

Upper bounds on the average edit distance between two random strings

Matthieu Rosenfeld

LIRMM, Univ Montpellier, CNRS, Montpellier, France

July 26, 2024

Abstract

We study the average edit distance between two random strings. More precisely, we adapt a technique introduced by Lueker in the context of the average longest common subsequence of two random strings to improve the known upper bound on the average edit distance. We improve all the known upper bounds for small alphabets. We also provide a new implementation of Lueker technique to improve the lower bound on the average length of the longest common subsequence of two random strings for all small alphabets of size other than 2 and 4.

1 Introduction

We consider two different notions of similarity between pairs of strings. The first notion is the *length of the longest common subsequence* between two strings u , and v , denoted by $\text{LCS}(u, v)$. The second notion is the edit distance (also called Levenshtein distance) between two strings u , and v , denoted by $d_e(u, v)$, which is the minimum number of substitutions, deletions and insertions necessary to transform u to v .

In particular, we are interested in the average edit distance denoted $e_k(n)$ (resp. average length of the longest common subsequence denoted $\ell_k(n)$) between two random k -ary strings of length n . More precisely, we provide bounds on the two following quantities whose existence is implied by Fekete's Lemma

$$\alpha_k = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{e_k(n)}{n} \text{ and } \gamma_k = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ell_k(n)}{n}.$$

The so called Chvátal-Sankoff constant γ_2 , and the other γ_k received a lot of attention since 1975 [1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 7, 9, 13, 18, ...]. In particular, we know that γ_2 is algebraic [18] and that $0.788071 \leq \gamma_2 \leq 0.826280$ [14]. Until recently the best bounds on γ_k for other small values of k were given in [12]. A few days before the publication of the present article on the arXiv another preprint improved most of the bounds known for γ_k and variant of γ_k that consider the expected LCS of t random strings [11]. In particular, they proved $\gamma_2 \geq 0.792665$. We improve on all the bounds for γ_k given by [11] other than γ_2 and γ_4 where we only beat the previous best bound by Lueker [14].

The study of α_k (α_4 and α_2 in particular) only started more recently in the context of DNA reconstruction from reads with errors [10] and nearest neighbor search [16]. The best bounds known on the α_k have been obtained recently [3, 17].

The main contribution of this article is to improve the upper bounds on the value of α_k for small k (see table 1a). For this, we adapt the technique that Lueker introduced to lower bounds γ_2 [14]. We emphasize the fact that our proof relies on adapting the ideas of [14]. The proof requires the computation of a large vector obtained by the iteration of a particular transformation. We also provide another implementation of the technique used by Lueker for γ_k (which is also what was recently done in [11]). We improve the bounds for all considered values of γ_k other than γ_2 and γ_4 (see table 1b).

k	Upper bounds		Lower bounds
	Our results	from [3]	from [3]
2	0.315514	0.36932	0.17372[14]
3	0.47276	0.53426	0.28366
4	0.56578	0.63182	0.35978
5	0.6325	0.70197	0.41517
6	0.68424	0.75149	0.45776
7	0.72016	0.79031	0.49183
8	0.74896	0.81166	0.51990
9	0.77264		
10	0.7925		
11	0.8095		
12	0.82432		
13	0.83744		
14	0.84646		
15	0.85608		
16	0.86462	0.89554	0.64475
17	0.87228		
18	0.87916		
19	0.88536		
20	0.89102		
21	0.89614		
22	0.90084		
23	0.90514		
24	0.90912		
25	0.91278		
32	0.93228	0.96588	0.73867
100	0.97946		
100	0.97982		

