

# Dynamic Time Warping and Geometric Edit Distance: Breaking the Quadratic Barrier

OMER GOLD and MICHA SHARIR, Tel Aviv University, Israel

Dynamic Time Warping (DTW) and Geometric Edit Distance (GED) are basic similarity measures between curves or general temporal sequences (e.g., time series) that are represented as sequences of points in some metric space  $(X, \text{dist})$ . The DTW and GED measures are massively used in various fields of computer science and computational biology. Consequently, the tasks of computing these measures are among the core problems in P. Despite extensive efforts to find more efficient algorithms, the best-known algorithms for computing the DTW or GED between two sequences of points in  $X = \mathbb{R}^d$  are long-standing dynamic programming algorithms that require quadratic runtime, even for the one-dimensional case  $d = 1$ , which is perhaps one of the most used in practice.

In this article, we break the nearly 50-year-old quadratic time bound for computing DTW or GED between two sequences of  $n$  points in  $\mathbb{R}$  by presenting deterministic algorithms that run in  $O(n^2 \log \log \log n / \log \log n)$  time. Our algorithms can be extended to work also for higher-dimensional spaces  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , for any constant  $d$ , when the underlying distance-metric  $\text{dist}$  is polyhedral (e.g.,  $L_1, L_\infty$ ).

CCS Concepts: • **Theory of computation** → **Design and analysis of algorithms**; **Computational geometry**;

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Dynamic time warping, geometric edit distance, time series, point matching, geometric matching

## ACM Reference format:

Omer Gold and Micha Sharir. 2018. Dynamic Time Warping and Geometric Edit Distance: Breaking the Quadratic Barrier. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*. 14, 4, Article 50 (August 2018), 17 pages.

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3230734>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Searching for optimal algorithms is a standard routine in the study of algorithm design. Among the most popular basic problems in P are those that have standard algorithms that run in  $O(n^c)$  time, where  $c = 2$  or  $3$ . For  $c = 3$  (cubic time), we can find many kinds of combinatorial matrix multiplication algorithms, and for  $c = 2$  (quadratic time), we can find many fundamental problems, such

This work was carried out in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Ph.D. degree of the first author. An extended abstract of this paper appeared in the *Proceedings of the 44th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP'17)* and is available at <http://drops.dagstuhl.de/opus/volltexte/2017/7382>.

Work on this article has been supported by Grant 892/13 from the Israel Science Foundation (ISF), by Grant 2012/229 from the U.S.–Israeli Binational Science Foundation (BSF), by the Israeli Centers of Research Excellence (I-CORE) program (Center No. 4/11), by the Blavatnik Research Fund in Computer Science at Tel Aviv University, and by the Hermann Minkowski–MINERVA Center for Geometry at Tel Aviv University.

Authors' addresses: O. Gold and M. Sharir, Tel Aviv University, Blavatnik School of Computer Science, Ramat Aviv, Tel Aviv, 69978, Israel; emails: {omergold, michas}@post.tau.ac.il.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](mailto:permissions@acm.org).

© 2018 ACM 1549-6325/2018/08-ART50 \$15.00

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3230734>

as 3SUM [22], and many basic matching problems among strings, curves, and point-sequences, such as Edit Distance, Geometric Edit Distance (GED), Dynamic Time Warping (DTW), Discrete Fréchet Distance, and Longest Common Subsequence (LCS). These problems are usually referred to as “quadratic problems.” See References [1, 5, 7, 11, 12] for some recent studies on these problems.

Motivated to find optimal algorithms for these basic problems, researchers have come up with time bounds of the form  $O(n^c / \text{polylog}(n))$ , where  $\text{polylog}(n)$  stands for  $\log^k n$  for some constant  $k > 0$ . By now, many classical quadratic problems have upper bounds of the form  $O(n^2 / \text{polylog}(n))$ , including all of the problems mentioned above, except for DTW and GED; see References [4, 16, 23, 25, 32] for such upper bounds. Among the very few archetypal quadratic problems for which no  $o(n^2)$ -time algorithm is known, DTW and GED seem to be prominent examples. Typically, these problems seem to be more resistant against standard  $\text{polylog}(n)$ -improvement techniques.

*Motivation.* Complementary to the standard theoretical interest in finding optimal algorithms for basic problems in P, significant progress has been made in recent years towards a better understanding of these problems by proving conditional lower bounds via reductions from basic problems, such as 3SUM [22] and CNF-SAT. Assuming that CNF-SAT takes  $\Omega(2^{(1-o(1))n})$  time (which is implied by the so-called *Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis* (SETH) [26, 27]), has led to recent lower bounds for a growing list of problems, including most of the quadratic problems mentioned above. Specifically, assuming SETH, there is no  $O(n^{2-\Omega(1)})$ -time algorithm for Discrete Fréchet Distance [11], Edit Distance [7], LCS [1, 12], and DTW [1, 12].

Recent seminal works by Abboud et al. [3] and by Abboud and Bringmann [2] show that even an improvement by a sufficiently high polylogarithmic factor for any of these problems would lead to major consequences, such as faster Formula-SAT algorithms or new circuit lower bounds. Hence, these works motivate and revive the study of polylogarithmic-factor improvements for these basic problems, since it may be the only way to push the efficiency of the solution “to the limit.”

## Problem Statement

Let  $A = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$  and  $B = (q_1, \dots, q_m)$  be two sequences of points (also referred to as curves) in some metric space  $(X, \text{dist})$ . A *coupling*  $C = (c_1, \dots, c_k)$  between  $A$  and  $B$  is an ordered sequence of distinct pairs of points from  $A \times B$ , such that  $c_1 = (p_1, q_1)$ ,  $c_k = (p_n, q_m)$ , and

$$c_r = (p_i, q_j) \Rightarrow c_{r+1} \in \{(p_{i+1}, q_j), (p_i, q_{j+1}), (p_{i+1}, q_{j+1})\},$$

for  $r < k$ . The DTW-distance between  $A$  and  $B$  is

$$\text{dtw}(A, B) = \min_{C: \text{coupling}} \left\{ \sum_{(p_i, q_j) \in C} \text{dist}(p_i, q_j) \right\}. \quad (1)$$

A coupling  $C$  for which the above sum is minimized is called an *optimal coupling*. The DTW problem is to compute  $\text{dtw}(A, B)$  and sometimes also an optimal coupling  $C$ .

A *monotone matching*  $\mathcal{M} = \{m_1, \dots, m_k\}$  between  $A$  and  $B$  is a set of pairs of points from  $A \times B$ , such that any two pairs  $(p_i, q_j), (p_{i'}, q_{j'}) \in \mathcal{M}$  satisfy that  $i < i'$  iff  $j < j'$ . This also implies that each point in  $A$  is matched with at most one point in  $B$  and vice versa (possibly some points in  $A \cup B$  do not appear in any pair of the matching); see Figure 1 for an illustration. Note the difference from coupling (defined above), which covers all points of  $A \cup B$ , and a point can appear in multiple pairs of the coupling. The cost of  $\mathcal{M}$  is defined to be the sum of all the distances between the points of each pair in  $\mathcal{M}$ , plus a *gap* penalty parameter  $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$ , for each point in  $A \cup B$  that does not appear in any pair of  $\mathcal{M}$ .




Fig. 1. Example of a monotone matching (in blue) between two polygonal curves (represented by point-sequences) in the plane.

The GED between  $A$  and  $B$  is

$$\text{ged}(A, B) = \min_{\mathcal{M}} \left\{ \left( \sum_{(p_i, q_j) \in \mathcal{M}} \text{dist}(p_i, q_j) \right) + \rho(n + m - 2|\mathcal{M}|) \right\}, \quad (2)$$

where the minimum is taken over all sets of monotone matchings  $\mathcal{M}$  in the complete bipartite graph  $A \times B$ . A monotone matching  $\mathcal{M}$  for which the above sum is minimized is called an *optimal matching*. The GED problem is to compute  $\text{ged}(A, B)$  and sometimes also an optimal matching. More sophisticated gap penalty functions have been proposed [18], but for this presentation, we focus on the standard linear gap penalty function, although our presented algorithm supports a more complex gap penalty, such as taking  $\rho$  to be a linear function in the coordinates of the points of  $A \cup B$ . By tuning  $\rho$  correctly, meaningful matchings can be computed even when faced with outlier points that arise from measurement errors or short deviations in otherwise similar trajectories.

The DTW-distance and GED are massively used in dozens of applications, such as speech recognition, geometric shape matching, DNA and protein sequences, protein backbones, matching of time series data, GPS, video and touch screen authentication trajectories, music signals, and countless data mining applications; see References [14, 17, 19, 29–31, 33, 35, 37] for some examples.

The best-known worst-case running times for solving DTW or GED are given by long-standing simple dynamic programming algorithms that require  $\Theta(nm)$  time. We review the standard quadratic-time DTW and GED algorithms in Sections 3 and 7, respectively.

DTW was perhaps first introduced as a speech discrimination method [36] in the 1960s. GED is a natural extension of the well-known string version of Edit Distance; however, the subquadratic-time algorithms for the string version do not seem to extend to GED (see below).

A popular setting in both theory and practice is the one-dimensional case  $X = \mathbb{R}$  (under the standard Euclidean distance  $\text{dist}(x, y) = |x - y|$ ). Even for this special case, no subquadratic-time algorithms have been known. We consider this case throughout most of the article.

