k)$, is the ancestor of v with depth $\text{depth}(v) - k$.

Edge-Labeled Trees in Tries. An edge-labeled tree (over alphabet Σ) is a tree with root r such that every edge is assigned a label in σ . Each node v in an edge-labeled tree is associated with a string $L(v)$, also called the label of v . The root r is associated with the empty string $L(r) = \varepsilon$, and every non-root node v has $L(v) = L(u) \cdot \sigma$ such that u is the parent of v and

σ is the label of the edge (u, v) . Notice that for every two nodes u, v in an edged-labeled tree with lowest common ancestor z , it holds that $L(z) = L(u)[1..\text{LCP}(L(u), L(v))]$.

A Trie is an edge-labeled tree that is derived from a set of strings. We define the Trie of a set \mathcal{S} of strings recursively. The Trie of an empty set $\mathcal{S} = \emptyset$ is a single root vertex. Let T' be the Trie of a set \mathcal{S} of $t \geq 0$ strings. For a string S , let $A = \arg \max_{S' \in \mathcal{S}} \text{LCP}((S, A))$. Let v be the node in T' with $L(v) = S[1, \text{LCP}(S, A)]$. The Trie of $\mathcal{S} \cup \{S\}$ is obtained by adding a path from v of length $|S| - \text{LCP}(S, A)$ with the labels $S[\text{LCP}(S, A) + 1..|S|]$ on the edges. Notice that the label of the node at the end of this path is S . Also notice that if $\text{LCP}(S, A) = |S|$, nothing is added to T' . In words, the Trie T of \mathcal{S} is the minimal edge labeled tree such that for every string S in \mathcal{S} there is a vertex $v \in T$ with $L(v) = S$.

For two nodes u, v , denote $\text{LCA}_T(u, v)$ as the longest common ancestor of u and v in T . It holds that for $S, S' \in \mathcal{S}$, $\text{LCP}(S, S') = \text{depth}(\text{LCA}_T(S, S'), T)$.

LZ77. The Lempel-Ziv [17] compression is an algorithm that given a string S , outputs a sequence of *phrases*, denoted $\text{LZ77}(S)$. The algorithm starts by initializing a left to right scan with $i = 1$ and an empty sequence P of phrases.

If $i = n + 1$, the algorithm halts and return the sequence P . Otherwise, the algorithm adds a new phrase as follows. If $S[i]$ is a new character, i.e. $\text{Occ}_{S[1..i-1]}(S[i]) = \emptyset$, add $S[i]$ as a phrase to LZ77 and continue with $i \leftarrow i + 1$. Otherwise, let j be an index in $[i]$ that maximizes $\text{LCP}(i, j)$. The algorithm adds $(j, \text{LCP}(i, j))$ as a phrase to the end of P and continues with $i \leftarrow i + \text{LCP}(j, i)$.

We denote the final sequence of phrases obtained from applying the above procedure on S as $\text{LZ77}(S)$.

2.1 Dynamic strings

Edit Operations. In this paper, we develop and analyze algorithm over a dynamic string S over alphabet Σ that undergoes *edit operations*. An edit operation on $S[1..n]$ can be one of three options listed below, each resulting in a new string S' .

1. *Substitution:* Represented as a tuple $(i, \sigma) \in [n] \times \Sigma$. Results in $S' = S[1, i-1] \cdot \sigma \cdot S[i+1, n]$.
 2. *Deletion:* Represented as an index $i \in [n]$. Results in $S' = S[1, i-1] \cdot S[i+1, n]$.
 3. *Insertion:* Represented as a tuple $(i, \sigma) \in [n+1] \times \Sigma$. Results in $S' = S[1, i-1] \cdot \sigma \cdot S[i, n]$.
- A dynamic algorithm receives as inputs a sequence of operations, each represented by the type of the edit operation (substitution, deletion, or insertion) and a tuple representing the operation.

When describing our algorithms, we abstain from providing a direct implementation for the substitution update, as it can be simulated using a deletion update and an insertion update.

Dynamic Indices. Even though edit operations are very local, a single operation may 'shift' a large number of indices. For instance, when applying a deletion at index i , every index $j \geq i$ in S becomes the index $j - 1$ in S . This phenomena is problematic for any data structure that stores indices from the text, as every index $j > i$ stored implicitly in the data structure should be modified. These 'shifts' also introduce clutter when making statement about strings in dynamic indices. For instance, One would like to sa

Therefore, we represent the indices of S not as explicit number but as nodes in a dynamic tree. Specifically, we store a balanced search tree T_I over n nodes, such that every node $v \in T_I$ stores the size of the sub-tree rooted at v as auxiliary information. The i 'th node in the in-order traversal of T_I is to the i 'th index of S . Note that due to the auxiliary

information, one can find the i 'th node in $O(\log n)$ time given i , and also, given a node - one can find the index i corresponding to it in $O(\log n)$ time. When an index is deleted (resp. inserted) from S , we delete (resp. insert) the corresponding index from T_I , which automatically shift all other indices.

With this framework, when discussing an index i of a dynamic string, we actually refer to the node in T_I representing i rather than the actual numeric value i . This introduces an additional multiplicative factor of $O(\log n)$ whenever our algorithm accesses an index of the dynamic text.

To avoid clutter, we omit this dynamic index implementation when describing algorithms and instead assume that indices are stored explicitly.

2.2 Stringology Tools

First, we make use of a data structure with the following functionality.

► **Lemma 3** ([14],Section 8). *There is a data structure for maintaining a dynamic string S that undergoes edit operations and supports the following queries in $\tilde{O}(1)$ time:*

1. LCP query: Given two indices i, j , report $\text{LCP}_S(i, j)$.
2. LCS query: Given two indices i, j , report $\text{LCS}_S(i, j)$.
3. $\text{IPM}_S(P, T)$ query: Given a pattern $P = S[i_P..j_P]$ and a text $T = S[i_T..j_T]$, both substrings of S represented using their endpoints such that $|T| \leq 2|P|$, returns $\text{Occ}_T(P)$ represented as at most 2 arithmetic progressions with difference $\text{per}(P)$.

The update time of the data structure is $\tilde{O}(1)$

It is well known that the following can be obtained from Lemma 3 by applying a 'standard trick':

► **Lemma 4.** *There is a data structure for maintaining a dynamic string S that undergoes edit operations and supports the following query:*

Given a pattern $P = S[i_P..j_P]$ and a text $T = S[i_T..j_T]$, both substrings of S represented using their endpoints, returns $\text{Occ}_T(P)$ represented as $O(\frac{|T|}{|P|})$ arithmetic progressions with difference $\text{per}(P)$. The query time is $\tilde{O}(\frac{|T|}{|P|})$ and the update time of the data structure is $\tilde{O}(1)$.

Proof. We simply maintain the data structure of Lemma 3. Upon a query for T and P , for every integer i we define $T_i = T[i_T + i \cdot |P|.. \min(i_T + 2|P| + i|P|, j_T)]$. It can be easily verified that every occurrence of P in T is contained in T_i for some $i \in [0.. \frac{|T|}{|P|}]$. We query for $\text{IPM}_S(P, T_i)$ for every $i \in [\frac{2|T|}{|P|}]$ and return all arithmetic progression returned from all queries. The number of reported arithmetic progression and the running time are direct implications of Lemma 3 ◀

We also use a data structure for for the Dynamic Substring Pattern Matching queries.

SubPM(i_T, j_T, i_P, j_P)

Input: Two substrings $T = S[i_T..j_T]$ and $P = S[i_P..j_P]$ of a string S given as their starting and ending indices.

Output: TRUE if there is an occurrence of P in T , and FALSE otherwise.

In Appendix B, we prove the following lemma.

► **Lemma 5.** *There is a data structure that maintains a dynamic string that undergoes edit operation and can answer a query $\text{SubPM}(i_T, j_T, i_P, j_P)$ in $\tilde{O}(1)$ time. The update time of the data structure is $\tilde{O}(1)$.*

We further exploit Lemma 5 to obtain the following data structure.

► **Lemma 6.** *There is a data structure that maintains a dynamic string that undergoes edit operation and given four indices i_T, j_T, i_P, j_P , can answer the following queries:*

1. Find $\min(\text{Occ}_{S[i_T..j_T]}(S[i_P..j_P]))$.
2. Find $\max(\text{Occ}_{S[i_T..j_T]}(S[i_P..j_P]))$.

The queries cost $\tilde{O}(1)$ time per query. The update time of the data structure is $\tilde{O}(1)$.

Proof. We describe an algorithm for finding the first occurrence of $P = [i_P..j_P]$ in $T = [i_T..j_T]$, an algorithm for finding the last occurrence can be constructed in a similar way. We use the data structure of Lemma 5. First we check whether P occurs in T . If not, return null. Otherwise, binary search for the minimal index $k \leq j_T$ such that $T[i_T..k]$ contains an occurrence of P and return $k - |P| + 1$. ◀

3 LPF and LPF-Trees

In this section, we repeat the notations and describe the data structure introduced in [5] that are useful in our fully dynamic algorithm.

Let $S[1..n]$ be a string and let $i \in [n]$. The *Longest Previous Factor* of i in S (denoted as $\text{LPF}_S(i)$) is the length of the maximal longest prefix of $S[i..n]$ that occurs strictly before i . Formally,

$$\text{LPF}_S(i) = \max_{j < i}(\text{LCP}_S(i, j)).$$

Similarly, let $\text{LPF}'_S(i) = \max(\text{LPF}_S(i), 1)$. The following observation connects the concepts of LPF and LZ77.

Additionally, let $\text{LPFpos}_S(i)$ be the rightmost position that is a witness for $\text{LPF}_S(i)$.

Formally,

$$\text{LPFpos}_S(i) = \max\{j < i \mid \text{LCP}_S(i, j) = \text{LPF}(i)\}.$$

We omit the subscript S when it is clear from context.

In [5], the authors prove the following.

► **Lemma 7** (Proof of Lemma 19, [5]). *For every text S and $i \in [|S| - 1]$, it holds that $i + \text{LPF}'_S(i) \leq i + 1 + \text{LPF}'_S(i + 1)$*

We prove the next useful lemma regarding LPF and LPFpos.

► **Lemma 8.** *There is a data structure that maintains a dynamic string that undergoes edit operations and that given an index i , returns $\text{LPF}'(i)$ in $\tilde{O}(1)$ time. The update time of the data structure is $\tilde{O}(1)$.*

Proof. We use the data structure of Lemma 6. We demonstrate the method for calculating $\text{LPF}_S(i)$, noting that the query $\text{LPF}'_S(i)$ simply provides $\max(\text{LPF}_S(i), 1)$. Observe that $\text{LPF}_S(i) = \max\{\ell \mid \text{Occ}_{S[1..i+\ell-1]}(S[i..i+\ell]) \neq \emptyset\}$. In particular, for every $x \in [1..n]$ we have that $\text{Occ}_{S[1..i+x-1]}(S[i..i+x]) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $x \leq \text{LPF}_S(i)$. the algorithm determines the correct value of $\text{LPF}_S(i)$ by performing a binary search on the range $[0..n - 1]$ (this search is valid due to Lemma 7), checking if the current value x is larger or smaller than $\text{LPF}_S(i)$ by querying the data structure of Lemma 5. Each step in the binary search is executed in $\tilde{O}(1)$ time, so the overall time complexity of computing $\text{LPF}_S(i)$ is $\tilde{O}(1)$. ◀

The LPF-tree data structure. We adapt the framework of [5] to the fully dynamic settings. Namely, they define LPF-tree and show how to maintain it in the semi-dynamic settings. We will show how to maintain the same structure in the fully dynamic settings. The LPF-tree of a string S with length n , denoted as \mathcal{T}_S is a tree $\mathcal{T}_S = (V, E)$ with nodes $V = [n+1]$ representing the indices of S and an additional node $n+1$, and $E = \{(i, j) \mid i \in [n], j = i + \text{LPF}'_S(i)\}$.² This defines a tree with the node $n+1$ as the root. For a node $i \in \mathcal{T}_S$, we denote $\text{depth}_S(i) = \text{depth}(i, \mathcal{T}_S)$.

