

# Optimal-Hash Exact String Matching Algorithms

Thierry Lecroq\*

Univ Rouen Normandie, INSA Rouen Normandie, Université Le Havre Normandie, Normandie Univ, LITIS UR 4108, CNRS NormaSTIC FR 3638, IRIB, F-76000 Rouen, France

## Abstract

String matching is the problem of finding all the occurrences of a pattern in a text. We propose improved versions of the fast family of string matching algorithms based on hashing  $q$ -grams. The improvement consists of considering minimal values  $q$  such that each  $q$ -grams of the pattern has a unique hash value. The new algorithms are fastest than algorithm of the HASH family for short patterns on large size alphabets.

## 1 Introduction

The string matching problem consists of finding one or more usually all the occurrences of a pattern  $x = x[0..m-1]$  of length  $m$  in a text  $y = y[0..n-1]$  of length  $n$ . It can occur in many applications, for instance in information retrieval, bibliographic search and molecular biology. It has been extensively studied and numerous techniques and algorithms have been designed to solve this problem (see [4, 8]). We are interested here in the problem where the pattern is given first and can then be searched in various texts. Thus a preprocessing phase is allowed on the pattern.

Basically a string-matching algorithm uses a window to scan the text. The size of this window is equal to the length of the pattern. It first aligns the left ends of the window and the text. Then it checks if the pattern occurs in the window (this specific work is called an *attempt*) and *shifts* the window to the right. It repeats the same procedure again until the right end of the window goes beyond the right end of

---

\*CURIB, UFR des Sciences et des Techniques, Université de Rouen Normandie, 76821 Mont-Saint-Aignan Cedex, France, [Thierry.Lecroq@univ-rouen.fr](mailto:Thierry.Lecroq@univ-rouen.fr), [monge.univ-mlv.fr/~lecroq/lec\\_en.html](http://monge.univ-mlv.fr/~lecroq/lec_en.html)

the text. The many different solutions differ in the way they compare the content of the window and the pattern, in the way they compute the lengths of the shifts and in the information that is stored from one attempt to the next.

There is no universal algorithm in the sense that the efficiency of a particular algorithm mainly depends on the size of the alphabet and the length of the pattern [7]. According to [8], the many algorithms can be classified in character comparison based algorithms, automata based algorithms and bit-parallelism based algorithms.

Among character comparison based algorithms, the HASH family of string matching algorithms [12] consists basically of hashing every  $q$ -grams  $u$  of  $x$  resulting in  $h(u)$  and computing a shift function for  $h(u)$  equal to  $\min\{m-i \mid h(x[i..i+q-1]) = h(u)\}$ . The other feature of the algorithms is that they avoid loops for computing  $h(u)$  thus  $q$  is not a parameter of the algorithm, there should be one algorithm per value of  $q$ .

Since its publication in 2007 the HASH family of string matching algorithms has aroused a lot of interest and has still been considered among the fastest algorithms [13, 10, 3, 14, 2, 15] and even the fastest ones in some special cases [1, 16, 11]. However, it has a main drawback: the length  $q$  of the  $q$ -grams has to be determined in advance which implies that the algorithm does not work for pattern of length smaller than  $q$ . We propose, in this article, algorithms that remedy to this problem by selecting the length of the  $q$ -gram as the smallest  $q$  such that the pattern has no two identical substrings of length  $q$  having the same hash value. It has three advantages: first the algorithms can considered pattern of any length, second when  $q = 1$  or  $q = 2$  it is easily possible to use perfect hashing and avoid some character comparisons when checking candidates and third they are faster in some cases than the original HASH algorithms.

This article is organized as follows: Section 2 presents the new algorithms, Section 3 shows experimental results and Section 4 provides our conclusion.

## 2 The new algorithms

The HASH family string matching algorithms consider substrings of length  $q$ . Substrings  $u$  of the pattern  $x$  of such a length are hashed using a function  $h$  into integer values within 0 and  $S$ . Then a shift value is defined for every hash value as follows. For  $0 \leq c \leq S$ :

$$shift[c] = \begin{cases} m - 1 - i & \text{with } i = \max\{0 \leq j \leq m - q + 1 \mid h(x[j..j+q-1]) = c\} \\ m - q & \text{when such an } i \text{ does not exist} \end{cases}$$

where  $S$  is the size of the hash table.