## Prior Results

Since no subquadratic-time algorithm is known for computing DTW, a number of heuristics were designed to speed up its exact computation in practice; see Wang et al. [38] for a survey. Very recently, Agarwal et al. [5] gave a near-linear approximation scheme for computing DTW or GED for a restricted, although quite large, family of curves.

Recently, Bringmann and Künnemann [12] proved that DTW on one-dimensional point sequences whose elements are taken from  $\{0, 1, 2, 4, 8\} \subset \mathbb{R}$  has no  $O(n^{2-\Omega(1)})$ -time algorithm, unless SETH fails. They proved a similar hardness result also for Edit Distance between two binary strings, improving the conditional lower bound of Backurs and Indyk [7]. This line of work was extended in a very recent work by Abboud et al. [3], mentioned above, where they show that even

a sufficiently large  $\text{polylog}(n)$ -factor improvement over the quadratic-time upper bound for Edit Distance or DTW, would lead to major consequences.

Masek and Paterson [32] showed that Edit Distance between two strings of length at most  $n$  over an  $O(1)$ -size alphabet can be solved in  $O(n^2/\log n)$  time. More recent works [10, 24] managed to lift the demand for  $O(1)$ -size alphabet and retain a subquadratic-time bound by making a better use of the word-RAM model. However, these works do not seem to extend to GED, especially not when taking sequences of points with arbitrary real coordinates. In the string version, the cost of replacing a character is fixed (usually 1); hence, we only need to detect that two characters are not identical to compute the replacement cost, unlike in GED, where the analogous cost for two matched points is taken to be their distance, under some metric.

## Our Results and Related Work

Efforts for breaking the quadratic time barrier for basic similarity measures between curves and point-sequences were recently stimulated by the result of Agarwal et al. [4] who showed that the discrete Fréchet distance can be computed in  $O(n^2/\log n)$  time. Their algorithm for (discrete) Fréchet distance does not extend to DTW or GED, as the formula for the (discrete) Fréchet distance uses the max function over distances between pairs of points, while the formulas for DTW and GED involve their sum. As a result, the Fréchet distance is effectively determined by a single pair of sequence elements, which fits well into the use of the Four-Russians technique [6], while the DTW and GED are determined by many pairs of elements. This makes our algorithms much more subtle, involving a combination and extension of techniques from computational geometry and graph shortest paths.

To simplify the presentation, we present our results only for the “balanced” case  $m = n$ ; extending them to the general case  $m \leq n$  is easy. The standard  $\Theta(mn)$ -time algorithm is superior to our solution only when  $m$  is subpolynomial in  $n$ .

Our results are stated in the following theorems.

**THEOREM 1.1.** *Given two sequences  $A = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$  and  $B = (q_1, \dots, q_n)$ , each of  $n$  points in  $\mathbb{R}$ , the DTW-distance  $\text{dtw}(A, B)$  (and optimal coupling), or the GED  $\text{ged}(A, B)$  (and optimal matching) can be computed by a deterministic algorithm in  $O(n^2 \log \log \log n / \log \log n)$  time.*

Theorem 1.1 gives the very first subquadratic-time algorithm for solving DTW, breaking the nearly 50-year-old  $\Theta(n^2)$  time bound [36]. We present the improved algorithm for DTW in Section 4. In Section 5 we extend our algorithm to give a more general result, which supports high-dimensional polyhedral metric spaces, as stated in Theorem 1.2 given below. In Section 7, we extend our algorithm to obtain a subquadratic solution for GED.

**THEOREM 1.2.** *Let  $A = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$  and  $B = (q_1, \dots, q_n)$  be two sequences of  $n$  points in a polyhedral metric space<sup>1</sup>  $(\mathbb{R}^d, \text{dist})$ . Then  $\text{dtw}(A, B)$  (and optimal coupling) or  $\text{ged}(A, B)$  (and optimal matching) can be computed by a deterministic algorithm in  $O(n^2 \log \log \log n / \log \log n)$  time.*

## 2 PRELIMINARIES

Throughout the article, we view matrices with rows indexed in increasing order from bottom to top and columns indexed in increasing order from left to right, so, for example,  $M[0, 0]$  corresponds to the value of the leftmost-bottom cell of a matrix  $M$ .

In Fredman’s classic 1976 articles on the decision tree complexity of  $(\min, +)$ -matrix multiplication [21], and on sorting  $X + Y$  [20], he often uses the simple observation that  $a + b < a' + b'$

<sup>1</sup>That is, the underlying metric is induced by a norm, whose unit ball is a symmetric convex polytope with  $O(1)$  facets of complexity  $O(1)$  (e.g.,  $L_1, L_\infty$ ).

iff  $a - a' < b' - b$ . This observation is usually referred to as *Fredman's trick*. In our algorithm, we will often use the following extension of Fredman's trick,

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 - b_1 + \cdots + a_r - b_r &< a'_1 - b'_1 + \cdots + a'_t - b'_t \\ \text{if and only if} & \\ a_1 + \cdots + a_r - a'_1 - \cdots - a'_t &< b_1 + \cdots + b_r - b'_1 - \cdots - b'_t. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Our algorithm uses the following geometric domination technique, based on an algorithm by Chan [15]. Given a finite set  $Q$  of red points and blue points in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , the *bichromatic dominating pairs reporting* problem is to report all the pairs  $(p, q) \in Q^2$  such that  $p$  is red,  $q$  is blue, and  $p$  dominates  $q$ , i.e.,  $p$  is greater than or equal to  $q$  at each of the  $d$  coordinates. A natural divide-and-conquer algorithm [34, p. 366] runs in  $O(|Q| \log^d |Q| + K)$  time, where  $K$  is the output size. Chan [15] provided an improved *strongly* subquadratic time bound (excluding the cost of reporting the output) when  $d = O(\log |Q|)$ , with a sufficiently small constant of proportionality.

LEMMA 2.1 (CHAN [15]). *Given a finite set  $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  of red and blue points, one can compute all bichromatic dominating pairs  $(p, q) \in Q^2$  in time  $O(c_\varepsilon^d |Q|^{1+\varepsilon} + K)$ , where  $K$  is the output size,  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  is an arbitrary prespecified parameter, and  $c_\varepsilon = 2^\varepsilon / (2^\varepsilon - 1)$ .*

Throughout the article, we invoke Lemma 2.1 many times, with  $\varepsilon = 1/2$ ,  $c_\varepsilon \approx 3.42$ , and  $d = \delta \log n$ , where  $\delta > 0$  is a sufficiently small constant, chosen to make the overall running time of all the invocations dominated by the total output size; see below for details.

We denote by  $[N] = \{1, \dots, \lceil N \rceil\}$ , the set of the first  $\lceil N \rceil$  natural numbers, for any  $N \in \mathbb{R}^+$ .

Throughout the article, we sometimes refer to a square matrix as a *box*.

Our model of computation is a simplified Real RAM model, in which “truly real” numbers are subject to only two unit-time operations: addition and comparison. In all other respects, the machine behaves like a  $w = O(\log n)$ -bit word RAM with the standard repertoire of unit-time  $AC^0$  operations, such as bitwise Boolean operations and left and right shifts.

### 3 THE QUADRATIC DTW ALGORITHM

We give an overview of the standard dynamic programming algorithm for computing the DTW-distance between two sequences of  $n$  points in  $\mathbb{R}$ , which requires quadratic time [36]. This algorithm can be easily extended to return also the optimal coupling (see below). In Section 7, we overview a “similar in principle” algorithm for solving GED.

We are given as input two sequences  $A = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$  and  $B = (q_1, \dots, q_n)$  of  $n$  points in  $\mathbb{R}$ . (The algorithm below can be (trivially) modified to handle sequences of different lengths.)

1. Initialize an  $(n+1) \times (n+1)$  matrix  $M$  and set  $M[0, 0] := 0$ .
2. For each  $\ell \in [n]$ 
  - 2.1.  $M[\ell, 0] := \infty, M[0, \ell] := \infty$ .
  3. For each  $\ell \in [n]$ ,
    - 3.1. For each  $m \in [n]$ ,
      - 3.1.1  $M[\ell, m] := |p_\ell - q_m| + \min\{M[\ell-1, m], M[\ell, m-1], M[\ell-1, m-1]\}$ .
  4. Return  $M[n, n]$ .

The optimal coupling itself can also be retrieved, at no extra asymptotic cost, by the standard technique of maintaining pointers from each  $(\ell, m)$  to the preceding position

$$(\ell', m') \in \{(\ell-1, m), (\ell, m-1), (\ell-1, m-1)\}$$

through which  $M[\ell, m]$  is minimized. Tracing these pointers backwards from  $(n, n)$  to  $(0, 0)$  and reversing these links yields the desired optimal coupling.

#### 4 DYNAMIC TIME WARPING IN SUBQUADRATIC TIME

As above, the input consists of two sequences  $A = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$  and  $B = (q_1, \dots, q_n)$  of  $n$  points in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Our algorithm can easily be modified to handle the case where  $A$  and  $B$  have different lengths.