[5] observed the following connection between \mathcal{T}_S and $\text{LZ77}(S)$.

► **Observation 9.** *[[5], Observation 18, rephrased] Let π be the 1-to- $|S|$ path in \mathcal{T}_S . Then, $\text{depth}_S(1) = |\text{LZ77}(S)|$. Additionally, for $k \leq |\pi|$, if the k th edge on π is $(i, i + \text{LPF}'_S(i))$, then the k th phrase of $\text{LZ77}(S)$ is equal to $S[i..i + \text{LPF}'_S(i)]$.*

3.1 Updating an LPF-tree

In this section, we introduce the data structure representing the LPF-tree. The data structure maintains a rooted tree $U = (V, E)$ that represents \mathcal{T}_S . Specifically, when an update modifies S to be S' the algorithm modifies $U = \mathcal{T}_S$ to obtain $U = \mathcal{T}_{S'}$.

Supported Updates Our algorithm manipulates and queries U via the following interface.

1. **Insert(v)** - add an isolated vertex v (may temporarily make U a forest).
2. **Delete(v)** - Removes a leaf v and edge adjacent to v from U .
3. **Link(v, u)** adds root v as a child of node u .
4. **MoveInterval($v, [i..j]$)** - Gets an interval of vertices $[i..j]$ such that there is a vertex $u \in V$ with all the vertices in $[i..j]$ being children of u . Moves all the vertices in $[i..j]$ to be children of v instead. We define $\text{MoveInterval}(v, i) = \text{MoveInterval}(v, [i..i])$.
5. **GetDepth(v)** - returns $\text{depth}(v, U)$.
6. **LevelAncestor(v, i)** - returns the i 'th ancestor of v .

Each of these operations can be executed in $O(\log n)$ time. [5] show how to support this functionality using link-cut trees, achieving amortized $\tilde{O}(1)$ time per operation. By employing top trees [2] instead of link-cut trees, this functionality can be obtained with worst-case $\tilde{O}(1)$ update time. We further explain how this is done in Appendix A.

4 Chains

In this section, we present a problem that is closely related to the runtime analysis of our algorithm. Let S be a string and let I be a set of indices in S . For $i \in I$ define the sequence $\text{chain}_I(i, S)$ as follows. Let $I_i = I \cap [1..i-1]$ be all the indices in I that are smaller than i . Sort I_i in a non-increasing order of $\text{LCP}(i, \cdot)$. Break ties in a non-decreasing order of $\text{LCS}(i, \cdot)$. If there are still ties, break ties arbitrarily. The first element in $\text{chain}_I(i, S)$ is $\text{chain}_I(i, S)[1] = I_i[1]$. The k th element of $\text{chain}_I(i, S)$ is the first element $i' \in I_i$ such that $\text{LCS}(i, i') > \text{LCS}(i, \text{chain}_I(i, S)[k-1])$. If there is no such i' , $\text{chain}_I(i, S)[k-1]$ is the last element of $\text{chain}_I(i, S)$. Notice that the k th element in $\text{chain}_I(i, S)$ **must** have a better LCS than all the previous $k-1$ elements in $\text{chain}_I(i, S)$.

Obviously, the sum $\Sigma_I = \sum_{i \in I} |\text{chain}_I(i, S)|$ is bounded by $O(|I|^2)$. In the next lemma we prove a tighter upper bound on Σ_I .

² In [5], a label is also defined for every edge in the tree. Our algorithm does not use these labels, hence we omit them.

► **Lemma 10.** $\Sigma_I = O(|I| \log^2 n)$

Proof. Let T_R be a Trie over the strings $S_R = \{S[i, n] \mid i \in I\}$. Let T_L be a Trie over the strings $S_L = \{S[1, i]^R \mid i \in I\}$. In T_R (resp. in T_L) the leaf corresponding to $S[i, n]$ (resp. to $S[1, i]^R$) is labeled as ' i_R ' (resp. i_L). The size of each string in T_R or in T_L is at most n , so the total size of T_L and T_R is $O(n^2)$ and in particular $O(\log |T_L|) = O(\log |T_R|) = O(\log n)$. For $d \in \{L, R\}$, we denote the lowest common ancestor of nodes i_d, j_d in a tree T_d as u_{i_d, j_d} .

For $d \in \{L, R\}$, let $\text{LCA}_i^d = \{u_{i_d, j_d} \mid j \in \text{chain}_I(i, S)\}$. Recall that $\text{depth}(u_{i_R, j_R}, T_R) = \text{LCP}(i, j)$ and $\text{depth}(u_{i_L, j_L}, T_L) = \text{LCS}(i, j)$. Also recall that $\{\text{LCP}(i, \text{chain}_I(i, S)[k]) \mid k \in [|\text{chain}_I(i, S)|]\}$ is decreasing, and therefore there are no two indices $j, j' \in \text{chain}_I(i, S)$ such that $u_{i_R, j_R} = u_{i_R, j'_R}$.

We make use of the following well-known fact.

► **Fact 11 (Heavy Path Decomposition).** *A rooted tree with n nodes can be decomposed into simple paths (called heavy paths) such that every root-to leaf path intersects $O(\log n)$ heavy paths.*

We assume that T_L and T_R are partitioned into Heavy Paths. For every $i \in I$ we denote as p_L^i and p_R^i the leaf to node path from i_L to the root of T_L and from i_R to the root of T_R , respectively. Denote as H_L^i and H_R^i the heavy paths that intersect with p_L^i and with p_R^i respectively. Then, $|H_L^i| + |H_R^i| \in O(\log n)$.

We make the following charging argument. Let $j \in \text{chain}_I(i, S)$. Let $h_{i,j}^R$ and $h_{i,j}^L$ be the heavy paths containing u_{i_R, j_R} and u_{i_L, j_L} , respectively. We say that j is a type 1 element of $\text{chain}_I(i, S)$ if u_{i_R, j_R} has the maximal depth among the vertices of $\text{LCA}_i^R \cap h_{i,j}^R$ or if u_{i_L, j_L} has the maximal depth in $\text{LCA}_i^L \cap h_{i,j}^L$. Otherwise, j is type 2 element of $\text{chain}_I(i, S)$. We charge every type 1 element of $\text{chain}_I(i, S)$ on i , and every type 2 element j of $\text{chain}_I(i, S)$ on j .

Since both p_L^i and p_R^i visit $O(\log n)$ heavy paths, and since the depths of elements in LCA_i^L and in LCA_i^R are distinct, every $i \in I$ is charged on $O(\log n)$ elements of type 1.

We next prove that every $i \in I$ is charged on $O(\log^2 n)$ elements of type 2.

Let $\text{Charge}_2(i)$ be the set of indices j such that i is a type 2 element in $\text{chain}_I(j, S)$. We claim that there are no two elements $j, k \in \text{Charge}_2(i)$ such that $(h_{i,j}^L, h_{i,j}^R) = (h_{i,k}^L, h_{i,k}^R)$. Notice that since for every $j \in I$ it holds that $(h_{i,j}^L, h_{i,j}^R) \in H_L^i \times H_R^i$, the above claim directly implies $|\text{Charge}_2(k)| = O(\log^2 n)$. This would conclude the proof, as it shows that every index in $|I|$ is charged at most $O(\log^2 n + \log n)$ times, leading to $\Sigma_I \in O(|I| \log^2 n)$.

Assume by contradiction that there are two elements $j < k \in \text{Charge}_2(i)$ such that $(h_{i,j}^L, h_{i,j}^R) = (h_{i,k}^L, h_{i,k}^R)$. For $d \in \{L, R\}$, let v_d be the lowest node in $h_{i,k}^d$ and let z_d be the successor of u_{v_d, i_d} in $h_{i,k}^d$. Notice that z_d exists because i is charged as type 2 for $i \in \text{chain}_I(k, S)$. Moreover, $z_d \in p_d^k \cap p_d^j$ which implies $\text{depth}(u_{j_d, k_d}, T_d) \geq \text{depth}(z_d, T_d)$. In addition, $u_{v_d, i_d} = u_{k_d, i_d} = u_{j_d, i_d}$. See Figure 1.


Therefore,

$$\text{LCP}(j, k) = \text{depth}(u_{j_R, k_R}, T_R) \geq \text{depth}(z_R, T_R) > \text{depth}(u_{v_R, i_R}, T_R) = \text{LCP}(i, k)$$

and

$$\text{LCS}(j, k) = \text{depth}(u_{j_L, k_L}, T_L) \geq \text{depth}(z_L, T_L) > \text{depth}(u_{v_L, i_L}, T_L) = \text{LCS}(i, k)$$

We have shown that $\text{LCP}(j, k) > \text{LCP}(i, k)$ and $\text{LCS}(j, k) > \text{LCS}(i, k)$. Therefore, i would never be picked as the first/next element of $\text{chain}_I(k, S)$ in the presence of j . Hence, $i \notin \text{chain}_I(k, S)$, a contradiction.




■ **Figure 1** A schematic figure of \mathcal{T}_d

To summarize, each node $i \in I$ is charged at most $O(\log n)$ on elements of type 1 and at most $O(\log^2 n)$ on elements of type 2. We clearly execute exactly Σ_I charges, so $\sum_{i \in [x]} |\text{chain}_I(i, S)| = O(|I| \log^2 n)$. ◀

5 Algorithm

In this section we introduce the data structure of Theorem 1. We describe the update algorithm in the following way. We assume that we currently have $U = \mathcal{T}_S$ for the dynamic string S , and that an edit operation is applied to S at index z , resulting in S' . This section is dedicated to showing how to modify U to be $\mathcal{T}_{S'}$. We fix the notation of S, S' , and z . Also, we refer to the update as (S, S') .

Let M be an integer to be fixed later. Let M_L be the substring of length M to the left of z , i.e. $M_L = S[z - M..z - 1]$, and let M_R be the substring of length M to the right of z , i.e. $M_R = S[z + 1..z + M]$.³



► **Definition 12** (Heavy Index). Let P be a string. We say that i is a P -heavy index for the update (S, S') if $\text{LPF}'_S(i) \neq \text{LPF}'_{S'}(i)$ and there is an occurrence of P in index k such that $k \in [i..i + \min(\text{LPF}'_{S'}(i), \text{LPF}'_S(i)) - |P|]$

In the following lemma, we classify the indices of S' into 4 types.

► **Lemma 13** (Indices types). Every index $i \in [|S'|]$ satisfies at least one of the following.


1. **Inactive index:** $\text{LPF}'_S(i) = \text{LPF}'_{S'}(i)$.
2. **Super Light index:** $i \in [z - M - 1..z]$
3. **Light index:** For some $T \in \{S, S'\}$, there are integers $a, b \in [0..M]$ such that $i = \min(\text{Occ}_{T[z+1..n]}(T[z - a..z + b]))$.

³ If $z \leq M$ or $z \geq n - M + 1$, M_L and M_R are truncated at the edges of S , we ignore that in future discussion to avoid clutter.

4. **Heavy index:** i is M_L -heavy or M_R -heavy for the update.

Proof. Let i be an index that is not an Inactive index.

We consider the following cases regarding where the edit happens (see Figure 2):



■ **Figure 2** Examples of the three cases in the proof of Lemma 13. In Figure 2b, there are three subcases. The index z_1 corresponds to case 2.1, The index z_2 corresponds to case 2.2, and the index z_3 corresponds to case 2.3.

