

UMEÅ UNIVERSITY
Efficient Algorithms

ASSIGNMENT STEP 2

Runtime analysis of the Java implementation of the CYK-algorithm

Pina Kolling

September 26, 2022

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Background	3
2.1	Formal language	3
2.2	Formal grammar	3
2.3	Chomsky-Normal-Form	3
2.4	CYK-algorithm	4
2.5	Dynamic programming	4
3	System Design	5
3.1	Main	5
3.2	Grammar	5
3.3	Parser	6
3.3.1	Naive	6
3.3.2	Top-Down	7
3.3.3	Bottom-Up	9
4	Evaluation	11
4.1	Experiments	11
4.2	Runtimes	11
5	Conclusion and Future Work	12
A	How to use the code?	13
B	Graphs and results	14
	Bibliography	16

1 Introduction

Parsing in Computer Science is the process of analysing a string of characters to examine if the string is built according to the rules of a formal grammar.

A formal grammar describes how to form strings with correct syntax from a language's alphabet (explained in section 2.2 and 2.1). To examine if such a string follows the rules of a grammar the *Cocke-Younger-Kasami*-algorithm (short: *CYK*) can be used. This algorithm is described in section 2.4. To use the *CYK*-algorithm the grammar needs to be in a specific format, that is called *Chomsky-Normal-Form* (short: *CNF*), which is explained in section 2.3. [5, 7]

The task for this assignment was to code three different parsing methods to execute the *CYK*-algorithm in *Java*. The different parsing methods will be described and presented as pseudo code in section 3. For the implementation three different classes are implemented: `main.java`, `grammar.java` and `parser.java`. The `main`-class calls the methods and the `grammar`-class parses the input grammar and string into a format that then can be processed in the `parser`-class. This `parser`-class has three different parsing methods, which will be tested and compared against each other. The function and implementation will be further described in section 3. Also in this section the runtimes in *O*-notation are calculated for each approach.

In section 4 the runtimes and experiments of the different algorithms are compared and differences in efficiency are shown.

In the final part (section 5) the results and future possibilities are discussed.

2 Background

In this section background information on formal languages (section 2.1), formal grammars (section 2.2), Chomsky-Normal-Form (section 2.3), CYK-algorithm (section 2.4) and dynamic programming (section 2.5) will be presented.

2.1 Formal language

Formal languages are abstract languages which define the syntax of the words that get accepted by that language. It consists of a set of words that get accepted by the language and a set of symbols that is called alphabet and contains the characters of the words. Those characters are called nonterminal symbols. [1, 6]

Example (Formal language).¹

The language accepts words that contain the same number of a s and b s, while the a has to be left of the b . The alphabet Σ of this language looks like this:

$$\Sigma = \{a, b\}$$

The language definition L is the following one:

$$L = \{(a^n b^n)^m\} \text{ with } n, m \in \mathbb{N}$$

2.2 Formal grammar

A formal grammar describes how to form strings with correct syntax from a language's alphabet. A grammar does not describe the meaning of the strings or any semantics — only their syntax is defined. The grammar is a set of rules which define which words are accepted by a formal language. Those rules consist of terminal and nonterminal symbols. The terminalsymbols are the characters of the alphabet of the language and the nonterminalsymbols are used to build the rules of the language — they get replaced by terminalsymbols. [1, 6]

Example (Formal grammar). *The example grammar for the previous example language is the following:*

$$S \rightarrow SS \mid aSb \mid ab$$

2.3 Chomsky-Normal-Form

The *Chomsky-Normal-Form* (short: *CNF*) is a grammar which is formatted in a specific way. If the startsymbol (nonterminal symbol) is not generating the empty word ($S \rightarrow \epsilon$) it either generates two nonterminal symbols or one terminal symbol for the grammar to be in *CNF*. [1]

¹The following examples show the *Well-Balanced Parentheses* example from the assignment task sheet with the alphabet $\{a, b\}$ instead of $\{(\cdot, \cdot)\}$.