##### Preparations

We fix some (small) parameter  $g$ , whose value will be specified later; for simplicity, we assume that  $\frac{n}{g-1}$  is an integer. We decompose  $A$  and  $B$  into  $s = \frac{n}{g-1}$  subsequences  $A_1, \dots, A_s$ , and  $B_1, \dots, B_s$ , such that for each  $i, j \in \{2, \dots, s\}$ , each of  $A_i$  and  $B_j$  consists of  $g-1$  consecutive elements of the corresponding sequence, prefixed by the last element of the preceding subsequence. We have that  $A_1$  and  $B_1$  are both of size  $g-1$ , each  $A_i$  and  $B_j$  is of size  $g$ , for  $i, j \in \{2, \dots, s\}$ , and each consecutive pair  $A_i, A_{i+1}$  or  $B_j, B_{j+1}$  have one common element.

For each  $i, j \in [s]$ , denote by  $D_{i,j}$  the *all-pairs-distances matrix* between points from  $A_i$  and points from  $B_j$ ; specifically,  $D_{i,j}$  is a  $g \times g$  matrix (aka a *box*) (see below for the cases  $i = 1$  or  $j = 1$ ) such that for every  $\ell, m \in [g]$ ,

$$D_{i,j}[\ell, m] = |A_i(\ell) - B_j(m)|.$$

For all  $i \in [s]$ , we add a leftmost column with  $\infty$  values to each box  $D_{i,1}$ , and, similarly, we add a bottommost row with  $\infty$  values to each box  $D_{1,i}$ . In particular,  $D_{1,1}$  is augmented by both a new leftmost column and a new bottommost row. The common element  $D_{1,1}[0, 0]$  of this row and column is set to 0. Overall, we have  $s^2 = (\frac{n}{g-1})^2$  boxes  $D_{i,j}$ , all of size  $g \times g$ .

We define a *staircase path*  $P$  on a  $g \times g$  matrix  $D_{i,j}$  as a sequence of positions from  $[g] \times [g]$  that form a monotone staircase structure, starting from a cell on the left or bottom boundary and ending at the right or top boundary, so that each subsequent position is immediately either to the right, above, or above-right of the previous one. Formally, by enumerating the path positions as  $P(0), \dots, P(t^*)$ , we have  $P(t+1) \in \{P(t) + (0, 1), P(t) + (1, 0), P(t) + (1, 1)\}$ , for each  $t \in \{0, \dots, t^* - 1\}$ . The path starts at some point  $P(0) = (\cdot, 1)$  or  $(1, \cdot)$ , and ends at some  $t^*$  (not necessarily the first such index) for which  $P(t^*) = (\cdot, g)$  or  $(g, \cdot)$ . Note that  $t^*$  can have any value in  $[2g - 2]$ . The number of possible monotone staircase paths in a box  $D_{i,j}$  is trivially bounded by  $O(g^2 3^{2g-2})$ , and a more careful reasoning improves the bound to  $O(3^{2g})$ , as is easily checked.<sup>2</sup>

We define the *cost* of a staircase path  $P$  in a box  $D_{i,j}$  by

$$\text{cost}_{i,j}(P) = \sum_{t=1}^{t^*} D_{i,j}(P(t)).$$

(For technical reasons, that will become clear in the sequel, we generally do not include the first position  $P(0)$  of the path in evaluating its cost, except in the boxes  $D_{i,1}$  and  $D_{1,j}$  for all  $i, j \in [s]$ .) To ease the presentation, in the algorithm that follows, we assume (or ensure) that no two distinct paths in a box  $D_{i,j}$  have the same cost. This will be the case if we assume that the input sequences are in sufficiently general position. In Section 6, we will show how this assumption can be completely removed, by adding a few additional steps to the preprocessing stage of the algorithm, without increasing its asymptotic time bound.

We denote by  $L$  the set of *positions* in the left and bottom boundaries of *any* box  $D_{i,j}$  and by  $R$  the set of positions in the right and top boundaries (note that  $L$  and  $R$  have two common positions). Given a starting position  $v \in L$ , and an ending position  $w \in R$ , we denote by  $S(v, w)$  the set of all

<sup>2</sup>Each staircase path can be encoded by its first position, followed by its sequence of moves, where each move is in one of the directions up/right/up-right. Thus, the number of staircase paths that start at some position  $(r, 1)$  (respectively,  $(1, r)$ ) at the left (respectively, bottom) boundary is bounded by  $3^{2g-1-r}$ . Thus, the total number of staircase paths that start at the left or the bottom boundary is bounded by  $2 \sum_{r=1}^g 3^{2g-1-r} = O(3^{2g})$ .



staircase paths  $P_{v,w}$  that start at  $v$  and end at  $w$  (if there is no staircase path between  $v$  and  $w$ , then  $S(v, w) = \emptyset$ ). We say that  $P_{v,w}^* \in S(v, w)$  is the *shortest path* between  $v$  and  $w$  in  $D_{i,j}$  iff

$$\text{cost}_{i,j}(P_{v,w}^*) = \min_{P_{v,w} \in S(v,w)} \{\text{cost}_{i,j}(P_{v,w})\}.$$

Note that according to our general position assumption, the shortest path between  $v$  and  $w$ , within a given box, is *unique*.

### First Stage: Preprocessing

The first stage of our algorithm is to construct a data structure in subquadratic time (and storage), such that for each box  $D_{i,j}$ , and for each pair of positions  $(v, w) \in L \times R$ , we can retrieve the shortest path  $P_{v,w}^*$  and  $\text{cost}_{i,j}(P_{v,w}^*)$  in  $O(1)$  time, when such a path exists (i.e., when  $S(v, w)$  is nonempty).

The algorithm enumerates all  $(2g - 1)^2$  pairs of positions  $(v, w)$  in a  $g \times g$  matrix (box) such that  $v \in L$  and  $w \in R$ , discarding pairs that cannot be connected by a monotone staircase path, and referring to the surviving pairs as *admissible*. Again, we simplify the notation by upper bounding this quantity by  $4g^2$ . For each such admissible pair  $(v, w) \in L \times R$ , we enumerate *every* possible staircase path in  $S(v, w)$  as  $P_{v,w} : [t^*] \rightarrow [g] \times [g]$ , where we write  $P_{v,w} = (P_{v,w}^r, P_{v,w}^c)$  as a pair of row and column functions  $P_{v,w}^r, P_{v,w}^c : [t^*] \rightarrow [g]$ , so that  $P_{v,w}(k) = (P_{v,w}^r(k), P_{v,w}^c(k))$ , for each  $k \in [t^*]$ . (Note that  $t^*$  is a path-dependent parameter, determined by  $v, w$  and the number of diagonal moves in the path.) There are  $O(3^{2g})$  possible staircase paths  $P_{v,w}$  (for all admissible pairs  $(v, w) \in L \times R$  combined), so in total, we enumerate  $O(3^{2g})$  staircase paths. These enumerations can be done in a natural lexicographic order, so that they induce a total order on the  $< 4g^2$  admissible pairs of positions of  $L \times R$ , and for each such pair  $(v, w)$ , a total order on all possible staircase paths  $P_{v,w} \in S(v, w)$ .

Given two staircase paths  $P_{v,w}$  and  $P'_{v,w}$  with the same starting and ending positions in a box  $D_{i,j}$ , we want to use the extended Fredman trick (as in Equation (3)) to compare  $\text{cost}_{i,j}(P_{v,w})$  with  $\text{cost}_{i,j}(P'_{v,w})$  by comparing two expressions such that one depends on points from  $A_i$  only and the other depends on points from  $B_j$  only. Suppose that  $P_{v,w} = ((\ell_1, m_1), \dots, (\ell_r, m_r))$  and  $P'_{v,w} = ((\ell'_1, m'_1), \dots, (\ell'_t, m'_t))$  (note that  $(\ell_r, m_r) = (\ell'_t, m'_t) = w$ , since both paths end at  $w$ , and that we ignore the common starting positions  $(\ell_0, m_0) = (\ell'_0, m'_0) = v$ ). We have

$$\text{cost}_{i,j}(P_{v,w}) = |A_i(\ell_1) - B_j(m_1)| + \dots + |A_i(\ell_r) - B_j(m_r)|,$$

and

$$\text{cost}_{i,j}(P'_{v,w}) = |A_i(\ell'_1) - B_j(m'_1)| + \dots + |A_i(\ell'_t) - B_j(m'_t)|,$$

and we want to test whether, say,  $\text{cost}_{i,j}(P_{v,w}) < \text{cost}_{i,j}(P'_{v,w})$  (recall that we assume that equalities do not arise), that is, testing whether

$$|A_i(\ell_1) - B_j(m_1)| + \dots + |A_i(\ell_r) - B_j(m_r)| < |A_i(\ell'_1) - B_j(m'_1)| + \dots + |A_i(\ell'_t) - B_j(m'_t)|. \quad (4)$$

The last term in each side of Equation (4) is actually unnecessary, since they are equal. To transform this inequality into a form suitable for applying the extended Fredman trick (3), we need to replace each absolute value  $|x|$  by either  $+x$  or  $-x$ , as appropriate. To see what we are after, assume first that the expressions  $A_i(\ell_k) - B_j(m_k)$  and  $A_i(\ell'_k) - B_j(m'_k)$  are all positive, so that Equation (4) becomes

$$A_i(\ell_1) - B_j(m_1) + \dots + A_i(\ell_r) - B_j(m_r) < A_i(\ell'_1) - B_j(m'_1) + \dots + A_i(\ell'_t) - B_j(m'_t).$$

By Equation (3) we can rewrite this inequality as

$$A_i(\ell_1) + \dots + A_i(\ell_r) - A_i(\ell'_1) - \dots - A_i(\ell'_t) < B_j(m_1) + \dots + B_j(m_r) - B_j(m'_1) - \dots - B_j(m'_t),$$

which can be written as

$$A_i(P_{v,w}^r(1)) + \cdots + A_i(P_{v,w}^r(r)) - A_i(P_{v,w}^{\prime r}(1)) - \cdots - A_i(P_{v,w}^{\prime r}(t)), \quad (5)$$

$$< B_j(P_{v,w}^c(1)) + \cdots + B_j(P_{v,w}^c(r)) - B_j(P_{v,w}^{\prime c}(1)) - \cdots - B_j(P_{v,w}^{\prime c}(t)). \quad (6)$$

If  $P_{v,w} = P_{v,w}^*$  (i.e., if  $P_{v,w}$  is the shortest path from  $v$  to  $w$ ) in  $D_{i,j}$ , then the inequality above holds for all pairs  $(P_{v,w}, P_{v,w}')$ , where  $P_{v,w}' \in S(v, w)$  is any other staircase path between  $v$  and  $w$ .