Case 1: $z \in [i..i + \text{LPF}'_{\hat{S}}(i)]$ for some $\hat{S} \in \{S, S'\}$. If $z - i \leq M$, we have that i is a Super Light index. Otherwise, let $d = z - i - 1 < \text{LPF}'_{\hat{S}}(i)$. Since the update does not affect indices smaller than z , we have $S[i..i + d] = S'[i..i + d]$. From the definition of $\text{LPFpos}_{\hat{S}}(i)$ and from $d < \text{LPF}'_{\hat{S}}(i)$ we have $\hat{S}[i..i + d] = \hat{S}[\text{LPFpos}_{\hat{S}}(i).. \text{LPFpos}_{\hat{S}}(i) + d]$. Since $\text{LPFpos}_S(i) < i$, we have that $\text{LPFpos}_{\hat{S}}(i) + d < z - 1$. Again, since the update does not affect indices smaller than z , we have $S[\text{LPFpos}_S(i).. \text{LPFpos}_S(i) + d] = S'[\text{LPFpos}_S(i).. \text{LPFpos}_S(i) + d]$. This implies that $\min(\text{LPF}'_S(i), \text{LPF}'_{S'}(i)) \geq d + 1$. It follows that i is an M_L heavy index since $[i..z - M] = [i..i + d + 1 - M] \subseteq [i..i + \min(\text{LPF}_S(i), \text{LPF}_{S'}(i)) - M]$ and M_L occurs at $z - M$.

Case 2: $z \in [\text{LPFpos}_{\hat{S}}(i).. \text{LPFpos}_{\hat{S}}(i) + \text{LPF}'_{\hat{S}}(i)]$ - for some $\hat{S} \in \{S, S'\}$. First notice that $\hat{S} = S$ iff $\text{LPF}'_S(i) > \text{LPF}'_{S'}(i)$.

Let $L_z = \hat{S}[\text{LPFpos}_{\hat{S}}(i)..z]$ and $R_z = \hat{S}[z.. \text{LPFpos}_{\hat{S}}(i) + \text{LPF}'_{\hat{S}}(i)]$ there are three sub-cases:

1. $z - M \leq \text{LPFpos}_{\hat{S}}(i)$. Since L_z occurs before i both in S and in S' , we have that $\min(\text{LPF}'_S(i), \text{LPF}'_{S'}(i)) \geq |L_z|$. It follows that $\text{LPFpos}_{S'}(i) + \min(\text{LPF}'_S(i), \text{LPF}'_{S'}(i)) \geq z$. From $S[i..i + \text{LPF}'_S(i)] = S[\text{LPFpos}_S(i).. \text{LPFpos}_S(i) + \text{LPF}'_S(i)]$ we have, in particular, $S[i + |L_z| - M + 1..i + |L_z|] = S[\text{LPFpos}_S(i) + |L_z| - M + 1.. \text{LPFpos}_S(i) + |L_z|] = S[z - M..z] = M_L$. We have shown that there is an occurrence of M_L in $i + |L_z| - M$ and that $\min(\text{LPF}'_S(i), \text{LPF}'_{S'}(i)) \geq |L_z|$, which together indicates that i is an M_L heavy index.
2. $z - M > \text{LPFpos}_{\hat{S}}(i)$ and also $z + M \geq \text{LPFpos}_{\hat{S}}(i) + \text{LPF}'_{\hat{S}}(i)$. In this case, we have $i > \text{LPFpos}_{\hat{S}}(i) \geq z - M$. If $i \in [z - M, z]$ then i is super light. Otherwise, $i \geq z + 1$. Notice that in this case, $\hat{S}[\text{LPFpos}_{\hat{S}}(i).. \text{LPFpos}_{\hat{S}}(i) + \text{LPF}'_{\hat{S}}(i) - 1] = \hat{S}[z - a..z + b]$ for some $a, b \in [M]$. Recall that among all occurrences of $\hat{S}[i..i + \text{LPF}'_{\hat{S}}(i) - 1]$ to the left of i , the occurrence at $\text{LPFpos}_{\hat{S}}(i)$ is the rightmost one. Therefore, i is a Light index as the first occurrence of $\hat{S}[z - a..z + b]$ after z .

3. $z - M > \text{LPFpos}_{\hat{S}}(i)$ and $z + M < \text{LPFpos}_{\hat{S}}(i) + \text{LPF}'_{\hat{S}}(i)$. Note that in this case $\text{LPFpos}_{\hat{S}}(i) = z - a$ for some $a \in [M]$. As in the previous case, $i > z - a \geq z - M$ and therefore if $i \leq z$ then i is a Super Light index. We assume $i \geq z + 1$. Let $j = \min(\text{Occ}_{\hat{S}[z+1..n]}(\hat{S}[z - a..z + M]))$. Notice that $j \leq i$.

If $j = i$, then i is a Light index. Otherwise, we claim that i is M_R -heavy. Notice that there is an occurrence of $M_R = \hat{S}[z..z + M]$ in index $i + a$. Additionally, due to the indices after $z + 1$ not being affected by the update we have $\min(\text{LCP}_S(i, j), \text{LCP}_{S'}(i, j)) \geq a + M$. It follows from the maximality of LPF' that $\min(\text{LPF}'_S(i), \text{LPF}'_{S'}(i)) \geq a + M$ and therefore the occurrence of M_R at $i + a$ satisfies $i + a \in [i..i + \min(\text{LPF}'_S(i), \text{LPF}'_{S'}(i)) - |M_R|]$, as required.

Case 3: Otherwise - we claim that i is an Inactive index. Assume by contradiction that i is not an Inactive index. Let $j = \text{LPFpos}_S(i)$ and let $j' = \text{LPFpos}_{S'}(i)$, and assume w.l.o.g. that $\text{LPF}_S(i) < \text{LPF}_{S'}(i)$. Since $z \notin [\text{LPFpos}_{S'}(i).. \text{LPFpos}_{S'}(i) + \text{LPF}_{S'}(i) - 1]$, and $z \notin [i..i + \text{LPF}'_{S'}(i)]$, we have that $S[i..i + \text{LPF}'_{S'}(i) - 1] = S'[i..i + \text{LPF}'_{S'}(i) - 1] = S'[j'..j' + \text{LPF}'_{S'}(i) - 1] = S'[j'..j' + \text{LPF}'_{S'}(i) - 1]$. In particular, $\text{LCP}_S(j', i) \geq \text{LCP}_{S'}(j', i) > \text{LCP}_S(j, i)$, contradicting the maximality of $\text{LPF}_S(i)$. ◀

In the rest of the section we describe how to modify U , which is initially \mathcal{T}_S , to obtain $\mathcal{T}_{S'}$. We present three separate algorithms, one for updating each type of indices. By 'updating' a type of indices, we mean that after the algorithm for this type is applied, every index i of the this type has its parent in U properly set to $i + \text{LPF}'_{S'}(i)$. Notice that inactive indices do not need to be treated. The algorithms for the Light and for the Super Light indices are straightforwardly implemented following the definition of the types. The M_L -Heavy and M_R -Heavy indices require a more intricate care.

Super Light Indices. To update all Super Light Indices, the algorithm applies the following procedure. For every $i \in [z - M - 1..z]$, calculate $\text{LPF}'_{S'}(i)$ on S' (this is the only place where the algorithm handles only S'). and applies the update to $\text{MoveInterval}(i + \text{LPF}'_{S'}(i), i)$ to U .

It is easy to see that all Super Light indices have their parents properly set after these procedure is applied. The following directly follows.

► **Observation 14.** *There is an algorithm that sets the parent of every Super Light index i of the update to $i + \text{LPF}'_{S'}(i)$ in $\tilde{O}(M)$ time.*

Light Indices. The algorithm updates Light indices as follows. For every $a, b \in [0..M]$, the algorithm finds $k = \min(\text{Occ}_{S[z+1..n]}(S[z - a..z + b]))$. The algorithm calls $\text{MoveInterval}(k + \text{LPF}'_{S'}(k), k)$. For $k' = \min(\text{Occ}_{S'[z+1..n]}(S'[z - a..z + b]))$, the algorithm calls $\text{MoveInterval}(k' + \text{LPF}'_{S'}(k'), k')$.

Clearly, every Light index has its parent in U properly set after running the above procedure.

The following directly follows.

► **Observation 15.** *There is an algorithm that sets the parent of every Light index i of the update $i + \text{LPF}'_{S'}(i)$ in $\tilde{O}(M^2)$ time.*

5.1 The Heavy Algorithm

The section is devoted to proving the following.

► **Lemma 16.** *There is an algorithm that sets the parent of every M_L -Heavy and M_R -Heavy index i of the update to $i + \text{LPF}'_{S'}(i)$ in $\tilde{O}(M)$ time.*

For clarity, we present a proof of Lemma 16 under the simplifying assumption that both M_L and M_R are aperiodic. The general proof is deferred to Appendix C.

We start by presenting some tools.

The algorithm computes ranges in S' and S that are needed to be moved based on the occurrences of M_L and M_R . We represent sequence of ranges by a sequence of starting indices followed by the last index of the last range i.e. $[s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k]$.

SeqGenQuery. Given a string S and two indices i, j we define the set $L_S(i, j) = \{l_{i,0}, l_{i,1}, \dots\}$ as follows. Let l_{\min} be the minimal index in $[1, i]$ such that $l_{\min} + \text{LPF}'(l_{\min}) \geq j$. We define an element $l_{i,k} \in L_S(i, j)$ recursively.

$$l_{i,k} = \begin{cases} i & \text{if } k = 0, \\ \min(i' \in [l_{\min}..i] \mid i' + \text{LPF}'_S(i') = i + \text{LPF}'_S(i)) & \text{if } k = 1, \\ \min(i' \in [l_{\min}..i] \mid i' + \text{LPF}'_S(i') = l_{i,k-1} - 1 + \text{LPF}'_S(l_{i,k-1} - 1)) & \text{if } k > 1. \end{cases}$$

$|L_S(i, j)|$ is the first k such that $l_{i,k}$ is undefined. We sometimes omit the subscript i when it is clear from the context.

SeqGenQuery(S, i, j)

Input: a string S , and two indices $i \leq j \in [|S|]$.

Output: The set $L_S(i, j)$

► **Lemma 17.** *There is an algorithm that given i, j , and access to the data structure of Lemma 8, computes $L_S(i, j)$ in $\tilde{O}(|L_S(i, j)| + 1)$.*

Proof. Recall that due to Lemma 7, the values $j + \text{LPF}_S(j)$ are monotonically increasing. This property allows us to find, given a value x and a range $[a, b]$, the minimal index $z \in [a, b]$ with $z + \text{LPF}_S(z) = x$ (or with $z + \text{LPF}_S(z) \geq x$). Since $\text{LPF}_S(z)$ can be found in $\tilde{O}(1)$ time for an input vertex z , this binary search is executed in $\tilde{O}(1)$ time.

The lemma follows by applying this procedure $O(1 + |L_S(i, j)|)$ times as follows. First, find $\text{LPF}_S(i)$. Then, find l_{\min} which is the minimal index in $[1, i]$ with $l_{\min} + \text{LPF}_S(l_{\min}) \geq j$. Then, find $l_{i,1}$ as the minimal element in $[l_{\min}..i]$ with $l_{i,1} + \text{LPF}'_S(l_{i,1}) = i + \text{LPF}'_S(i)$. If no such element exists - report that $L_S(i, j)$ is empty. As long as l_k exists, l_{k+1} can be found straightforwardly according to the definition of $L_S(i, j)$ by applying the binary search procedure. ◀

Notice that the last element of $L_S(i, j)$ is l_{\min} , and that $L_S(i, j)$ has a decreasing order.