Example (Chomsky-Normal-Form). *To change the previous example into CNF the rules have to be split up:*

$$S \rightarrow SS \mid LA \mid LR$$

$$A \rightarrow SR$$

$$L \rightarrow a$$

$$R \rightarrow b$$

2.4 CYK-algorithm

Cocke-Younger-Kasami-algorithm (short: *CYK*) takes a grammar in *CNF* and a word as an input. It then examines if the word follows the rules of the grammar. [7]

Example (Chomsky-Normal-Form). *The following table shows the CYK-algorithm with the previous grammar example and the input word aaabbb. [3]*




Figure 1: CYK-algorithm table for the word *aaabbb*

The word is accepted by the grammar rules, because the initiating nonterminal symbol S can be filled into the lowest field.

2.5 Dynamic programming

The technique of dynamic programming can be used to solve problems, which can be divided into smaller subproblems. The solutions of the subproblems are saved (for example in a multi-dimensional array) and referenced later. [2]

3 System Design

The implementation was done in Java and three different classes were implemented: `main.java` (described in section 3.1), `grammar.java` (described in section 3.2) and `parser.java` (described in section 3.3). The `main`-class calls the methods and the `grammar`-class parses the input grammar and string into a format that then can be processed in the `parser`-class.

3.1 Main

The `main`-class takes the input grammar and word and parses them into `String[]` and `String`. The arguments have to follow the following rules:

- The Grammar needs to be in *CNF*.
- The first rule begins with the start symbol of the grammar.
- The rules are put in without arrows, one rule body is represented by one string, beginning with the rule head.
- The last argument is the input word.

Input example (*Well-Balanced-Parantheses*):

```
java Main "SSS" "SLA" "SLR" "ASR" "L(" "R)" "((())"
```

for the grammar $S \rightarrow SS \mid LA \mid LR$, $A \rightarrow SR$, $L \rightarrow ($, $R \rightarrow)$ and the input word `((())`.

A more detailed description on how to run the code can be found in appendix A.

3.2 Grammar

The `grammar`-class assigns the nonterminal symbols to integers and builds arrays with them. The start symbol for example is then assigned with the integer zero and the bodies of that rule are at the index zero of an two-dimensional array. One array that only contains nonterminal symbols is build, one array that contains terminal and nonterminal symbol and one array that represents the integers that represent each nonterminal symbol is built.

For the input `java Main "SSS" "SLA" "SLR" "ASR" "L(" "R)" "((())"` the two-dimensional arrays shown on the screenshot on the right side are built.

(Right now the arrays still have the type `String[][]`, that will be changed later to `int[][]` to minimize the access time in the parsing methods.)

```
Matrix all rules:
[SS, LA, LR]
[SR, , ]
[(, , ]
[), , ]

Matrix T rules:
[]
[]
[(]
[)]

Matrix NT rules:
[SS, LA, LR]
[SR, , ]

Integers of NT symbols:
[0, 1, 2, 3]
[S, A, L, R]

Matrix all rules:
[00, 21, 23]
[03, , ]
[(, , ]
[), , ]

Matrix T rules:
[]
[]
[(]
[)]

Matrix NT rules:
[00, 21, 23]
[03, , ]
```

3.3 Parser

The **parser**-class contains three different parsing methods. Each methods has a counter as **long** which counts the number of iterations and a timer as **long** in *ms* which measures the runtime of the method.

3.3.1 Naive

The naive algorithm is a recursive algorithm which returns a boolean and has an initial method to start the recursion with the start values. Then the recursive method gets called.

Algorithm 1 Recursion call: Boolean parseNaive()

```

1: counter  $\leftarrow$  0
2: return parseNaive(0, 0, inputWord.length)

```

Algorithm 2 Boolean parseNaive(int indexNT, int i, int j)

```

1: counter  $\leftarrow$  counter + 1
2: if i == (j - 1) then
3:   for l  $\leftarrow$  0 to ruleset[0].length do
4:     if ruleset[indexNT][1] == inputWord[i] then
5:       return true
6:     end if
7:   end for
8: else
9:   for bodyIndex  $\leftarrow$  0 to ruleset[indexNT].length do
10:    if ruleset[indexNT][bodyIndex].length >= 2 then
11:      first  $\leftarrow$  ruleset[indexNT][bodyIndex].charAt(0)
12:      second  $\leftarrow$  ruleset[indexNT][bodyIndex].charAt(1)
13:      for k  $\leftarrow$  i + 1 to j do
14:        if parseNaive(first, i, k) and parseNaive(second, k, j) then
15:          return true
16:        end if
17:      end for
18:    end if
19:  end for
20: end if
21: return false

```

In the following table the upper boundarie runtime of the second method (algorithm 2) is listed for each line. The variable n represents the length of the input word and k the dimension of the rule array.