For each admissible pair of positions  $(v, w) \in L \times R$ , we choose some staircase path  $P_{v,w}$  as a candidate for being the shortest path from  $v$  to  $w$ . The overall number of sets of candidate paths is fewer than  $(3^{2g})^{4g^2} = 3^{8g^3}$ . For a fixed choice of such a set of paths (one path for each admissible pair  $(v, w) \in L \times R$ ), we want to test, within some given box  $D_{i,j}$ , whether all the  $< 4g^2$  chosen paths are the shortest paths between the corresponding pairs of positions. As unfolded next, we will apply this test for all boxes  $D_{i,j}$  and output those boxes at which the outcome is positive (for the current chosen set of shortest paths). We will repeat the procedure for all  $< 3^{8g^3}$  possible sets of candidate paths  $P_{v,w}$ . Since we enumerated the staircase paths in lexicographical order earlier, we can easily proceed through all sets of candidate paths, using this order.

*Testing a Fixed Choice of Shortest Paths.* For each subsequence  $A_i$ , we create a (blue) point  $\alpha_i$ , and for each subsequence  $B_j$  we create a (red) point  $\beta_j$ , such that, for every admissible pair  $(v, w) \in L \times R$ , we have one coordinate for each path  $P_{v,w}' \in S(v, w)$ , different from the chosen path  $P_{v,w}$ . The value of  $\alpha_i$  (respectively,  $\beta_j$ ) at that coordinate is the corresponding expression (5) (respectively, (6)). The points  $\alpha_i$  and  $\beta_j$  are embedded in  $\mathbb{R}^{d_g}$ , where  $d_g = \sum_{(v,w)} \Gamma_{v,w}$  is the sum over all admissible pairs  $(v, w) \in L \times R$ , and  $\Gamma_{v,w}$  is the number of monotone staircase paths from  $v$  to  $w$  minus 1. As discussed earlier,  $d_g = O(3^{2g})$ .

We have that a (blue) point

$$\alpha_i = (\dots, A_i(P_{v,w}^r(1)) + \cdots + A_i(P_{v,w}^r(r)) - A_i(P_{v,w}^{\prime r}(1)) - \cdots - A_i(P_{v,w}^{\prime r}(t)), \dots)$$

is dominated by a (red) point

$$\beta_j = (\dots, B_j(P_{v,w}^c(1)) + \cdots + B_j(P_{v,w}^c(r)) - B_j(P_{v,w}^{\prime c}(1)) - \cdots - B_j(P_{v,w}^{\prime c}(t)), \dots),$$

if and only if each of the paths that we chose (a path for every admissible pair  $(v, w) \in L \times R$ ) is the shortest path between the corresponding positions  $v, w$  in box  $D_{i,j}$ . The number of points is  $2s = \Theta(n/g)$ , and the time to prepare the points, i.e., to compute all their coordinates, is  $O(2s \cdot 3^{2g} \cdot g) = O(3^{2g}n)$ .

By Lemma 2.1, we can report all pairs of points  $(\alpha_i, \beta_j)$  such that  $\alpha_i$  is dominated by  $\beta_j$ , in  $O(c_\varepsilon^{O(3^{2g})}(n/g)^{1+\varepsilon} + K)$  time, where  $K$  is the number of boxes at which the test of our specific chosen paths comes out positive. As mentioned earlier, we use  $\varepsilon = 1/2$ , with  $c_\varepsilon \approx 3.42$ .

This runtime is for a specific choice of a set of shortest paths between all admissible pairs in  $L \times R$ . As already mentioned, we repeat this procedure at most  $3^{8g^3}$  times. Overall, we will report exactly  $s^2 = \Theta((n/g)^2)$  dominating pairs (red on blue), because the set of shortest paths between admissible pairs in  $L \times R$  in each box  $D_{i,j}$  is unique (recall that we assumed that any pair of distinct staircase paths in a box do not have the same cost). Since the overall number of sets of candidate paths is bounded by  $3^{8g^3}$ , the overall runtime for all invocations of the bichromatic dominance reporting algorithm (including preparing the points) is

$$O\left(3^{8g^3} \left(3^{2g}n + c_\varepsilon^{O(3^{2g})}(n/g)^{1+\varepsilon}\right) + (n/g)^2\right).$$

Recall that, so far, we have assumed that all the differences within the absolute values  $D_{i,j}[\ell, m] = |A_i(\ell) - B_j(m)|$  are positive, which allowed us to drop the absolute values, and write



$D_{i,j}[\ell, m] = A_i(\ell) - B_j(m)$ , for every  $i, j \in [s]$ , and  $\ell, m \in [g]$ , thereby facilitating the use of the extended Fredman trick (3). Of course, in general this will not be the case, so, to still be able to drop the absolute values, we also have to verify the signs of all these differences.

For each box  $D_{i,j}$ , there is a *unique* sign assignment  $\sigma^* : [g] \times [g] \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$  such that

$$D_{i,j}[\ell, m] = |A_i(\ell) - B_j(m)| = \sigma^*(\ell, m)(A_i(\ell) - B_j(m)),$$

for every  $\ell, m \in [g]$  (our “general position” assumption implies that each difference is nonzero). Thus for any staircase path  $P = (P^r, P^c)$  in  $D_{i,j}$ , of length  $t^*$ , we have

$$\text{cost}_{i,j}(P) = \sum_{t=1}^{t^*} \sigma^*(P(t)) (A_i(P^r(t)) - B_j(P^c(t))).$$

Now we proceed as before, testing sets of paths, but now we also test sign assignments of the box, by trying *every* possible assignment  $\sigma : [g] \times [g] \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$ , and modify the points  $\alpha_i$  and  $\beta_j$ , defined earlier, by (i) adding sign factors to each term, and (ii) adding coordinates that enable us to test whether  $\sigma$  is the correct assignment  $\sigma^*$  for the corresponding boxes  $D_{i,j}$ .

Denote by  $P$  a candidate for the shortest path for some admissible pair of positions  $(v, w) \in L \times R$ , and let  $\sigma$  be a candidate sign assignment. Then, for every other path  $P' \in S(v, w)$ , we have the following modified coordinates for  $\alpha_i$  and  $\beta_j$ , respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} & (\dots, \sigma(P(1))A_i(P^r(1)) + \dots + \sigma(P(r))A_i(P^r(r)) - \sigma(P'(1))A_i(P'^r(1)) - \dots - \sigma(P'(t))A_i(P'^r(t)), \dots), \\ & (\dots, \sigma(P(1))B_j(P^c(1)) + \dots + \sigma(P(r))B_j(P^c(r)) - \sigma(P'(1))B_j(P'^c(1)) - \dots - \sigma(P'(t))B_j(P'^c(t)), \dots), \end{aligned}$$

where we use the same notations as in Equations (4), (5), and (6). In addition, to validate the correctness of  $\sigma$ , we extend  $\alpha_i$  and  $\beta_j$  by adding the following  $g^2$  coordinates to each of them. For every pair  $(\ell, m) \in [g] \times [g]$ , we add the following coordinates to  $\alpha_i$  and  $\beta_j$ , respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} & (\dots, -\sigma(\ell, m)A_i(\ell), \dots), \\ & (\dots, -\sigma(\ell, m)B_j(m), \dots). \end{aligned}$$

This ensures that a point  $\alpha_i$  is dominated by a point  $\beta_j$  iff  $D_{i,j}[\ell, m] = \sigma(\ell, m)(A_i(\ell) - B_j(m))$ , for every  $\ell, m \in [g]$ , and all the  $< 4g^2$  candidate paths that we test are indeed shortest paths in  $D_{i,j}$ .

