

# Forward-Fast-Search: Another Fast Variant of the Boyer-Moore String Matching Algorithm

Domenico Cantone and Simone Faro

Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica, Università di Catania, Italy

e-mail: {cantone, faro}@dmi.unict.it

**Abstract.** We present a variation of the **Fast-Search** string matching algorithm, a recent member of the large family of Boyer-Moore-*like* algorithms, and we compare it with some of the most effective string matching algorithms, such as Horspool, Quick Search, Tuned Boyer-Moore, Reverse Factor, Berry-Ravindran, and **Fast-Search** itself. All algorithms are compared in terms of run-time efficiency, number of text character inspections, and number of character comparisons.

It turns out that our new proposed variant, though not linear, achieves very good results especially in the case of very short patterns or small alphabets.

**Keywords:** string matching, experimental algorithms, text processing.

## 1 Introduction

Given a text  $T$  and a pattern  $P$  over some alphabet  $\Sigma$ , the *string matching problem* consists in finding *all* occurrences of the pattern  $P$  in the text  $T$ . It is a very extensively studied problem in computer science, mainly due to its direct applications to such diverse areas as text, image and signal processing, speech analysis and recognition, information retrieval, computational biology and chemistry, etc.

Several string matching algorithms have been proposed over the years. The Boyer-Moore algorithm [BM77] deserves a special mention, since it has been particularly successful and has inspired much work. It is based upon three simple ideas: right-to-left scanning, bad character heuristics, and good suffix heuristics. We will review it at length in Section 2.1.

Many subsequent algorithms have been based on variations on how to apply the two mentioned heuristics. For instance, the **Fast-Search** algorithm, recently introduced by the authors [CF03], requires that the bad character heuristics is used only if the mismatching character is the last character of the pattern, otherwise the good suffix heuristics is to be used.

In this paper, we present a variation of the **Fast-Search** algorithm in which the good suffix heuristics uses also a look-ahead character to determine larger advancements. We also propose a practical algorithm to precompute the table encoding such an extended good suffix rule.

Before entering into details, we need a bit of notations and terminology. A string  $P$  is represented as a finite array  $P[0..m-1]$ , with  $m \geq 0$ . In such a case we say

that  $P$  has length  $m$  and write  $\text{length}(P) = m$ . In particular, for  $m = 0$  we obtain the empty string, also denoted by  $\varepsilon$ . By  $P[i]$  we denote the  $(i + 1)$ -st character of  $P$ , for  $0 \leq i < \text{length}(P)$ . Likewise, by  $P[i..j]$  we denote the substring of  $P$  contained between the  $(i + 1)$ -st and the  $(j + 1)$ -st characters of  $P$ , for  $0 \leq i \leq j < \text{length}(P)$ . Moreover, for any  $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we put

$$P[i..j] = \begin{cases} \varepsilon & \text{if } i > j \\ P[\max(i, 0), \min(j, \text{length}(P) - 1)] & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For any two strings  $P$  and  $P'$ , we write  $P' \sqsupset P$  to indicate that  $P'$  is a suffix of  $P$ , i.e.,  $P' = P[i..\text{length}(P) - 1]$ , for some  $0 \leq i < \text{length}(P)$ . Similarly, we write  $P' \sqsubset P$  to indicate that  $P'$  is a prefix of  $P$ , i.e.,  $P' = P[0..i - 1]$ , for some  $0 \leq i \leq \text{length}(P)$ . In addition, we write  $P.P'$  to denote the concatenation of  $P$  and  $P'$ .

Let  $T$  be a text of length  $n$  and let  $P$  be a pattern of length  $m$ . When the character  $P[0]$  is aligned with the character  $T[s]$  of the text, so that the character  $P[i]$  is aligned with the character  $T[s + i]$ , for  $i = 0, \dots, m - 1$ , we say that the pattern  $P$  has *shift*  $s$  in  $T$ . In this case the substring  $T[s..s + m - 1]$  is called the *current window* of the text. If  $T[s..s + m - 1] = P$ , we say that the shift  $s$  is *valid*. Thus the string matching problem can be rephrased as the problem of finding *all* valid shifts of a pattern  $P$  relative to a text  $T$ .

Most string matching algorithms have the following general structure. First, during a *preprocessing phase*, they calculate useful mappings, in the form of tables, which later are accessed to determine nontrivial shift advancements. Next, starting with shift  $s = 0$ , they look for all valid shifts, by executing a *matching phase*, which determines whether the shift  $s$  is valid and computes a *positive* shift increment  $\Delta s$ . Such increment  $\Delta s$  is used to produce the new shift  $s + \Delta s$  to be fed to the subsequent matching phase. Observe that for the correctness of the algorithm it is plainly necessary that each shift increment  $\Delta s$  computed is *safe*, namely the interval  $\{s + 1, \dots, s + \Delta s - 1\}$  contains no valid shifts.

For instance, in the case of the naive string matching algorithm, there is no preprocessing phase and the matching phase always returns a unitary shift increment, i.e., all possible shifts are actually processed.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we survey some of the most effective string matching algorithms. Next, in Section 3, we introduce a new variant of the **Fast-Search** algorithm. Experimental data obtained by running under various conditions all the algorithms reviewed are presented and compared in Section 4. Finally, we draw our conclusions in Section 5.

## 2 Some Very Fast String Matching Algorithms

In this section we briefly review the Boyer-Moore algorithm and some of its most efficient variants that have been proposed over the years. In particular, we present the Horspool [Hor80], Tuned Boyer-Moore [HS91], Quick-Search [Sun90], Berry-Ravindran [BR99], and the Fast-Search [CF03] algorithms.

We also review the Reverse Factor algorithm [CCG<sup>+</sup>94], which is based on the smallest suffix automaton of the reverse pattern.

## 2.1 The Boyer-Moore Algorithm

The Boyer-Moore algorithm [BM77] is the progenitor of several algorithmic variants which aim at computing close to optimal shift increments very efficiently. Specifically, the Boyer-Moore algorithm checks whether  $s$  is a valid shift by scanning the pattern  $P$  from right to left and, at the end of the matching phase, computes the shift increment as the maximum value suggested by the *good suffix rule* and the *bad character rule* below, using the functions  $gs_P$  and  $bc_P$  respectively, provided that both of them are applicable.

If the first mismatch occurs at position  $i$  of the pattern  $P$ , the good suffix rule suggests to align the substring  $T[s + i + 1 \dots s + m - 1] = P[i + 1 \dots m - 1]$  with its rightmost occurrence in  $P$  preceded by a character different from  $P[i]$ . If such an occurrence does not exist, the good suffix rule suggests a shift increment which allows to match the longest suffix of  $T[s + i + 1 \dots s + m - 1]$  with a prefix of  $P$ .