One can think of $L_S(i, j)$ as a sequence of ranges. However, we denote $|L_S(i, j)|$ as the number of indices in $L_S(i, j)$, not the number of ranges. By Lemma 7, there is an index u such that for all $i \in [l_k..l_{k-1} - 1]$, $u = i + \text{LPF}'(i)$. We sometimes say that $[l_k..l_{k-1} - 1] \in L_S(i, j)$.

We say that a range $[s..t]$ is S -clean if there is an index u such that for all $i, j \in [s..t]$, it holds that $i + \text{LPF}'_S(i) = j + \text{LPF}'_S(j)$. A sequence of ranges $R = [s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k]$ is S -clean if every $r \in R$ is S -clean. It holds that $L_S(i, j)$ is S -clean.

We observe the following connection between $\text{chain}_I(i, S)$ and $L_S(i, j)$.

► **Lemma 18.** *Let S be a string and let i, j be two indices. Then,*

$$|L_S(i, j)| \leq |\text{chain}_{\text{OCC}_S(S[i..j])}(i, S)| + 1.$$

Proof. We denote $A = \text{Occ}_S(S[i..j])$. Denote $\text{chain}_A(i, S) = i_1, i_2, i_3, \dots, i_{|\text{chain}_I(i, S)|}$ and $L_S(i, j) = i, l_1, l_2, \dots, l_k$. For every $x \in [k]$, we have $l_x + \text{LPF}'_S(l_x) \geq j$ since $l_x \in [1, l_{\min}]$. We denote $j_x = \text{LPFpos}_S(l_x)$. Due to the definition of LPF, we have $S[l_x, l_x + \text{LPF}'_S(l_x)] = S[j_x, j_x + \text{LPF}'_S(l_x)]$ which in particular gives rise to the equality $S[i, j] = S[j_x + (i - l_x)..j_x + (j - l_x)]$. We have shown that $o_x = j_x + (i - l_x) \in A$ (o_x is an occurrence of $S[i, j]$).

We will show that for every $x \in [k]$ it holds that $\text{LCP}_S(i, o_x) = \text{LCP}_S(i, i_x)$. Since the sequence $\{\text{LCP}(i, i_x)\}_{x=1}^{|\text{chain}_I(i, S)|}$ is strictly decreasing, this introduces an Injection from $[k]$ to $|\text{chain}_I(i, S)|$, hence proving the statement of the lemma.

▷ **Claim 19.** For every $x \in [k]$, it holds that $\text{LCS}_s(i, o_x) = i - l_x + 1$

Proof. Recall that $S[j_x, o_x] = S[l_x, i]$. This already implies that $\text{LCS}_S(i, o_x) \geq i - l_x + 1$. Assume to the contrary that $\text{LCS}_S(i, o_x) > i - l_x + 1$, we therefore have that $S[l_x - 1] = S[j_x - 1]$ which implies $\text{LCP}(l_x - 1, j_x - 1) = \text{LCP}(l_x, j_x) + 1$. This in turn implies $\text{LPF}(l_x - 1) \geq \text{LPF}(l_x) + 1$ which due to Lemma 7 yields $\text{LPF}'_S(l_x - 1) = \text{LPF}'_S(l_x) + 1$. Due to the definition of $L_S(i, j)$, we have $l_x - 1 + \text{LPF}'_S(l_x - 1) = l_{x-1} - 1 + \text{LPF}'_S(l_{x-1} - 1)$. This is a contradiction to the minimality of l_x . ◁

We prove the claim by induction.

Induction Base. Notice that if $\text{LPF}_S(i) < j - i + 1$, l_1 is undefined and the lemma holds trivially. We can therefore assume $\text{LPF}_S(i) \geq j - i + 1$. We claim $\text{LCP}_S(i, i_1) = \text{LPF}_S(i)$. Clearly, for every $i' \in A \cap [1..i - 1]$ it hold that $\text{LCP}_S(i, i_1) \geq \text{LCP}_S(i, i')$. For every $i' \notin A$, we have $\text{LCP}(i, i') < |S[i..j]| = j - i + 1 \leq \text{LPF}_S(i)$.

We need to prove that $\text{LCP}_S(i, o_1) = \text{LPF}_S(i)$. Recall that l_1 is the leftmost index in $[1, l_{\min}]$ with $l_1 + \text{LPF}_S(l_1) = i + \text{LPF}_S(i)$. Assume to the contrary that there is an index $o' < i$ with $\text{LCP}_S(i, o') > \text{LCP}_S(i, o_1)$. Recall that $S[l_1..i] = S[j_1..o_1]$. This leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LCP}_S(i, o') > \text{LCP}_S(i, o_1) &= \text{LCP}_S(l_1, j_1) - (i - l_1) = \text{LPF}_S(l_1) - i + l_1 \\ &= \text{LPF}_S(i) + i - l_1 - i + l_1 = \text{LPF}_S(i). \end{aligned}$$

A contradiction to the maximality of $\text{LPF}_S(i)$.

Induction Step. Assume that for $x \in [k - 1]$ we have $\text{LCP}(i, i_x) = \text{LCP}(i, o_x)$. Let $A_x = \{o \in A \cap [1..i - 1] \mid \text{LCS}(i, o) > \text{LCS}(i, i_x)\}$. By definition of $\text{chain}_A(i, S)$, we have that $\text{LCP}(i, i_{x+1}) = \max_{o \in A_x}(\text{LCP}(i, o))$. We therefore need to prove that $\text{LCP}(i, o_{x+1}) = \max_{o \in A_x}(\text{LCP}(i, o))$. We start by proving that $o_{x+1} \in A_x$. Assume to the contrary that $\text{LCS}_S(i, o_{x+1}) \leq \text{LCS}_S(i, i_x)$. It follows from Claim 19 that $\text{LCS}(i, i_x) \geq i - l_{x+1} + 1$. It follows from the induction hypothesis that $\text{LCP}_S(i, i_x) = \text{LCP}_S(i, o_x)$. Recall that $\text{LCP}(i, o_x) = i - l_x + \text{LPF}_S(l_x)$ putting the two equalities implied by $\text{LCP}(i, i_x)$ and by $\text{LCS}(i, i_x)$ together, we obtain $S[l_{x+1}..i + \text{LPF}_S(l_x)] = S[i_x - i + l_{x+1} + l_x..i_x + \text{LPF}_S(l_x)]$. It follows that $l_{x+1} + \text{LPF}_S(l_{x+1}) \geq l_x + \text{LPF}_S(l_x)$, which according to Lemma 7 implies $l_{x+1} + \text{LPF}_S(l_{x+1}) = l_x + \text{LPF}_S(l_x)$. From the definition of $L_S(i, j)$ we have that l_x is the minimal index with $l_x + \text{LPF}_S(l_x) = l_{x-1} - 1 + \text{LPF}_S(l_{x-1} - 1)$. This contradicts $l_{x+1} + \text{LPF}_S(l_{x+1}) = l_x + \text{LPF}_S(l_x)$, as $l_{x+1} < l_x$.

We have shown that $o_{x+1} \in A_x$. It remains to show that $\text{LCP}(i, o_{x+1}) = \max_{o \in A_x}(\text{LCP}(i, o))$. Recall that among indices $\hat{o} \in A \cap [1..i - 1]$ with $\text{LCP}(i, \hat{o}) = \text{LCP}(i, i_x)$, the index i_x maximizes $\text{LCS}(i, i_x)$ (i.e. LCS is a tiebreaker in the generation of $\text{chain}_A(i, S)$). Therefore the induction hypothesis implies $\text{LCS}(i, i_x) \geq \text{LCS}(i, o_x)$. Assume to the contrary that there is $o' \in A_x$ with $\text{LCP}_S(i, o') > \text{LCP}_S(i, o_{x+1})$. It holds that $\text{LCS}(i, o') > \text{LCS}(i, i_x) \geq \text{LCS}(i, o_x) = i - l_x + 1$.

Recall that $\text{LCP}(i, i_x) = \text{LCP}(i, o_x) = i - l_x + \text{LPF}_S(l_x)$. Therefore, $S[l_x - 1..i + \text{LPF}(l_x)] = S[i_x + l_x - i - 1..i_x + \text{LPF}(l_x)]$. This indicates that $(l_x - 1) + \text{LPF}_S(l_x - 1) \geq l_x + \text{LPF}_S(l_x)$ which due to Lemma 7 yields $(l_x - 1) + \text{LPF}_S(l_x - 1) = l_x + \text{LPF}_S(l_x)$. Again, we have reached a contradiction to the minimality of l_x as an index with $l_x + \text{LPF}(l_x) = \mathcal{X}_x$ for some number \mathcal{X}_x . \blacktriangleleft

Update Trees. We present a procedure for updating U . Given two sequences of ranges (represented by indices), $(L_S, L_{S'})$ such that L_S is S -clean and $L_{S'}$ is S' -clean, $\text{UpdateTreeByRange}(L_S, L_{S'})$ updates the U as follows.

First, merge $(L_S, L_{S'})$ into one non-increasing ordered sequence \hat{L} .

Second, remove from \hat{L} ranges that appear only in one of L_S and $L_{S'}$ to obtain L . Namely, let $s = \max(\min(L_S), \min(L_{S'}))$ and $t = \min(\max(L_S), \max(L_{S'}))$. Then, $L = \hat{L} \cap [s..t]$.

Finally, for every range $[a..b]$ represented by L , update the LPF-tree of S' by calling $\text{MoveInterval}(a + \text{LPF}'_{S'}(a), [a, b])$.

► **Lemma 20.** L is both S -clean and S' -clean.

Proof. Given a range $R = [a..b]$ in L , we prove that R is S -clean (having that R is S' -clean is symmetric). Since $a \geq \min(L_S)$ and $b \leq \max(L_S)$, it holds that $[a..b] \subseteq [\min(L_S).. \max(L_S)]$. Moreover, by the merge operation, there is an S -clean range $R' \in L_S$ such that $R \subseteq R'$. Therefore, R is S -clean. \blacktriangleleft

Notice that after applying $\text{UpdateTreeByRange}(L_S, L_{S'})$, every index in $[s..t]$ has its parent in U properly set to $i + \text{LPF}'(i)$. Specifically, the index i is on some range $[a, b] \in L$, and the parent of i was set to be $a + \text{LPF}'_{S'}(a)$ which is equal to $\text{LPF}'_{S'}(i)$ due to $[a, b]$ being S' -clean.

Given the data structure of Lemma 8, the procedure UpdateTreeByRange costs $\tilde{O}(|L_S| + |L_{S'}|) = \tilde{O}(|L|)$ time.

5.1.1 Non-Periodic Case

In this section, we provide an algorithm that has a sufficient running time only under the assumption that M_L and M_R are aperiodic. Let $A_1 = \text{Occ}_S(M_L)$, $A_2 = \text{Occ}_{S'}(M_L)$. and $A = A_1 \cap A_2$ (notice that A_1 is similar to A_2 up to indices that are in $[z - M..z]$). Due to our aperiodic settings, Fact 2 suggests that $|A| \in O(\frac{n}{M})$.

For every $i \in A$, the algorithm computes $L_{S,i} = L_S(i, i + M - 1) = \text{SeqGenQuery}(S, i, i + M - 1)$ and $L_{S',i} = L_{S'}(i, i + M - 1) = \text{SeqGenQuery}(S', i, i + M - 1)$. Then the algorithm calls $\text{UpdateTreeByRange}(L_{S,i}, L_{S',i})$ to update U .