Line	Runtime	Type
1	1	Assignment
2	1	Comparison
3	k	Loop
4	1 · k	Comparison
5	1 · k	Return statement
9	k	Loop
10	1 · k	comparison
11	1 · k	Assignment
12	1 · k	Assignment
13	n · k	Loop
14	n · n · k	Recursive call
15	1 · n · k	Return statement
21	1	Return statement

Calculating the runtime:

$$\begin{aligned}
& 1 + 1 + k + k + k + k + k + k + k \\
& + n \cdot k + n \cdot n \cdot k + n \cdot k \\
& = 2 + 7k + 2(n \cdot k) + n \cdot n \cdot k \\
& = 2 + 7k + 2n \cdot 2k + 2n^2 \cdot k \\
& \in O(n^2)
\end{aligned}$$

The runtime of the naive method is in $O(n^2)$.

3.3.2 Top-Down

The top-down method is an improves version of the naive method (section 3.3.1). This algorithm works recursive, too. In this algorithm another array is used, which contains the values **true**, **false** and **null**. If one of the values is not **null**, the next recursive call is not executed.

Algorithm 3 Recursion call: Boolean parseTD()

```

1: counter ← 0
2: for i ← 0 to table.length do
3:   for j ← 0 to table[i].length do
4:     for k ← 0 to table[i][j].length do
5:       table[i][j][k] ← null
6:     end for
7:   end for
8: end for
9: return parseTD(0, 0, inputWord.length)

```

The variable n represents the length of the input word and k the dimension of the rule array.

Line	Runtime	Type
1	1	Assignment
2	k	Loop
3	k · n	Loop
4	k · n · n	Loop
5	k · n · n · 1	Assignment
9	...	Function call

Calculating the runtime of the method call:

$$\begin{aligned}
& 1 + k + k \cdot n + k \cdot n \cdot n + k \cdot n \cdot n \\
& = 1 + k + k \cdot n + 2(n^2 \cdot k) \\
& \in O(n^2)
\end{aligned}$$

Algorithm 4 Boolean parseTD(int indexNT, int i, int j)

```
1: counter  $\leftarrow$  counter + 1
2: rulesetLength  $\leftarrow$  ruleset[0].length
3: if table[indexNT][i][j]  $\neq$  null then
4:   return table[indexNT][i][j]
5: end if
6: if i == (j - 1) then
7:   for l  $\leftarrow$  0 to ruleset[0].length do
8:     if ruleset[indexNT][1] == inputWord[i] then
9:       return true
10:    end if
11:  end for
12: else
13:   for bodyIndex  $\leftarrow$  0 to ruleset[indexNT].length do
14:     if ruleset[indexNT][bodyIndex].length  $\geq$  2 then
15:       first  $\leftarrow$  ruleset[indexNT][bodyIndex].charAt(0)
16:       second  $\leftarrow$  ruleset[indexNT][bodyIndex].charAt(1)
17:       for k  $\leftarrow$  i + 1 to j do
18:         if parseNaive(first, i, k) and parseNaive(second, k, j) then
19:           return true
20:         end if
21:       end for
22:     end if
23:   end for
24: end if
25: return false
```

The runtime analysis of the `parseTD` method is analog to the `parseNaive` runtime analysis. Both algorithms have a runtime in $O(n^2)$.

3.3.3 Bottom-Up

The `parseBU` method works with dynamic programming.