The searching phase of the algorithm consists in reading substrings  $u$  of length  $q$ . If  $shift[h(u)] > 0$  then a shift of length  $shift[h(u)]$  is applied. Otherwise, when

$shift[h(u)] = 0$  the pattern  $x$  is naively checked in the text. In this case a shift of length  $sh$  is applied where  $sh = m - 1 - i$  with  $i = \max\{0 \leq j \leq m - q \mid h(x[j..j + q - 1]) = h(x[m - q + 1..m - 1])\}$ .

The idea of the new algorithms is to consider substrings of length  $q$  when the pattern has no two substrings of length  $q$  hashed to same the value. This can be easily computed using the suffix array of the pattern along with the Longest Common Prefix array [5, 6]. This gives a lower bound of  $q$  and then all substrings of  $x$  have to be hashed to check that all the hash values are different. If not  $q$  is incremented by one and the values are checked again until all the hash values of the  $q$ -gram of  $x$  are different.

When  $q = 1$  then it is possible to use easily perfect hashing with a hashing table of size 256 and when  $q = 2$  the size of the hash table grows to 65536. Tables of this size could efficiently be allocated on the execution stack. For larger values of  $q$ , simple perfect hashing requires larger hash tables that cannot be allocated on the execution stack and that needs to be allocated and deallocated explicitly in the heap which considerably slows down the algorithm.

The advantage of perfect hashing is that if  $h(y[j..j + q - 1]) = 0$  (for some  $0 \leq j \leq n - q$ ) then it means that  $y[j..j + q - 1] = x[m - q..m - 1]$  thus the checking phase only requires to test if  $y[j + q - m..j - 1] = x[0..m - q - 1]$  whereas if the hashing is not perfect the test becomes  $y[j + q - m..j + q - 1] = x$ .

### 3 Experimental results

To evaluate the efficiency of the new string matching algorithms we used the SMART system [9]. We perform several experiments with different algorithms on different data sets of the system.

#### 3.1 Algorithms

We have tested 6 algorithms:

- HASH3 [12];
- HASH5 [12];
- HASH8 [12];
- OHASH1: perfect hashing for  $q = 1$ , hashing with possible collisions for  $2 \leq q \leq 10$  and HASH8 when  $q > 10$ ;

Table 1: Results for short patterns and random text on an alphabet of size 8

$m$	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20	22
HASH3	-	3.19	1.70	1.21	0.98	<b>0.83</b>	<b>0.72</b>	<b>0.67</b>	<b>0.61</b>	<b>0.57</b>	<b>0.54</b>
HASH5	-	-	3.38	1.78	1.27	0.98	0.82	0.72	0.64	0.59	<b>0.54</b>
HASH8	-	-	-	7.80	2.69	1.70	1.27	1.04	0.88	0.79	0.71
OHASH1	3.54	2.87	2.06	1.58	1.33	1.13	1.04	0.93	0.87	0.81	0.77
OHASH2	<b>3.48</b>	<b>2.53</b>	1.60	1.20	0.98	0.86	0.78	0.73	0.68	0.64	0.61
OHASH3	<b>3.48</b>	<b>2.53</b>	<b>1.59</b>	<b>1.18</b>	<b>0.97</b>	0.85	0.78	0.71	0.66	0.62	0.59

- OHASH2: perfect hashing for  $q = 1$  and  $q = 2$ , hashing with possible collisions for  $3 \leq q \leq 10$  and HASH8 when  $q > 10$ ;
- OHASH3: perfect hashing for  $q = 1$  and  $q = 2$ , HASH3 for  $3 \leq q \leq 10$  and HASH8 when  $q > 10$ .

These algorithms have been coded in C in an homogeneous way to keep the comparison significant. Since the suffix array has to be build for the pattern which is relatively short comparing to the text, its construction has been naively implemented. The machine we used has an Intel Xeon processor at 2.4GHz running Ubuntu version 14.04.5 LTS. The code of the OHASH algorithms is available on [github.com/lecroq/ohash](https://github.com/lecroq/ohash).

## 3.2 Data

We give experimental results for the running times of the above algorithms for different types of text: random texts alphabet of size 8, 16, 32, 64, 128 and 250, texts in natural languages (English and Italian) and protein sequences. We consider short patterns (even length within 2 and 22).