The runtime analysis is similar to the preceding one, but now we increase the number of candidate choices by a factor of  $2^{g^2}$  (this factor bounds the number of all possible sign assignments), and the dimension of the space where the points are embedded increases by  $g^2$  additional coordinates. We now have  $2s = \Theta(n/g)$  points in  $\mathbb{R}^{d_g + g^2}$  ( $d_g = O(3^{2g})$  is as defined earlier), and the time to prepare them (computing the value of each coordinate) is  $O((n/g)(d_g + g^2)g) = O(3^{2g}n)$ . There are at most  $3^{8g^3}$  sets of candidate paths to test, and for each set, there are at most  $2^{g^2}$  sign assignment to test, so in total, we invoke the bichromatic dominance reporting algorithm at most  $2^{g^2} 3^{8g^3} < 3^{8g^3 + g^2}$  times for an overall runtime (including preparing the points) of

$$O\left(3^{8g^3 + g^2} \left(3^{2g}n + c_\varepsilon^{O(3^{2g}) + g^2} (n/g)^{1+\varepsilon}\right) + (n/g)^2\right).$$

By setting  $\varepsilon = 1/2$  and  $g = \delta \log \log n$ , for a suitable sufficiently small constant  $\delta$ , the first two terms become negligible (strongly subquadratic), and the runtime is therefore dominated by the output size, that is,  $O((n/g)^2) = O(n^2/(\log \log n)^2)$ . Each reported pair  $(\alpha_i, \beta_j)$  certifies that the current set of  $< 4g^2$  chosen candidate paths are all shortest paths in box  $D_{i,j}$ . Each of the  $s^2 = \Theta((n/g)^2)$  sets of shortest paths is represented by  $O(g^3) = O((\log \log n)^3)$  bits (there are  $< 4g^2$  shortest paths connecting admissible pairs, each of length at most  $2g - 1$ , and each path can be encoded by its first position, followed by the sequence of its at most  $2g - 2$  moves, where each move is in one of the three directions up/right/up-right), and thus it can easily be stored in one

machine word (for sufficiently small  $\delta$ ). Moreover, we have an order on the pairs  $(v, w)$  (induced by our earlier enumeration), so for each set, we can store its shortest paths in this order, and therefore, accessing a specific path (for some admissible pair) from the set takes  $O(1)$  time (in the word-RAM model that we assume).

Note, however, that we obtain only the *positions* that the paths traverse and not their *cost*. In later stages of our algorithm we will also need to compute, on demand, the cost of certain paths, but doing this naively would take  $O(g)$  time per path, which is too expensive for us. To handle this issue, when we chose a candidate sign assignment  $\sigma$ , and a set  $S$  of the  $< 4g^2$  paths as candidates for the shortest paths, we also compute and store, for each path  $P \in S$  that we have not yet encountered, the *rows-cost* of  $P$  in  $A_i$ ,

$$V_i^r(P, \sigma) = \sigma(P(1))A_i(P^r(1)) + \cdots + \sigma(P(t^*))A_i(P^r(t^*)),$$

for every  $i \in [s]$ , and the *columns-cost* of  $P$  in  $B_j$ ,

$$V_j^c(P, \sigma) = \sigma(P(1))B_j(P^c(1)) + \cdots + \sigma(P(t^*))B_j(P^c(t^*)),$$

for every  $j \in [s]$ , where  $t^*$  is the length of  $P$ . Observe that, for the correct sign assignment  $\sigma^*$  of box  $D_{i,j}$ ,

$$\text{cost}_{i,j}(P) = V_i^r(P, \sigma^*) - V_j^c(P, \sigma^*). \quad (7)$$

We do not compute  $V_i^r(P, \sigma) - V_j^c(P, \sigma)$  yet, but only compute and store (if not already stored) the separate quantities  $V_i^r(P, \sigma)$  and  $V_j^c(P, \sigma)$ , for each  $P \in S$ , for every chosen set  $S$ , and sign assignment  $\sigma$ . We store the values  $V_i^r(P, \sigma)$  and  $V_j^c(P, \sigma)$  in arrays, ordered by the earlier enumeration of all staircase paths, so that given a staircase path  $P$ , and indices  $i, j \in [\frac{n}{g-1}]$ , we can retrieve, on demand, the values  $V_i^r(P, \sigma^*)$  and  $V_j^c(P, \sigma^*)$  and compute  $\text{cost}_{i,j}(P)$  by using (7), in  $O(1)$  time. In total, over all possible candidate paths and sign assignments, this takes  $O(2^{2g} 3^{2g} \cdot (n/g) \cdot g) = O(3^{g^2+2g}n)$  time and space, which is already subsumed by the time (and space) bound for reporting dominances from the previous stage.

To summarize this stage of the algorithm, we presented a subquadratic-time preprocessing procedure, which runs in  $O((n/g)^2) = O(n^2/(\log \log n)^2)$  time, such that for any box  $D_{i,j}$ , and an admissible pair of positions  $(v, w) \in L \times R$ , we can retrieve the shortest path  $P_{v,w}^*$  in  $O(1)$  time and can also compute  $\text{cost}_{i,j}(P_{v,w}^*)$  in  $O(1)$  time. This will be useful in the next stage of our algorithm.

## Second Stage: Compact Dynamic Programming

Our approach is to view the  $(n+1) \times (n+1)$  matrix  $M$  from the dynamic programming algorithm (see Section 3) as decomposed into  $s^2 = (\frac{n}{g-1})^2$  boxes  $M_{i,j}$ , each of size  $g \times g$ , so that each box  $M_{i,j}$  occupies the same positions as does the corresponding box  $D_{i,j}$ . That is, the indices of the rows (respectively, columns) of  $M_{i,j}$  are those of  $A_i$  (respectively,  $B_j$ ). In particular, for each  $i, j \in [s]$ , the positions  $(\cdot, g)$  on the right boundary of each box  $M_{i,j}$  coincide with the corresponding positions  $(\cdot, 1)$  on the left boundary of  $M_{i,j+1}$ , and the positions  $(g, \cdot)$  on the top boundary of  $M_{i,j}$  coincide with the corresponding positions  $(1, \cdot)$  on the bottom boundary of  $M_{i+1,j}$ . Formally,  $M_{i,j}[\ell, m] = M[(i-1)(g-1) + \ell, (j-1)(g-1) + m]$ , for each position  $(\ell, m) \in [g] \times [g]$ . See Figure 2 for an illustration.

Our strategy is to traverse the boxes, starting from the leftmost-bottom one  $M_{1,1}$ , where we already have the values of  $M$  at the positions of its left and bottom boundaries  $L$  (initialized to the same values as in the algorithm in Section 3), and we compute the values of  $M$  on its top and right boundaries  $R$ . We then continue to the box on the right,  $M_{1,2}$ , now having the values on its  $L$ -boundary (where its left portion overlaps with the  $R$ -boundary of  $M_{1,1}$  and its bottom portion is taken from the already preset bottom boundary), and we compute the values of  $M$  on




Fig. 2. The  $L$ -boundary (shaded in gray) of box  $M_{i,j}$  overlaps with the top boundary of  $M_{i-1,j}$  and the right boundary of  $M_{i,j-1}$ . Once we have the values of  $M$  at the positions of the  $L$ -boundary of  $M_{i,j}$ , our algorithm computes the values of  $M$  at the positions of its  $R$ -boundary (shaded in blue).

its  $R$ -boundary. We continue in this way until we reach the rightmost-bottom box  $M_{1,s}$ . We then continue in the same manner in the next row of boxes, starting at  $M_{2,1}$  and ending at  $M_{2,s}$ , and keep going through the rows of boxes in order. The process ends once we compute the values of  $M$  on the  $R$ -boundary of the rightmost-top box  $M_{s,s}$ , from which we obtain the desired entry  $M[n, n]$ .

For convenience, we enumerate the positions in  $L$  as  $L(1), \dots, L(2g-1)$  in “clockwise” order, so that  $L(1)$  is the rightmost-bottom position  $(1, g)$ , and  $L(2g-1)$  is the leftmost-top position  $(g, 1)$ . Similarly, we enumerate the positions of  $R$  by  $R(1), \dots, R(2g-1)$  in “counterclockwise” order, with the same starting and ending locations. Let  $M_{i,j}(L) = \{M_{i,j}[L(1)], \dots, M_{i,j}[L(2g-1)]\}$  and  $M_{i,j}(R) = \{M_{i,j}[R(1)], \dots, M_{i,j}[R(2g-1)]\}$ , for  $i, j \in [s]$ .

By definition, for each position  $(\ell, m) \in [n+1] \times [n+1]$ ,  $M[\ell, m]$  is the minimal cost of a staircase path from  $(0, 0)$  to  $(\ell, m)$ . It easily follows, by construction, that for each box  $D_{i,j}$ , and for each position  $w \in R$ , we have

$$M_{i,j}[w] = \min_{\substack{v \in L \\ (v, w) \text{ admissible}}} \left\{ M_{i,j}[v] + \text{cost}_{i,j}(P_{v,w}^*) \right\}. \quad (8)$$

(Note that, by definition, the term  $D_{i,j}[v]$  is included in  $M_{i,j}[v]$  and not in  $\text{cost}_{i,j}(P_{v,w}^*)$ , so it is not doubly counted.) For each box  $M_{i,j}$  and each position  $w \in R$ , our goal is thus to compute the position  $u \in L$  that attains the minimum in Equation (8). We call such  $(u, w)$  the *minimal pair* for  $w$  in  $M_{i,j}$ .

For each box  $D_{i,j}$ , and each admissible pair  $(v, w) \in L \times R$ , we refer to the value  $M_{i,j}[v] + \text{cost}_{i,j}(P_{v,w}^*)$  as the *cumulative cost* of the pair  $(v, w)$ , and denote it by  $\text{c-cost}(v, w)$ .

