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Abstract. We study methods for counting occurrences of words from a given set \(\mathcal{H}\) over an alphabet \(V\) in a given text. All words have the same length \(m\). Our goal is the computation of the probability to find \(p\) occurrences of words from a set \(\mathcal{H}\) in a random text of size \(n\), assuming that the text is generated by a Bernoulli or Markov model. We have designed an algorithm solving the problem; the algorithm relies on traversals of a graph, whose set of vertices is associated with the overlaps of words from \(\mathcal{H}\). Edges define two oriented subgraphs that can be interpreted as equivalence relations on words of \(\mathcal{H}\). Let \(P(\mathcal{H})\) be the set of equivalence classes and \(S\) be the set of other vertices. The run time for the Bernoulli model is \(O(np(\mid P(\mathcal{H})\mid + \mid S\mid))\) time and the space complexity is \(O(pm\mid S\mid + \mid P(\mathcal{H})\mid))\). In a Markov model of order \(K\), additional space complexity is \(O(pm\mid V\mid^K)\) and additional time complexity is \(O(npm\mid V\mid^K)\). Our preprocessing uses a variant of Aho-Corasick automaton and achieves \(O(m\mid \mathcal{H}\mid)\) time complexity. Our algorithm is implemented and provides a significant space improvement in practice. We compare its complexity to the additional improvement due to Aho-Corasick minimization.

1 Introduction

Studies on word probabilities started as early as Eighties with the seed paper [GO81]. A recent interest arose from applications to computational biology [GKM00,Lat04,GK97,PMG00,VM03]. Numerous statistical softwares have been designed recently [CFG+05,TML+02,BPL+04] to extract “In Silico” exceptional words, i.e. words that are either overrepresented or underrepresented in genomes. An international competition was organized by M. Tompa [TLB+05] to evaluate their capabilities and weaknesses. All softwares combine an algorithm to extract candidate motifs and a statistical criterium to evaluate overrepresented or underrepresented motifs. Sensitivity and selectivity of such criteria turn out to be
crucial, as well as the speed and easiness of computation. A survey on motif searching can be found in [DD07].

We address here the following problem, that is fundamental to assess significance. Given the alphabet $V$ and a set $H$ of words on alphabet $V$, all words in $H$ have the same length $m$. Our aim is to compute the probability to find exactly $p$ occurrences of a word from a set $H$ in a text of size $n$. Below, $t_n^p (H)$ denotes this probability. One assumes the text is randomly generated according to a Bernoulli or Markov model of order $K$. Naive solutions to this problem when $p = 1$ [CP90] lead to a $O(n|V|^K|H|^2)$ time complexity. Recent states of the art of various improvements can be found in [Szp01, Lot05]. On the one hand, the language approach defined in [RS97] allows for an elimination of $|V|^K$ multiplicative factor in [Rég00]. On the other hand, several approximations can be derived for $t_n^1 (H)$. They imply, at some stage, the computation of all possible overlaps of two words of $H$ or a formal inversion of a $|H| \times |H|$ matrix of polynomials. Therefore, time complexity is $O(|H|^2)$. A recent algorithm [HZGD05] allows for the computation of the generating function $\sum_{n \geq 0} t_n^p (H) z^n$ in $O(nm|H|)$ time and $O(m|H|)$ space complexity. Interestingly, $O(nm|H|)$ time complexity outperforms $O(|H|^2)$ complexity for most practical values of $n$. Indeed, sets may be rather big [TV07], especially when they are defined through a Position Specific Scoring Matrix or PSSM [Sto00]. Other algorithms simulate an automaton. This automaton is derived from a transition study [CS03] or language equations in [NSF02]; it is embedded in a Markov chain, using sparse matrices in [FL03, Nue06]. Algorithm AhoPro [BCR+07] addresses a more general problem. It computes the probability to find several occurrences (up to fixed bound $p_i$ for set $H_i$) in several sets $H_1, \ldots, H_q$. It simulates an Aho-Corasick like automaton. Its time and space complexity are $O(n(|S| + |H|)|V| \prod p_i)$ and $O((|S| + |H|) \times \prod p_i)$, where $|S|$ is the size of the automaton. A rough upper bound for this size is $(m-1)|H|$. This reduces to $O(n(|S| + |H|))$ and $O(p(|S| + |H|))$ for $p$ occurrences in a single set.

One common feature of these approaches is their easy extension to the Markov model. The multiplicative factor $|V|^K$ in time complexity [CP90] becomes an additive factor, except for [NSF02]. The main difference comes from the space complexity. As mentioned in [RR08], Markov chain embeddings may be costly, due to matrices sparsity. Although automaton implementations are less sparse, space complexity remains an actual drawback [BCR+07].

One possible way to reduce space requirement is the classical minimization of the underlying automaton. This is realized, for $p$ occurrences in a single set $H$, in [Nue08], with an $O(np|S||V|)$ time complexity. A recent publication [RR08] simulates the minimzed automaton and implements a $\log n$ time complexity improvement, for a single set. In this paper, we propose an alternative modelling of word counting based on graphs that are related to overlaps of words of the set. We define a partition of set $H$ into equivalence overlap classes that we represent in graphs and we show that the set of equivalence overlap classes, denoted $P(H)$, is efficiently computed in a preprocessing step from a variant of classic Aho-Corasick tree, that can be built in $O(m|H|)$ time. Let $S$ denote the set of internal nodes, that are associated to proper overlaps. We also show
that probabilities \( t[H]^p \) satisfy induction equations that only depend on these overlap classes. A simple algorithm follows, that relies on classical tree traversals with simple additional data structures that optimize memory management. As a whole, this algorithm improves on [NSF02,CS03,HZGD05,Nue06,BCR+07] as it achieves a \( O(np(|P(H)|+|S|)) \) time computation and \( O(pm|S|) \) space complexity with a smaller set \( S \). Here, \( S \) is the set of vertices of the overlap graph that are not in \( P(H) \). Finally, this algorithm can be extended to address the same features as AhoPro. This drastic space improvement on space and time complexity is discussed in 5. We also compare it with the alternative minimization approach [Nue08]. Finally, we suggest on one example a possible combination with Aho-Corasick minimization.

2 Overlap Graphs

We will use terms word and text as synonyms; informally, a text is long, and a word is short. A pattern \( H \) of length \( m \) is a set \( H = \{H_1, \ldots, H_q\} \) of words such that all words have the same length \( m \).

Given a word \( w \), let \(|w|\) denote its length. Given two words \( w \) and \( t \), one notes \( w \prec t \) iff \( w \) is a proper prefix of \( t \) and \( w \subset t \) iff \( w \) is a proper suffix of \( t \).

Definition 1. Given a pattern \( H \) over an alphabet \( V \), a word \( w \) is a suffixprefix word for \( H \) iff exists \( H, F \) in \( H \) such as

\[
  w \subset H \text{ and } w \prec F .
\]

The set of suffixprefix words of a set \( H \) is called its overlap set and denoted \( OV(H) \).

In all examples, we use DNA alphabet \( V = \{A,C,G,T\} \).

Example 1. Let \( H \) be the set

\[
\begin{align*}
  H_1 &= ACATATA, \quad H_2 = AGACACA, \quad H_3 = ATACACA, \quad H_4 = ATAGATA, \\
  H_5 &= CATTATA, \quad H_6 = CTTTCAC, \quad H_7 = CTTTCCA, \quad H_8 = TACCACA.
\end{align*}
\]

Overlap set is \( OV(H) = \{ATA, ACA, TA, CA, A, AC, C, \epsilon\} \). One has, for example, \( ACA \subset H_2 \) and \( ACA \prec H_1 \).

One observes that prefix relation and suffix relation define partial orders on \( OV(H) \). Clearly, the empty sequence \( \epsilon \) is a prefix (respectively a suffix) of any suffixprefix and any word from \( H \). Moreover, the set of prefixes (respectively suffixes) of a word \( H \) in \( H \) is totally ordered. Thus, it admits a maximal element in \( OV(H) \). Therefore, these relations naturally define equivalence relations between words in set \( H \) and, consequently, a partition of set \( H \).

Definition 2. Given a pattern \( H \) over an alphabet \( V \), the left predecessor of a word \( H \), noted \( \text{lpred}(H) \), is its longest prefix belonging to the overlap set \( OV(H) \). In other words,

\[
\text{lpred}(H) = \max\{w \prec H, w \in OV(H)\} .
\]
Analogously, the right predecessor of $H$, noted $\text{rpred}(H)$, is its longest suffix belonging to the overlap set $\text{OV}(H)$. In other words,

\[
\text{rpred}(H) = \max \{ w \subset H, w \in \text{OV}(H) \}.
\]

(3)

Two words $H$ and $F$ are said left (respectively right) equivalent iff they have the same left (respectively right) predecessor. For any pattern $H$, its left class is denoted $\bar{H}$ and its right class is denoted $\tilde{H}$.

Two words $H$ and $F$ are said overlap equivalent if they are both left and right equivalent. The overlap class (i.e. the class of overlap equivalence) of a word $H$ is denoted $\hat{H}$. The set of all overlap classes is denoted $\mathcal{P}(H)$. One denotes $\text{lpred}(\hat{H})$ (respectively $\text{rpred}(\hat{H})$) the common left (respectively right) predecessor of the patterns in $\hat{H}$.