(a) New upper bounds on α_k

k	Lower bounds		Upper bounds
	Our results	Previous best	from [7]
2	0.789872	0.792665 [11]	0.8263[14]
3	0.68422	0.682218 [11]	0.76581
4	0.61422	0.614333 [11]	0.70824
5	0.56206	0.549817 [11]	0.66443
6	0.51850	0.4992299 [11]	0.62932
7	0.48712	0.466481 [11]	0.60019
8	0.46074	0.438799 [11]	0.57541
9	0.43806	0.414876 [11]	0.55394
10	0.41826	0.393811 [11]	0.53486
11	0.40072	0.37196 [7]	0.51785
12	0.38504	0.35899 [7]	0.50260
13	0.37088	0.34737 [7]	0.48880
14	0.35798	0.33687 [7]	0.47620
15	0.34616	0.32732 [7]	0.46462
16	0.33528		
17	0.32518		
18	0.31580		
19	0.30702		
20	0.29880		
21	0.29106		
22	0.28376		
23	0.27686		
24	0.27032		
25	0.26412		
50	0.16930		
100	0.0991		
1000	0.01164		

(b) New lower bounds on γ_k

Table 1: A summary of the bounds provided in this article. We indicate in bold the best results.

2 Average edit distance

For any strings u, v , $d_e(u, v)$ is the *edit distance* (or *Levenshtein distance*) between u and v , that is, the minimum number of substitutions, deletions and insertions necessary to transform u to v . Given two strings $u, v \in \mathcal{A}^*$, and letters $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$, we have

$$d_e(au, bv) = \begin{cases} d_e(u, v) & \text{if } a = b \\ 1 + \min(d_e(u, v), d_e(u, bv), d_e(au, v)) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

and for all u , $d_e(u, \varepsilon) = d_e(\varepsilon, u) = |u|$, where ε is the empty string. For any strings u, v, u', v' , we have

$$d_e(uv, u'v') \leq d_e(u, u') + d_e(v, v'). \quad (2)$$

For any n , we let $U_{n,k} = d_e(X_1 \dots X_n, Y_1 \dots Y_n)$ where the X_i and Y_i are taken uniformly at random from $\mathcal{A} = \{1, \dots, k\}$. For all k , the quantity α_k is defined as

$$\alpha_k = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[d_e(X_1 \dots X_n, Y_1 \dots Y_n)]}{n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{U_{n,k}}{n}.$$

Linearity of expectation and equation (2) imply that the sequence $(\mathbb{E}[U_{n,k}])_{n \geq 1}$ is subadditive. Thus by Feketes's lemma, α_k is well-defined.

Since we will always be working with one specific ambient alphabet \mathcal{A} , we omit the k , and, from now on, we write for instance U_n instead of $U_{n,k}$. Similarly, in the following the X_i and Y_i always denote random variables taken uniformly at random from $\mathcal{A} = \{1, \dots, k\}$. For all $1 \leq i, j, \ell, m \leq n$, we let

$$U_{[i,j],[\ell,m]} = d_e(X_i \dots X_j, Y_\ell \dots Y_m).$$

Finally, we let $V_n = \min_{i \in \{0, \dots, n\}} U_{[1,i],[1,n-i]}$ and

$$\alpha'_k = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[V_n]}{n}.$$

We will show that $\alpha_k = 2\alpha'_k$, and then explain how we compute bounds on α'_k .

2.1 From α_k to α'_k

We first prove that $\alpha_k = 2\alpha'_k$. The proof is directly inspired by the similar proof for γ_k in [1]. We will use the following special case of McDiarmid's inequality [15].

Theorem 1 (McDiarmid's inequality). *Let $f : \mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2 \times \dots \times \mathcal{X}_m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function with the property that changing any one argument of f while holding the others fixed changes the value of f by at most c . Consider independent random variables X_1, \dots, X_m where $X_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$ for all i . Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}[f(X_1, \dots, X_m) - \mathbb{E}[f(X_1, \dots, X_m)] \geq \varepsilon] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{2\varepsilon^2}{mc^2}\right),$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}[f(X_1, \dots, X_m) - \mathbb{E}[f(X_1, \dots, X_m)] \leq -\varepsilon] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{2\varepsilon^2}{mc^2}\right).$$

We can apply this theorem to both V_n and U_n with $m = 2n$, $c = 1$ and well-chosen values of ε that are going to be useful in what follows.