More formally, if the first mismatch occurs at position  $i$  of the pattern  $P$ , the good suffix rule states that the shift can be safely incremented by  $gs_P(i+1)$  positions, where

$$gs_P(j) =_{\text{Def}} \min\{0 < k \leq m \mid P[j - k \dots m - k - 1] \sqsupset P \text{ and } (k \leq j - 1 \rightarrow P[j - 1] \neq P[j - 1 - k])\} ,$$

for  $j = 0, 1, \dots, m$ . (The situation in which an occurrence of the pattern  $P$  is found can be regarded as a mismatch at position  $-1$ .)

The bad character rule states that if  $c = T[s + i] \neq P[i]$  is the first mismatching character, while scanning  $P$  and  $T$  from right to left with shift  $s$ , then  $P$  can be safely shifted in such a way that its rightmost occurrence of  $c$ , if present, is aligned with position  $(s + i)$  in  $T$ . In the case in which  $c$  does not occur in  $P$ , then  $P$  can be safely shifted just past position  $(s + i)$  in  $T$ . More formally, the shift increment suggested by the bad character rule is given by the expression  $(i - bc_P(T[s + i]))$ , where

$$bc_P(c) =_{\text{Def}} \max(\{0 \leq k < m \mid P[k] = c\} \cup \{-1\}) ,$$

for  $c \in \Sigma$ , and where we recall that  $\Sigma$  is the alphabet of the pattern  $P$  and text  $T$ . Notice that there are situations in which the shift increment given by the bad character rule can be negative.

It turns out that the functions  $gs_P$  and  $bc_P$  can be computed during the pre-processing phase in time  $\mathcal{O}(m)$  and  $\mathcal{O}(m + |\Sigma|)$ , respectively, and that the overall worst-case running time of the Boyer-Moore algorithm, as described above, is linear (cf. [GO80]).

## 2.2 The Horspool Algorithm

Horspool suggested a simplification of the original Boyer-Moore algorithm, defining a new variant which, though quadratic, performed better in practical cases (cf. [Hor80]). He just dropped the good suffix rule and proposed to compute the shift advancement in such a way that the rightmost character  $T[s + m - 1]$  is aligned with its rightmost occurrence on  $P[0 \dots m - 2]$ , if present; otherwise the pattern is advanced just past the window. This corresponds to advance the shift by  $hbc_P(T[s + m - 1])$  positions, where

$$hbc_P(c) =_{\text{Def}} \min(\{1 \leq k < m \mid P[m - 1 - k] = c\} \cup \{m\}) .$$

The resulting algorithm performs well in practice and can be immediately translated into programming code (see Baeza-Yates and Régner [BYR92] for a simple implementation in the **C** programming language).

### 2.3 The Tuned Boyer-Moore Algorithm

The Tuned Boyer-Moore algorithm [HS91] can be seen as an efficient implementation of the Horspool algorithm. Again, let  $P$  be a pattern of length  $m$ . Each iteration of the Tuned Boyer-Moore algorithm can be divided into two phases: *last character localization* and *matching phase*. The first phase searches for a match of  $P[m-1]$ , by applying rounds of three blind shifts (based on the classical bad character rule) until needed. The matching phase tries then to match the rest of the pattern  $P[0..m-2]$  with the corresponding characters of the text, proceeding from right to left. At the end of the matching phase, the shift advancement is computed according to the Horspool bad character rule. Moreover, to begin with, the algorithm adds  $m$  copies of  $P[m-1]$  at the end of the text, as a sentinel, to compute the last shifts correctly.

The fact that the blind shifts require no comparison is at the heart of the very good practical behavior of the Tuned Boyer-Moore, despite its quadratic worst-case time complexity (cf. [Lec00]).

### 2.4 The Quick-Search Algorithm

The Quick-Search algorithm, presented in [Sun90], uses a modification of the original heuristics of the Boyer-Moore algorithm, much along the same lines of the Horspool algorithm. Specifically, it is based on the following observation: when a mismatch character is encountered, the pattern is always shifted to the right by at least one character, but never by more than  $m$  characters. Thus, the character  $T[s+m]$  is always involved in testing for the next alignment. So, one can apply the bad character rule to  $T[s+m]$ , rather than to the mismatching character, obtaining larger shift advancements. This corresponds to advance the shift by  $qbc_P(T[s+m])$  positions, where

$$qbc_P(c) =_{\text{def}} \min(\{0 < k \leq m \mid P[m-k] = c\} \cup \{m+1\}) .$$

Experimental tests have shown that the Quick-Search algorithm is very fast especially for short patterns (cf. [Lec00]).

### 2.5 The Berry-Ravindran Algorithm

The Berry-Ravindran algorithm [BR99] extends the Quick-Search algorithm in that its bad character rule uses the two characters  $T[s+m]$  and  $T[s+m+1]$  rather than just the last character  $T[s+m]$  of the window, where  $m$  is the size of the pattern  $P$ . Thus, at the end of each matching phase with shift  $s$ , the Berry-Ravindran algorithm advances the pattern so that the substring of the text  $T[s+m..s+m+1]$  is aligned with its rightmost occurrence in  $P$ .

The precomputation of the table used by the bad character rule requires  $\mathcal{O}(|\Sigma|^2)$ -space and  $\mathcal{O}(m + |\Sigma|^2)$ -time complexity, where  $\Sigma$  is the alphabet of the text and pattern. Experimental results [BR99] show that the Berry-Ravindran algorithm is fast in practice and performs a low number of text/pattern character comparisons.

## 2.6 The Fast-Search Algorithm

Again, let  $P$  be a pattern of length  $m$  and let  $T$  be a text of length  $n$  over a finite alphabet  $\Sigma$ . The main observation upon which the Fast-Search algorithm [CF03] is based is the following: the Horspool bad character rule leads to larger shift increments than the good suffix rule if and only if a mismatch occurs immediately, while comparing the pattern  $P$  with the window  $T[s..s+m-1]$ , namely when  $P[m-1] \neq T[s+m-1]$ , where  $0 \leq s \leq m-n$  is a shift.

In agreement with the above observation, the Fast-Search algorithm computes its shift increments by applying the Horspool bad character rule only if a mismatch occurs during the first character comparison. Otherwise it uses the good suffix rule.

Notice that  $hbc_P(a) = bc_P(a)$ , whenever  $a \neq P[m-1]$ , so that to compute the shift advancement one can use the traditional bad character rule,  $bc_P$ , rather than the Horspool bad character rule,  $hbc_P$ .