Example 2. In Example 1, $\tilde{H}_2 = \tilde{H}_3 = \tilde{H}_8$ as $ACA$ is their largest suffix in $\text{OV}(H)$. There are four right classes $\tilde{C}_{ACA} = \{ H_2, H_3, H_8 \}$, $\tilde{C}_{AT} = \{ H_1, H_4, H_5 \}$, $\tilde{C}_{AC} = \{ H_6 \}$ and $\tilde{C}_{CA} = \{ H_7 \}$.

$H_3 = H_4$ as $ATA$ is their largest prefix in $\text{OV}(H)$. There are six left classes $\tilde{C}_{ACA} = \{ H_1 \}$, $\tilde{C}_{AT} = \{ H_3, H_4 \}$, $\tilde{C}_{AC} = \{ H_5 \}$, $\tilde{C}_{TA} = \{ H_8 \}$, $\tilde{C}_{C} = \{ H_6, H_7 \}$, $\tilde{C}_{A} = \{ H_2 \}$.

There are eight overlap classes in $\mathcal{P}(H)$, that are the eight singletons of $H$. In other words, $\mathcal{P}(H) = H$ and the partition is trivial.

Definition 3. The left overlap graph is the oriented graph $\text{LOG}_H$ built on the set of vertices $\text{OV}(H) \cup \mathcal{P}(H)$ with an edge from vertex $s$ to vertex $t$ iff:

\[
s = \text{lpred}(t) = \max \{ w < t, w \in \text{OV}(H) \}.
\]

(4)

The right overlap graph is the oriented graph $\text{ROG}_H$ built on the set of vertices $\text{OV}(H) \cup \mathcal{P}(H)$ with an edge from vertex $s$ to vertex $t$ iff

\[
s = \text{rpred}(t) = \max \{ w \subset t, w \in \text{OV}(H) \}.
\]

(5)

The overlap graph $\text{GOV}_H$ is the oriented graph $\text{LOG}_H \cup \text{ROG}_H$.

As all words in an overlap class have the same predecessor in the prefix and suffix relations, this definition makes sense for vertices $t$ that represent overlap classes. Moreover, one observes that all predecessors of a word are totally ordered and that the empty string is a minimal element for this order. Therefore, both left overlap graph and right overlap graphs are trees where the root is associated to the empty string $\epsilon$ that has no predecessor. The leaves are the elements of $\mathcal{P}(H)$. This definition implies the property below.

Property 1. Given a word $H$ in $\mathcal{H}$, or a class $\hat{H}$ in $\mathcal{P}(H)$, its ancestors in the left (respectively right) overlap graph are its prefixes (respectively suffixes) that belong to $\text{OV}(H)$.
**Example 3.** In Example 1, ancestors of \(H_1\) and \(H_6\) in left overlap graph, depicted in Figure 1, distinct from the root are \{ACA, AC, A\} and \{C\} respectively. In the right overlap graph, depicted in Figure 2, their ancestors distinct from the root, are \{ATA, TA, A\} and \{AC, C\}. The paths associated to a node in \(LOG_H\) (respectively \(ROG_H\)) are read from the top to the node (respectively, from the node to the top). [htb]
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**Fig. 1.** Left overlap graphs for Example 1. Round nodes are the elements of \(OV(H)\) and leaves are the elements of \(P(H)\). In that particular case, since \(P(H) = H\), each leaf \(i\) is even simply the word \(H_i\).

**Remark 1.** Let us call **deep nodes** are the predecessors of overlap classes. In automaton theory, deep nodes represent left and right quotients of the recognized language, e.g. \(H\).

One observes that \(AC\) represents a right class and does not represent a left class. Nevertheless, the largest words in \(OV(H)\), e.g. \(ACA\) and \(ATA\), represent a right class and a left class.

**Example 4.** Let \(G\) be \{ACNNNTA\} where \(N\) stands for any symbol in alphabet \(V\). Pattern \(G\) contains \(4^3 = 64\) words and its overlap set contains...
6 words: $OV(\mathcal{G}) = \{A, ACTA, ACATA, ACCTA, ACGTA, ACTTA, \epsilon\}$. There are 12 overlap classes in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G})$. For each class, the left predecessor is underlined and the right predecessor is given in bold. Nine overlap classes reduce to one element: $\dot{\mathcal{G}}_3 = \{ACACATA\}$, $\dot{\mathcal{G}}_4 = \{ACACCTA\}$, $\dot{\mathcal{G}}_5 = \{ACACGTA\}$, $\dot{\mathcal{G}}_6 = \{ACACTTA\}$, $\dot{\mathcal{G}}_7 = \{ACTACTA\}$, $\dot{\mathcal{G}}_9 = \{ACATATA\}$, $\dot{\mathcal{G}}_{10} = \{ACCTATA\}$, $\dot{\mathcal{G}}_{11} = \{ACGTATA\}$, and $\dot{\mathcal{G}}_{12} = \{ACTTATA\}$. Three overlap classes contain several words: $\dot{\mathcal{G}}_2 = \{AC[ACG]ACTA\}$ and $\dot{\mathcal{G}}_8 = \{ACTA[AGT]TA\}$.

The remaining 49 words of the pattern $\mathcal{G}$ form the last overlap class $\dot{\mathcal{G}}_1$: left and right predecessors of the class are equal to $A$. Interestingly, the minimal automaton that recognizes $\mathcal{G}$ has a larger number of states, namely 19.

Below, we define unions of overlap classes, as they appear in equations of words occurrences probabilities.

**Definition 4.** Given a set $\mathcal{H}$ over an alphabet $V$ and a word $w$ in $OV(\mathcal{H})$, let $\tilde{T}_w$ and $\check{T}_w$ be the subtrees rooted in $w$ in the left and right overlap graphs, respectively. One defines the subsets of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$:

$$\tilde{C}_w = \tilde{T}_w \cap \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}),$$

$$\check{C}_w = \check{T}_w \cap \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}).$$

A set $\tilde{C}_w$ is called a right union and a set $\check{C}_w$ is called a left union.
Remark 2. Given a right union $\tilde{C}_w$ and an overlap class $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$, the set $\hat{\mathcal{O}} \cap \tilde{C}_w$ is either empty, or equal to $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ when $w$ is a suffix of any word in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$. When $w$ is a maximal suffixprefix, $\overline{C}_w$ and $\tilde{C}_w$ are overlap classes. It follows from these definitions that a right (respectively left) union contains the leaves of tree $\tilde{T}_w$ (respectively $\overline{T}_w$). Therefore, Equations (8) and (9) follow immediately.

\[
\tilde{C}_w = \bigcup_{x \in \text{ROG}_{\mathcal{H}, w \subseteq x}} \tilde{C}_x = \bigcup_{w \subseteq H} (\hat{\mathcal{O}}) ,
\]

\[
\overline{C}_w = \bigcup_{x \in \text{LOG}_{\mathcal{H}, w \sqsubseteq x}} \overline{C}_x = \bigcup_{w \prec H} (\hat{\mathcal{O}}) .
\]

In Example 1, $\tilde{C}_A = \tilde{C}_{ACA} \cup \tilde{C}_{ATA} \cup \tilde{C}_{CA} = \{H_1, H_2, H_3, H_4, H_5, H_7, H_8\}$ and $\overline{C}_A = \overline{C}_{ACA} \cup \overline{C}_{ATA} \cup \overline{C}_A = \{H_1, H_2, H_3, H_4\}$. In Example 4, one has $\tilde{C}_{ACTA} = \tilde{G}_2 \cup \tilde{G}_7$.

Our bottom-up computations in 4.1 and 4.2 rely on these union properties.

Remark 3. The relation $\sim$ defined as $x \sim y$ iff $xt \in \mathcal{H}$ is equivalent to $yt \in \mathcal{H}$ is well-known in automata theory as right $\mathcal{H}$-equivalence. There is a bijection between the states of the minimal automaton that recognizes $\mathcal{H}$ and classes of right equivalence.

3 Equations for words occurrences probabilities

The aim of this section is to establish our master Theorems 1 and 2 which state induction relations for word occurrence probabilities, in the Bernoulli and Markov model. They rely on a factorization lemma to achieve announced time and space complexities to be discussed in 5.1.

3.1 Basic Notations and Equations

One assumes the text $T$ may be generated according to either one of the two models below.

(B) BERNOULLI MODEL: every symbol $s$ of a finite alphabet $V$ is created independently of the other symbols, with probability $p_s$.

(M) MARKOV MODEL: in a Markov model of order $K$, the probability of a symbol occurrence at some position in the text depends on the $K$ previous symbols.

In a Markov model of order $K$, let $P_w(H)$ denote the probability to find $H$ right of a given word $w$ of length $K$. A Bernoulli model is viewed as a Markov model where $K$ is 0. Given a word $H$, one denotes $P(H)$ its probability in the Bernoulli model. Given a set of words $\mathcal{F}$, one denotes $P(\mathcal{F}) = \sum_{H \in \mathcal{F}} P(H)$ and $P_w(\mathcal{F}) = \sum_{H \in \mathcal{F}} P_w(H)$ its probability in the Bernoulli and the Markov models, respectively.
Definition 5. Let $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_q\}$ be a given set of words with the same length $m$ over an alphabet $V$.

One denotes $t_n^{[p]}(\mathcal{H})$ (respectively $f_n^{[p]}(\mathcal{H})$) the probability to find exactly (respectively at least) $p$ occurrences of $\mathcal{H}$ words in a text of size $n$.