Algorithm 5 Boolean `parseBU()`

```
1: wordlength  $\leftarrow$  word.length
2: String[][] DP  $\leftarrow$  newString[wordLength][wordLength]
3: for i  $\leftarrow$  0 to wordlength do
4:   if ruleset contains word[i] then
5:     temp  $\leftarrow$  indexofword[i] in ruleset
6:     if DP[i][i]  $\neq$  null then
7:       DP[i][i]  $\leftarrow$  DP[i][i] + temp
8:     else
9:       DP[i][i]  $\leftarrow$  +temp
10:    end if
11:  end if
12: end for
13: for l  $\leftarrow$  0 to wordlength do
14:   for i  $\leftarrow$  0 to wordlength - l do
15:     j  $\leftarrow$  i + l
16:     for k  $\leftarrow$  0 to j do
17:       for head  $\leftarrow$  0 to ruleset.length do
18:         for body  $\leftarrow$  0 to ruleset[head].length do
19:           conter  $\leftarrow$  counter + 1
20:           if ruleset[head][body].length  $\geq$  2 then
21:             first  $\leftarrow$  ruleset[head][body].charAt(0)
22:             second  $\leftarrow$  ruleset[head][body].charAt(1)
23:             if DP[i][k] contains first and DP[k + 1][j] contains second then
24:               temp  $\leftarrow$  head
25:               DP[i][j]  $\leftarrow$  DP[i][j] + temp
26:             end if
27:           end if
28:         end for
29:       end for
30:     end for
31:   end for
32: end for
33: if DP[0][wordlength - 1] contains 0 then
34:   return true
35: end if
36: return false
```

The variable n represents the length of the input word and k the dimension of the rule array.

Line	Runtime	Type
1	1	Assignment
2	1	Assignment
3	n	Loop
4	n	Comparison
5	n	Assignment
6	n	Comparison
7	n	Assignment
9	n	Assignment
13	n	Loop
14	$n \cdot n$	Loop
15	$n \cdot n$	Assignment
16	$n \cdot n \cdot n$	Loop
17	$n \cdot n \cdot n \cdot k$	Loop
18	$n \cdot n \cdot n \cdot k \cdot k$	Loop
19	$n \cdot n \cdot n \cdot k \cdot k$	Assignment
20	$n \cdot n \cdot n \cdot k \cdot k$	Comparison
21	$n \cdot n \cdot n \cdot k \cdot k$	Assignment
22	$n \cdot n \cdot n \cdot k \cdot k$	Assignment
23	$n \cdot n \cdot n \cdot k \cdot k$	Comparison
24	$n \cdot n \cdot n \cdot k \cdot k$	Assignment
25	$n \cdot n \cdot n \cdot k \cdot k$	Assignment
33	1	Comparison
34	1	Return statement
36	1	Return statement

Calculating the runtime:

$$\begin{aligned}
& 5 + 7n + 2n^2 + n^3 + n^3 \cdot k + 8 \cdot n^3 \cdot k^2 \\
& 5 + 7n + 2n^2 + (k + 1)n^3 + 8 \cdot n^3 \cdot k^2 \\
& \in O(n^3)
\end{aligned}$$

The runtime of the `parseBU` method is in $O(n^3)$.

4 Evaluation

In this section the runtimes and experiments will be compared.

4.1 Experiments

The following tables show some tests that were run with the different parsing methods and grammars. The first of each column for the method shows the truth value that is returned (as T for true and F for false), C represents the counter and T the time in ms.

Well-Balanced-Parantheses:

Word	Length	N	NC	NT	B	BC	BT	T	TC	TT
()	2	T	6	5ms	F	0	2ms	T	6	1ms
(())	4	T	33	4ms	F	84	3ms	T	28	1ms
((()))	6	T	212	6ms	F	360	6ms	T	84	1ms
(((()))	8	T	1295	6ms	F	924	9ms	T	190	1ms
((((()))	10	T	7666	9ms	F	1872	11ms	T	362	1ms
(((((()))	20	T	51.863.993	1049ms	F	15.732	23ms	T	2.772	3ms
(((...))	40				F	127.452	50ms	T	21.743	4ms

The input word with a length of 40 did not terminate for the naive parsing in 60 minutes.

4.2 Runtimes

The runtimes of the methods are calculated in section 3. The results are the following:

Method	Runtime
parseNaive	$O(n^2)$
ParseTD	$O(n^2)$
ParseBU	$O(n^3)$

Seeing those runtimes one could think that the naive and the topdown approach are equally efficient. Considering the differences in the algorithms and the results of the experiments it gets shown that this is not the case. The O-notation runtimes are the upper boundary for the runtime.

Regarding the experiments that were run on the code, the topdown method seems to be the most efficient, followed by the bottomup method. The least efficient method is in these cases the naive approach.