A more effective implementation of the Fast-Search algorithm is obtained along the same lines of the Tuned Boyer-Moore algorithm: the bad character rule can be iterated until the last character  $P[m-1]$  of the pattern is matched correctly against the text. At this point it is known that  $T[s+m-1] = P[m-1]$ , so that the subsequent matching phase can start with the  $(m-2)$ -nd character of the pattern. At the end of the matching phase the algorithm uses the good suffix rule for shifting.

As in the case of the Tuned Boyer-Moore algorithm, the Fast-Search algorithm benefits from the introduction of an external sentinel, which allows to compute correctly the last shifts with no extra checks.

Experimental results [CF03] show that the Fast-Search algorithm obtains the best run-time performances in most cases and, sporadically, it is second only to the Tuned Boyer-Moore algorithm. Concerning the number of text character inspections, it turns out that the Fast-Search algorithm is quite close to the Reverse Factor algorithm, which generally shows the best behavior. We notice, though, that in the case of very short patterns the Fast-Search algorithm reaches the lowest number of text character accesses.

## 2.7 The Reverse Factor Algorithm

Unlike the variants of the Boyer-Moore algorithm summarized above, the Reverse Factor algorithm computes shifts which match prefixes of the pattern, rather than suffixes. This is made possible by the smallest suffix automaton of the reverse of the pattern  $P$ , which is a deterministic finite automaton  $S(P)$  whose accepted language is the set of suffixes of  $P$  (for a complete description see [CCG<sup>+</sup>94]).

The Reverse Factor algorithm has a quadratic worst-case time complexity, but it is very fast in practice (cf. [Lec00]). Moreover, it has been shown that on the average it inspects  $\mathcal{O}(n \log(m)/m)$  text characters, reaching the best bound shown by Yao in [Yao79].

## 3 The Forward-Fast-Search Algorithm

In this section we present a new efficient variant of the Boyer-Moore algorithm obtained by modifying the Fast-Search algorithm presented in Section 2.6.

The new algorithmic variant, that we call **Forward-Fast-Search**, maintains the same structure of the **Fast-Search** algorithm, but is based upon a modified version of the good suffix rule, called *forward good suffix* rule, which uses a look-ahead character to determine larger shift advancements.

The forward good suffix requires a precomputed table of size  $(m \cdot |\Sigma|)$ , where  $m$  is the length of the pattern and  $\Sigma$  is the alphabet of the text and pattern.

Concerning the running time, the forward good suffix rule can be precomputed by  $|\Sigma|$  iterations of the standard linear precomputation of the Boyer-Moore good suffix rule, yielding a  $\mathcal{O}(m \cdot |\Sigma|)$  time complexity. Nevertheless, we propose an alternative, more direct approach which behaves very well in practice, though it requires  $\mathcal{O}(m \cdot \max(m, |\Sigma|))$  time in the worst case.

### 3.1 Strengthening the Good Suffix Rule

#### 3.1.1 The Backward Good Suffix Rule

A first natural way to strengthen the good suffix rule, which yields the *backward good suffix* rule, can be obtained by merging it with the bad character rule as follows. As usual, let us assume that we are comparing a pattern  $P$  of length  $m$  with the window  $T[s..s+m-1]$  at shift  $s$  of a given text  $T$ , scanning it from right to left. If the first mismatch occurs at position  $i$  of the pattern  $P$ , i.e.  $P[i+1..m-1] = T[s+i+1..s+m-1]$  and  $P[i] \neq T[s+i]$ , then the backward good suffix rule proposes to align the substring  $T[s+i+1..s+m-1]$  with its rightmost occurrence in  $P$  preceded by the *backward* character  $T[s+i]$ . If such an occurrence does not exist, the backward good suffix rule proposes a shift increment which allows to match the longest suffix of  $T[s+i+1..s+m-1]$  with a prefix of  $P$ . More formally, this corresponds to increment the shift  $s$  by  $\overleftarrow{gs}_P(i+1, T[s+i])$ , where

$$\overleftarrow{gs}_P(j, c) =_{\text{def}} \min\{0 < k \leq m \mid P[j-k..m-k-1] \sqsupset P \text{ and } (k \leq j-1 \rightarrow P[j-1] = c)\} ,$$

for  $j = 0, 1, \dots, m$  and  $c \in \Sigma$ .

#### 3.1.2 The Forward Good Suffix Rule

As observed by Sunday [Sun90], after a matching phase with shift  $s$ , the *forward* character  $T[s+m]$  is always involved in the subsequent matching phase. Thus, another possible variant of the good suffix rule, which we call *forward good suffix* rule, consists in matching the forward character  $T[s+m]$ , rather than the mismatched character  $T[s+i]$ . More precisely, if as above the first mismatch occurs at position  $i$  of the pattern  $P$ , the forward good suffix rule suggests to align the substring  $T[s+i+1..s+m]$  with its rightmost occurrence in  $P$  preceded by a character different from  $P[i]$ . If such an occurrence does not exist, the forward good suffix rule proposes a shift increment which allows to match the longest suffix of  $T[s+i+1..s+m]$  with a prefix of  $P$ . This corresponds to advance the shift  $s$  by  $\overrightarrow{gs}_P(i+1, T[s+m])$  positions, where

$$\overrightarrow{gs}_P(j, c) =_{\text{def}} \min(\{0 < k \leq m \mid P[j-k..m-k-1] \sqsupset P \text{ and } (k \leq j-1 \rightarrow P[j-1] \neq P[j-1-k]) \text{ and } P[m-k] = c\} \cup \{m+1\}) ,$$

for  $j = 0, 1, \dots, m$  and  $c \in \Sigma$ .

### 3.1.3 Comparing the Good Suffix Rule with its Variants

We computed the average shift advancement suggested by the good suffix rule and its backward and forward variants on four  $\text{Rand}\sigma$  problems, for  $\sigma = 2, 4, 8, 20$ , with pattern lengths 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 20, 40, 80, and 160, where a  $\text{Rand}\sigma$  problem consists in searching, for each assigned value of the pattern length, a set of 200 random patterns over an alphabet  $\Sigma$  of size  $\sigma$  in a 20Mb random text over the same alphabet  $\Sigma$ .

Experimental results, presented in the tables below, show that the forward and backward good suffix rules propose on the average much larger shift advancements than the standard good suffix rule (up to 400% better). In addition, the forward good suffix rule shows always a slightly better behavior than the backward one, which becomes more sensible in the case of very small alphabets. This is partly due to the fact that the forward character is always used by the forward good suffix rule to compute shift advancements, whereas there are cases in which the backward good suffix rule does not exploit the backward character.