We can rewrite Equation (8), for each position  $w \in R$ , as

$$M_{i,j}[w] = \min \{ M_{i,j}^E[w], M_{i,j}^S[w] \},$$

where  $M_{i,j}^S[w]$  is the minimum in Equation (8) computed only over  $v \in \{L(1), \dots, L(g)\}$ , which is the portion of  $L$  that overlaps the  $R$ -boundary of the bottom (south) neighbor  $M_{i-1,j}$  (when  $i > 1$ ), and  $M_{i,j}^E[w]$  is computed over  $v \in \{L(g), \dots, L(2g-1)\}$ , which overlaps the  $R$ -boundary of the left (east) neighbor  $M_{i,j-1}$  (when  $j > 1$ ). See Figure 2 for a schematic illustration. (Recall that the bottommost row and the leftmost column of  $M$  are initialized with  $\infty$  values, except their shared




Fig. 3. By Lemma 4.1, if  $(u, w)$  and  $(u', w')$  are minimal pairs in  $M_{i,j}$ , then the illustrated scenario is impossible, since the path  $P_{u,w}^*$  (in green) is a portion of the shortest path from  $M[0, 0]$  to  $M_{i,j}[w]$ , and the path  $P_{u',w'}^*$  (in orange) is a portion of the shortest path from  $M[0, 0]$  to  $M_{i,j}[w']$ . The illustrated intersection implies that one of the latter paths can decrease its cumulative cost by replacing its portion that ends at  $h$  by the respective portion that ends in  $h$  of the other path (we assume that there are no two paths with the same cost), which contradicts the fact that both of these paths are shortest paths.

cell  $M[0, 0]$  that is initialized with 0.) The output of the algorithm is  $M_{s,s}[R(g)] = M_{s,s}[g, g] = M[n, n]$ . We can also return the optimal coupling, by using a simple backward pointer tracing procedure, similar in principle to the one mentioned for the quadratic algorithm in Section 3.

*Computing Minimal Pairs.* We still have to explain how to compute the minimal pairs  $(u, w)$  in each box  $M_{i,j}$ . Our preprocessing stage produces, for every box  $D_{i,j}$ , the set of all its shortest paths  $S_{i,j} = \{P_{v,w}^* \mid (v, w) \in L \times R\}$  (ordered by the earlier enumeration of  $L \times R$  and including only admissible pairs), and we can also retrieve the cost of each of these paths in  $O(1)$  time (as explained earlier in the preprocessing stage). The cumulative cost (defined above) of each such pair  $(v, w)$  can also be computed in  $O(1)$  time, assuming we have already computed  $M_{i,j}[v]$ . A naive, brute-force technique for computing the minimal pairs is to compute all the cumulative costs  $c\text{-cost}_{i,j}(v, w)$ , for all admissible pairs  $(v, w) \in L \times R$ , and select from them the minimal pairs. This however would take  $O(g^2)$  time for each of the  $s^2$  boxes, for a total of  $\Theta(g^2 s^2) = \Theta(n^2)$  time, which is what we want to avoid.

Fortunately, we have the following important lemma, which lets us compute all the minimal pairs within a box, significantly faster than in  $O(g^2)$  time.

**LEMMA 4.1.** *For a fixed box  $D_{i,j}$ , and for any two distinct positions  $w, w' \in R$ , let  $u, u' \in L$  be the positions for which  $(u, w)$  and  $(u', w')$  are minimal pairs in  $M_{i,j}$ . Then their corresponding shortest paths  $P_{u,w}^*$  and  $P_{u',w'}^*$  can partially overlap but can never cross each other. Formally, assuming that  $w > w'$  (in the counterclockwise order along  $R$ ), we have that for any  $\ell, \ell', m \in [g]$ , if  $(\ell, m) \in P_{u,w}^*$  and  $(\ell', m) \in P_{u',w'}^*$  then  $\ell \geq \ell'$ . That is,  $P_{u,w}^*$  lies fully above  $P_{u',w'}^*$  (partial overlapping is possible). In particular, we also have  $u \geq u'$  (in the clockwise order along  $L$ ).*

Lemma 4.1 asserts the so-called *Monge property* of shortest-path matrices (see, e.g., References [13, 28]). See Figure 3 for an illustration (of an impossible crossing) and a sketch of a proof.

We can therefore use the following divide-and-conquer paradigm for computing the minimal pairs within a box  $M_{i,j}$ . We start by setting the median index  $k = \lfloor |R|/2 \rfloor$  of  $|R|$  and compute the minimal pair  $(u, R(k))$  and its  $c\text{-cost}(u, R(k))$ , naively, in  $O(g)$  time, as explained above. The path  $P_{u,R(k)}^*$  decomposes the box  $M_{i,j}$  into two parts, so that one part,  $X$ , consists of all the positions in  $M_{i,j}$  that are (weakly) above  $P_{u,R(k)}^*$ , and the other part,  $Y$ , consists of all the positions in  $M_{i,j}$  that are (weakly) below  $P_{u,R(k)}^*$ , so that  $X$  and  $Y$  are disjoint, except for the positions along the

path  $P_{u,R(k)}^*$  which they share. By Lemma 4.1, the shortest paths between any other minimal pair of positions in  $L \times R$  can never cross  $P_{u,R(k)}^*$ . Thus, we can repeat this process separately in  $X$  and in  $Y$ . Note that the input to each recursive step is just the sequences of positions of  $X$  and  $Y$  along  $L$  and  $R$ , respectively (and we encode each sequence simply by its first and last elements); there is no need to keep track of the corresponding portion of  $M_{i,j}$  itself.

Denote by  $T(a, b)$  the maximum runtime for computing all the minimal pairs  $(u, w)$ , within any box  $M_{i,j}$ , for  $u$  in some contiguous portion  $L'$  of  $a$  entries of  $L$ , and  $w$  in some contiguous portion  $R'$  of  $b$  entries of  $R$ . Clearly,  $T(1, b) = O(b)$ , and  $T(a, 1) = O(a)$ . In general, the runtime is bounded by the recurrence

$$T(a, b) = \max_{k \in [a]} \{ T(k, \lfloor b/2 \rfloor) + T(a - k + 1, \lfloor b/2 \rfloor) \} + O(a).$$

It is an easy induction exercise to show that the solution of this recurrence satisfies  $T(a, b) = O((a + b) \log b)$ . Thus, the runtime of the divide-and-conquer procedure described above, for a fixed box  $M_{i,j}$ , is  $O((|R| + |L|) \log |R|) = O(g \log g)$ .

The runtime of computing  $M_{i,j}(R)$  for all  $s^2 = \Theta((n/g)^2)$  boxes is thus  $O((n/g)^2 g \log g) = O(n^2 \log g/g)$ . Overall, including the preprocessing stage, the total runtime of the algorithm is  $O((n/g)^2 + n^2 \log g/g) = O(n^2 \log g/g)$ . As dictated by the preprocessing stage, we need to choose  $g = \Theta(\log \log n)$ , so the overall runtime is  $O(n^2 \log \log \log n / \log \log n)$ . This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1 for DTW for sequences of points in  $\mathbb{R}$ .  $\square$

## 5 EXTENSION TO HIGH-DIMENSIONAL POLYHEDRAL METRIC SPACES

The algorithm described above can be extended to work in higher-dimensional spaces  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , for any constant  $d$ , when the underlying metric is polyhedral. That is, the underlying metric is induced by a norm, whose unit ball is a symmetric convex polytope with  $O(1)$  facets of complexity  $O(1)$ . To illustrate this extension, consider the  $L_1$ -metric in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , whose unit ball is the symmetric polytope  $|x_1| + \dots + |x_d| \leq 1$ , with  $2^d$  facets. In this case, each entry in the blocks  $D_{i,j}$  is a sum of  $d$  absolute values. By choosing a candidate sign assignment for all the absolute values, we get a sum of differences, and the extended Fredman trick (3) can then be applied when comparing the costs of two staircase paths. Then, in much the same way as before, we can encode the inequalities into red and blue points  $\alpha_i$  and  $\beta_j$  and use a suitable modification of the preceding machinery to compare costs of staircase paths and validate sign assignments correctness. Omitting further details, we get a subquadratic algorithm for DTW in such a higher-dimensional setup under the  $L_1$ -metric, with the same asymptotic time bound as that of the algorithm described above but with the constant of proportionality depending (exponentially) on  $d$ .

To handle general polyhedral metrics, let  $K$  denote the unit ball of the metric. For each pair of points  $p_\ell \in A$ ,  $q_m \in B$ , we choose some facet of  $K$  as a candidate for the facet that is hit by the oriented ray that emanates from the origin in the direction of the vector  $\overrightarrow{p_\ell q_m}$  (this replaces the sign assignments used in the one-dimensional case and for the  $L_1$ -metric). Given such a candidate facet,  $\text{dist}(p_\ell, q_m)$  is a linear expression, and the extended Fredman trick, with all the follow-up for comparing costs of staircase paths can be applied, except that we also need to validate the correctness of our chosen candidate facet of  $K$ . This is done as follows.

Assume, without loss of generality, that each facet of  $K$  is a  $(d - 1)$ -simplex (this can be achieved by a suitable triangulation of the facets). Consider a simplex-facet  $f$ , and let  $F$  be the cone spanned by  $f$  with apex at the origin.  $F$  is the intersection of  $d$  halfspaces, each of the form  $\langle h_i, x \rangle \geq 0$ , for suitable normal unit vectors  $h_1, \dots, h_d$ . To verify that the direction  $\overrightarrow{p_\ell q_m}$  hits  $f$ , we need to verify that  $\langle h_i, q_m - p_\ell \rangle \geq 0$ , or that  $\langle h_i, q_m \rangle \geq \langle h_i, p_\ell \rangle$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . These are  $d$  linear tests, which

fit well into the frame of the extended Fredman trick (they replace the sign test that are used in the one-dimensional case, and in the  $L_1$ -case).