5 Conclusion and Future Work

Regarding the experiments from section 4, the topdown method seems to be the most efficient, followed by the bottomup method. The least efficient method is in these cases the naive approach.

Depending on the input word and the grammar then naive and the topdown approach have the same worst case runtime with $O(n^2)$. The bottomup method has the highest worst case runtime with $O(n^3)$.

These algorithms show differences in efficiency but also limits for the examination of words with the *CYK*-algorithm. The amount of calls raised especially with the Well-Balanced-Parantheses language exponentially. This can also be seen in the graphs in appendix B.

Formal languages and grammars can be used in different use cases. For example for AI learning methods. Real languages like English can be defined as a formal language, too. But it is important to consider that formal languages only define the syntax and not the semantics. In addition to this has english a lot of rules and many exceptions. [4]

A How to use the code?

The code can be run in the terminal and input is expected as Strings in quotation marks. The grammar needs to be in CNF. The first rule begins with the startsymbol of the grammar.

First: Rules without arrows (one rule as one String)

Last: The last argument is the input word

Input example (*Well-Balanced-Parantheses*):

```
java Main "SSS" "SLA" "SLR" "ASR" "L(" "R)" "(())"
```

for the grammar $S \rightarrow SS \mid LA \mid LR$, $A \rightarrow SR$, $L \rightarrow ($, $R \rightarrow)$ and the input word $(())$.

Output example:

The first part of the output shows the arrays, which get generated in the `Grammar.java` class.

The first array contains all rules.

The second array contains only the terminal rules.

The third array contains only the nonterminal rules.

Then it is shown which nonterminal symbols are represented by which integers. Later the nonterminal symbols can be referred to with those integers.

After this the mentioned arrays are shown again but the nonterminal symbols got replaced with the according integers.

```
Input word: (())
Naive: true Amount of calls: 33
Naive runtime: 9ms

CYK-Table (Bottom Up):
[2, , ]
[ , 2, 0, 1]
[ , , 3, ]
[ , , , 3]

BottomUp: false Amount of calls: 84
Naive runtime: 4ms

TopDown: true Amount of calls: 28
Naive runtime: 1ms
```

```
Matrix all rules:
[SS, LA, LR]
[SR, , ]
[(, , ]
[), , ]

Matrix T rules:
[]
[]
[(]
[)]

Matrix NT rules:
[SS, LA, LR]
[SR, , ]

Integers of NT symbols:
[0, 1, 2, 3]
[S, A, L, R]



Matrix all rules:
[00, 21, 23]
[03, , ]
[(, , ]
[), , ]

Matrix T rules:
[]
[]
[(]
[)]

Matrix NT rules:
[00, 21, 23]
[03, , ]
```

Then the results, counter and runtime in *ms* is shown for each parsing method.

For the `BottomUp` method is the CYK algorithm table printed.

Graphs:

References

- [1] *Chomsky's Normal Form (CNF)*. Website. <https://www.javatpoint.com/automata-chomskys-normal-form>, opened on 26.09.2022.
- [2] *Dynamic Programming*. Website. <https://www.programiz.com/dsa/dynamic-programming>, opened on 26.09.2022.
- [3] Robert Eisele. *A CYK Algorithm Visualization*. May 2018. URL: <https://www.xarg.org/tools/cyk-algorithm/>.
- [4] Maggie Johnson and Julie Zelenski. *Formal Grammars*. Website. <https://web.stanford.edu/class/archive/cs/cs143/cs143.1128/handouts>, opened on 26.09.2022. 2012.
- [5] Glenn K. Manacher. "An improved version of the Cocke-Younger-Kasami algorithm". In: *Computer Languages* 3.2 (1978), pp. 127–133. ISSN: 0096-0551. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0096-0551\(78\)90029-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0096-0551(78)90029-2). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0096055178900292>.
- [6] A.J. Kfoury Robert N. Moll Michael A. Arbib. *An Introduction to Formal Language Theory*. Springer-Verlag, 1988.
- [7] Fabio Massimo Zanzotto, Giorgio Satta, and Giordano Cristini. "CYK Parsing over Distributed Representations". In: *Algorithms* 13 (Oct. 2020), p. 262. DOI: 10.3390/a13100262.