$\sigma = 2$	2	4	6	8	10	20	40	80	160
$gs$	1.540	2.762	3.869	4.765	5.468	8.464	12.254	16.137	21.807
$\overleftarrow{gs}$	1.540	2.762	3.869	4.765	5.468	8.464	12.254	16.137	21.807
$\overrightarrow{gs}$	<b>2.269</b>	<b>3.642</b>	<b>5.026</b>	<b>6.310</b>	<b>7.394</b>	<b>12.21</b>	<b>18.200</b>	<b>25.586</b>	<b>34.798</b>
$\sigma = 4$	2	4	6	8	10	20	40	80	160
$gs$	1.750	3.062	4.334	5.196	6.079	8.697	12.382	16.857	22.645
$\overleftarrow{gs}$	1.750	3.540	5.170	6.691	8.097	13.62	21.604	30.540	42.891
$\overrightarrow{gs}$	<b>2.687</b>	<b>4.407</b>	<b>6.114</b>	<b>7.696</b>	<b>9.245</b>	<b>15.55</b>	<b>25.149</b>	<b>36.584</b>	<b>51.398</b>
$\sigma = 8$	2	4	6	8	10	20	40	80	160
$gs$	1.880	3.453	4.833	5.399	6.656	10.05	13.613	19.510	25.807
$\overleftarrow{gs}$	1.880	3.857	5.692	7.441	9.294	17.63	31.570	51.010	75.734
$\overrightarrow{gs}$	<b>2.860</b>	<b>4.775</b>	<b>6.671</b>	<b>8.399</b>	<b>10.24</b>	<b>18.72</b>	<b>33.225</b>	<b>54.825</b>	<b>81.334</b>
$\sigma = 20$	2	4	6	8	10	20	40	80	160
$gs$	1.930	3.714	5.238	6.684	8.512	12.81	19.078	25.169	33.975
$\overleftarrow{gs}$	1.930	3.956	5.892	7.919	9.867	19.47	38.167	72.950	136.45
$\overrightarrow{gs}$	<b>2.946</b>	<b>4.929</b>	<b>6.896</b>	<b>8.868</b>	<b>10.85</b>	<b>20.44</b>	<b>39.206</b>	<b>74.084</b>	<b>138.22</b>

Average advancements for some  $\text{Rand}\sigma$  problems

### 3.1.4 Implementing the Forward Good Suffix Rule

Given a pattern  $P$  of length  $m$  over an alphabet  $\Sigma$ , we have plainly

$$\overrightarrow{gs}_P(j, c) = gs_{P.c}(j) ,$$

for  $j = 0, 1, \dots, m$  and  $c \in \Sigma$ , where  $P.c$  is the string obtained by concatenating the character  $c$  at the end of  $P$ . Thus, a natural way to compute the forward good suffix function  $\overrightarrow{gs}_P$  consists in computing the standard good suffix functions  $gs_{P.c}$ , for all  $c \in \Sigma$ , by means of the  $\mathcal{O}(m)$  tricky algorithm firstly given in [KMP77] and then corrected in [Rit80].

Such a procedure is asymptotically optimal, as it has  $\mathcal{O}(m \cdot |\Sigma|)$  space and time complexity.

In Figure 1 we propose an alternative procedure to compute the forward good suffix function which, despite its  $\mathcal{O}(m \cdot \max(m, |\Sigma|))$  worst-case time complexity, turns out to be very efficient in practice, even for large values of  $m$ .

```

precompute-forward-good-suffix( $P$ )
Initialization:
1.    $m = \text{length}(P)$ 
2.   for  $i = 0$  to  $m$  do
3.       for  $c \in \Sigma$  do
4.            $\vec{gs}[i, c] = m + 1$ 
5.   for  $i = 0$  to  $m - 1$  do
6.        $next[i] = i - 1$ 
Computation:
7.   for  $slen = 0$  to  $m - 1$  do
8.        $last = m - 1$ 
9.        $i = next[last]$ 
10.    while  $i \geq 0$  do
11.        if  $\vec{gs}[m - slen, P[i + 1]] > m - 1 - i$  then
12.            if  $(i - slen < 0$  or
13.                 $(i - slen \geq 0$  and  $P[i - slen] \neq P[m - 1 - slen]))$  then
14.                 $\vec{gs}[m - slen, P[i + 1]] = m - 1 - i$ 
15.            if  $(i - slen \geq 0$  and  $P[i - slen] = P[last - slen])$  or
16.                 $(i - slen < 0)$  then
17.                 $next[last] = i$ 
18.                 $last = i$ 
19.             $i = next[i]$ 
20.        if  $\vec{gs}[m - slen, P[0]] > m$  then
21.             $\vec{gs}[m - slen, P[0]] = m$ 
22.             $next[last] = -1$ 
23.    return  $\vec{gs}$ 
    
```

Figure 1: The function for computing forward good suffixes

After an initialization phase which takes  $\mathcal{O}(m \cdot |\Sigma|)$  space and time complexity, the **precompute-forward-good-suffix** procedure carries out  $m$  iterations of its main **for**-loop, starting at line 7. During the  $k$ -th iteration, for  $k = 1, 2, \dots, m$ , it computes the sequence  $\mathcal{S}_k(P)$  of all occurrences in  $P$  of the suffix  $P[m - k .. m - 1]$  of length  $k$ , implicitly represented by means of the array  $next$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{S}_k(P) = & \langle P[next[m - 1] - k + 1 .. next[m - 1]] , \\
 & P[next^{(2)}[m - 1] - k + 1 .. next^{(2)}[m - 1]], \\
 & \dots\dots\dots \\
 & P[next^{(r_k)}[m - 1] - k + 1 .. next^{(r_k)}[m - 1]] \rangle ,
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where  $r_k$  is such that  $next^{(r_k+1)}[m - 1] = -1$ . For that purpose, lines 15-18 implement the recurrence

$$\mathcal{S}_k(P) = \langle P[j - k + 1 .. j] \mid P[j - k + 2 .. j] \in \mathcal{S}_{k-1}(P) \text{ and } P[j - k + 1] = P[m - k] \rangle ,$$

where  $\mathcal{S}_0(P)$  is also formally given by (1), thanks to the way the array  $next$  is initialized in lines 5-6. Moreover, during the  $k$ -th iteration of the **for**-loop, for each



$P[j - k + 1 .. j] \in \mathcal{S}_k(P)$ , the procedure updates, if necessary, the value  $\vec{gs}(m - k - 1, P[j + 1])$  by setting it to  $(m - 1 - j)$  (lines 11-14).