One denotes $r_n^{[p]}(H)$ the probability to find word $H$ in text $T$, with its end at position $n$, under the condition that exactly $(p-1)$ other patterns from $\mathcal{H}$ appeared among positions $1, \ldots, n-1$.

For a subset $\mathcal{F}$ of $\mathcal{H}$, one denotes $r_n^{[p]}(\mathcal{F})$ the probability to find a word of $\mathcal{F}$ ending at position $n$ in text $T$ with exactly $(p-1)$ $\mathcal{F}$-words before it, i.e. $r_n^{[p]}(\mathcal{F}) = \sum_{H \in \mathcal{F}} r_n^{[p]}(H)$.

Property 2. For any integers $n$ and $p$, one has

$$t_n^{[p]}(\mathcal{H}) = f_n^{[p]}(\mathcal{H}) - f_n^{[p+1]}(\mathcal{H}),$$

$$f_n^{[p]}(\mathcal{H}) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} r_k^{[p]}(\mathcal{H})$$

Therefore, the computation of $t_n^{[i]}$ follows from the computation of $(r_n^{[i]}(H))$ where $H$ ranges over $\mathcal{H}$.

Definition 6. Given a word $t$ and a prefix $w$ of $t$, one denotes $\Phi_w(t)$ the suffix of $t$ that satisfies $t = w\Phi_w(t)$. One denotes $\phi_w(t)$ the probability of $\Phi_w(t)$ in the Bernoulli model. By convention, $\phi_w(t) = 0$ if $w$ is not a prefix of $t$.

Given a set $\mathcal{F}$ of words with a left common ancestor $w$, one defines

$$\phi_w(\mathcal{F}) = \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \phi_w(F).$$

Example 5. For word $H_1$ from set $\mathcal{H}$ in Example 1, one has $\Phi_{ACA}(H_1) = TATA$; then, in the Bernoulli model, $\phi_{ACA}(H_1) = p_T^2p_A^2$.

Proposition 1 below rewrites, using unions in overlap graphs defined above, a classical equation for words in $\mathcal{H}$ derived for $p = 1$ in [Szp01,Lot05,HZGD05] for the Bernoulli model. This rewriting will incorporate classes of overlap equivalence in Theorems 1 and allows for a further generalization to Markov models in 2. These two theorems allow for an implementation based on overlap graphs with announced complexities.

Proposition 1. Assume a Bernoulli model. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a given set of words and $p$ be an integer. The probabilities $(r_n^{[1]}(H))_{n \geq m}$ where $H$ ranges in $\mathcal{H}$ satisfy the induction relation:

$$r_n^{[1]}(H) = \left[ 1 - \sum_{k=1}^{n-m} t_k^{[1]}(\mathcal{H}) \right] P(H) - \sum_{w \in LOG_H \setminus \{\epsilon\}, w < H} r_{n-m+|w|}^{[1]}(\tilde{C}_w) \phi_w(H).$$

(11)
For any integer $i$ satisfying $2 \leq i \leq p$, the probabilities $(r_n^i(H))_{n \geq m}$ where $H$ ranges in $\mathcal{H}$ satisfy the induction relations:

\[
    r_n^i(H) = \sum_{k=1}^{n-m} \left[ r_k^{i-1}(\mathcal{H}) - r_k^i(\mathcal{H}) \right] P(H) \\
    + \sum_{w \in \text{LOG}_n \setminus \{\epsilon\}, w \prec H} \left[ r_{n-m+|w|}(\tilde{C}_w) - r_{n-m+|w|}(\tilde{C}_w) \right] \phi_w(H),
\]

with initial conditions:

\[
    r_1^i(H) = \cdots = r_{m-1}^i(H) = 0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq p, \\
    r_m^i(H) = P(H), \\
    r_i^m(H) = 0, \quad 2 \leq i \leq p.
\]

Proof. We propose a proof of this Proposition in the Bernoulli model, when $p = 1$, that extends to $p$ occurrences, $p \geq 1$. This Proposition is extended to overlap classes and to Markov model in Theorems 1 and 2. We study events that lead to a first occurrence and establish their probabilities. A word $H$ is the first occurrence of $H$ in text $T$ at position $n$ iff

(i) word $H$ occurs, ending at position $n$;
(ii) no $H$ word occurred up to position $n - m$;
(iii) no $H$ word occurred in positions $n - m + 1, \cdots, n - 1$.

The probability of (ii) is $1 - \sum_{k=1}^{n-m} r_k^1(\mathcal{H})$. Term $(1 - \sum_{k=1}^{n-m} r_k^1(\mathcal{H})) P(H)$ is the probability of the simultaneous occurrence of (i) and (ii), as these events are independent in the Bernoulli model. One must subtract the probability of the complementary event of (iii), conditioned by (i) and (ii). Complementary event of (iii) conditioned by (ii) is the union of $(m - 1)$ disjoint events, $(E_l)_{1 \leq l \leq m-1}$, where each event $E_l$ represents a first occurrence of a $H$-word ending at position $n - m + l$. Each event $E_l$ contains (i). Now, event $E_l$ conditioned by (i) occurs iff a word $F$ of $H$ occurs at position $n - m + l$ when $H$ ends at position $n$. This is satisfied iff exists $w$, with $|w| = l$ and $l \neq 0$, that is a prefix of $H$ and a suffix of $F$. Equivalently, $w$ is a left ancestor of $H$ different from the root and $F$ belongs to $\tilde{C}_w$.

This reasoning steadily extends. To find an $i$-th occurrence ending at position $n$, $(i - 1)$ occurrences, are needed before $n - m$; an $i$-th occurrence is forbidden before position $n - m$ (condition (ii)), and between $n - m + 1$ and $n - 1$ (condition (iii)).

Example 6. Equation for word $H_1 \in \mathcal{H}$ is:

\[
    r_n^1(H_1) = \left[ 1 - \sum_{k=1}^{n-7} r_k^1(\mathcal{H}) \right] P(H_1) - r_{n-6}^1(\tilde{C}_A) P(\text{CATATA}) - \\
    - r_{n-5}^1(\tilde{C}_{AC}) P(\text{ATATA}) - r_{n-4}^1(\tilde{C}_{ACA}) P(\text{TATA}).
\]
As each word has no more than \( m \) ancestors, the recursive equations (11) and (12) provide an easy way to compute \( (r_n^{[p]}(H))_{H \in \mathcal{H}} \) in \( O(npm|\mathcal{H}|) \) time complexity. This complexity is achieved in [HZGD05] with a matrix and in [BCR+07] with an Aho-Corasick-like automaton. In [Nue08], the automaton is minimized, which yields a complexity \( O(np|V||S|) \), where the size of the automaton is smaller. Overlap graphs provide an alternative improvement.

### 3.2 Overlap Graph Traversal

Our time complexity improvement, i.e. \( O(np(|\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})| + |S|)) \), where \( S = \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{H})) \), relies on a factorization property introduced below that reduces the computation to two graph traversals in Lemmas 1, 2 and 3. Space complexity issues will be discussed in Section 4 below.

**Graph traversal** Equations (11) and (12) are the same for all words \( H \) in \( \mathcal{H} \), up to the coefficients \( \mathcal{P}(H) \) and \( \phi_w(H) \). Lemma 1 establishes that the computation of the second term in (11) or (12) for each word \( H \) or left class \( \bar{H} \) only requires one parameter \( \psi^{[n]}_n(t) \) defined for its left predecessor \( t \) in \( \text{LOG}_{\mathcal{H}} \) and that this parameter can be computed in a traversal of the graph.

**Definition 7.** In the Bernoulli model, one defines \( \{(\psi^{[n]}_n(w))_{w \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})\setminus\{\epsilon\}}\}_{1 \leq i \leq p} \) by the \( p \) top-down inductions

\[
\psi^{[n]}_n(w) = r_n^{[i]}(\tilde{C}_w), \quad \text{if \text{lpred}(w) = \epsilon},
\]

\[
\psi^{[n]}_n(w) = \psi^{[i]}_n(\text{lpred}(w)) \cdot \phi_{\text{lpred}(w)}(w) + r_n^{[i]}(\tilde{C}_w), \quad \text{otherwise} . \quad (13)
\]

Lemma 1 establishes that \( \psi^{[n]}_n(w) \) represents the information on the past that is shared by all descendants of \( w \).

**Lemma 1.** For any word \( H \) in \( \mathcal{H} \), and any left ancestor \( w \) of \( H \) such that \( w \neq \epsilon \), one has:

\[
\sum_{x \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})\setminus\{\epsilon\}, x \leq w} r_n^{[i]}(\tilde{C}_x)\phi_x(H) = \psi^{[i]}_n(w) \cdot \phi_w(H) . \quad (14)
\]

Any subset \( T \) of a left class \( \bar{H} \) in \( \mathcal{H} \) satisfies

\[
\sum_{F \in T} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})\setminus\{\epsilon\}, w \prec F} r_n^{[i]}(\tilde{C}_w)\phi_w(F) = \psi^{[i]}_n(t) \cdot \phi_t(T) , \quad (15)
\]

where \( t \) is the common left predecessor.

