

#### COMP261 Lecture 18

Marcus Frean

String Searching 2 of 2



## String search - recap

- Simple search
  - Slide the window by 1

• 
$$k = k+1$$
;

- Knuth-Morris-Pratt (KMP)
  - Slide the window faster

• 
$$k = k + i - M[i]$$

- is there a "suffix ==prefix"?
  - If No, skip these characters altogether (big jump ahead for S)

$$M[i] = 0$$

If Yes, reuse: no need to recheck those characters!
(smaller jump for S, but start further along it)
» M[;] is the length of the "reusable" suffix

```
abbabbtabbarsaa;ldifewskf
abbabbczz
abbabbczz
abbabbczz
abbabbczz
abbabbczz
```

abbabbtabbarsaa;ldifewskf abbabbczz abbabbczz abbabbczz abbabbczz

# Knuth-Morris-Pratt (KMP) algorithm

After a mismatch, advance to the earliest place where search string could possibly match.

• avoids the re-checking of characters that brute-force does

How far can we advance safely? (as much as possible, no further)

- Use a table based on the search string.
- Let M[0..m-1] be a table showing how far to back up the search if a prefix of S has been matched.

m is the length of 5

#### KMP - how far to move along? (in general)

- long text: ...ananx???...
- string: <u>an</u>ancba

- If mismatch at string position s (and text position k+i)
  - find longest suffix of text (up to just before the fail point) that matches a prefix of string
  - move k forward by (i length of substring)
  - keep matching from i ← length of substring
- special case:
  - if i = 0, then move k to k + 1 and match from  $i \leftarrow 0$

#### KMP

- having got to a fail point, where should we check next?
- jump ahead, and re-start at... where?

the fail point

fail: not 'g'

but it could be 'a'!

- - what about this one?
  - unsafe to jump straight to the fail point!

move S by 2, but restart from the <u>fail point (#)</u>

- - what about this one?
  - (nb: in theory, could jump further in such cases, for a small extra saving)

simplest: treat same as above

#### **KMP**

T:

S:

MOVING FROM THE LEFT of the search string S, on mismatch with T we check for a suffix == prefix, skip ahead that many, and continue checking matches from the fail point.

suffix of 3 in the matched part: abbabbczz skip ahead 3, and restart from "t" abbabbtabbabbczzrsaldifewsk T: no suffix: move to "t", and restart abbabbczz abbabbtabbabbczzrsaldifewsk T: no suffix: move to "t", and restart abbabbczz S: and we could precompute abbabbtabbabbczzrsaldifewsk T: all these jumps, just from S

abbabbtabbabbczzrsaldifewsk

abbabbczz

## Knuth Morris Pratt, the algorithm

```
while k + i < n
    if S[i] = T[k+i] then // match at i
        i \leftarrow i + 1
        if i = m then return k // found S
    else if M[i] = -1 then // mismatch, no self overlap
        k \leftarrow k + i + 1, i \leftarrow 0
    else
                                      // mismatch, with self overlap
        k \leftarrow k + i - M[i]
                                      // match position jumps forward
        i \leftarrow M[i]
                                               detour to slide 10 here.
                                               then return here.
return -1 // failed to find S
```

### How do we build the "jump" table? Example.

- Consider the search string abcdabd.
- Look for a proper suffix of failed match, which is a prefix of S, starting at each position in S
  so suffix ends at previous position.
- 0: abcdabd
  We can't have a failed match at position 0.
  Special case, set M[0] to -1.
- 1: abcdabd a not a proper suffix. Special case, set M[1] to 0.
- 2: ab**c**dabd b not a prefix, set M[2] to 0.

# How do we build the "jump" table? Example.

- 3: abcdabd abc has no suffix which is a prefix, set M[3] to 0.
- 4: abcdabd abcd has no suffix which is a prefix, set M[4] to 0.
- 5: abcdabd a is longest suffix which is a prefix, set M[5] to 1.
- 6: abcdab<u>d</u> ab is longest suffix which is a prefix, set M[6] to 2.
- Knowing what we matched before allows us to determine length of next match.