Plainly, the procedure in Figure 1 requires  $\mathcal{O}(m \cdot |\Sigma|)$  space. To compute its time complexity, it is enough to observe that the  $k$ -th execution of the **while**-loop in lines 10-19, for  $k = 1, 2, \dots, m$ , takes  $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{S}_{k-1}(P)|)$  time, giving a total of  $\mathcal{O}(\sum_{j=0}^{m-1} |\mathcal{S}_j(P)|) = \mathcal{O}(m^2)$  time in the worst case. This leads to an overall  $\mathcal{O}(m \cdot \max(m, |\Sigma|))$  worst-case time complexity, taking into account also the initialization phase.

Experimental results show that the sum  $\sum_{j=0}^{m-1} |\mathcal{S}_j(P)|$  has on the average an almost linear behavior. For instance, the following tables report the average of the sum  $\sum_{j=0}^{m-1} |\mathcal{S}_j(P)|$  computed for 100,000 random patterns of size  $m$  over an alphabet of size  $\sigma$ , for  $\sigma = 2, 4, 8, 20$  and  $m = 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 20, 40, 80, 160$ . The tests relative to a natural language buffer NL have been computed by randomly selecting 100,000 substrings for each given pattern length over the 3.13Mb file obtained by discarding the nonalphabetic characters from the WinEdt spelling dictionary.

$m$	2	4	6	8	10	20	40	80	160
$m^2$ (worst case)	4	16	36	64	100	400	1600	6400	25600
Average for $\sigma = 2$	2.50	7.38	13.07	19.01	25.02	55.09	114.89	234.98	474.57
Average for $\sigma = 4$	2.24	5.46	8.76	12.10	15.45	32.09	65.34	132.06	264.98
Average for $\sigma = 8$	2.12	4.67	7.23	9.81	12.40	25.24	50.93	102.45	204.98
Average for $\sigma = 20$	2.04	4.25	6.46	8.68	10.89	21.96	44.00	88.21	176.63
Average on NL	2.04	4.23	6.47	8.84	11.99	28.57	57.97	111.61	208.00

For the same set of random tests, we also computed the *total* time taken to construct the forward good suffix function  $\vec{gs}$ , using the two implementations described earlier, namely the one which has a  $\mathcal{O}(m \cdot |\Sigma|)$  worst-case time and space complexity and the procedure **precompute-forward-good-suffix**. Such implementations are denoted respectively “ $\vec{gs}$  (I)” and “ $\vec{gs}$  (II)” in the tables below, where experimental results are expressed in hundredths of seconds.

$\sigma = 2$	2	4	6	8	10	20	40	80	160
$\vec{gs}$ (I)	58.1	60.1	63.1	66.1	68.1	81.1	103.2	149.2	<b>239.3</b>
$\vec{gs}$ (II)	<b>3.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>15.1</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>37.0</b>	<b>74.1</b>	<b>145.3</b>	288.4

$\sigma = 4$	2	4	6	8	10	20	40	80	160
$\vec{gs}$ (I)	113.2	117.1	121.2	124.2	128.2	142.2	174.2	235.4	357.5
$\vec{gs}$ (II)	<b>3.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>16.0</b>	<b>33.1</b>	<b>64.1</b>	<b>126.2</b>	<b>250.3</b>

$\sigma = 8$	2	4	6	8	10	20	40	80	160
$\vec{gs}$ (I)	225.3	230.4	237.3	240.4	243.3	268.4	313.4	401.6	577.9
$\vec{gs}$ (II)	<b>4.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>36.1</b>	<b>72.1</b>	<b>141.2</b>	<b>289.4</b>

$\sigma = 20$	2	4	6	8	10	20	40	80	160
$\vec{gs}$ (I)	558.8	573.9	580.8	589.8	598.9	642.9	733.1	905.3	1250.8
$\vec{gs}$ (II)	<b>5.0</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>16.0</b>	<b>20.1</b>	<b>26.0</b>	<b>50.1</b>	<b>98.1</b>	<b>195.3</b>	<b>394.6</b>

NL	2	4	6	8	10	20	40	80	160
$\vec{gs}$ (I)	553.8	565.8	573.8	583.8	592.8	636.9	725.0	895.3	1238.8
$\vec{gs}$ (II)	<b>5.0</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>16.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>23.1</b>	<b>48.1</b>	<b>95.1</b>	<b>189.3</b>	<b>379.5</b>

```

Forward-Fast-Search( $P, T$ )
1.    $n = \text{length}(T)$ 
2.    $m = \text{length}(P)$ 
3.    $T' = T.P[m-1]^{m+1}$ 
4.    $bc = \text{precompute-bad-character}(P)$ 
5.    $\vec{gs} = \text{precompute-forward-good-suffix}(P)$ 
7.    $s = 0$ 
8.   while  $bc[T'[s+m-1]] > 0$  do
9.        $s = s + bc[T'[s+m-1]]$ 
10.  while  $s \leq n - m$  do
11.       $j = m - 2$ 
12.      while  $j \geq 0$  and  $P[j] = T'[s+j]$  do
13.           $j = j - 1$ 
14.      if  $j < 0$  then
15.           $\text{print}(s)$ 
16.           $s = s + \vec{gs}[j+1, T[s+m]]$ 
17.          while  $bc[T'[s+m-1]] > 0$  do
18.               $s = s + bc[T'[s+m-1]]$ 

```

Figure 2: The Forward-Fast-Search algorithm

The analysis of the above experimental results show that for alphabets of size at least 4 the procedure `precompute-forward-good-suffix` is on the average always faster than the implementation of the forward good suffix function described at the beginning the present section.

### 3.2 Building up the Forward-Fast-Search Algorithm

The implementation of the Forward-Fast-Search algorithm can be obtained along the same lines of the Fast-Search and the Tuned Boyer-Moore algorithms.

In the first phase, called *character localization* phase, the algorithm iterates the bad character rule until the last character  $P[m-1]$  of the pattern is matched correctly against the text. More precisely, starting from a shift position  $s$ , if we denote by  $j_i$  the total shift advancement after the  $i$ -th iteration of the bad character rule, then we have the following recurrence:

$$j_i = j_{i-1} + bc_P(T[s + j_{i-1} + m - 1]) .$$

Therefore, the bad character rule is applied  $k$  times in a row, where  $k = \min\{i \mid T[s + j_i + m - 1] = P[m-1]\}$ , with an overall shift advancement of  $j_k$ .