**Proof.** Indeed, \( \phi_x(H) \) rewrites \( \phi_x(w)\phi_w(H) \). Therefore, \( \psi^{[i]}_n \) inductive definition allow to prove inductively, for any \( i \) in \([1..p]\), that

\[
\sum_{w \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{H})\setminus\{\epsilon\}, w \prec H} r_n^{[i]}(\tilde{C}_w)\phi_w(H) = \psi^{[i]}_n(t) \cdot \phi_t(H) , \quad (16)
\]

where \( t \) is the left predecessor of \( H \) in \( \text{LOG}\mathcal{H} \). A summation over all words in a subset \( T \) of left class \( \bar{H} \) and a factorization yields (15).
Second term in (11) or (12) may be computed once for any subset of words in a left class. Yet, probabilities computation for larger $n$ implies to memorize separately right classes. Therefore, we split left classes with respect to right equivalence, which yields classes of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$. A rewriting of Equation (8) leads to Lemma 2 below.

**Lemma 2.** Let $w$ be a node in $\text{ROG}_\mathcal{H}$. For any integer $i$ or $n$, probabilities $r_{n}^{[i]}(\tilde{C}_w)$ satisfy:

$$r_{n}^{[i]}(\tilde{C}_w) = \sum_{x \in \text{OV}(\mathcal{H}), w \subseteq x} r_{n}^{[i]}(\tilde{C}_x) = \sum_{\hat{H} \subseteq \tilde{C}_w} r_{n}^{[i]}(\hat{H}).$$

(17)

**Corollary 1.** The set $\{r_{n}^{[i]}(\tilde{C}_w)\}_{w \in \text{OV}(\mathcal{H})}$ can be computed from $\{r_{n}^{[i]}(\tilde{C}_x)\}_{x \in \mathcal{D}}$ by a bottom-up traversal of $\text{ROG}_\mathcal{H}$.

**Theorem 1.** Let $\tilde{H}$ be a class in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ and denote $t$ the left predecessor of $\tilde{H}$. In the Bernoulli model, probabilities $r_{n}^{[i]}(\tilde{H})$ satisfy

$$r_{n}^{[1]}(\tilde{H}) = 1 - \sum_{k=1}^{n-m} r_{k}^{[1]}(\mathcal{H}) P(\mathcal{H}) - \psi_{n}^{[1]}(t) \cdot \phi(t),$$

(18)

and, for $i \geq 2$,

$$r_{n}^{[i]}(\tilde{H}) = \sum_{k=1}^{n-m} \left[r_{k}^{[i-1]}(\mathcal{H}) - r_{k}^{[i]}(\mathcal{H})\right] P(\mathcal{H}) + \left[\psi_{n}^{[i-1]}(t) - \psi_{n}^{[i]}(t)\right] \cdot \phi(t),$$

(19)

with initial conditions

$$r_{1}^{[i]}(\mathcal{H}) = \cdots = r_{m-1}^{[i]}(\mathcal{H}) = 0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq p,$$

$$r_{m}^{[i]}(\mathcal{H}) = P(\mathcal{H}),$$

$$r_{m}^{[i]}(\mathcal{H}) = 0, \quad 2 \leq i \leq p.$$  

### 3.3 Markov extension

Unlike the algorithms based on finite automata accepting the corresponding texts (see e.g. [NSF02,CS03,HZGD05,Nue08,BCR07,RR08]), our computation on the Markov model is a generalization of (11) that relies onto overlap graphs introduced above. An extension of the induction to the Markov model requires to extend the $(\psi_{n}^{[i]})$ family for nodes $w$ with a depth smaller than $K$. This is realized with a suitable partition of union $\tilde{C}_w$. We use the notations of Definition 6 and restrict the presentation to the case $K \leq m$.

**Definition 8.** Given a word $w$ such that $K \leq |w|$, one denotes $\text{suf}_K(w)$ its suffix of size $K$. Given a word $\alpha$ in $V^K$, one denotes

$$\mathcal{H}(\alpha) = \{H \in \mathcal{H}; \alpha = \text{suf}_K(H)\}.$$

Given a word $t$ such that $w$ is a prefix of $t$, one defines parameter $\phi_w(t)$ by

$$\phi_w(t) = P_{\text{suf}_K(w)}(\Phi_w(t)).$$

(20)
Remark 4. \( \phi_w(t) \) represents the probability to find \( \Phi_w(t) \) right after a \( w \)-occurrence. In Example 1, \( \Phi_{ACA}(H_1) = P_{CA}(T)P_{AT}(A)P_{TA}(T)P_{AT}(A) \) in the Markov model of order 2.

Definition 9. Given a set \( \mathcal{H} \) and a Markov model of order \( K \), with \( K \leq m \), one defines the right \( K \)-frontier of \( \mathcal{H} \), noted \( RF_K(\mathcal{H}) \), and the left \( K \)-frontier, noted \( LF_K(\mathcal{H}) \), by:

\[
RF_K(\mathcal{H}) = \{ w \in OV(\mathcal{H}); |r_{pred}(w)| < K \leq |w| \},
\]
\[
LF_K(\mathcal{H}) = \{ w \in OV(\mathcal{H}); |l_{pred}(w)| < K \leq |w| \}.
\]

The set of right \( K \)-leaves, noted \( RL_K(\mathcal{H}) \), and the set of left \( K \)-leaves, noted \( LL_K(\mathcal{H}) \), are defined as:

\[
RL_K(\mathcal{H}) = \{ \hat{H} \in P(\mathcal{H}); |r_{pred}(\hat{H})| < K \},
\]
\[
LL_K(\mathcal{H}) = \{ \hat{H} \in P(\mathcal{H}); |l_{pred}(\hat{H})| < K \}.
\]

Example 7. In Example 1, the right 3-frontier is \( \{ ACA, ATA \} \) and the right 3-leaves are \( H_6 \) and \( H_7 \).

The right \( K \)-frontier and the set of right \( K \)-leaves allow to define for every word \( w \) such that \( |w| < K \), a natural partition of each union \( \tilde{C}_w \) defined by the successors of \( w \) in \( ROG_\mathcal{H} \) that belong to these two sets.

Definition 10. Given a word \( w \) in \( OV(\mathcal{H}) \setminus \{ \epsilon \} \) such that \( |w| < K \), one defines a subset \( S_K(w) \) of \( V^K \) as

\[
S_K(w) = \bigcup_{t \in RF_K(\mathcal{H}) \cup RL_K(\mathcal{H}), w \subseteq t} \{ \text{su}_fK(t) \}.
\]

Given a word \( w \) in \( RF_K(\mathcal{H}) \cup RL_K(\mathcal{H}) \), one denotes

\[
S_K(w) = \{ \text{su}_fK(w) \}.
\]

Example 8. Let \( w \) be \( A \) in Example 1. Word \( t \) will range in \( \{ ACA, ATA, H_7 \} \). Therefore \( S_3(A) = \{ ACA, ATA, CCA \} \). Let \( w \) be \( AC \). Then word \( t \) ranges in \( \{ H_6 \} \) and \( S_3(AC) = \{ CAC \} \).

Remark 5. With the notations above, one gets

\[
\tilde{C}_w = \left( \bigcup_{t \in RF_K(\mathcal{H}); w \subseteq r_{pred}(t)} \tilde{C}_t \right) \bigcup \left( \bigcup_{\hat{H} \in RL_K(\mathcal{H}); w \subseteq l_{pred}(\hat{H})} (\hat{H}) \right).
\]

For instance, it follows from Example 8 that \( \tilde{C}_{CA} = \tilde{C}_{ACA} \cup \{ H_7 \} \).

Definition 11. Given a word \( w \) in \( OV(\mathcal{H}) \setminus \{ \epsilon \} \) satisfying \( |w| < K \), one defines for each \( \alpha \) in \( S_K(w) \):

\[
r_{n,\alpha}^{[i]}(w) = \sum_{t \in RF_K(\mathcal{H}); w \subseteq r_{pred}(t), \alpha \subseteq t} r_n^{[i]}(\tilde{C}_t) + \sum_{\hat{H} \subseteq RL_K(\mathcal{H}); w \subseteq l_{pred}(\hat{H}), \alpha \subseteq \hat{H}} r_n^{[i]}(\hat{H})
\]

By convention, \( r_{n,\alpha}^{[i]}(w) = 0 \) if \( \alpha \in V^K \setminus S_K(w) \).
Remark 6. It is guaranteed that at least one of the two sums contribute, and that \( w \subset \alpha \).

We now show how this knowledge on the past allows for the computation of Equations (11) and (12).

**Definition 12.** Given a word \( w \) in \( OV(\mathcal{H}) \setminus \{\epsilon\} \) satisfying \(|w| < K\), one denotes \( \text{SP}_K(w) \) the subset of \( V^K \) defined inductively as follows.

\[
\text{SP}_K(w) = \begin{cases} 
S_K(w) & \text{if } \text{lpred}(w) = \epsilon \\
S_K(w) \cup \{\alpha \in V^K; S^{[\alpha]}(w) \neq \emptyset\} & \text{otherwise} 
\end{cases},
\]

where

\[
S^{[\alpha]}(w) = \{\beta \in \text{SP}_K(\text{lpred}(w)); \alpha = \text{sup}_K(\beta \cdot \Phi_{\text{lpred}(w)}(w))\}.
\]

**Example 9.** In Example 1, one has \( \text{SP}_3(A) = S_3(A) = \{\text{ACA}, \text{ATA}, \text{CCA}\} \). Let \( w \) be \( \text{AC} \). One has \( \text{lpred}(\text{AC}) = A \), and \( \alpha \) ranges over \( \{\text{CAC}, \text{TAC}\} \) when \( \beta \) ranges over \( \text{SP}_3(A) \). Finally, \( S^{[\text{CAC}]}(\text{AC}) = \{\text{ACA}, \text{CCA}\} \) and \( S^{[\text{TAC}]}(\text{AC}) = \{\text{ATA}\} \) that are a partition of \( \text{SP}_3(A) \). Finally, \( \text{SP}_3(\text{AC}) = \{\text{CAC}, \text{TAC}\} \).