Correctness. Since $L_{S,i}$ is S -clean and $L_{S',i}$ is S' -clean, Lemma 20 holds and therefore calling to the procedure $\text{UpdateTreeByRange}(L_{S,i}, L_{S',i})$ is valid and every index set by a call to $\text{UpdateTreeByRange}(L_{S,i}, L_{S',i})$ has its parent in U set to be its correct parent in \mathcal{T}_s . We claim that the algorithm achieves the following.

► **Lemma 21.** Let i be an M_L -Heavy index or an M_R -Heavy index. For some $k \in A$, the call to $\text{UpdateTreeByRange}(L_{S,k}, L_{S',k})$ updates i .

Proof. Assume that i is M_L -heavy. The proof for the case where i is M_R -heavy is symmetric.

Since i is M_L -heavy, there is an occurrence of M_L in an index k such that $k \in [i..i + \min(\text{LPF}'_{S'}(i), \text{LPF}'_S(i)) - |M_L|]$. Let $s = \max(\min(L_{S,i}), \min(L_{S',i}))$. We prove that $i \in [s..k]$. Let $q = \min(L_S(k, k + M - 1))$. Recall that q is the leftmost index with $q + \text{LPF}_S(q) \geq k + M - 1$.

By the definition of M_L -heavy $i + \text{LPF}'_S(i) \geq k + M - 1$ it follows that $i \geq q = \min(L_{S,k})$. Symmetrically, we have that $i \geq \min(L_{S',i})$. By the definition of M_L -Heavy, $i \leq k$.

$\text{UpdateTreeByRange}(L_{S,i}, L_{S',i})$ updates all the indices in $[q..k]$ and we have shown that $i \in [q..k]$, which completes the proof. \blacktriangleleft

Time Complexity. The algorithm uses Lemma 4 to obtain all occurrences of M_L and all occurrences of M_R in $\tilde{O}(\frac{n}{M})$ time. For each $i \in A$, the algorithm computes $L_{S,i}$ and $L_{S',i}$ using Lemma 17 in $\tilde{O}(|L_{S,i}| + |L_{S',i}|)$. Then, the algorithm applies $\text{UpdateTreeByRange}(L_{S,i}, L_{S',i})$ in $\tilde{O}(|L_{S,i}| + |L_{S',i}|)$ time. By Lemmas 10 and 18, $\sum_{i \in A} |L_{S,i}| \leq \sum_{i \in A} \text{chain}_A(i, S) + |A| \in \tilde{O}(|A|)$. Due to the same reasoning, $\sum_{i \in A} |L_{S',i}| \in \tilde{O}(|A|)$ as well. Therefore, the algorithm has a running time of $\tilde{O}(\frac{n}{M})$.

5.2 Proof of Theorem 1.

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.

proof of Theorem 1. Given a string S , the algorithm builds the dynamic data structures described in Lemmas 3, 4, 6, and 8 that supports pattern matching, LCP, LCS, and LPF' queries. Since the insertion time for each of these data structures is $\tilde{O}(1)$, they can be constructed in $\tilde{O}(n)$ time by initializing them for the empty string and inserting S symbol by symbol.

In addition, the algorithm builds $U = \mathcal{T}_S$ in $\tilde{O}(n)$ time using $O(n)$ LPF' queries.

When an update is applied to the string S in index z , resulting in a modified string S' , the algorithm applies Observation 14, Observation 15, and Lemma 16 to properly assign the parents of all Super Light, Light, and Heavy indices in S with respect to the update. The remaining indices are Inactive due to Lemma 13, and therefore require no update and the application of Observation 14, Observation 15, and Lemma 16 on $U = \mathcal{T}_S$ results in $U = \mathcal{T}_{S'}$. We refer to this part of the algorithm as 'the transition'.

If the updates inserts an index z , the algorithm adds z to U with $\text{Insert}(z)$ prior to the transition. If the update deletes the index z , the algorithm deletes the index z with $\text{Delete}(z)$ from U after the transition.

By Observation 14, Observation 15, and Lemma 16, the transition is applies in $\tilde{O}(M^2 + \frac{n}{M})$ time. By setting $M = n^{2/3}$ we obtain $\tilde{O}(n^{2/3})$ update time.

To query $\text{SelectPhrase}(i)$, the algorithm calls $a = \text{LevelAncestor}(1, i - 1)$ and $b = \text{LevelAncestor}(1, i) - 1$ in $\tilde{O}(1)$ time. It then reports that the i 'th phrase of $\text{LZ77}(S)$ is $S[a, b]$.

To query $\text{ContainingPhrase}(i)$, the algorithm binary search LZ77 using SelectPhrase to find k such that the k 'th phrase is a range $[a..b]$ satisfies $i \in [a..b]$. Each step in the binary search takes $\tilde{O}(1)$ time, and hence $\text{ContainingPhrase}(i)$ is implemented in $\tilde{O}(1)$ time.

To query $\text{LZLength}(i)$, the algorithm applies a binary search for z such that $S[a, b] = \text{SelectPhrase}(z)$ satisfies $i \in [a, b]$. This is implemented using $O(\log n)$ queries to SelectPhrase for a total of $\tilde{O}(1)$ time. \blacktriangleleft

References

- 1 Jyrki Alakuijala, Andrea Farruggia, Paolo Ferragina, Eugene Kliuchnikov, Robert Obryk, Zoltan Szabadka, and Lode Vandevenne. Brotli: A general-purpose data compressor. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.*, 37(1):4:1–4:30, 2019. doi:10.1145/3231935.

- 2 Stephen Alstrup, Jacob Holm, Kristian de Lichtenberg, and Mikkel Thorup. Maintaining information in fully dynamic trees with top trees. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 1(2):243–264, 2005. doi:10.1145/1103963.1103966.
- 3 Amihood Amir, Itai Boneh, Panagiotis Charalampopoulos, and Eitan Konradovsky. Repetition detection in a dynamic string. In *27th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA 2019)*. Schloss-Dagstuhl-Leibniz Zentrum für Informatik, 2019.
- 4 Amihood Amir, Panagiotis Charalampopoulos, Solon P Pissis, and Jakub Radoszewski. Dynamic and internal longest common substring. *Algorithmica*, 82(12):3707–3743, 2020.
- 5 Hideo Bannai, Panagiotis Charalampopoulos, and Jakub Radoszewski. Maintaining the size of LZ77 on semi-dynamic strings. In Shunsuke Inenaga and Simon J. Puglisi, editors, *35th Annual Symposium on Combinatorial Pattern Matching, CPM 2024, June 25-27, 2024, Fukuoka, Japan*, volume 296 of *LIPICs*, pages 3:1–3:20. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2024. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.CPM.2024.3>, doi:10.4230/LIPICs.CPM.2024.3.
- 6 Karl Bringmann, Nick Fischer, Ivor van der Hoog, Evangelos Kipouridis, Tomasz Kociumaka, and Eva Rotenberg. Dynamic dynamic time warping. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 208–242. SIAM, 2024.
- 7 Panagiotis Charalampopoulos, Paweł Gawrychowski, and Karol Pokorski. Dynamic longest common substring in polylogarithmic time. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.02408*, 2020.
- 8 Panagiotis Charalampopoulos, Tomasz Kociumaka, and Shay Mozes. Dynamic string alignment. In *31st Annual Symposium on Combinatorial Pattern Matching (CPM 2020)*. Schloss-Dagstuhl-Leibniz Zentrum für Informatik, 2020.
- 9 Panagiotis Charalampopoulos, Tomasz Kociumaka, and Philip Wellnitz. Faster approximate pattern matching: A unified approach. In *2020 IEEE 61st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 978–989. IEEE, 2020.
- 10 Jonas Ellert. Sublinear time lempel-ziv (lz77) factorization. In *International Symposium on String Processing and Information Retrieval*, pages 171–187. Springer, 2023.
- 11 N. J. Fine and H. S. Wilf. Uniqueness theorems for periodic functions. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 16:109–114, 1965.
- 12 Paweł Gawrychowski, Adam Karczmarz, Tomasz Kociumaka, Jakub Łacki, and Piotr Sankowski. Optimal dynamic strings. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1509–1528. SIAM, 2018.
- 13 Daniel Gibney, Ce Jin, Tomasz Kociumaka, and Sharma V Thankachan. Near-optimal quantum algorithms for bounded edit distance and lempel-ziv factorization. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 3302–3332. SIAM, 2024.
- 14 Dominik Kempa and Tomasz Kociumaka. Dynamic suffix array with polylogarithmic queries and updates. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 1657–1670, 2022.
- 15 Dominik Kempa and Tomasz Kociumaka. Lempel-ziv (lz77) factorization in sublinear time. In *2024 IEEE 65th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 2045–2055. IEEE, 2024.
- 16 Matt Mahoney. Large text compression benchmark. Accessed: 2025-02-06. Available at <http://mattmahoney.net/dc/text.html>.
- 17 Jacob Ziv and Abraham Lempel. A universal algorithm for sequential data compression. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 23(3):337–343, 1977. doi:10.1109/TIT.1977.1055714.

A Implementation of a Dynamic LPF-tree using Top Trees

In this section, we reproduce the proof from [5] for completeness, showing that the LPF-tree operations can be performed in $\tilde{O}(1)$ time. We replace link-cut trees with top trees[2], as they support the same operations as link-cut trees, but top trees guarantee $\tilde{O}(1)$ worst-case time complexity. The operations supported by top trees are as follows.

1. insert a single node to the forest.
2. remove a leaf from a tree.
3. attach a root to another node as a child.
4. detach a node from its parent.
5. add a weight x to a node and all of its descendants.
6. get the weight of a given node.
7. get the i 'th ancestor of a node.

As in [5], we use Red-black (RB) trees, that are balanced search trees supporting the following operations.

1. Insert an element to an RB tree
2. Delete an element from an RB tree
3. Join two RB trees T_1, T_2 into a single RB containing the values of both, under the promise that the maximal value in T_1 is smaller than the minimal value in T_2 .
4. Given a value c and a RB tree T , split T into two RB trees T_1 and T_2 such that T_1 contains all values smaller than c and the rest of the values are in T_2 .

All these operations cost $\tilde{O}(1)$ time.

The following observation is useful.

► **Observation 22** (Observation 23 in [5]). *A collection of red-black trees (RB trees) on n nodes can be simulated using top trees. The cost of every operation on an RB tree is then $O(\log^2 n)$.*

The indices of the string S are stored as nodes of one top tree. For every node i , the children of i are stored in an RB tree, where only the root of the RB tree is linked to node i . Internal RB tree edges have weight 0, and the rest have weight 1. Hence, for example, the weight of a path from node 1 to the root is $|LZ77(S)|$. Let the weight of a node i be the weight of the path from i to root.

Insert, Link, Delete are simple top tree operations, and cost $\tilde{O}(1)$ by Observation 22. For the MoveInterval operation, we need to move consecutive nodes from an RB tree to another RB tree. This is done in $\tilde{O}(1)$ by Observation 22. In addition, the weight of these nodes should be updated. This is done in $O(1)$ calls to get-weight and add-weight. Therefore, MoveInterval costs $\tilde{O}(1)$ time.

Insert, Link, Delete require the move of a node from one RB-tree to another RB-tree in our top tree. This costs $\tilde{O}(1)$ time by Observation 22. GetDepth, LevelAncestor are simple top tree queries.

B Implementation of Dynamic Substring Pattern Matching

In this section, we provide the following data structure for the Dynamic Substring Pattern Matching problem.