Again, omitting the further, rather routine details, we obtain a subquadratic algorithm for DTW in any fixed dimension, under any polyhedral metric, with the same runtime as in Theorem 1.1 and as stated in Theorem 1.2, though the constant of proportionality depends on the dimension  $d$  and on the complexity of the metric's unit ball  $K$  (i.e., the number and complexity of its facets).

## 6 LIFTING THE GENERAL POSITION ASSUMPTION

In the algorithm above, we assumed that in each box  $D_{i,j}$  there are no two staircase paths with the same cost. This assumption was crucial for preserving the overall output size of the dominance reporting routines  $O(n^2/g^2)$ . Specifically, all we need to ensure is that for each admissible boundary pair from  $L \times R$ , there will be only one staircase path with minimum cost. Our goal is to be able to break ties consistently. However, this is not trivial, as we must find a way to do it while using the Fredman-Chan mechanism. We can do it as follows.

In the preprocessing stage, our algorithm enumerated all the  $< 3^{2g}$  staircase paths in a  $g \times g$  grid. These enumerations are done in a natural lexicographic order and thus induce a total order on the staircase paths. Denote this total order by  $\mathcal{L}$ . (Note that  $\mathcal{L}$  is independent of the values of  $A$  and  $B$ .)

Let  $A, B$  be two given input sequences of points (numbers) in  $\mathbb{R}$  (a similar solution works for the extension to  $\mathbb{R}^d$  under polyhedral metrics described above). First, sort  $A$  and  $B$  in increasing order in  $O(n \log n)$  time. Find a *positive closest pair*  $(a, b) \in A \times B$ , i.e., such that

$$|a - b| = \min_{(a_i, b_j) \in A \times B: |a_i - b_j| > 0} \{|a_i - b_j|\}.$$

This can be done while merging the sorted  $A$  and  $B$ , in  $O(n)$  time. (If we are in a polyhedral  $\mathbb{R}^d$  metric space, then we use a straightforward modification of the standard  $O(2^d n \log n)$  divide-and-conquer closest pair algorithm of Bentley and Shamos [8, 9] to find the positive closest pair in the set  $A \cup B$ .) Put  $\varepsilon = |a - b|$ . For every boundary pair in  $L \times R$ , there are strictly less than  $3^{2g}$  staircase paths, denote this number by  $r$ . Set

$$\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon/3^{2g} < \varepsilon_2 = 2\varepsilon/3^{2g} < \varepsilon_3 = 3\varepsilon/3^{2g} < \dots < \varepsilon_r = r\varepsilon/3^{2g}.$$

For every boundary pair  $(v, w) \in L \times R$ , and every staircase path  $P_{v,w}$  (recall that  $P_{v,w}$  is a sequence of positions in the  $g \times g$  grid, and is independent of the values of  $A$  and  $B$ ), we check for the index  $k$  of  $P_{v,w}$  in the total order  $\mathcal{L}$ , and add  $\varepsilon_k$  to  $\text{cost}_{i,j}(P_{v,w})$ , for every  $i, j \in [\frac{n}{g-1}]$ .

For a boundary pair  $(v, w) \in L \times R$ , let  $P_{v,w}$  and  $P'_{v,w}$  be two distinct staircase paths, and let  $k, k' \in [r]$  be their corresponding (distinct) indices in the total order  $\mathcal{L}$ . Assume, without loss of generality, that  $k < k'$  (it must be that either  $k < k'$  or  $k' < k$ , since the two paths are distinct, and  $\mathcal{L}$  is a total order). Since  $\varepsilon_k < \varepsilon_{k'} < |a - b|$ , it holds that for every  $i, j \in [\frac{n}{g-1}]$ ,

$$\text{cost}_{i,j}(P_{v,w}) \leq \text{cost}_{i,j}(P'_{v,w}) \text{ if and only if } \text{cost}_{i,j}(P_{v,w} + \varepsilon_k) < \text{cost}_{i,j}(P'_{v,w} + \varepsilon_{k'}).$$

We now proceed with the same steps of the algorithm we described in Section 4 (and Section 5) but with the modified path costs. (Note that we used the same  $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_r$  for all boxes  $D_{i,j}$ , thus we can still use the extended Fredman trick for the new costs.) By the above, ties on the original costs of (any) two distinct staircase paths break on their new costs, according to their order in  $\mathcal{L}$ , while the other relations ( $<$ ,  $>$ ) are preserved.

## 7 GEOMETRIC EDIT DISTANCE IN SUBQUADRATIC TIME

We now show how our DTW algorithm can be extended to compute  $\text{ged}(A, B)$  (and optimal matching). Recall the definitions of monotone matching (see Figure 1),  $\text{ged}(A, B)$ , and optimal matching



from Section 1. First, we overview the standard dynamic programming algorithm for computing GED between two sequences  $A = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$  and  $B = (q_1, \dots, q_n)$  of  $n$  points in  $\mathbb{R}$ .

*The Quadratic GED Algorithm.*

1. Initialize an  $(n + 1) \times (n + 1)$  matrix  $M$  and set  $M[0, 0] := 0$ .
2. For each  $\ell \in [n]$ 
  - 2.1.  $M[\ell, 0] := \ell\rho$ ,  $M[0, \ell] := \ell\rho$ .
3. For each  $\ell \in [n]$ ,
  - 3.1. For each  $m \in [n]$ ,
    - 3.1.1  $M[\ell, m] := \min\{M[\ell - 1, m] + \rho, M[\ell, m - 1] + \rho, M[\ell - 1, m - 1] + |p_\ell - q_m|\}$ .
4. Return  $M[n, n]$ .

The optimal matching can be retrieved by maintaining pointers from each  $(\ell, m)$  to the preceding position  $(\ell', m') \in \{(\ell - 1, m), (\ell, m - 1), (\ell - 1, m - 1)\}$  through which  $M[\ell, m]$  is minimized. By tracing these pointers backwards from  $(n, n)$  to  $(0, 0)$  and including in the matching only the positions that we reach “diagonally” (when going backwards), we obtain the optimal matching.

*Subquadratic GED Algorithm.* Recall the all-pairs-distances matrix  $D$  and its decomposition into boxes  $D_{i,j}$ , as defined in Section 4. For a monotone matching  $\mathcal{M}$  between two point-subsequences  $A_i, B_j$ , let  $\text{cost}_{i,j}(\mathcal{M})$  be the corresponding sum of distances in the definition of  $\text{ged}(A_i, B_j)$ . To adapt our DTW algorithm for GED, we modify the way we evaluate the cost of a staircase path  $P$  in a box  $D_{i,j}$ , so that it equals the cost of its corresponding monotone matching  $\mathcal{M}(P)$  (defined below).

We view each box  $D_{i,j}$  as a weighted directed grid graph  $G$ , whose vertices are the pairs of  $[g] \times [g]$ , and its set of edges is

$$\begin{aligned} & \{ \langle (\ell, m), (\ell + 1, m) \rangle \mid \ell \in [g - 1], m \in [g] \} \\ & \cup \{ \langle (\ell, m), (\ell, m + 1) \rangle \mid \ell \in [g], m \in [g - 1] \} \\ & \cup \{ \langle (\ell, m), (\ell + 1, m + 1) \rangle \mid \ell, m \in [g - 1] \}. \end{aligned}$$

We refer to the edges in the first subset as vertical edges, the edges in the second subset as horizontal edges, and the ones in the third subset as diagonal edges. The weight of the vertical and horizontal edges is set to  $\rho$ , and the weight of each diagonal edge  $\langle (\ell, m), (\ell + 1, m + 1) \rangle$  is  $|A_i(\ell) - B_j(m)|$ . Each staircase path  $P$  in  $D_{i,j}$  is then a path in the graph  $G$ , whose corresponding monotone matching  $\mathcal{M}(P)$  is defined to consist of exactly all the pairs of points  $(A_i(\ell), B_j(m))$  that correspond to the positions  $(\ell, m)$  from the diagonal edges  $\langle (\ell, m), (\ell + 1, m + 1) \rangle$  of the path.

By defining  $\text{cost}_{i,j}(P)$  to be the weight of its corresponding path in  $G$ , we obtain that  $\text{cost}_{i,j}(P) = \text{cost}_{i,j}(\mathcal{M})$ , and that the dynamic programming matrix  $M$  (given above) satisfies that for each position  $(\ell, m) \in [n + 1] \times [n + 1]$ ,  $M[\ell, m]$  is the minimal cost of a staircase path from  $(0, 0)$  to  $(\ell, m)$  in  $D$ . This implies that Lemma 4.1 can be used in this setup, too, for computing the values on the  $R$ -boundaries of the boxes  $M_{i,j}$ , as done in the second stage of our DTW algorithm. Thus, once we have a corresponding data structure from the preprocessing procedure, we can apply the second stage of our DTW algorithm verbatim.