**Definition 13.** Let \( w \) be any word in \( OV(\mathcal{H}) \setminus \{\epsilon\} \).

If \(|w| < K\), one defines a family \( \left( \psi^{[p]}_{n,\alpha}(w) \right)_{\alpha \in \text{SP}_K(w)} \).

\[
\psi^{[p]}_{n,\alpha}(w) = \begin{cases} 
\left[r^{[p]}_{n-m+|w|,\alpha}(w)\right] & \text{if } \text{lpred}(w) = \epsilon \\
\sum_{\beta \in S^{[\alpha]}(w)} \psi^{[p]}_{n,\beta}(x) P_{\beta}(\Phi_x(w)) + r^{[p]}_{n-m+|w|,\alpha}(w) & \text{otherwise} 
\end{cases}
\]

If \(|w| \geq K\), one defines a single function \( \psi^{[p]}_n(w) \).

\[
\psi^{[p]}_n(w) = r^{[p]}_{n-m+|w|}(\tilde{C}_w) + \left(\sum_{\beta \in S^{[\text{sup}_K(w)]}(w)} \psi^{[p]}_{n,\beta}(x) P_{\beta}(\Phi_x(w))\right) \text{ if } w \in \text{LF}_K(\mathcal{H})
\]

\[
\psi^{[p]}_n(w) = \sum_{\beta \in S^{[\text{sup}_K(w)]}(w)} \psi^{[p]}_{n,\beta}(x) \cdot \phi_x(w) \text{ otherwise}. 
\]

**Example 10.** Let us use (26), (29) and (30) in Example 1.

(i) Let \( w \) be \( A \). As \( \text{lpred}(A) = \epsilon \), one applies the first equation in (29) for \( \alpha \) ranging in \( S_3(A) \). Right members are computed through (26) which yields \( \psi^{[p]}_{n,\text{ACA}}(A) = r^{[p]}_{n-6}(H_2) + r^{[p]}_{n-6}(H_3) + r^{[p]}_{n-6}(H_8) \), \( \psi^{[p]}_{n,\text{ATA}}(A) = r^{[p]}_{n-6}(H_1) + r^{[p]}_{n-6}(H_4) + r^{[p]}_{n-6}(H_5) \) and \( \psi^{[p]}_{n,\text{CCA}}(A) = r^{[p]}_{n-6}(H_7) \).

(ii) One uses (29) to compute \( \psi^{[i]}_{n,TAC}(\text{AC}) \) and \( \psi^{[i]}_{n,\text{CAC}}(\text{AC}) \). For instance,

\[
\psi^{[i]}_{n,CAC}(\text{AC}) = \psi^{[i]}_{n,\text{ACA}}(A) \cdot P_{\text{ACA}}(C) + \psi^{[i]}_{n,\text{CCA}}(A) \cdot P_{\text{CCA}}(C) + r^{[i]}_{n-5,CAC}(\text{AC}),
\]

where, using (26), \( r^{[i]}_{n-5,CAC}(\text{AC}) = r^{[i]}_{n-5}(H_6) \).
(iii) Word $A$ is the left predecessor of $ATA$ that belongs to the right 3-frontier. Therefore, (30) yields

$$
\psi_n^{[p]}(ATA) = \psi_{n,ACA}^{[p]}(A)P_{ACA}(TA) + \psi_{n,ATA}^{[p]}(A)P_{ATA}(TA) + \psi_{n,CCA}^{[p]}(A)P_{CCA}(TA) + r_n^{[p]}(H_1) + r_n^{[p]}(H_4) + r_n^{[p]}(H_5).$

Lemma 1 can now be rewritten into Lemma 3 below that steadily yields Theorem 2.

**Lemma 3.** Any leaf class $\hat{H}$ in $P(\mathcal{H})$ with left predecessor $t$ satisfies

$$\sum_{w \in LOG_{n+1}[t], w < \hat{H}} r_n^{[p]}(w)(C_w)\phi_w(\hat{H}) = \psi_n^{[p]}(t) \cdot \phi_t(\hat{H}) \text{ if } |t| \geq K \quad (31)$$

$$= \sum_{\alpha \in V^K, t \subseteq \alpha} \psi^{[p]}_n(t) \cdot \phi_t(\hat{H}) \text{ if } |t| < K \quad (32)$$

**Definition 14.** Let $f_k^{[p]}(\alpha)$ be the probability that a text of size $k$, $k \geq m$, ending with suffix $\alpha$ in $V^K$, contains at least $p$ occurrences of words from $\mathcal{H}$.

**Lemma 4.** The probabilities $f_k^{[p]}(\alpha)$ satisfy the following induction

$$f_k^{[p]}(\alpha) = \sum_{\beta \in V^K} f_{k-1}^{[p]}(\beta) \cdot P_\beta(\alpha) + r_k^{[p]}(\mathcal{H}(\alpha)), \quad (33)$$

with the initial condition

$$f_m^{[p]}(\alpha) = r_m^{[p]}(\mathcal{H}(\alpha)).$$

**Theorem 2.** Let $\hat{H}$ be a class in $P(\mathcal{H})$ and $t$ be its left predecessor. In the Markov model, probabilities $r_n^{[i]}(\hat{H}(\beta))$ are equal to

$$\sum_{\alpha \in V^K} (f_n^{[i-1]}(\alpha) - f_n^{[i]}(\alpha))P_\alpha(\hat{H}(\beta)) + \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} (\psi_n^{[i-1]}(t) - \psi_n^{[i]}(t)) \cdot \phi_t(\hat{H}) & \text{if } |t| \geq K \\ \sum_{\alpha \in V^K} (\psi_n^{[i-1]}(t) - \psi_{n,\alpha}^{[i]}(t)) \cdot \phi_t(\hat{H}) & \text{if } \hat{H} \subset LL_K(\mathcal{H}) \end{array} \right. \quad (34)$$

with initial conditions

$$r_1^{[i]}(H) = \cdots = r_{m-1}^{[i]}(H) = 0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq p,$$

$$r_n^{[i]}(H) = P(H),$$

$$r_n^{[i]}(H) = 0, \quad 2 \leq i \leq p,$$

and convention $\psi_n^{[0]}(t) = 0$ and $\psi_n^{[i]}(t) = 0$.

### 4 Basic Algorithm

We describe a procedure to compute the probabilities of words occurrences in texts. Our input is a set of words $\mathcal{H}$. Our output is the set of probabilities $(r_n^{[i]}(\mathcal{H}))_{1 \leq i \leq p}$ for a given position $n$. Overlap graph modelling provides a straightforward but efficient algorithm.
4.1 Overlap Graphs Construction

Our preprocessing step builds right and left overlap graphs and partition $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$. It relies on a tree $T_\mathcal{H}$ built with Aho-Corasick algorithm [AC75]. A basic feature of Aho-Corasick is the on-line construction of so-called suffix links. Given a word $s$ in $V^*$, suf$(s)$ denotes the largest suffix of $s$ that is a proper prefix of some word from the set $\mathcal{H}$. Below, we identify each node or leaf with the word defined by the path from the root. A suffix link is a link from a node $s$ to node suf$(s)$.

**Right overlap graph** We start with the right overlap graph. According to Definition 1, a node in $T_\mathcal{H}$ belongs to $OV(\mathcal{H})$ iff there exists a sequence of suffix links from a leaf to this node. Therefore, a bottom-up traversal of $T_\mathcal{H}$ according to the suffix links allows one to find out the nodes from $OV(\mathcal{H})$ and to construct $ROG_\mathcal{H}$. See Figure 3.

**Left overlap graph** To link the nodes in $OV(\mathcal{H})$ with the links for $LOG_\mathcal{H}$, one can use a depth-first traversal of $T_\mathcal{H}$.

![Fig. 3. Aho-Corasick tree $T_\mathcal{H}$ for set $\mathcal{H}$ in Example 1 used to build $ROG_\mathcal{H}$ and $LOG_\mathcal{H}$ in Figures 1 and 2. The nodes corresponding to $OV(\mathcal{H})$ are marked with double circles. A leaf corresponding to the word $H_i$ in $\mathcal{H}$ is labeled with the number $i$, $1 \leq i \leq 8$. The dashed lines depicts suffix links needed to construct $ROG_\mathcal{H}$; the other Aho-Corasicks suffix links are omitted.](image)

**Partition** Thanks to the order of AC tree, a depth-first traversal of $LOG_\mathcal{H}$, MaxSufPref, achieves a partition of $\mathcal{H}$ into $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$. As all words of a class are left equivalent, it is enough to identify below each deep node $x$ all words that are right equivalent and number the designed classes. To achieve this linearly, one maintains in each internal node $s$ the class number $i(s)$ of the last visited leaf $H$.
in \( \mathcal{H} \) satisfying \( \text{suf}(H) = s \). One achieves an increasing numbering; let \( j \) denote the number of the last class created before the visit of leaves below \( x \). When a leaf \( H \) is visited, an equivalent leaf has been previously visited iff \( i(\text{suf}(H)) > j \). In this case, leaf \( H \) is addressed to class \( i(\text{suf}(H)) \). Otherwise, it is given the next available class number \( k \) and \( i(\text{suf}(H)) \) is updated to \( k \).