## 3.3 Results

The results for short patterns (length less or equal to 22) are presented in tables 1 to 9 (fastest results are in bold face) and in figures 1 to 9.

From the experiments it appears that algorithm OHASH3 is the fastest:

- on random texts on an alphabet of size 8 for  $2 \leq m \leq 10$ ;
- on random texts on an alphabet of size 16 for  $2 \leq m \leq 14$ ;

Table 2: Results for short patterns and random text on an alphabet of size 16

$m$	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20	22
HASH3	-	3.07	1.64	1.16	0.91	0.77	0.68	<b>0.60</b>	<b>0.55</b>	<b>0.51</b>	<b>0.48</b>
HASH5	-	-	3.44	1.78	1.24	0.98	0.81	0.70	0.62	0.57	0.52
HASH8	-	-	-	7.87	2.72	1.72	1.27	1.03	0.88	0.78	0.70
OHASH1	2.88	2.03	1.63	1.33	1.14	1.02	0.91	0.85	0.79	0.75	0.71
OHASH2	<b>2.85</b>	<b>1.93</b>	<b>1.38</b>	1.07	<b>0.88</b>	0.77	0.68	0.62	0.59	0.55	0.53
OHASH3	<b>2.85</b>	1.95	<b>1.38</b>	<b>1.06</b>	<b>0.88</b>	<b>0.75</b>	<b>0.67</b>	0.62	0.58	0.55	0.53

Table 3: Results for short patterns and random text on an alphabet of size 32

$m$	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20	22
HASH3	-	3.02	1.60	1.13	0.89	<b>0.74</b>	<b>0.64</b>	<b>0.58</b>	<b>0.53</b>	<b>0.49</b>	<b>0.46</b>
HASH5	-	-	3.37	1.79	1.24	0.97	0.80	0.70	0.63	0.57	0.53
HASH8	-	-	-	7.81	2.72	1.70	1.26	1.02	0.90	0.78	0.70
OHASH1	2.47	1.59	1.22	1.06	0.95	0.88	0.81	0.77	0.74	0.69	0.67
OHASH2	2.48	<b>1.55</b>	<b>1.16</b>	<b>0.97</b>	0.84	<b>0.74</b>	0.67	0.62	0.58	0.54	0.52
OHASH3	<b>2.46</b>	<b>1.55</b>	<b>1.16</b>	<b>0.97</b>	<b>0.83</b>	<b>0.74</b>	0.67	0.62	0.58	0.54	0.52

Table 4: Results for short patterns and random text on an alphabet of size 64

$m$	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20	22
HASH3	-	3.00	1.58	1.11	0.86	<b>0.73</b>	<b>0.64</b>	<b>0.57</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.48</b>	<b>0.45</b>
HASH5	-	-	3.35	1.79	1.23	0.96	0.81	0.72	0.62	0.57	0.53
HASH8	-	-	-	7.78	2.69	1.70	1.27	1.04	0.88	0.79	0.70
OHASH1	2.33	<b>1.34</b>	<b>1.03</b>	<b>0.88</b>	<b>0.78</b>	0.76	0.71	0.69	0.65	0.64	0.63
OHASH2	<b>2.32</b>	1.38	1.07	0.92	0.81	0.77	0.70	0.66	0.62	0.59	0.56
OHASH3	<b>2.32</b>	1.38	1.07	0.92	0.81	0.77	0.70	0.66	0.62	0.59	0.56

Table 5: Results for short patterns and random text on an alphabet of size 128

$m$	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20	22
HASH3	-	2.98	1.57	1.10	0.88	0.73	0.64	<b>0.58</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.48</b>	<b>0.44</b>
HASH5	-	-	3.35	1.76	1.25	0.97	0.81	0.71	0.63	0.57	0.52
HASH8	-	-	-	7.82	2.71	1.69	1.27	1.03	0.87	0.77	0.69
OHASH1	<b>2.21</b>	<b>1.26</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>0.79</b>	<b>0.68</b>	<b>0.64</b>	<b>0.61</b>	0.60	0.57	0.56	0.56
OHASH2	2.22	1.30	0.96	0.86	0.75	0.72	0.68	0.66	0.63	0.62	0.60
OHASH3	2.22	1.30	0.96	0.86	0.75	0.72	0.68	0.66	0.63	0.62	0.60