At this point we have that  $T[s + j_k + m - 1] = P[m-1]$ , so that the subsequent *matching* phase can test for an occurrence of the pattern by comparing only the remaining  $(m-1)$  characters of the pattern. At the end of the *matching* phase the algorithm applies the forward good suffix rule instead of the traditional good suffix rule.

As in the case of the Fast-Search and Tuned Boyer-Moore algorithms, the Forward-Fast-Search algorithm benefits from the introduction of an external sentinel: since the

forward good suffix rule looks at the character  $T[s+m]$  just after the current window,  $m+1$  copies of the character  $P[m-1]$  are added at the end of the text  $T$ , obtaining a new text  $T' = T.P[m-1]^{m+1}$ . This allows to compute correctly the last shifts with no extra checks. Plainly, all the valid shifts of  $P$  in  $T$  are the valid shifts  $s$  of  $P$  in  $T'$  such that  $s \leq n-m$ , where, as usual,  $n$  and  $m$  denote respectively the lengths of  $T$  and  $P$ . The code of the Forward-Fast-Search algorithm is presented in Figure 2.

## 4 Experimental Results

We present next experimental data which allow to compare the following string matching algorithms under various conditions: Horspool (HOR), Quick-Search (QS), Barry-Ravidran (BR), Tuned Boyer-Moore (TBM), Reverse Factor (RF), Fast-Search (FS), and Forward-Fast-Search (FFS).

We have chosen to compare the algorithms in terms of running time, number of text character inspections, and number of character comparisons.

All algorithms have been implemented in the **C** programming language and were used to search for the same strings in large fixed text buffers on a PC with AMD Athlon processor of 1.19GHz. In particular, the algorithms have been tested on four  $\text{Rand}\sigma$  problems, for  $\sigma = 2, 4, 8, 20$ , and on a natural language text buffer NL with patterns of length  $m = 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 20, 40, 80$ , and 160.

We recall that each  $\text{Rand}\sigma$  problem consists in searching a set of 200 random patterns of a given length in a 20Mb random text over a common alphabet of size  $\sigma$ .

The tests on the natural language text buffer NL have been performed on a 3.13Mb file obtained by discarding the nonalphabetic characters from the WinEdt spelling dictionary. For each pattern length  $m$ , we have selected 200 random substrings of length  $m$  in the file which subsequently have been searched for in the same file.

### 4.1 Running Times

Experimental results show that the Forward-Fast-Search algorithm obtains the best run-time performance in most cases and, sporadically, it is second only to the Fast-Search algorithm, in the case of natural language texts and long patterns, and to the Barry-Ravidran algorithm, in the case of large alphabets and patterns.

In the following tables, running times are expressed in hundredths of seconds.

$\sigma = 2$	2	4	6	8	10	20	40	80	160
HOR	42.01	44.18	42.86	42.02	46.57	40.24	39.51	38.83	39.95
QS	34.33	41.12	38.35	39.30	42.80	37.42	36.77	36.42	36.54
BR	44.84	49.36	44.42	43.48	47.69	40.66	40.70	40.74	40.54
TBM	33.96	36.54	36.88	36.65	40.53	35.98	36.05	35.54	36.30
RF	249.2	200.0	145.9	114.2	107.3	57.95	36.84	27.95	22.36
FS	41.79	35.36	28.72	25.32	26.15	20.40	18.40	17.99	17.31
FFS	<b>31.08</b>	<b>28.87</b>	<b>25.28</b>	<b>22.37</b>	<b>23.15</b>	<b>18.05</b>	<b>16.78</b>	<b>16.62</b>	<b>15.82</b>

Running times for a Rand2 problem

$\sigma = 4$	2	4	6	8	10	20	40	80	160
HOR	34.66	25.57	22.05	20.76	20.27	19.68	20.05	19.54	20.20
QS	26.49	22.10	19.87	19.35	18.98	18.58	19.05	18.73	19.04
BR	32.20	25.68	22.08	20.31	19.24	17.29	16.66	16.36	16.51
TBM	25.53	20.68	19.15	18.85	18.76	18.50	18.81	18.38	18.78
RF	156.1	98.60	74.84	62.28	53.79	34.73	24.26	20.34	16.67
FS	28.60	20.58	18.91	18.26	17.86	17.22	16.53	16.18	15.82
FFS	<b>24.87</b>	<b>20.06</b>	<b>18.35</b>	<b>17.65</b>	<b>17.22</b>	<b>16.23</b>	<b>15.61</b>	<b>15.33</b>	<b>14.40</b>

Running times for a Rand4 problem

$\sigma = 8$	2	4	6	8	10	20	40	80	160
HOR	27.71	20.19	18.40	17.43	16.84	15.70	15.56	15.62	15.71
QS	20.91	18.27	17.17	16.59	16.25	15.36	15.22	15.23	15.35
BR	25.19	20.55	18.77	17.74	17.02	15.33	14.55	14.55	13.96
TBM	21.09	17.78	16.78	16.77	16.22	15.14	15.11	15.05	15.18
RF	114.8	70.75	54.97	46.27	40.62	27.26	20.58	18.17	15.01
FS	20.66	17.75	16.75	16.41	16.01	15.02	14.89	14.80	14.81
FFS	<b>20.20</b>	<b>17.58</b>	<b>16.60</b>	<b>16.17</b>	<b>15.82</b>	<b>14.87</b>	<b>14.54</b>	<b>14.52</b>	<b>13.92</b>

Running times for a Rand8 problem

$\sigma = 20$	2	4	6	8	10	20	40	80	160
HOR	23.45	18.17	16.58	16.21	15.89	15.21	14.90	14.84	14.98
QS	18.67	16.84	15.78	15.69	15.49	14.98	14.74	14.73	14.79
BR	21.83	18.88	17.32	16.89	16.47	15.47	14.90	<b>14.42</b>	<b>12.60</b>
TBM	<b>18.76</b>	16.78	15.64	<b>15.44</b>	15.39	14.85	14.82	14.65	14.65
RF	92.44	54.83	41.67	35.57	31.61	23.12	19.25	17.69	14.72
FS	19.11	16.59	15.57	15.49	<b>15.24</b>	<b>14.81</b>	14.66	14.65	14.58
FFS	<b>18.76</b>	<b>16.51</b>	<b>15.51</b>	<b>15.44</b>	<b>15.24</b>	14.83	<b>14.64</b>	14.65	14.35