► **Lemma 5.** *There is a data structure that maintains a dynamic string that undergoes edit operation and can answer a query $\text{SubPM}(i_T, j_T, i_P, j_P)$ in $\tilde{O}(1)$ time. The update time of the data structure is $\tilde{O}(1)$.*

We highlight that in [14], the above data structure is implemented in the more general settings in which a persistent family \mathcal{F} of string is dynamically maintained, and new strings are created either by concatenating strings from the family, splitting a string from the family, or adding a new string of length 1. It is easy to see that each edit operation can be implemented by at most 3 such actions.

For a string $S[1..n]$, the suffix array of S is an array of length n that contains all the suffixes of S in their lexicographic order. The suffix $S[i..n]$ is represented in S by its starting index i .

We make use of the following data structure.

► **Lemma 23** ([14], Theorem 10.16, simplified). *There is a data structure for maintaining a dynamic string S that undergoes edit operations and supports the following query in $\tilde{O}(1)$ time: Given an index i , return $SA_S[i]$.*

The update time of the data structure is $\tilde{O}(1)$ and the construction time for an initial string of length n is $\tilde{O}(n)$.

It is well-known that the suffix array can be used to search a pattern in a text. We bring the following observation to describe the exact framework in which we use suffix arrays for text searching.

► **Observation 24.** *There is an algorithm that decides if a pattern P occurs in a text T of length n using $O(\log n)$ queries of the form $\text{LCP}(P, T[i..n])$ for some $i \in [|T|]$ and $O(\log n)$ queries to SA_T , and $O(\log n)$ additional time.*

Proof. One can binary search for an occurrence of P in T . At every point, the algorithm checks if there is a starting index of an occurrence of P in $SA_T[i..j]$ for some i and j initially set as $i = 1$ and $j = |T|$. If $i = j$, the algorithm simply checks if $x = SA_T[i]$ is a starting index of an occurrence of P by querying $\text{LCP}(P, T[x..n])$. Otherwise, the algorithm sets $c = \lceil \frac{j-i}{2} \rceil$, obtains $x = SA_T[c]$ and queries for $\ell = \text{LCP}(P, T[x..n])$. If $\ell = |P|$, we have found an occurrence of P in T . Otherwise, the lexicographical order between P and $T[x..n]$ is decided by the order between $P[\ell]$ and $T[x + \ell]$. We proceed our search in the half of SA_T that may contain an occurrence of P . Clearly, the binary search terminates in $O(\log(|T|))$ steps. In each step, the algorithm executes a single LCP query and a single query to SA_T . ◀

We are ready to describe our data structure for Lemma 5. We describe a data structure with amortized update time. The running time can be de-amortized using standard techniques. We maintain the dynamic data structure of Lemma 3 on S .

Additionally, for every $i \in [0.. \lceil \log |S| \rceil]$, we are interested in maintaining a partition \mathcal{P}^i of the indices of $|S|$ into intervals $I_1^i, I_2^i, \dots, I_{|\mathcal{P}^i|}^i$ with the following properties.

1. For every $j \in [|\mathcal{P}^i|]$, $|I_j^i| < 2^{i+1}$
 2. For every $j \in [|\mathcal{P}^i| - 1]$, $|I_j^i| + |I_{j+1}^i| \geq 2^i$
- Every interval $I_j^i = [a_j^i..b_j^i]$ corresponds to a substring $S_j^i = S[a_j^i..b_j^i]$. For every S_j^i the algorithm stores the structure of Lemma 23 allowing queries for $SA_{S_j^i}$.

We maintain the intervals as follows. Initially, \mathcal{P}^i is simply a partition of $[1..|S|]$ into disjoint intervals of length exactly 2^i (excluding a last interval that may be shorter). When an insertion (resp. deletion) is applied at index x in S , the algorithm increases (resp. reduces) the ending index of I_j^i that contains x by 1 (and implicitly shift all intervals following I_j^i). The algorithm also applies the appropriate insertion (resp. deletion) to the dynamic data structure of S_j^i .

If the update results in the length of I_j^i reaching 2^{i+1} , the algorithm splits I_j^i into two intervals I_j^i and I_{j+1}^i with length 2^i each (thus shifting all intervals following I_j^i prior to the update). Then, the algorithm constructs the data structure of Lemma 23 for S_j^i and for S_{j+1}^i from scratch. Similarly, if the update results in two adjacent intervals I_j^i and I_{j+1}^i with combined length that exactly $2^i - 1$, the algorithm merges I_j^i and I_{j+1}^i into a single interval I_j^i with length $2^i - 1$, and computes S_j^i for the new I_j^i from scratch.

It should be clear that all invariants are maintained and that for every interval I_j^i the data structure of Lemma 23 is maintained for the corresponding S_j^i .

Finding the interval I_j^i can be implemented in $O(\log n)$ time by storing the dynamic endpoints of the intervals in a balanced search tree. Then, applying a constant number of updates for the data structure of Lemma 23 takes $\tilde{O}(1)$ time. The only case when we apply more than a single operation to the data structure of Lemma 23 is when we merge or split intervals.

The newly created intervals, either merged or splitted, are always of size $O(2^i)$, so initializing the data structure of Lemma 23 can be implemented by initializing an empty data structure and applying $O(2^i)$ insertions, which requires $\tilde{O}(2^i)$ time. We make a standard charging argument to account for this running time.

When an interval I_j^i is split, its length is 2^{i+1} , meaning that at least $2^i - 1$ insertion operations were applied to the interval since its creation. We can charge the $\tilde{O}(2^i)$ cost of computing S_j^i and S_{j+1}^i from scratch on these 2^i edit operations for an amortized cost of $\tilde{O}(1)$. Similarly, when two intervals I_j^i, I_{j+1}^i are merged, one of I_j^i, I_{j+1}^i must be of length at most $2^{i-1} - 1$. It follows that at least $2^{i-1} + 1$ deletion operations were applied to the shorter of the two merged intervals since its creation. Again, we can charge the $\tilde{O}(2^i)$ cost of constructing the data structure of Lemma 23 for the merged interval on these deletions, resulting in $\tilde{O}(1)$ amortized running time.

The only part of the algorithm that is not worst-case but amortized is the construction of the suffix array data structure for new intervals.

we can modify the algorithm to de-amortize part by employing the standard technique of gradually constructing the data structure for future intervals in advance.

We show how to implement this approach to de-amortize the running time for splitting an interval. A similar de-amortization can be applied to de-amortize the running time for merging intervals.

Every Interval I_j^i stores, in addition to the data structure of $S_j^i = S[a_j^i..b_j^i]$, additional two suffix array data structures $SA_j^i(1)$ and $SA_j^i(2)$, for the strings $S_j^i(1) = S[a_j^i..c]$ and $S_j^i(2) = S[c+1..b_j^i]$ for $c = \lfloor \frac{a+b}{2} \rfloor$, respectively. To be more precise, $SA_j^i(1)$ and $SA_j^i(2)$ are *under construction*, and we wish to have the property that if I_j^i is splitted, $SA_j^i(1)$ and $SA_j^i(2)$ are the proper suffix array data structures of the newly created intervals. We also want I_j^i to store a copy of the string S_j^i in its state when the interval I_j^i was created.

When I_j^i is created, both $SA_j^i(1)$ and $SA_j^i(2)$ data structures are initialized as suffix array data structures for the empty string in $\tilde{O}(1)$ time. The interval I_j^i also initializes an empty list U_j^i meant for storing all future insertions, substitutions, and deletions applied to I_j^i .

Denote $S_j^i(1, init)$ (resp. $S_j^i(2, init)$) as the content of $S_j^i(1)$ (resp. $S_j^i(2)$) at the time of the creation of the interval I_j^i . Let us consider the following implementation of splitting an interval in the amortized data structure: When the interval I_j^i is split, the algorithm initializes the suffix array data structure for $SA_j^i(1)$ as a data structure for the empty string, inserts all symbols of $S_j^i(1, init)$ one by one and then applies all updates that $S_j^i(1)$ received during the lifetime of I_j^i (a similar procedure is applied to obtain $SA_j^i(2)$). Clearly, this correctly constructs $SA_j^i(1)$ and $SA_j^i(2)$. This implementation requires $1 + 2^{i+1} + |U_j^i|$ operations of the dynamic suffix array data structure of Lemma 23. We call this sequence of operations the *construction sequence* of I_j^i .

Now, every time that an operation is applied to I_j^i , if $SA_j^i(1)$ and $SA_j^i(2)$ are already fully constructed for the current left and right halves of S_j^i , the algorithm applies the appropriate update to one of them.

Otherwise, $SA_j^i(1)$ and $SA_j^i(2)$ are still under construction. The algorithm applies the

next 8 operations from the construction sequence of I_j^i to $SA_j^i(1)$ and to $SA_j^i(2)$. Note that these operations are known, as we have access to $S_j^i(1, \text{init})$ and to $S_j^i(2, \text{init})$ (which is sufficient for applying the first 2^{i+1} operations) and to U_j^i . Recall that at least 2^{i-1} updates are applied to I_j^i before it is split. It is therefore guaranteed that by the time I_j^i splits, the algorithm has already applied $8|U_j^i| = 4|U_j^i| + 4|U_j^i| \geq 2^{i+2} + |U_j^i| + 1$ operations from the construction sequence. Therefore, the construction sequence has already been executed, and $SA_j^i(1)$ and $SA_j^i(2)$ are already constructed as required. We also need to have an already prepared, copy of the current $S_j^i(1)$ and $S_j^i(2)$, which could take $O(2^{i+1})$ time to write and store if done at the time of the split. This can be de-amortized in the same manner.

Recall that the data structure maintains dynamic partition of intervals for every $i \in [\lceil \log n \rceil + 1]$. Each partition is stored as a balanced search tree with delta representation, storing the starting indices of the intervals. We make the following observation.

▷ **Claim 25.** For every $a \leq b \in [|S|]$, there is a set $\mathcal{I}_{a,b}$ of $O(\log n)$ intervals in $\cup_{i=1}^{\lceil \log n \rceil + 1} \mathcal{P}^i$ such that $\cup_{I \in \mathcal{I}_{a,b}} I = [a..b]$. The set $\mathcal{I}_{a,b}$ can be found in $\tilde{O}(1)$ time given a and b .

Proof. We describe a greedy algorithm for finding $\mathcal{I}_{a,b}$. The algorithm initializes an empty list L and an index $k = a$ and runs the following procedure until a termination condition is met.

1. If $k > b$, return L as $\mathcal{I}_{a,b}$.
2. Find the maximal i such that the interval I_j^i of \mathcal{P}^i containing k has $I_j^i \subseteq [a..b]$.
3. Append I_j^i to L and set $k \leftarrow b_j^i + 1$.

First, we claim that I_j^i is well defined for every $k \in [a..b]$. This follows from the fact that all intervals in \mathcal{P}^0 are of length exactly 1, therefore the interval $I_k^0 = [k..k]$ is a feasible candidate for I_j^i . It follows that the algorithm terminates. It should be clear that at the beginning of every iteration of the algorithm, the list L already contains a set of interval covering $[a..k-1]$, so when the algorithm terminates the list L indeed satisfies $\cup_{I \in L} I = [a..b]$.

Every iteration of the algorithm is implemented in $\tilde{O}(1)$ time by querying each of the search trees of \mathcal{P}^i for the interval containing k . It is left to prove that $|L| \in O(\log n)$ - notice that this also leads to the running time of the algorithm being $\tilde{O}(1)$.

Let k_t be the value of k at the beginning of the t 'th iteration. Similarly, let i_t be the maximal i value found in Step 2 of the algorithm in the t 'th iteration, and I_t be the interval added to L in the t 'th iteration.

We claim that for every $i \in [\lceil \log n \rceil + 1]$, i can appear in the sequence $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{|L|}$ at most 8 times - the bound on $|L|$ directly follows from this claim.