**Markov model** Main preprocessing step is the computation of the right \( K \)-frontier and the right \( K \)-leaves, which is \( O(|V|^K) \).

Aho-Corasick construction of the tree, including the suffix links, can be achieved in time and space \( O(m|H|) \) [CR02]. Subgraph extraction algorithms are classical graph traversals. They run with \( O(|T_H|) \) time and space complexity and \( O(|T_H|) \) is upper bounded by \( O(m|H|) \) [AC75]. Once these steps have been performed, tree \( T_H \) is not needed any more and space can be released.

### 4.2 Algorithm and basic data structures

Our algorithm computes inductions (19) and (34) in a depth-first traversal of \( \text{LOG}_H \). Bottom-up traversals of \( \text{ROG}_H \) allow to manage memory: an extraction of suitable information is performed at the beginning of each cycle and an update is realized at the end of each cycle. For sake of clarity, we first describe the Bernoulli model.

**Memory management** One observes that results of previous computations that are used in (19) are
\[
\sum_{k=1}^{n-m} (r_k^{[i-1]}(H) - r_k^{[i]}(H)) \quad 1 \leq i \leq p
\]
and (\(\psi_n^{[i]}(t)\)) that depend on
\[
(r_n^{[i]}(H) - r_n^{[i-1]}(H)) \quad 1 \leq i \leq p
\]
where \( i \) ranges in \( \{1 \cdots p\} \).

1. Values \( \sum_{k=1}^{n-m} (r_k^{[i]}(H)) \) where \( i \) ranges in \( \{1 \cdots p\} \) are memorized in \( p \) global variables, e.g. an array \( \text{SumProb} \) of \( p \) integers.

2. For each node \( w \) at depth \( |w| \) in \( \text{LOG}_H \setminus \{\epsilon\} \), one needs, to perform computation at cycle \( n \), values \( (\psi_n^{[i]}(w)) \) of \( 1 \leq i \leq p \). Therefore, one memorizes the \( p(m - |w|) \) values \( \{r_n^{[i]}(H) \ldots r_n^{[i]}(H)\} \) in an array \( \text{ProbMark} \) of size \( p(m - |w|) \).

3. In each node \( w \) and in each leaf class \( \dot{H} \) in \( \text{LOG}_H \setminus \{\epsilon\} \), one memorizes probability \( \phi_x(w) \) or \( \phi_x(H) \), where \( x \) is its father in \( \text{LOG}_H \).

**Algorithm** For any inductive step \( n \), our algorithm executes:

1. In a bottom-up traversal of \( \text{ROG}_H \), including the root, \( \text{ProbMainCalc} \) extracts from \( \text{ProbMark} \), for each internal node, the \( p \) values \( (r_n^{[i]}(H)) \) \( 1 \leq i \leq p \).

2. In a depth-first traversal of \( \text{LOG}_H \):
   a) when one visits an internal node, \( (\psi_n^{[i]}(w)) \) \( 1 \leq i \leq p \) are computed according to (13);
when a leaf class $\hat{H}$ is visited:

(i) compute $r_n^i(\hat{H})$ using (19), for $i$ in \{1, $\cdots$, $p$\};

(ii) Add $r_n^i(\hat{H})$ to a temporary variable, $FirstTemp[i]$, in its predecessor in $ROG_H$ (a deep node).

3. In a bottom-up traversal of $ROG_H$, update $ProbMark$ for internal nodes, using $FirstTemp$ according to (17). At the root $\epsilon$, $r_n^i(C_\epsilon) = r_n^i(H)$ is added to $SumProb$.

Markov model For memory management, it is now necessary to store values $\sum r_n^i(\mathcal{H}(\beta))$ for all words $\beta$ in $V^K$. Moreover, for a node $w$ at depth smaller than $K$, one stores, for each $i$, non-zero values $r_n^i(w)$. For a node $w$ in the left $K$-frontier or above it, and for a leaf class $\hat{H}$ in the left $K$-leaves, one must memorize several values $P_\beta(\Phi_x(w))$ or $P_\beta(\Phi_t(\hat{H}))$.

Procedures are slightly modified. In nodes above the right $K$-frontier, one extracts additional values, namely $r_n^i(w)$, in step 1. In step 2, families $(\psi_n^i(w))$ computation relies on (29) and necessitates a pre-processing to memorize all $\phi_x(w)$.

If a leaf class $\hat{H}$ is a left $K$-leaf, one computes $r_n^i(\hat{H})$ through (34) instead of (19). In step 3, the bottom-up traversal stops at the right $K$-frontier.

5 Complexity and experimental results

5.1 Complexity

Overlap graph complexity Our algorithm achieves an overall $O(np(|S| + |P(H)|))$ time complexity, where $S = OV(H)$. Indeed, depth-first traversal at step 2 and bottom-up traversals at steps 1 and 3 yield a $O(p|S|)$ time complexity. Computation of (19) is done for each overlap class in constant time. This yields an $O(|P(H)|)$ time complexity in the Bernoulli model.

Temporary memory for $\psi_n^i(w)$ computation or probability update is $O(p|S|)$. In our current implementation, $ProbMark$ is built for all internal nodes, which yields a $O(mp|S|)$ space complexity. This already improves on recent algorithms [HZGD05,BCR+07]. This upper bound can be improved. Indeed, given a node $w$ at depth $k$, one needs only memorize $(r_n^i(\hat{C}_w))$ when for $1 \leq i \leq p$ and $1 \leq l \leq m - k$. Therefore, space complexity is $pD$ with

$$D = \sum_{w \in S} [m - |w|] .$$

When a Markov model is used, additional space is needed. First, $m$ values $f_k^i(\alpha)$ use $O(pm|V|^K)$ space. Then, for a node $w$, constraint $w \subset \alpha$ yields at most $|V|^K-|w|$ non-zero values $r_n^i$. Additional space is $O(pK|V|^K)$. Finally, computation of (29) needs values $P_\beta(\Phi_x(w))$. A node $x$ needs at most $|V|^K-|x|$ values $P_\beta(\Phi_x(w))$. Summing over at most $|V|^{|x|}$ nodes at level $|x|$ yields
an upper bound $O(pK|V|^K)$. Therefore, overall additional space complexity is $O(pm|V|^K)$. As each term is computed once at each inductive step, in $O(1)$ time, additional time complexity is $O(npm|V|^K)$.

Previous algorithms. Exact computation of $p$ occurrences probability depends on the text size $n$ as a linear function $O(n)$ or a logarithmic function $O(\log n)$. Let us mention that there also exist approximate computations that may be realized in constant time with some drawbacks on the space complexity or the tightness of the approximation. They are beyond the scope of this paper.

We now discuss exact computation. All approaches, including automata or Markov Chain embedding [NSF02,CS03,FL03,Nue08], matrices [HZGD05] or languages [Rég00] need to compute a set of linear equations of order $m$ with constant coefficients. Therefore, theoretical complexity is known. Algorithms that are linear in $n$, such as RegExpCount, AhoPro or Spatt achieve a complexity $p|S|n$ where $|S|$ is the size of the structure used for the computation. Using the classical system reduction [Rég00], it is theoretically possible to achieve a $O(mp\log n)$ algorithm, with a constant factor that depends of the data structure to be used. This optimization has been recently implemented in [RR08]. Nevertheless, one observes that the $mp$ factor may represent a significant drawback. Therefore, counting algorithms are compared below on the basis of the two data structures used in the computation and the memorization.

[HZGD05] data structure is $O(|\mathcal{H}| \log |\mathcal{H}|)$. Markov Chain Embedding algorithms use very sparse matrices. Therefore, RegExpCount and AhoPro automata outperform them, and the minimization achieved in [Nue08] is a further improvement. Overlap graph is an alternative approach. In both cases, there is no non-trivial upper bound for the ratio between $|S|$ and the size of Aho-Corasick automata. Remark that one must take into account the alphabet size $V$ in automata time complexity and a multiplicative factor $m$ in overlap graph space complexity. When a minimization is very efficient, (pattern $\text{ANNNNNA}$), an overlap graph is less significantly reduced. Our last example suggests that building an overlap graph on a minimized automaton is an improvement and might be optimal. Indeed, for set $\mathcal{G}$ in Example 4, minimized Aho-Corasick automaton has 3 final states and 19 internal nodes. Overlap graph for this minimized automaton contains 4 classes and 4 internal nodes, associated to prefixes $\epsilon, C, CC = GG$ and $CCCC$. This difference is mainly due to backward links, that are necessary for a searching algorithm, but are unnecessary for counting algorithms, and therefore erased by overlap graphs.

5.2 Experiments

We have performed computer experiments to compare our approach and the approach using finite automaton representation of the corresponding set of text (e.g. [BCR+07,Nue08]). We used an Intel Celeron 2.26 GHz with Windows XP. The complexity of automaton based methods can be described with the size $|\Sigma|$ of minimal automaton accepting the set of texts containing the desired number of patterns. The proposed approach leads to other characteristics of the pattern:
(i) \(|S|\) is the number of overlaps;
(ii) \(|\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})|\) is the number of overlap classes, i.e. equivalence classes in the overlap-based partition of the given word set;
(iii) \(D\) is the sum of differences \(m-|w|\) over all suffix-prefixes \(w\) defined in (35).

In our case, it was stated above in section 5.1) that the run-time is proportional to \(|S| + |\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})|\) and the required space is proportional to \(D\).