Table 6: Results for short patterns and random text on an alphabet of size 250

$m$	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20	22
HASH3	-	3.01	1.58	1.10	0.86	0.72	0.63	0.57	0.52	<b>0.48</b>	<b>0.45</b>
HASH5	-	-	3.35	1.77	1.22	0.96	0.80	0.71	0.63	0.57	0.52
HASH8	-	-	-	7.86	2.68	1.68	1.25	1.04	0.88	0.79	0.71
OHASH1	<b>2.17</b>	<b>1.22</b>	<b>0.86</b>	<b>0.71</b>	<b>0.62</b>	<b>0.56</b>	<b>0.53</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.50</b>	0.51	0.49
OHASH2	<b>2.17</b>	1.29	0.92	0.82	0.72	0.70	0.67	0.70	0.68	0.72	0.70
OHASH3	2.18	1.29	0.92	0.83	0.72	0.70	0.68	0.69	0.68	0.71	0.70

Table 7: Results for short patterns and English texts

$m$	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20	22
HASH3	-	3.06	1.63	1.14	<b>0.90</b>	<b>0.76</b>	<b>0.66</b>	<b>0.59</b>	<b>0.54</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>0.47</b>
HASH5	-	-	3.40	1.79	1.24	0.98	0.81	0.71	0.63	0.58	0.53
HASH8	-	-	-	7.81	2.70	1.70	1.26	1.03	0.88	0.79	0.71
OHASH1	<b>2.85</b>	1.80	1.45	1.21	1.01	0.89	0.80	0.75	0.70	0.68	0.65
OHASH2	<b>2.85</b>	<b>1.79</b>	1.39	1.12	0.92	0.80	0.71	0.65	0.61	0.58	0.55
OHASH3	2.88	1.80	<b>1.38</b>	<b>1.11</b>	0.92	0.79	0.70	0.64	0.60	0.56	0.53

Table 8: Results for short patterns and Italian Texts

$m$	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20	22
HASH3	-	3.03	1.66	1.15	<b>0.91</b>	<b>0.76</b>	<b>0.66</b>	<b>0.59</b>	<b>0.54</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>0.47</b>
HASH5	-	-	3.44	1.82	1.25	0.98	0.82	0.71	0.64	0.58	0.54
HASH8	-	-	-	7.92	2.74	1.71	1.28	1.04	0.89	0.78	0.72
OHASH1	<b>3.01</b>	2.18	1.77	1.36	1.11	0.97	0.87	0.81	0.76	0.71	0.69
OHASH2	3.04	2.17	1.72	1.28	1.02	0.88	0.78	0.70	0.65	0.61	0.58
OHASH3	3.04	<b>2.07</b>	<b>1.46</b>	<b>1.13</b>	0.93	0.80	0.70	0.64	0.59	0.55	0.51

Table 9: Results for short patterns and protein sequences

$m$	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20	22
HASH3	-	3.03	1.60	1.13	0.89	<b>0.75</b>	<b>0.66</b>	<b>0.59</b>	<b>0.54</b>	<b>0.51</b>	<b>0.46</b>
HASH5	-	-	3.36	1.76	1.23	0.96	0.81	0.70	0.63	0.57	0.52
HASH8	-	-	-	7.81	2.70	1.70	1.27	1.03	0.89	0.80	0.71
OHASH1	2.84	2.10	1.60	1.29	1.12	0.96	0.88	0.81	0.76	0.73	0.69
OHASH2	<b>2.82</b>	<b>2.00</b>	1.43	1.10	0.91	0.77	0.71	0.63	0.60	0.56	0.53
OHASH3	<b>2.82</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>1.39</b>	<b>1.06</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>0.75</b>	0.70	0.62	0.59	0.54	0.51