Let us fix some $i \in [\lceil \log n \rceil + 1]$. Assume to the contrary that there exist $t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_9$ iterations of the algorithm in which $i_t = i$. Notice that for every $x < y \in [9]$ we have $I_{t_x} \neq I_{t_y}$. It follows from $k_{t_y} \geq k_{t_{x+1}} > b_{t_x}^i$ i.e. I_{t_x} does not contain k_y . It immediately follows that the claim is correct for $i = \lceil \log n \rceil + 1$ as $|\mathcal{P}^{\lceil \log n \rceil + 1}| \leq 2$.

Let us assume that $i \in [\lceil \log n \rceil]$. Recall that the length of two consecutive intervals in \mathcal{P}^i is least 2^i . Therefore, $k_{t_5} > k_{t_1} + 2^{i+1}$ and $k_{t_9} > k_{t_5} + 2^{i+1}$. Since the length of all intervals in \mathcal{P}^{i+1} is less than 2^{i+1} , there must be an interval $I_j^{i+1} \in \mathcal{P}^{i+1}$ starting in $a_j^{i+1} \in [k_{t_1}..k_{t_5}] \subseteq [a..k_{t_5}]$. It follows from the fact that $i_{t_5} = i$ that I_j^{i+1} is not contained in $[a..b]$, which means that $b_j^{i+1} > b$. From $|I_j^{i+1}| < 2^{i+1}$ we have $a_j^{i+1} + 2^{i+1} - 1 > b_j^{i+1} > b$. It follows from $a_j^{i+1} \leq k_{t_5}$ that $k_{t_5} > b - 2^{i+1} + 1$. Finally, recall that $k_{t_9} > k_{t_5} + 2^{i+1}$, which in turn implies $k_{t_9} > b$, a contradiction (i_{t_9} was selected as i , so the iteration t_9 is not be the halting iteration). ◀

We now show how to answer the query $\text{SubPM}(i_T, j_T, i_P, j_P)$ given the partitions, and the data structure Lemma 3. First, we apply Claim 25 to obtain a set \mathcal{I}_{i_T, j_T} of intervals from the partitions such that the union of the intervals is exactly $S[i_T..j_T]$. For every $I_j^i \in \mathcal{I}_{i_T, j_T}$, we can access entries of the suffix array of $S_j^i = S[a_j^i..b_j^i]$ in $\tilde{O}(1)$ time, and we can query the LCP between indices in S_j^i and i_P via the data structure of Lemma 3 in $\tilde{O}(1)$ time. It follows from Observation 24 that we can report if there is an occurrence of $P = S[i_P..j_P]$ in S_j^i in $\tilde{O}(1)$ time. We do this for each of the $\tilde{O}(1)$ intervals of \mathcal{I}_{i_T, j_T} for a total running time of $\tilde{O}(1)$ and report that there is an occurrence of P in $T = S[i_T..j_T]$ if one of the applications of Observation 24 finds an occurrence.

Notice that this is insufficient: there may be an occurrence of P in T that is not contained in any of the intervals of \mathcal{I}_{i_T, j_T} . We observe that every such 'missed' occurrence must contain an endpoint of an interval in \mathcal{I}_{i_T, j_T} .

We complement our algorithm with the following procedure. For every $x \in \cup_{[a..b] \in \mathcal{I}_{i_T, j_T}} \{a, b\}$ (i.e. each endpoint of an interval of \mathcal{I}_{i_T, j_T}) we find a representation of all occurrences of P in $S[\max(x - |P|, i_T), \min(x + |P|, j_T)]$ using an internal pattern matching query to the data structure of Lemma 3. This adds another factor of $\tilde{O}(1)$ to the time complexity. It is easy to see that each occurrence of P that contains an endpoint of an interval is found in this way, thus concluding the algorithm and proving Lemma 5.

C Periodic Case

We handle the case where M_L is periodic with period p . The case where M_R is periodic is symmetric. The algorithm uses Lemma 4 to obtain a set \mathcal{C} of $O(\frac{n}{m})$ arithmetic progressions representing all occurrences of M_L in S and in S' .

In particular, let \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 be the sets of clusters representing occurrences of M_L in S and in S' , respectively. Let $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_1 \cup \mathcal{C}_2$. We can assume without loss of generality that all clusters in \mathcal{C} are maximal, meaning that if for a cluster $C = (a, b, p)$ of S (resp. of S'), we have $a - p, b + p \notin \text{Occ}_S(M_L)$ (resp. $\notin \text{Occ}_{S'}(M_L)$). This can be easily achieved via $\tilde{O}(|\mathcal{C}|)$ processing on \mathcal{C} .

For some cluster $C = (a_C, b_C, p)$ of occurrences in S (resp. in S'), we denote the unique run in S (resp. in S') containing all occurrences of C as $R_C = S[s_C..e_C]$ (resp. $= S'[s_C..e_C]$). For every cluster of occurrences of M_L $C = (a_C, b_C, p)$ and for every $\hat{S} \in \{S, S'\}$, the algorithm computes the following.

1. $L_{\hat{S}, a_C} = \text{SeqGenQuery}(\hat{S}, a_C, a_C + M - 1)$.
2. $L_{\hat{S}, a_C + p} = \text{SeqGenQuery}(\hat{S}, a_C + p, a_C + p + M - 1)$.
3. $L_{\hat{S}, b_C} = \text{SeqGenQuery}(\hat{S}, b_C, e_C)$.

Then, for every $x \in \{a_C, a_C + p, b_C\}$ the algorithm calls $\text{UpdateTreeByRange}(L_{S, x}, L_{S', x})$.

Correctness. Since for all $x \in \{a_C, a_C + 1, b_C\}$ it holds that $L_{S, x}$ is S -clean and $L_{S', x}$ is S' -clean, Lemma 20 holds and therefore calling to the procedure $\text{UpdateTreeByRange}(L_{S, x}, L_{S', x})$ is valid. It remains to prove that every heavy index j that needs to be updated, is indeed updated.

We first prove that if j is M_L -heavy, then there is an occurrence k of M_L that is a witness for j being M_L -Heavy such that k is either the first, the second or the last occurrence in a cluster.

► **Lemma 26.** *Let j be an M_L -heavy index. Then, there is a cluster C and a corresponding index $x \in \{a_C, a_C + p, b_C\}$ such that $x \in [j..j + \min(\text{LPF}'_{S'}(j), \text{LPF}'_S(j)) - |M_L|]$.*

Proof. Since j is M_L -heavy, there is an occurrence of M_L in an index k such that $k \in [j..j + \min(\text{LPF}'_{S'}(j), \text{LPF}'_S(j)) - |M_L|]$. k must belong to some cluster $C = (a_C, b_C, p)$ in S and a cluster $C' = (a_{C'}, b_{C'}, p)$ in S' . If $k \in \{a_C, a_{C'}, a_C + p, a_{C'} + p\}$, we are done. Otherwise, both C and C' are of size at least 3. Let $\hat{a} = \max(a_C, a_{C'})$. Since k is at least the third occurrence in both clusters, we have $\hat{a} + p \leq k \leq j + \min(\text{LPF}'_{S'}(j), \text{LPF}'_S(j))$. It follows that if $\hat{a} + p \geq j$, we are done. Assume $j \geq \hat{a} + p$. Recall that $R_C = S[s_C..e_C]$ (resp. $R_{C'} = S[s_{C'}..e_{C'}]$) is the run with period p containing all occurrences of M_L in S (resp. in S') represented by C (resp. C'). Let $\hat{s} = \max(s_C, s_{C'})$ and $\hat{e} = \min(e_C, e_{C'})$. Notice that for all $\hat{S} \in \{S, S'\}$, the string $\hat{S}[\hat{s}..\hat{e}]$ is periodic with period p . Due to $j - p \geq a_{\hat{C}} + p \geq \hat{s} + p$, it holds that $\hat{S}[j..\hat{e}] = \hat{S}[j - p..\hat{e} - p]$. It follows that $j + \text{LCP}_{\hat{S}}(j, j - p) \geq \hat{e}$ and in particular $\hat{e} \leq j + \min(\text{LPF}'_{S'}(j), \text{LPF}'_S(j)) - 1$. If $\hat{e} = e_C$, the run R_C contains the occurrence b_C so $\hat{e} \geq b_C - |M_L| + 1$ and therefore $b_C \leq j + \min(\text{LPF}'_{S'}(j), \text{LPF}'_S(j)) - |M_L|$ and $b_C \geq k \geq i$ satisfies the claim. If $\hat{e} = e_{C'}$, the same arguments can be made to show that $b_{C'}$ satisfies the claim. \blacktriangleleft

► **Lemma 27.** *Let j be an M_L -heavy index. There is a cluster C and a corresponding index $x \in \{a_C, a_C + p, b_C\}$ such that the procedure $\text{UpdateTreeByRange}(L_{S,x}, L_{S',x})$ updates j .*

Proof. Since j is M_L -heavy, by Lemma 26 there is an occurrence of M_L in an index k' such that $k' \in [j..j + \min(\text{LPF}'_{S'}(j), \text{LPF}'_S(j)) - |M_L|]$. Let C be the cluster representing the occurrence k' in S and let C' be the cluster representing the occurrence k' in S' . Note that we may have $C \neq C'$ only if $z \in [s_C..e_C]$ or $z \in [s_{C'}..e_{C'}]$. If we indeed have $C \neq C'$, we claim that either $[s_C, e_C] \subset [s_{C'}, e_{C'}]$ or $[s_{C'}..e_{C'}] \subset [s_C..e_C]$. In particular, we claim that $s_C = s_{C'}$ or $e_C = e_{C'}$. Clearly, if $C \neq C'$ then $[s_C..e_C] \neq [s_{C'}..e_{C'}]$. If $z \geq k' + p \in [k'..k' + M - 1]$, then $S[s_C - 1..k' + p] = S'[s_{C'} - 1..k' + p]$. It follows that in this case, the extension to the left of the run to the with period p containing $[k'..k'..k' + M - 1]$ in S and in S' i.e. $s_C = s_{C'}$. In the complementary case where $z < k' + p \leq k' + M - p$ we have that the $e_C = e_{C'}$.

We proceed with the assumption that $[s_C..e_C] \subset [s_{C'}..e_{C'}]$.

If $k' \in \{a_C, a_C + p, a_{C'}, a_{C'} + p\}$, then the claim follows from Lemma 21. Otherwise, both clusters are of size at least 3, and $k' \in \{b_C, b_{C'}\}$. Observe that if $j \leq a_C + p$, we have that $a_C + p \in [j..k'] \subseteq [j..j + \min(\text{LPF}'_{S'}(j), \text{LPF}'_S(j)) - |M_L|]$. It remains to treat the case where $j > a_C + p$. We have that both $R_C = S[s_C..e_C]$ and $R' = S'[s_{C'}..e_{C'}]$ are periodic with period p . From $j > a_C + p \geq s_C + p$, $S[j..e_C] = S[j - p..e_C - p]$. Therefore, $b_C \in [j..e_C - M + 1] \subseteq [j..j + \min(\text{LPF}'_{S'}(j), \text{LPF}'_S(j)) - |M_L|]$. \blacktriangleleft

Time. The time complexity of the algorithm is $\tilde{O}(n/M)$. We first bound $\sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} |L_{S,b_C}|$. Note that for every cluster C such that $z \notin [s_C - 1..e_C + 1]$, both $S[s_C..e_C]$ and $S'[s_{C'}..e_{C'}]$ are runs. At most one run with period p can intersect an index, so for all but 3 clusters in each string (one touching each of $z - 1, z$, and $z + 1$), the endpoints of R_C enclose a run both in S and in S' . Let \mathcal{C}' be the set $O(1)$ clusters such that $z \in [s_C - 1..e_C + 1]$ for $C \in \mathcal{C}'$.