As for the preprocessing procedure, the cost of a staircase path in a box  $D_{i,j}$  is now a sum of distances  $|A_i(\ell) - B_j(m)|$ ,  $\ell, m \in [g]$ , plus a multiple of the parameter  $\rho$ . Since  $\rho$  is a fixed real number and the multiple of  $\rho$  in the cost of a staircase path in  $D_{i,j}$  only depends on the positions of the path (and is independent of the actual values of  $A$  and  $B$ ), we can execute a similar machinery as described in Section 4. That is, we can choose a candidate sign assignment as before, get a linear expression in  $A_i(\ell)$  and  $B_j(m)$  (which also involves a fixed multiple of  $\rho$ ), then, the extended

Fredman trick (3) can be applied when comparing the costs of two staircase paths and validating the correctness of candidate sign assignments. (Our algorithm works also for more general gap penalty functions, as long as they are linear in the coordinates of the points of  $A \cup B$ .) The rest of the preprocessing procedure and the extension to high-dimensional polyhedral metric spaces are similar to those we showed for DTW. To lift the general position assumption, a tiny modification to what is described in Section 6 is required; to set  $\varepsilon$  from Section 6 as the minimum over the distance of the positive closest pair from  $A \cup B$  and  $\rho$ , the rest is verbatim. By the above, we obtain the results stated in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 for GED.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] Amir Abboud, Arthur Backurs, and Virginia Vassilevska Williams. 2015. Tight hardness results for LCS and other sequence similarity measures. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'15)*. 59–78. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2015.14>
- [2] Amir Abboud and Karl Bringmann. 2018. Tighter connections between formula-SAT and shaving logs. In *45th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP'18)*, vol. 107. 8:1–8:18.
- [3] Amir Abboud, Thomas Dueholm Hansen, Virginia Vassilevska Williams, and Ryan Williams. 2016. Simulating branching programs with edit distance and friends: Or: A polylog shaved is a lower bound made. In *Proceedings of the 48th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*. 375–388. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.1145/2897518.2897653>
- [4] Pankaj K. Agarwal, Rinat Ben Avraham, Haim Kaplan, and Micha Sharir. 2014. Computing the discrete Fréchet distance in subquadratic time. *SIAM J. Comput.* 43, 2 (2014), 429–449. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.1137/130920526>
- [5] Pankaj K. Agarwal, Kyle Fox, Jiangwei Pan, and Rex Ying. 2016. Approximating dynamic time warping and edit distance for a pair of point sequences. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Symposium on Computational Geometry (SoCG'16)*. 6:1–6:16. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.SoCG.2016.6>
- [6] V. Arlazarov, E. Dinic, M. Kronrod, and I. Faradzev. 1970. On economical construction of the transitive closure of a directed graph. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk.* 194, 11 (1970).
- [7] Arturs Backurs and Piotr Indyk. 2015. Edit distance cannot be computed in strongly subquadratic time (unless SETH is false). In *Proceedings of the 47th Annual ACM on Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC'15)*. 51–58. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.1145/2746539.2746612>
- [8] Jon Louis Bentley. 1980. Multidimensional divide-and-conquer. *Commun. ACM* 23, 4 (1980), 214–229.
- [9] Jon Louis Bentley and Michael Ian Shamos. 1976. Divide-and-conquer in multidimensional space. In *Proceedings of the 8th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC'76)*. 220–230.
- [10] Philip Bille and Martin Farach-Colton. 2008. Fast and compact regular expression matching. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 409, 3 (2008), 486–496. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2008.08.042>
- [11] Karl Bringmann. 2014. Why walking the dog takes time: Fréchet distance has no strongly subquadratic algorithms unless SETH fails. In *Proceedings of the 55th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'14)*. 661–670. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2014.76>
- [12] Karl Bringmann and Marvin Künnemann. 2015. Quadratic conditional lower bounds for string problems and dynamic time warping. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'15)*. 79–97. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2015.15>
- [13] Rainer E. Burkard, Bettina Klinz, and Rüdiger Rudolf. 1996. Perspectives of monge properties in optimization. *Discr. Appl. Math.* 70, 2 (1996), 95–161. DOI : [https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-218X\(95\)00103-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-218X(95)00103-X)
- [14] E. G. Caiani, A. Porta, G. Baselli, M. Turiel, S. Muzzupappa, F. Pieruzzi, C. Crema, A. Malliani, and S. Cerutti. 1998. Warped-average template technique to track on a cycle-by-cycle basis the cardiac filling phases on left ventricular volume. In *Computers in Cardiology*. 73–76. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.1109/CIC.1998.731723>
- [15] Timothy M. Chan. 2008. All-pairs shortest paths with real weights in  $O(n^3 / \log n)$  time. *Algorithmica* 50, 2 (2008), 236–243.
- [16] Timothy M. Chan. 2018. More logarithmic-factor speedups for 3SUM, (median, +)-convolution, and some geometric 3SUM-hard problems. In *Proceedings of the 29th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA'18)*. 881–897. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611975031.57>
- [17] Alexander De Luca, Alina Hang, Frederik Brudy, Christian Lindner, and Heinrich Hussmann. 2012. Touch me once and I know it's you!: Implicit authentication based on touch screen patterns. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 987–996. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.1145/2207676.2208544>
- [18] Richard Durbin, Sean R. Eddy, Anders Krogh, and Graeme Mitchison. 1998. *Biological Sequence Analysis: Probabilistic Models of Proteins and Nucleic Acids*. Cambridge University Press, New York.

- [19] Alon Efrat, Quanfu Fan, and Suresh Venkatasubramanian. 2007. Curve matching, time warping, and light fields: New algorithms for computing similarity between curves. *J. Math. Imag. Vis.* 27, 3 (2007), 203–216. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10851-006-0647-0>
- [20] Michael L. Fredman. 1976. How good is the information theory bound in sorting? *Theor. Comput. Sci* 1, 4 (1976), 355–361.
- [21] Michael L. Fredman. 1976. New bounds on the complexity of the shortest path problem. *SIAM J. Comput.* 5, 1 (1976), 83–89.
- [22] Anka Gajentaan and Mark H. Overmars. 1995. On a class of  $O(n^2)$  problems in computational geometry. *Comput. Geom.* 5 (1995), 165–185. DOI : [https://doi.org/10.1016/0925-7721\(95\)00022-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0925-7721(95)00022-2)
- [23] Omer Gold and Micha Sharir. 2017. Improved bounds for 3SUM,  $k$ -SUM, and linear degeneracy. In *Proceedings of the 25th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA '17)*, Vol. 87. 42:1–42:13. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.ESA.2017.42>
- [24] Szymon Grabowski. 2016. New tabulation and sparse dynamic programming based techniques for sequence similarity problems. *Discr. Appl. Math.* 212 (2016), 96–103. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2015.10.040>
- [25] Allan Grönlund and Seth Pettie. 2014. Threesomes, degenerates, and love triangles. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'14)*. 621–630.
- [26] Russel Impagliazzo and Ramamohan Paturi. 2001. On the complexity of  $k$ -SAT. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* 62, 2 (2001), 367–375. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.1006/jcss.2000.1727>
- [27] Russell Impagliazzo, Ramamohan Paturi, and Francis Zane. 2001. Which problems have strongly exponential complexity? *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* 63, 4 (2001), 512–530. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.1006/jcss.2001.1774>
- [28] Haim Kaplan, Shay Mozes, Yahav Nussbaum, and Micha Sharir. 2012. Submatrix maximum queries in monge matrices and monge partial matrices, and their applications. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA'12)*. 338–355.
- [29] Eamonn Keogh and Ann Chotirat Ratanamahatana. 2005. Exact indexing of dynamic time warping. *Knowl. Inf. Syst.* 7, 3 (2005), 358–386. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10115-004-0154-9>
- [30] Eamonn J. Keogh and Michael J. Pazzani. 1999. *Scaling up Dynamic Time Warping to Massive Datasets*. Springer, Berlin, 1–11. DOI : [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-48247-5\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-48247-5_1)
- [31] Eamonn J. Keogh and Michael J. Pazzani. 2000. Scaling up dynamic time warping for datamining applications. In *Proceedings of the 6th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 285–289. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.1145/347090.347153>
- [32] William J. Masek and Michael S. Paterson. 1980. A faster algorithm computing string edit distances. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* 20, 1 (1980), 18–31. DOI : [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0000\(80\)90002-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0000(80)90002-1)
- [33] Meinard Müller. 2007. *Information Retrieval for Music and Motion*. Springer, Berlin, 69–84. DOI : [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-74048-3\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-74048-3_4)
- [34] Franco P. Preparata and Michael I. Shamos. 1985. *Computational Geometry*. Springer, New York, NY.
- [35] Chotirat A. Ratanamahatana and Eamonn Keogh. 2005. Three myths about dynamic time warping data mining. In *Proceedings of the 2005 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining*. 506–510. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611972757.50>
- [36] Taras Klymovych Vintsyuk. 1968. Speech discrimination by dynamic programming. *Cybernetics* 4, 1 (1968), 52–57. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01074755>
- [37] Kongming Wang and Theo Gasser. 1997. Alignment of curves by dynamic time warping. *Ann. Stati.* 25, 3 (1997), 1251–1276.
- [38] Xiaoyue Wang, Abdullah Mueen, Hui Ding, Goce Trajcevski, Peter Scheuermann, and Eamonn Keogh. 2013. Experimental comparison of representation methods and distance measures for time series data. *Data Min. Knowl. Discov.* 26, 2 (2013), 275–309. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10618-012-0250-5>

Received October 2017; revised April 2018; accepted June 2018