# How do we precompute the "jump" table, M?

Look for suffix of a failed match which is prefix of the search string. eg:

- abcmndsjhhhsjgrjgslagfiigirnvkfir abcefg
  - No suffix. Resume checking at 'm': abcefg
- ananfdfjoijtoiinkjjkjgfjgkjkkhgklhg ananaba
  - Yes ('an'). Resume checking at the second 'a': ananaba
- NB: suffix of a partial match is also part of the search string... We can find partial matches just by analysing the search string!

# KMP – Partial Match Table

Index	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
S	a	b	С	d	а	b	d
M	-1						

# KMP – Partial Match Table

Index	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
S	a	n	а	n	а	b	a
M	-1						

## Building the table.

```
M: 0
input: S[0 .. m-1] // the string
output: M[0 .. m-1] // match table
initialise: M[0] \leftarrow -1
                                                                andandba
             M[1] \leftarrow 0
             j \leftarrow 0 // position in prefix
                                                                andandba
             pos \leftarrow 2 // position in table
while pos < m
     if S[pos - 1] = S[j]
                                   //substrings ...pos-1 and 0...j match
          M[pos] \leftarrow j+1
          pos++, j++
     else if j > 0
                                   // mismatch, restart the prefix
          j \leftarrow M[j]
     else //j = 0
                                   // we have run out of candidate prefixes
          M[pos] \leftarrow 0,
          pos++
```

## String search: Knuth Morris Pratt

Cost?

• What happens for the worst case for brute force search?

S = aaaaab

T = aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa

#### String search: can we do even better?!

• The previous lecture said: "ideally, we'd have an algorithm that never needs to re-trace its steps in the long string. Can we check each letter just once?" (Answer: yes, it's KMP).

```
fail
```

- but notice h is *nowhere* in the key string, so we can jump past...
- Boyer-Moore exploits this notion to the absolute max, so much so that it does *better* than our "aim" of only checking everything once!

## String search: Boyer-Moore (details not examinable)

- KMP searches forwards, and gets worse as the search sequence gets longer.
- It seems implausible that one could do better than looking at each T element only once, and yet...
- Boyer-Moore algorithm searches backward, gets *better* as search sequence gets longer!
- 1. Bad character rule tries to turn mis-match into match
- 2. Good suffix rule tries to keep existing matches okay

# Boyer Moore's "Bad Character rule" (details not examinable)

Go FROM THE RIGHT within the search string S, CCTTTGC upon a mis-match, we skip until either

- mismatch becomes a match, or
- S moves past the mis-match character

T: GCTTCTGCTACCTTTTGCGCGCGCGCGAA

S: CCTTTTGC

T: GCTTCTGCTACCTTTTGCGCGCGCGCGAA

S: CCTTTTGC

T: GCTTCTGCTACCTTTTGCGCGCGCGCGAA

S: CCTTTTGC

# Boyer Moore's "Good Suffix rule" (details not examinable)

Let *t* be the substring matched by the inner loop.

On mismatch we skip until either

- no mismatch between S and t, or
- S moves past *t*

```
T: CGTGCCTACTTACTTACTTACTTACGCGAA
```

S: CTTACTTAC

T: CGTGCCTACTTACTTACTTACTTACGCGAA

S: CTTACTTAC

T: CGTGCCTACTTACTTACTTACTTACGCGAA

S: CTTACTTAC

# Boyer-Moore algorithm (details not examinable)

completely ignored!!

This is the go-to algorithm for fast string search in most practical cases.

• At each step, look up *both* jumps, and take max!

```
CTTATAGCTGATCGCGGCGTAGCGGCGAA
T:
      G T A G C G G C G
                                               bad character: 6
      CTTATAGCTGATCGCGGCGTAGCGGCGAA
T:
                                               good suffix: 2
                GTAGCGGCG
      CTTATAGCTGATCGCGGCGTAGCGGCGAA
T:
                                               good suffix: 7
                    GTAGCGGCG
      C T T A T A G C T G A T C G C G G C G T A G C G G C G A A
                                GTAGCGGCG
```