Let $B = \cup_{C \in \mathcal{C}'} \{b_C\}$.

► **Lemma 28.** $\sum_{C \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}'} |L_{S,b_C}| \in \tilde{O}(|B| + n/M + M)$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{P} = \cup_{C \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}'} S[b_C..e_C + 1]$ be a set of non-periodic strings beginning in the last occurrence of M_L in a cluster C and ending in the first character after R_C . We partition the set of indices B into smaller sets, such that for each $P \in \mathcal{P}$, $B_P = \text{Occ}_S(P)$. Notice that $B = \cup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} B_P$. That follows from the fact that for each $P \in \mathcal{P}$, $P[1..|P| - 1]$ is periodic with period p , and therefore every occurrence of P is attached to some run.

Given a cluster C , let $q = |L_{S,b_C}|$, let $P_C = S[b_C..e_C + 1]$ an element in \mathcal{P} . Given a string P let $\mathcal{C}_P = \{C \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}' \mid S[b_C..e_C + 1] = P\}$.

By the construction of L_{S,b_C} , the element $l_{b_C,q-1}$ is the leftmost index in L_{S,b_C} , and $l_{b_C,q-2}$ is the leftmost index in $L_{S,b_C} \setminus \{l_{b_C,q-1}\}$. By the construction of L_{S,b_C} , it holds that $l_{b_C,q-2} + \text{LPF}'_S(l_{b_C,q-2}) > e_C$. Denote $L_3 = \text{SeqGenQuery}(S, b_C, e_C + 1)$. By the construction of L_{S,b_C} ,

$$|L_{S,b_C} \setminus \{l_{b_C,q-1}\}| = |\text{SeqGenQuery}(S, b_C, e_C)| - 1 \leq |\text{SeqGenQuery}(S, b_C, e_C - 1)| = |L_3|$$

By Lemma 18, $|L_3| \leq |\text{chain}_{B_{P_C}}(b_C, S)| + 1$. Therefore, for a given cluster C , it holds that $|L_{S,b_C}| \leq |\text{chain}_{B_{P_C}}(b_C, S)| + 2$. To conclude,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}'} |L_{S,b_C}| &\leq \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}'} (|\text{chain}_{A_{P_C}}(b_C, S)| + 2) = |\mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}'| + \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}'} |\text{chain}_{A_{P_C}}(b_C, S)| \\ &= |\mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}'| + \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}_P} |\text{chain}_{B_P}(b_C, S)| \\ &= |\mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}'| + \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \tilde{O}(|B_P|) \in \tilde{O}(|B| + n/M). \end{aligned}$$

◀

Next we bound L_{S,a_C} and L_{S,a_C+p} . We define the sets $A_1 = \cup_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \{a_C\}$ and $A_2 = \cup_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \{a_C + p\}$.

► **Lemma 29.** $\sum_{C \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}'} |L_{S,a_C}| + |L_{S,a_C+p}| \in \tilde{O}(|B| + |A_1| + |A_2| + n/M)$

Proof. We prove the lemma for $\sum_{C \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}'} |L_{S,a_C+p}|$. The proof for $\sum_{C \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}'} |L_{S,a_C}|$ is symmetric.

Fix some M_L -cluster C in S . For every $l_k \in L_{S,a_C+p}$, denote $r_k = l_k + \text{LPF}'(l_k)$.

Let $L_{i,1}$ be the indices $\{l_k \in L_{S,a_C+p} \mid r_k > b_C\}$. We prove that $|L_{i,1}| \leq |L_{S,b_C}|$. Let $l_k \in L_{i,1}$. It holds that $r_k > e_C$. By the construction of L_{S,b_C} , $l_k \in L_{S,b_C}$. Therefore, by Lemma 28, $\sum_{C \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}'} |L_{i,1}| \leq \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}'} |L_{S,b_C}| \in \tilde{O}(|B| + n/M)$.

Let $L_{i,2}$ be the indices $\{l_k \in L_{S,a_C+p} \mid l_k < s_C\}$ and let $\hat{L}_{i,2} = \text{SeqGenQuery}(S, s_C - 1, a_C + M - 1)$. Let $l_k \in L_{i,2}$. It holds that $r_k \geq a_C + M - 1$. The construction of $\hat{L}_{i,2}$ ensures that $l_k \in \hat{L}_{i,2}$. Hence, $L_{i,2} \subseteq \hat{L}_{i,2}$. Since $S[s_C - 1..a_C + M - 1]$ is non-periodic and $a_C + M - 1 - s_C \geq M$, $\text{Occ}_S(S[s_C - 1..a_C + M - 1]) \in O(n/M)$. Using Lemma 18, we have that

$$\sum_{C \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}'} |L_{i,2}| \leq \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}'} |\hat{L}_{i,2}| \leq \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}'} |\text{chain}_{\text{Occ}_S(S[s_C - 1..a_C + M - 1])}(s_C - 1, S)| \in \tilde{O}(n/M).$$

Finally, let $L_{i,3} = L_{S,a_C+p} \setminus (L_{i,1} \cup L_{i,2} \cup \{s_C\})$. We prove that $\sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} |L_{i,3}| \in \tilde{O}(n/M + |A_1| + |A_2|)$. We prove the following claim.

▷ **Claim 30.** Let $l_k \in L_{i,3}$. Then there is an index q_k such that $l_k = a_C + p - \text{LCS}_S(q_k, a_C + p)$ and $q_k \in \text{chain}_{A_1 \cup A_2}(a_C + p, S)$

Proof. $l_k \in L_{i,3}$ is the leftmost index such that $l_k + \text{LPF}'(l_k) = l_{k-1} - 1 + \text{LPF}'(l_{k-1} - 1) = r_k \geq a_C + p + M_L$ (where $l_{k-1} - 1 = a_C + p$ if $k = 1$).

Therefore, there is an index $q_k \in \text{Occ}_S(M_L)$ such that $\text{LCP}_S(q_k, a_C + p) + a_C + p = r_k$ and $\text{LCS}_S(q_k, a_C + p) = a_C + p - l_k$. We prove that $q_k \in \text{chain}_{A_1 \cup A_2}(a_C + p, S)$.

There is an integer $x = r_k - a_C - p + 1$ such that For all $\{q' < a_C + p \mid \text{LCP}(q', a_C + p) < x\}$, it holds that $\text{LCP}(q_k, a_C + p) \geq \text{LCP}(q', a_C + p)$. Moreover, by the maximality of l_k , for all $q' < a_C + p$ such that $\text{LCP}(q_k, a_C + p) = \text{LCP}(q', a_C + p)$, it holds that $\text{LCS}(q_k, a_C + p) \geq \text{LCS}(q', a_C + p)$. Therefore, $q_k \in \text{chain}_{A_1 \cup A_2 \cup \{q_k\}}(a_C + p, S)$.

We are left to prove that $q_k \in A_1 \cup A_2$. Let C' be the cluster where $q_k \in [s_{C'}..e_{C'}]$. Let $p = \text{per}(C') = \text{per}(C)$. Assume by contradiction that $q_k \geq s_C + 2p$ (recall that $q_k \in \text{Occ}_S(M_L)$). Let $q'_k = q_k - \text{LCS}_S(q_k, a_C + p)$, so $S[q'_k..q_k] = S[l_k..a_C + p]$, and in particular, there is a character $c = S[q'_k + p - 1] = S[l_k + p - 1]$ (notice that $\text{LCP}_S(q'_k, l_k) \geq M_L \geq p$). Since $l_k > i_s$, then $S[l_k - 1] = S[l_k + p - 1] = c$. It holds that $\text{LCS}_S(q_k, a_C + p) = a_C + p - l_k \leq 2p - 1$ and that $|S[s_{C'}..q_k]| \geq 2p$. Therefore, $|S[i'_s..q_k]| > \text{LCS}_S(q_k, a_C + p)$ and in particular, $S[q'_k - 1] = S[q'_k + p - 1] = c$. Therefore, $\text{LCS}_S(q_k, a_C + p) \geq a_C + p - l_k + 1$, in contradiction. \triangleleft

It holds that

$$\sum_{C_i \in \mathcal{C}} |L_{i,3}| \leq \sum_{a_C \in A_1} |\text{chain}_{A_1 \cup A_2}(a_C, S)| \in \tilde{O}(n/M + |A_1| + |A_2|)$$

and therefore,

$$\sum_{C \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}'} |L_{S, a_C + p}| \leq \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}'} |L_{i,1} \cup L_{i,2} \cup L_{i,3} \cup \{s_C\}| \in \tilde{O}(|B| + |A_1| + |A_2| + n/M)$$

\blacktriangleleft

There are $O(n/M)$ clusters. Since $|A_2| \leq |A_1| = |B| \in O(n/M)$, it holds that it only remains to bound $\sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}'} \sum_{x \in \{a_C, a_C + p, b_C\}} (|L_{S,x}|) \mathcal{C}'$. Notice that there are $O(1)$ elements in the sum, and each is bounded by $\tilde{O}(M + \frac{n}{M})$ due to the following lemma.

► Lemma 31. *For every cluster $C = (a_C, b_C, p) \in \mathcal{C}$, for every $x \in \{a_C, a_C + p, b_C\}$, and for every $\hat{S} \in \{S, S'\}$ it holds that $|L_{\hat{S},x}| \in O(M + \frac{n}{M})$*

Proof. Let $R = S[s..e]$ be the run with period p containing x in \hat{S} . Let $L_{\hat{S},x} = l_1, l_2, \dots, l_q$ and recall that $l_i + \text{LPF}_{\hat{S}}(l_i)$ is a decreasing sequence as well as l_i . Let z_1 be the minimal index in $[q]$ such that $l_{z_1+1} + \text{LPF}_{\hat{S}}(l_{z_1}) \leq e$ ($z_1 = q+1$ if no such index exist). Let z_2 be the first index in $[z_1..q]$ which $l_i < s$ (we defined $z_2 = q+1$ if no such index exists. We claim that $z_1 \in O(\frac{n}{M})$. Due to the definition of z_1 , l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{z_1} is a subsequence of $L_{\hat{S}}(x, e+1)$. Since $S[x..e+1]$ is aperiodic with length at least M , it follows from Fact 2 that $|\text{Occ}_{\hat{S}}(S[x..e+1])| \in O(\frac{n}{M})$. It follows from Lemma 18 that $z_1 \leq |\text{chain}_{\text{Occ}_{\hat{S}}(S[x..e+1])}(x, \hat{S})| \in O(\frac{n}{M})$.

We claim that $z_2 - z_1 \leq M$. For every $l \in [s + p..e]$, it holds that $\hat{S}[l..e] = S[l - p..e - p]$ and therefore $l + \text{LPF}_{\hat{S}}(l) \geq e$.

Therefore, all l_z with $z \in [z_1, z_2 - 2]$ are in $[s..s + p]$. Since l_z is strictly decreasing, we have that $z_2 - z_1 - 1 \leq p + 1 \leq M$.

Finally, we claim that $q - z_2 \in O(\frac{n}{M})$. Since all l_z with $z \in [z_2 + 1..q]$ have $l_z \leq s - 1$ and $l_z + \text{LPF}_{\hat{S}}(z) \geq x + M - 1$, it holds that $l_{z_2+1}, l_{z_2+2}, \dots, l_q$ is a subsequence of $L_{\hat{S}}(s - 1, x + M - 1)$. This is an aperiodic string with length more than M , therefore, due to similar arguments as for z_1 , we have $q - z_2 \in O(\frac{n}{M})$. In conclusion, we have shown that $q = z_1 + (z_2 - z_1) + (q - z_2) \in O(M + \frac{n}{M})$ as required. \blacktriangleleft