Running times for a Rand20 problem

NL	2	4	6	8	10	20	40	80	160
HOR	3.40	2.65	2.45	2.36	2.36	2.22	2.15	2.11	1.98
QS	2.73	2.42	2.35	<b>2.24</b>	2.20	<b>2.14</b>	2.09	<b>2.09</b>	2.01
BR	3.28	2.87	2.66	2.59	2.47	2.33	2.25	2.21	1.95
TBM	2.77	2.39	2.27	2.25	<b>2.18</b>	2.19	2.09	2.12	1.93
RF	13.94	8.33	6.48	5.46	4.87	3.35	2.79	2.68	4.67
FS	2.79	2.45	<b>2.22</b>	<b>2.24</b>	2.19	<b>2.14</b>	<b>2.06</b>	<b>2.09</b>	<b>1.91</b>
FFS	<b>2.70</b>	<b>2.35</b>	2.26	2.26	<b>2.18</b>	2.15	2.13	2.11	2.24

Running times for a natural language problem

## 4.2 Average Number of Text Character Inspections

For each test, the average number of character inspections has been obtained by taking the total number of times a text character is accessed, either to perform a comparison with a pattern character, or to perform a shift, or to compute a transition in an automaton, and dividing it by the length of the text buffer.

It turns out that the **Forward-Fast-Search** algorithm is always very close the best results which are generally obtained by the **Fast-Search** algorithm, for short patterns, and by **Reverse-Factor** algorithm, for long patterns. We notice, however, that the **Forward-Fast-Search** algorithm obtains in most cases the second best result and is better than **Reverse-Factor**, for short patterns, and **Fast-Search**, for long patterns.

$\sigma = 2$	2	4	6	8	10	20	40	80	160
HOR	<b>1.00</b>	1.15	1.26	1.26	1.28	1.24	1.27	1.23	1.27
QS	1.54	1.67	1.63	1.67	1.64	1.61	1.65	1.61	1.60
BR	1.28	1.25	1.20	1.20	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.18	1.16
TBM	1.23	1.35	1.46	1.46	1.47	1.43	1.46	1.42	1.46
RF	1.43	1.06	<b>.799</b>	<b>.615</b>	<b>.519</b>	<b>.294</b>	<b>.169</b>	<b>.096</b>	<b>.054</b>
FS	<b>1.00</b>	<b>.929</b>	.806	.698	.632	.460	.348	.270	.213
FFS	1.15	.993	.833	.703	.621	.410	.289	.210	.161
$\sigma = 4$	2	4	6	8	10	20	40	80	160
HOR	<b>.714</b>	.510	.435	.404	.392	.373	.389	.365	.392
QS	1.03	.817	.700	.675	.645	.610	.650	.622	.633
BR	.949	.713	.569	.488	.429	.307	.264	.244	.251
TBM	.841	.591	.504	.468	.454	.432	.450	.422	.446
RF	.886	.528	<b>.387</b>	<b>.316</b>	<b>.264</b>	<b>.154</b>	<b>.089</b>	<b>.051</b>	<b>.028</b>
FS	<b>.714</b>	<b>.489</b>	.398	.356	.330	.273	.239	.200	.177
FFS	.768	.526	.418	.367	.330	.241	.182	.136	.105
$\sigma = 8$	2	4	6	8	10	20	40	80	160
HOR	<b>.600</b>	.350	.263	.222	.198	.158	.153	.149	.152
QS	.842	.575	.456	.393	.358	.291	.282	.278	.277
BR	.844	.582	.443	.360	.305	.179	.109	.072	.057
TBM	.663	.386	.291	.245	.218	.174	.168	.164	.167
RF	.674	.381	.278	.225	<b>.191</b>	<b>.112</b>	<b>.063</b>	<b>.036</b>	<b>.020</b>
FS	<b>.600</b>	<b>.348</b>	<b>.260</b>	<b>.217</b>	.193	.150	.137	.126	.117
FFS	.627	.368	.274	.227	.201	.146	.117	.093	.075
$\sigma = 20$	2	4	6	8	10	20	40	80	160
HOR	<b>.538</b>	.285	.199	.157	.132	.083	.061	.054	.053
QS	.734	.463	.346	.282	.242	.157	.118	.104	.104
BR	.787	.528	.397	.318	.266	.146	.078	.042	.023
TBM	.563	.297	.208	.164	.137	.086	.063	.056	.056
RF	.565	.302	.214	.170	.143	.084	<b>.049</b>	<b>.027</b>	<b>.014</b>
FS	<b>.538</b>	<b>.284</b>	<b>.198</b>	<b>.156</b>	<b>.131</b>	<b>.082</b>	.060	.053	.052
FFS	.550	.293	.205	.161	.135	<b>.082</b>	.060	.049	.043
NL	2	4	6	8	10	20	40	80	160
HOR	<b>.550</b>	.300	<b>.211</b>	<b>.171</b>	.144	.091	.059	.042	.032
QS	.759	.489	.375	.309	.261	.175	.125	.086	.066
BR	.795	.538	.411	.335	.278	.155	.085	.050	.028
TBM	.584	.318	.226	.182	.153	.096	.062	.044	.034
RF	.588	.321	.231	.185	.153	<b>.084</b>	<b>.045</b>	<b>.024</b>	<b>.013</b>
FS	<b>.550</b>	<b>.299</b>	<b>.211</b>	<b>.171</b>	<b>.143</b>	.087	.055	.038	.027
FFS	.565	.312	.220	.180	.152	.088	.054	.036	.026

Average number of text character inspections for some Rand $\sigma$  problems and for a natural language problem

### 4.3 Average Number of Comparisons

For each test, the average number of character comparisons has been obtained by taking the total number of times a text character is compared with a character in the pattern and dividing it by the total number of characters in the text buffer.

It turns out that the Forward-Fast-Search algorithm achieves the best results in most cases. Sporadically our algorithm is second only to the Berry-Ravindran algorithm which obtains very good results for short patterns and small alphabets. Moreover we observe that Tuned Boyer-Moore, Fast-Search and Forward-Fast-Search

algorithms perform a very low number of characters comparisons in the case of large alphabets.