First, we studied the dependence of the size \(|S|\) of overlap graph on the size and length of the pattern \(\mathcal{H}\). Data are given in Table 2 and depicted in Figure 4. Surprisingly, the average value of \(|S|\) for random patterns does not depend on the pattern length \(m\) while the size of the minimal automaton grows almost linearly with the growth of the pattern length (the number of words in the pattern being fixed). One can see that for reasonable pattern lengths (up to 24) and sizes (up to 1500 words) the value \(|S|\) (and even \(|S| + |\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})|\)) is less than the number \(|\Sigma|\) of states of the corresponding minimized automaton. The independence of value \(|S|\) of the pattern length can be justified theoretically (see Theorem 3 in Section 6).

Fig. 4. Overlap graph size \(|S|\) and minimal automaton size \(|\Sigma|\). Average values for random patterns of size 500. Blue diamond shapes represent \(|S|\) and purple squares represent \(|\Sigma|\).
Figure 5 demonstrates the impact of usage of overlap classes instead of individual words (cf. equations (11) and (19)). We have generated 30 sets of 50k random words ($k = 1, 2, \ldots, 30$) of length 8 and 12; the random words were generated in 4-letter alphabet $\{A, C, G, T\}$ using Bernoulli model with equal probabilities of all letters. In the vast majority of cases, the number of overlap classes coincides with the initial number of words. We give the line only for the random patterns of length 8; the line for random patterns of length 12 coincides with it. Two lower lines corresponds to the patterns based on two position-specific scoring matrices (PSSM). Given a PSSM $M$, a threshold or cutoff $s$ defines a set $F(M, s)$, that consists of all the words in $V^m$ with a score greater than $s$. Different cutoffs were used to obtain patterns of different sizes. The PSSMs were created by Dan Pollard for Drosophila genes (http://www.danielpollard.com/matrices.html) and are given in Table 1. The PSSMs are referred to as PSSM-08 and PSSM-12; their lengths are 8 and 12, respectively. Cutoffs are chosen to ensure that the set sizes range from 1 to 1500. One can see that in case of non-random patterns usage of overlap classes may bring significant improvement.

Fig. 5. Number of overlap classes as a function of the number of words in the pattern. The data are given for three series of patterns: (1) random patterns of length 8; (2) patterns corresponding to two PSSMs with different cutoffs. The upper line (blue triangles) corresponds to random patterns.

Tables 3, 4, 5 and 6 demonstrate results of experiments with the above four series of patterns. For each pattern we show its length and size, as well as above complexity measures related both to automaton-based and overlap-based approaches. Columns Time and Space represent time and space complexity of algorithms. For the automaton-based approach the run-time is proportional to
Table 1. Position-specific scoring matrices (PSSM) built to study Drosophila genes (http://www.danielpollard.com/matrices.html) of lengths 8 and 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>-2.197</td>
<td>-0.588</td>
<td>0.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>-2.197</td>
<td>-2.197</td>
<td>0.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-2.197</td>
<td>-2.197</td>
<td>-2.197</td>
<td>1.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.299</td>
<td>-2.197</td>
<td>-2.197</td>
<td>-2.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.299</td>
<td>-2.197</td>
<td>-2.197</td>
<td>-2.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.299</td>
<td>-2.197</td>
<td>-2.197</td>
<td>-2.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-2.197</td>
<td>-2.197</td>
<td>-2.197</td>
<td>1.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-2.197</td>
<td>-2.197</td>
<td>-2.197</td>
<td>-2.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.022</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-2.197</td>
<td>-2.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.588</td>
<td>-2.197</td>
<td>0.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td>-0.588</td>
<td>-0.588</td>
<td>-0.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>-0.588</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>-2.197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n \cdot p \cdot |V| \cdot |\Sigma|$ and the required space is proportional to $p \cdot |\Sigma|$ (see [Nue08]); here $n$ is the length of the text and $p$ is the desired number of occurrences. As we have shown in section 5.1, in our approach we get analogous formulas, namely $O(n \cdot p \cdot (|S| + |P(H)|))$ for time and $O(p \cdot \Delta)$ for space. Thus, in our comparison we use $|V| \cdot |\Sigma|$ and $|\Sigma|$ as time and space coefficients for automaton-based algorithm; we use $|S| + |P(H)|$ and $\Delta$ as analogous coefficients for the overlap-based approach.

In Figures 6, 7, 8 and 9, one can see that in the vast majority of cases the coefficients for overlap approach are less than ones for the automaton approach. Time coefficients and space coefficients for PSSM-08 patterns are depicted in Figures 6 and 7, respectively. The average ratios of time coefficients are 4.64 (for patterns of length less than 500); 2.12 (for patterns with lengths between 500 and 1000); 1.65 (for patterns of length between 1000 and 1500). The plot for PSSM-12 is similar (the plot is not shown, see Tables 3 and 4). The advantage of overlap approach for space coefficients (in case of PSSM-08 patterns) is not so high compared to time coefficients, but still significant (see Figure 7). However for the PSSM-12 patterns, the space coefficients for the automaton approach are in average slightly better (the plot is not shown, see Tables 3 and 4).

The data on random patterns (see Figures 8 and 9) demonstrate that in this case the overlap-based approach works better. The lines depicting the behavior of the overlap approach for random patterns of different lengths almost coincide. This corresponds to the results given in Table 2 and Figure 4. In contrast, the automaton approach coefficients for the patterns of length 12 are significantly greater than ones for the patterns of length 8.

6 Discussion

The majority of the algorithms [NSF02,CS03,FL03,Nue06,BCR07,Nue08] computing probability to find the given number of occurrences of a pattern in a ran-
dom text are based on the usage of the automaton accepting the appropriate set of texts. The structure of the automaton reflects the set of suffix-prefixes (overlaps) of the given pattern but relation between states of the minimal automaton and overlaps can be quite complicated.

In this paper we present another approach based on explicit usage of partition of the given word set according to the structure of its overlaps. Recursive equations, (11) used here and in [HZGD05], (12) and (19) employ subtraction of probabilities and therefore cannot be reduced to the automaton-based equations for any automaton.
Fig. 8. Time coefficients for the random patterns of lengths 8 and 12. The graphs for overlap coefficients of lengths 8 and 12 (the lowest lines) almost coincide.

Fig. 9. Space coefficients for the random patterns of lengths 8 and 12. The graphs for overlap coefficients of lengths 8 and 12 (the lowest lines) almost coincide.

The series of computer experiments allowed one to learn and compare the advantages of the approaches. For the overlap approach, the important characteristics of the pattern is number $|S|$ of its suffix-prefixes; the characteristics is also important for various pattern matching methods. The experiments demonstrate that for random patterns the value $|S|$ depend only of patterns size (i.e. number of words) but does not depend on pattern length (see Table 2 and Figure 4). The following Theorem justifies this observation.
Theorem 3. Let $V$ be an alphabet and $U(r; m)$ be a set of all sets (patterns) of $r$ words with the same length $m$ over an alphabet $V$; all elements of $U(r; m)$ are considered as having the same probability. Let further $E(r, m)$ be the average number of suffix-prefixes (overlaps) of the patterns from $U(r; m)$. Then

$$E(r, m) \leq C \cdot r$$

(36)

where $C$ does not depend on $r$ and $m$.

The proof of the theorem is not given here due to lack of space and will be presented in a companion paper.

The above feature predetermines that the proposed approach exceeds the automaton one in case of random patterns (Figures 8 and 9). For non-random patterns, the automaton approach due to general minimization procedure get benefits from the structure of pattern and in these cases the advantage of the overlap approach is not so clear; moreover, in some cases the automaton approach works better. It seems to be interesting to provide deeper investigation of the dependence of the methods behavior on the structure of patterns and to develop a new method combining the advantages of the approaches.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduced a new concept of overlap graphs to count word occurrences and their probabilities. The concept led to a recursive equation that differs from the classical one based on the finite automaton accepting the proper set of texts. In case of many occurrences, our approach yields the same order of time and space complexity as the approach based on minimized automaton.

For random patterns, our approach has asymptotically better constants and this advantage is achieved for relatively small pattern length, e.g. for lengths around 10 (see Figures 8 and 9). For non-random patterns, our approach gives results compatible with S-PATT [Nue08]; the results depend on the structure of the pattern. Because of this, we here restricted ourselves with comparison of theoretical constants rather than run-times. The description of the algorithm in Sections 4 and 5 justifies this way of algorithms comparison. Remark that the constants well describe the space complexity of the algorithms. In the same time, our results are significantly better than the results of methods that do not implement the automaton minimization, e.g. [NSF02,CS03,HZGD05,Nue06,BCR+07].