Figure 1: Results for short patterns and random text on an alphabet of size 8




Figure 2: Results for short patterns and random text on an alphabet of size 16






Figure 3: Results for short patterns and random text on an alphabet of size 32




Figure 4: Results for short patterns and random text on an alphabet of size 64




Figure 5: Results for short patterns and random text on an alphabet of size 128




Figure 6: Results for short patterns and random text on an alphabet of size 250




Figure 7: Results for short patterns on English texts




Figure 8: Results for short patterns on Italian texts




Figure 9: Results for short patterns on protein sequences

- on random texts on an alphabet of size 32 for  $2 \leq m \leq 12$ ;
- on English texts for  $2 \leq m \leq 8$ ;
- on Italian texts for  $2 \leq m \leq 8$ ;
- on protein sequences for  $2 \leq m \leq 12$ ;

and that algorithm OHASH1 is the fastest:

- on random texts on an alphabet of size 64 for  $2 \leq m \leq 10$ ;
- on random texts on an alphabet of size 128 for  $2 \leq m \leq 14$ ;
- on random texts on an alphabet of size 250 for  $2 \leq m \leq 18$ .

## 4 Conclusion

In this article we presented simple and though very fast improvements of the exact string matching algorithms of the HASH family [12]. The new algorithms are fast for short patterns (length 2 to 18) on alphabet of size at least 8. These values correspond

roughly to the search of words in natural language texts. The gain is relatively small comparing to the HASH family algorithms however in the era of green IT, small gains on very repetitive tasks such as looking for patterns can lead to large gains overall.

This paper constitutes a preliminary study. It remains, at least, to conduct more experiments to see what is the expected value of  $q$  depending on the pattern length and the alphabet size so to adjust the strategy for choosing between the OHASH and HASH subroutines. The efficient use of perfect hashing for values of  $q$  larger or equal to 3 could also improve the algorithms.

## References

- [1] A. M. Al-Ssulami. Hybrid string matching algorithm with a pivot. *Journal of Information Science*, 41(1):82–88, 2015.
- [2] A. M. Al-Ssulami, A. M. Azmi, H. Mathkour, and H. Aboalsamh. LsHASHq: A string matching algorithm exploiting longer  $q$ -gram shifting. *Information Processing & Management*, 59(5):103057, 2022.
- [3] A. M. Al-Ssulami and H. Mathkour. Faster string matching based on hashing and bit-parallelism. *Information Processing Letters*, 123:51–55, 2017.
- [4] C. Charras and T. Lecroq. *Handbook of exact string matching algorithms*. King’s College Publications, 2004.
- [5] M. Crochemore, C. Hancart, and T. Lecroq. *Algorithms on strings*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [6] M. Crochemore, T. Lecroq, and W. Rytter. *125 Problems in Text Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2021.
- [7] S. Faro and T. Lecroq. The Exact String Matching Problem: a Comprehensive Experimental Evaluation. Report arXiv:1012.2547, 2010.
- [8] S. Faro and T. Lecroq. The exact online string matching problem: a review of the most recent results. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 45(2):13, 2013.
- [9] S. Faro, T. Lecroq, S. Borzi, S. D. Mauro, and A. Maggio. The string matching algorithms research tool. In J. Holub and J. Zdárek, editors, *Proceedings of the Prague Stringology Conference 2016 (PSC 2016)*, pages 99–113, Prague, Czech Republic, 2016.

- [10] A. A. Karcioglu and H. Bulut. Improving hash-q exact string matching algorithm with perfect hashing for DNA sequences. *Computers in Biology and Medicine*, 131:104292, 2021.
- [11] S. Kobayashi, D. Hendrian, R. Yoshinaka, and A. Shinohara. Fast and linear-time string matching algorithms based on the distances of  $q$ -gram occurrences. *CoRR*, abs/2002.08004, 2020.
- [12] T. Lecroq. Fast exact string matching algorithms. *Information Processing Letters*, 102(6):229–235, 2007.
- [13] T. H. Nguyen. A new approach to exact pattern matching. *Journal of Computer Science and Cybernetics*, 35(3):197–216, Aug. 2019.
- [14] H. Peltola and J. Tarhio. String matching with lookahead. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 163:352–360, 2014. Stringology Algorithms.
- [15] M. Tahir, M. Sardaraz, and A. A. Ikram. EPMA: Efficient pattern matching algorithm for DNA sequences. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 80:162–170, 2017.
- [16] I. O. Zavadskyi. A family of exact pattern matching algorithms with multiple adjacent search windows. In J. Holub and J. Žďárek, editors, *Proceedings of the Prague Stringology Conference 2017*, pages 152–166, Czech Technical University in Prague, Czech Republic, 2017.