

# String Matching

---

# Pattern Matching

- Given a **text** string  $T[0..n-1]$  and a **pattern**  $P[0..m-1]$ , find all occurrences of the pattern within the text.
- Example:  $T = 000010001010001$  and  $P = 0001$ , the occurrences are:
  - first occurrence starts at  $T[1]$
  - second occurrence starts at  $T[5]$
  - third occurrence starts at  $T[11]$

# Naïve algorithm

```
for (s = 0; s <= n-m; s++)
    if P[0..m-1] equal to T[s..s+m-1]
        output s;
```

Example:

	T	0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 1
s=0		0 0 0 1 ^mismatch
s=1		0 0 0 1 ^match
s=2		0 0 0 1 ^mismatch
s=3		0 0 0 1 ^mismatch
s=4		0 0 0 1 ^mismatch
s=5		0 0 0 1 ^match

**Worst-case running time =  $O(nm)$ .**

# Rabin-Karp Algorithm

- Key idea:
  - think of the pattern  $P[0..m-1]$  as a key, transform (hash) it into an equivalent integer  $p$
  - Similarly, we transform substrings in the text string  $T[]$  into integers
    - 📁 For  $s=0,1,\dots,n-m$ , transform  $T[s..s+m-1]$  to an equivalent integer  $t_s$
  - The pattern occurs at position  $s$  if and only if  $p=t_s$
- If we compute  $p$  and  $t_s$  quickly, then the pattern matching problem is reduced to comparing  $p$  with  $n-m+1$  integers

# Rabin-Karp Algorithm ...

- How to compute  $p$ ?

$$p = 2^{m-1} P[0] + 2^{m-2} P[1] + \dots + 2 P[m-2] + P[m-1]$$

- Using horner's rule

$$p = P[m-1] + 2 * (P[m-2] + 2 * (P[m-3] + \dots 2 * (P[1] + 2 * P[0]) \dots)).$$

```
p = 0;
for (i = 0; i < m; i++)
    p = 2*p + P[i];
```

**This takes  $O(m)$  time, assuming each arithmetic operation can be done in  $O(1)$  time.**

# Rabin-Karp Algorithm ...

- Similarly, to compute the  $(n-m+1)$  integers  $t_s$  from the text string

```
for (s = 0; s <= n-m; s++) {  
    t[s] = 0;  
    for (i = 0; i < m; i++)  
        t[s] = 2*t[s] + T[s+i];  
}
```

- This takes  $O((n - m + 1) m)$  time, assuming that each arithmetic operation can be done in  $O(1)$  time.
- This is a bit time-consuming.

# Rabin-Karp Algorithm

- A better method to compute the integers is:

```
t[0] = 0;
offset = 1;
for (i = 0; i < m; i++)
    offset = 2*offset;
for (i = 0; i < m; i++)
    t[0] = 2*t[0] + T[i];
for (s = 1; s <= n-m; s++)
    t[s] = 2*(t[s-1] - offset*T[s-1]) + T[s+m-1];
```

**This takes  $O(n+m)$  time, assuming that each arithmetic operation can be done in  $O(1)$  time.**

# Problem

- The problem with the previous strategy is that when  $m$  is large, it is unreasonable to assume that each arithmetic operation can be done in  $O(1)$  time.
  - In fact, given a very long integer, we may not even be able to use the default integer type to represent it.
- Therefore, we will use modulo arithmetic. Let  $q$  be a prime number so that  $2q$  can be stored in one computer word.
  - This makes sure that all computations can be done using single-precision arithmetic.



```
p = 0;
for (i = 0; i < m; i++)
    p = (2*p + P[i]) % q;

t[0] = 0;
offset = 1;
for (i = 0; i < m; i++)
    offset = 2*offset % q;
for (i = 0; i < m; i++)
    t[0] = (2*t[0] + T[i]) % q;
for (s = 1; s <= n-m; s++)
    t[s] = (2*( t[s-1] - offset*T[s-1]) + T[s+m-1]) % q;
```

- Once we use the modulo arithmetic, when  $p = t_s$  for some  $s$ , we can no longer be sure that  $P[0 \dots M-1]$  is equal to  $T[s \dots S+m-1]$
- Therefore, after the equality test  $p = t_s$ , we should compare  $P[0 \dots m-1]$  with  $T[s \dots s+m-1]$  character by character to ensure that we really have a match.
- So the worst-case running time becomes  $O(nm)$ , but it avoids a lot of unnecessary string matchings in practice.