In the future, we plan to design a novel recursion equation combining advantages of overlap graphs and minimal automata. Other directions of improvement are extensions of the scheme allowing to count differently various patterns and implement probability distributions described with Hidden Markov Models.
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Table 2. Average number of overlaps and size of minimized Aho-Corasick automaton for random patterns of different lengths (from 8 to 24) and sizes (from 100 to 1000 words). The number of overlaps does not depend on the pattern’s length while the size of the automaton grows linearly with the length of the pattern.
Table 3. Characteristics of patterns related to PSSM-08 containing different numbers $|\mathcal{H}|$ of words. For the automaton approach, $N_{AC}$ is the size of Aho-Corasick automaton; $\Sigma$ is the size of minimal automaton that represents the coefficient for space complexity; coefficient for time complexity $\text{Time}$ equals $|\Sigma| \times |V|$. For the overlap approach we give the number of overlap classes, $P(\mathcal{H})$; the number of overlaps $S$; time coefficient that is equal to $|S| + |P(\mathcal{H})|$ and space coefficient $\text{Space}$ from (35).

| $|\mathcal{H}|$ | $N_{AC}$ | $\Sigma$ | Time | $P(\mathcal{H})$ | $|S|$ | Time | Space |
|-------|-------|-------|------|-------------|------|------|------|
| 4     | 19    | 10    | 40   | 4           | 4    | 8    | 18   |
| 102   | 305   | 86    | 344  | 42          | 11   | 53   | 55   |
| 208   | 550   | 134   | 536  | 94          | 19   | 113  | 90   |
| 293   | 733   | 152   | 608  | 128         | 24   | 152  | 112  |
| 409   | 971   | 209   | 836  | 204         | 31   | 235  | 138  |
| 502   | 1159  | 218   | 872  | 244         | 34   | 278  | 149  |
| 600   | 1351  | 213   | 852  | 289         | 36   | 325  | 153  |
| 695   | 1528  | 251   | 1004 | 419         | 55   | 474  | 241  |
| 802   | 1740  | 322   | 1288 | 501         | 65   | 566  | 273  |
| 915   | 1940  | 327   | 1308 | 576         | 73   | 649  | 301  |
| 1009  | 2130  | 339   | 1356 | 707         | 85   | 792  | 344  |
| 1094  | 2288  | 377   | 1508 | 793         | 94   | 887  | 381  |
| 1200  | 2499  | 381   | 1524 | 883         | 97   | 980  | 392  |
| 1300  | 2689  | 445   | 1780 | 978         | 106  | 1084 | 409  |
| 1395  | 2860  | 484   | 1936 | 1089        | 113  | 1202 | 430  |
| 1498  | 3039  | 513   | 2052 | 1164        | 122  | 1286 | 450  |

Table 3. Characteristics of patterns related to PSSM-08 containing different numbers $|\mathcal{H}|$ of words. For the automaton approach, $N_{AC}$ is the size of Aho-Corasick automaton; $\Sigma$ is the size of minimal automaton that represents the coefficient for space complexity; coefficient for time complexity $\text{Time}$ equals $|\Sigma| \times |V|$. For the overlap approach we give the number of overlap classes, $P(\mathcal{H})$; the number of overlaps $S$; time coefficient that is equal to $|S| + |P(\mathcal{H})|$ and space coefficient $\text{Space}$ from (35).
| $|\mathcal{H}|$ | $N_{AC}$ | $|\Sigma|$ | Time | $|P(\mathcal{H})|$ | $|S|$ | Time | Space |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 48 | 243 | 57 | 228 | 14 | 6 | 20 | 18 |
| 104 | 416 | 103 | 412 | 24 | 8 | 32 | 55 |
| 160 | 512 | 108 | 432 | 74 | 14 | 88 | 90 |
| 232 | 640 | 119 | 476 | 125 | 16 | 141 | 112 |
| 296 | 736 | 119 | 476 | 144 | 16 | 160 | 138 |
| 360 | 840 | 129 | 516 | 198 | 20 | 218 | 149 |
| 400 | 928 | 131 | 524 | 213 | 21 | 234 | 153 |
| 464 | 1016 | 133 | 532 | 237 | 21 | 258 | 241 |
| 528 | 1120 | 145 | 580 | 304 | 23 | 327 | 273 |
| 592 | 1224 | 148 | 592 | 312 | 23 | 335 | 301 |
| 664 | 1469 | 207 | 828 | 446 | 44 | 490 | 344 |
| 728 | 1533 | 205 | 820 | 488 | 44 | 532 | 381 |
| 768 | 1589 | 201 | 804 | 496 | 45 | 541 | 382 |
| 816 | 1725 | 234 | 936 | 563 | 50 | 613 | 383 |
| 880 | 1861 | 246 | 984 | 611 | 50 | 661 | 384 |
| 952 | 1973 | 219 | 876 | 638 | 51 | 689 | 385 |
| 984 | 2005 | 214 | 856 | 662 | 51 | 713 | 386 |
| 1184 | 2997 | 344 | 1376 | 754 | 58 | 812 | 392 |
| 1240 | 3077 | 345 | 1380 | 762 | 58 | 820 | 409 |
| 1328 | 3237 | 404 | 1616 | 792 | 60 | 852 | 430 |
| 1584 | 4213 | 561 | 2244 | 1111 | 83 | 1194 | 450 |

Table 4. Characteristics of patterns related to PSSM-12 containing different numbers of words.
### Table 5. Characteristics of random patterns of length 8 containing different numbers of words.

| $|H|$ | $N_{AC}$ | $\Sigma$ | Time | $|P(H)|$ | $|S|$ | Time | Space |
|-----|--------|--------|------|--------|------|------|------|
| 50 | 299    | 284    | 1136 | 50     | 51   | 101  | 256 |
| 100| 549    | 512    | 2048 | 100    | 108  | 208  | 501 |
| 150| 783    | 729    | 2916 | 149    | 150  | 299  | 660 |
| 200| 1003   | 919    | 3676 | 200    | 208  | 408  | 868 |
| 250| 1198   | 1085   | 4340 | 250    | 243  | 493  | 985 |
| 300| 1410   | 1290   | 5160 | 300    | 301  | 601  | 1175|
| 350| 1592   | 1448   | 5792 | 350    | 341  | 691  | 1319|
| 400| 1814   | 1658   | 6632 | 400    | 417  | 817  | 1561|
| 450| 1993   | 1808   | 7232 | 450    | 454  | 904  | 1648|
| 500| 2156   | 1941   | 7764 | 500    | 488  | 988  | 1766|
| 550| 2362   | 2161   | 8644 | 550    | 561  | 1111 | 1973|
| 600| 2528   | 2276   | 9104 | 600    | 584  | 1184 | 2034|
| 650| 2722   | 2469   | 9876 | 650    | 674  | 1324 | 2291|
| 700| 2855   | 2564   | 10256| 700    | 697  | 1397 | 2346|
| 750| 3050   | 2738   | 10952| 750    | 746  | 1496 | 2483|
| 800| 3217   | 2914   | 11656| 800    | 815  | 1615 | 2656|
| 850| 3336   | 2955   | 11820| 850    | 799  | 1649 | 2641|
| 900| 3519   | 3130   | 12520| 900    | 879  | 1779 | 2807|
| 950| 3693   | 3303   | 13212| 950    | 947  | 1897 | 3002|
|1000| 3823   | 3398   | 13592| 1000   | 976  | 1976 | 3044|
|1100| 4156   | 3699   | 14796| 1100   | 1059 | 2159 | 3262|
|1200| 4452   | 3970   | 15880| 1200   | 1195 | 2395 | 3564|
|1300| 4756   | 4202   | 16808| 1300   | 1231 | 2531 | 3693|
|1400| 5063   | 4502   | 18008| 1400   | 1388 | 2788 | 4027|
|1500| 5356   | 4790   | 19160| 1500   | 1509 | 3009 | 4284|

*Table 5.* Characteristics of random patterns of length 8 containing different numbers of words.
| $|H|$ | $N_{AC}$ | $|\Sigma|$ | Time | $|P(H)|$ | $|S|$ | Time | Space |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 50 | 496 | 476 | 1904 | 50 | 51 | 101 | 256 |
| 100 | 959 | 921 | 3684 | 99 | 95 | 194 | 501 |
| 150 | 1367 | 1311 | 5244 | 150 | 153 | 303 | 660 |
| 200 | 1801 | 1722 | 6888 | 199 | 200 | 399 | 868 |
| 250 | 2224 | 2142 | 8568 | 250 | 265 | 515 | 985 |
| 300 | 2613 | 2494 | 9976 | 300 | 288 | 588 | 1175 |
| 350 | 3007 | 2888 | 11552 | 349 | 370 | 719 | 1319 |
| 400 | 3396 | 3232 | 12928 | 400 | 395 | 795 | 1561 |
| 450 | 3756 | 3579 | 14316 | 450 | 452 | 902 | 1648 |
| 500 | 4170 | 3959 | 15836 | 500 | 489 | 989 | 1766 |
| 550 | 4552 | 4335 | 17340 | 550 | 567 | 1117 | 1973 |
| 600 | 4938 | 4694 | 18776 | 600 | 609 | 1209 | 2034 |
| 650 | 5294 | 5013 | 20052 | 650 | 627 | 1277 | 2291 |
| 700 | 5650 | 5339 | 21356 | 699 | 677 | 1376 | 2346 |
| 750 | 5985 | 5686 | 22744 | 750 | 736 | 1486 | 2483 |
| 800 | 6368 | 6022 | 24088 | 800 | 803 | 1603 | 2656 |
| 850 | 6776 | 6431 | 25724 | 850 | 887 | 1737 | 2641 |
| 900 | 7061 | 6675 | 26700 | 900 | 908 | 1808 | 2807 |
| 950 | 7514 | 7194 | 28776 | 950 | 994 | 1944 | 3002 |
| 1000 | 7854 | 7495 | 29980 | 1000 | 1021 | 2021 | 3044 |
| 1100 | 8499 | 8019 | 32076 | 1099 | 1060 | 2159 | 3262 |

Table 6. Characteristics of random patterns of length 12 containing different numbers of words.