$\sigma = 2$	2	4	6	8	10	20	40	80	160
HOR	1.000	1.159	1.260	1.269	1.281	1.244	1.272	1.235	1.270
QS	.9588	1.109	1.088	1.119	1.095	1.073	1.104	1.079	1.080
BR	<b>.2631</b>	<b>.3766</b>	.3916	.3989	.3962	.3973	.3969	.3940	.3893
TBM	.3333	.6044	.6995	.7154	.7249	.7082	.7215	.7024	.7205
FS	.3333	.4767	.4466	.3925	.3573	.2609	.1967	.1530	.1248
FFS	.3076	.4224	<b>.3875</b>	<b>.3324</b>	<b>.2962</b>	<b>.1964</b>	<b>.1377</b>	<b>.1003</b>	<b>.0766</b>
$\sigma = 4$	2	4	6	8	10	20	40	80	160
HOR	.7143	.5100	.4356	.4041	.3922	.3732	.3890	.3652	.3928
QS	.6053	.4864	.4109	.3908	.3716	.3491	.3719	.3556	.3742
BR	.2747	.2353	.1898	.1628	.1432	.1025	.0883	.0813	.0837
TBM	.1429	.1445	.1264	.1175	.1140	.1085	.1131	.1062	.1141
FS	.1429	.1373	.1141	.1024	.0949	.0784	.0690	.0577	.0526
FFS	<b>.1323</b>	<b>.1272</b>	<b>.1041</b>	<b>.0913</b>	<b>.0822</b>	<b>.0601</b>	<b>.0454</b>	<b>.0341</b>	<b>.0263</b>
$\sigma = 8$	2	4	6	8	10	20	40	80	160
HOR	.6000	.3501	.2639	.2222	.1985	.1586	.1531	.1490	.1522
QS	.4631	.3189	.2505	.2139	.1943	.1559	.1504	.1487	.1524
BR	.2711	.1940	.1479	.1202	.1018	.0598	.0364	.0243	.0190
TBM	.0667	.0482	.0365	.0307	.0274	.0219	.0212	.0206	.0210
FS	.0667	.0477	.0359	.0300	.0267	.0207	.0190	.0175	.0167
FFS	<b>.0634</b>	<b>.0459</b>	<b>.0345</b>	<b>.0287</b>	<b>.0252</b>	<b>.0184</b>	<b>.0148</b>	<b>.0117</b>	<b>.0095</b>
$\sigma = 20$	2	4	6	8	10	20	40	80	160
HOR	.5385	.2844	.1991	.1569	.1316	.0828	.0608	.0541	.0537
QS	.3837	.2427	.1805	.1476	.1263	.0817	.0607	.0538	.0534
BR	.2608	.1760	.1323	.1061	.0887	.0490	.0263	.0141	.0079
TBM	.0256	.0149	.0104	.0082	.0069	.0043	.0032	.0028	.0028
FS	.0256	.0149	.0104	.0082	.0069	.0043	.0032	.0028	.0027
FFS	<b>.0251</b>	<b>.0147</b>	<b>.0103</b>	<b>.0081</b>	<b>.0068</b>	<b>.0042</b>	<b>.0030</b>	<b>.0025</b>	<b>.0022</b>
NL	2	4	6	8	10	20	40	80	160
HOR	.5501	.3000	.2117	.1716	.1445	.0913	.0595	.0420	.0329
QS	.4031	.2605	.2002	.1646	.1393	.0914	.0654	.0455	.0364
BR	.2599	.1794	.1371	.1118	.0927	.0519	.0286	.0168	.0094
TBM	.0345	.0245	.0171	.0142	.0123	.0089	.0061	.0046	.0042
FS	.0345	.0245	.0171	<b>.0141</b>	<b>.0121</b>	.0066	.0043	.0030	.0025
FFS	<b>.0333</b>	<b>.0244</b>	<b>.0168</b>	.0153	.0140	<b>.0058</b>	<b>.0032</b>	<b>.0020</b>	<b>.0014</b>

Average number of comparisons for some Rand $\sigma$  problems and for a natural language problem

## 5 Conclusion

We presented a new efficient variant of the Boyer-Moore string matching algorithm, named Forward-Fast-Search. As its progenitor Fast-Search, the Forward-Fast-Search algorithm applies repeatedly the bad character rule until the last character of the pattern is matched correctly and then it begins to match the pattern against the text from right to left. At the end of each matching phase, it computes the shift advancement as a function of the matched suffix of the pattern and the first character of the text past the current window (forward good suffix rule).

It turns out that, despite the  $\mathcal{O}(m \cdot |\Sigma|)$ -space and  $\mathcal{O}(m \cdot \max(m, |\Sigma|))$ -time complexity required in the worst case to precompute the forward good suffix function, the

Forward-Fast-Search algorithm is very fast in practice and compares well with other fast variants of the Boyer-Moore algorithm.

We plan to evaluate theoretically the average time complexity of the Forward-Fast-Search algorithm, and to adapt it to scanning strategies depending on the character frequencies.

## References

- [BM77] R. S. Boyer and J. S. Moore. A fast string searching algorithm. *Commun. ACM*, 20(10):762–772, 1977.
- [BR99] T. Berry and S. Ravindran. A fast string matching algorithm and experimental results. *Proc. of the Prague Stringology Club Workshop '99* Czech Technical University, Prague, Czech Republic, Collaborative Report DC–99–05, pp. 16–28, 1999.
- [BYR92] R. A. Baeza-Yates and M. Régner. Average running time of the Boyer-Moore-Horspool algorithm. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 92(1):19–31, 1992.
- [CF03] D. Cantone and S. Faro. Fast-Search: a new variant of the Boyer-Moore string matching algorithm. In K. Jansen et al. (Eds.), *Proc. of WEA 2003*, LNCS 2647, pp. 47–58, 2003.
- [CCG<sup>+</sup>94] M. Crochemore, A. Czumaj, L. Gąsieniec, S. Jarominek, T. Lecroq, W. Plandowski, and W. Rytter. Speeding up two string matching algorithms. *Algorithmica*, 12(4/5):247–267, 1994.
- [GO80] L. J. Guibas and A. M. Odlyzko. A new proof of the linearity of the Boyer-Moore string searching algorithm. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 9(4):672–682, 1980.
- [Hor80] R. N. Horspool. Practical fast searching in strings. *Softw. Pract. Exp.*, 10(6):501–506, 1980.
- [HS91] A. Hume and D. M. Sunday. Fast string searching. *Softw. Pract. Exp.*, 21(11):1221–1248, 1991.
- [KMP77] D. E. Knuth, J. H. Morris, and V. B. Pratt. Fast pattern matching in strings. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 6:323–350, 1977.
- [Lec00] T. Lecroq. New experimental results on exact string-matching. Rapport LIFAR 2000.03, Université de Rouen, France, 2000.
- [Rit80] W. Rytter. A correct preprocessing algorithm for Boyer-Moore string searching. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 9:509–512, 1980.
- [Sun90] D. M. Sunday. A very fast substring search algorithm. *Commun. ACM*, 33(8):132–142, 1990.
- [Yao79] A. C. Yao. The complexity of pattern matching for a random string. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 8(3):368–387, 1979.