Lemma 2. For all n ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left[V_n \leq \mathbb{E} [V_n] + \sqrt{n \log 2} \right] \geq \frac{1}{2}, \quad (3)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P} \left[U_n \geq \mathbb{E} [U_n] + \sqrt{n \log(4(n+1)^2)} \right] \leq \frac{1}{4(n+1)^2}. \quad (4)$$

Lemma 3. For all k ,

$$\alpha_k = 2\alpha'_k.$$

Proof. By definition, for all n ,

$$\frac{\mathbb{E} [V_n]}{n} \leq \frac{\mathbb{E} [U_{[1, \lceil n/2 \rceil], [1, \lceil n/2 \rceil]}]}{n} \leq \frac{\mathbb{E} [U_{[1, \lceil n/2 \rceil], [1, \lceil n/2 \rceil]}]}{\lceil n/2 \rceil} \cdot \frac{\lceil n/2 \rceil}{n}.$$

The limit of the right-hand side as n goes to infinity is $\frac{\alpha_k}{2}$ which implies $\alpha'_k \leq \frac{\alpha_k}{2}$.

We now focus on proving $\alpha'_k \geq \frac{\alpha_k}{2}$. We have from (3),

$$\frac{1}{2} \leq \mathbb{P} \left[V_n \leq \mathbb{E} [V_n] + \sqrt{n \log 2} \right] \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P} \left[U_{[1, i], [1, n-i]} \leq \mathbb{E} [V_n] + \sqrt{n \log 2} \right].$$

Hence, there exists i such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[U_{[1, i], [1, n-i]} \leq \mathbb{E} [V_n] + \sqrt{n \log 2} \right] \geq \frac{1}{2n}.$$

Since $U_{[i+1, n], [n-i+1, n]}$ has the same distribution as $U_{[1, i], [1, n-i]}$, and they are independent of each others, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{4n^2} &\leq \mathbb{P} \left[U_{[1, i], [1, n-i]} \leq \mathbb{E} [V_n] + \sqrt{n \log 2} \right] \cdot \mathbb{P} \left[U_{[i+1, n], [n-i+1, n]} \leq \mathbb{E} [V_n] + \sqrt{n \log 2} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left[U_{[1, i], [1, n-i]} \leq \mathbb{E} [V_n] + \sqrt{n \log 2} \text{ and } U_{[i+1, n], [n-i+1, n]} \leq \mathbb{E} [V_n] + \sqrt{n \log 2} \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left[U_{[1, n], [1, n]} \leq 2\mathbb{E} [V_n] + 2\sqrt{n \log 2} \right] \end{aligned}$$

From (4),

$$\mathbb{P} \left[U_n \leq \mathbb{E} [U_n] - \sqrt{n \log(4(n+1)^2)} \right] \leq \frac{1}{4(n+1)^2} < \mathbb{P} \left[U_n \leq 2\mathbb{E} [V_n] + 2\sqrt{n \log 2} \right],$$

which implies

$$\mathbb{E} [U_n] - \sqrt{n \log(4(n+1)^2)} \leq 2\mathbb{E} [V_n] + 2\sqrt{n \log 2}.$$

This implies $\mathbb{E} [U_n] \leq 2\mathbb{E} [V_n] + o(n)$. Taking the limit as n goes to infinity, we get $\alpha_k \leq 2\alpha'_k$ which concludes the proof. \square

2.2 Bounds on α'_k

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and, $s, t \in \mathcal{A}^*$, we let

$$V_n(s, t) = \mathbb{E} \left[\min_{\substack{i+j=n \\ i, j \geq 0}} d_e(sX_1X_2 \dots X_i, tY_1Y_2 \dots Y_j) \right].$$

As n goes to infinity, the impact of the fixed prefixes s and t is negligible and the following Lemma is immediate.

Lemma 4. *For any fixed $s, t \in \mathcal{A}^*$, we have*

$$\alpha'_k = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{V_n(s, t)}{n}.$$

We are now ready to bound α'_k using this second expression. We let \vec{V}_n be the vector whose components are the $V_n(s, t)$ where s and t range over all strings of length h for a given h . Using the dynamic programming given earlier we provide upper bounds on the components of \vec{V}_n based on V_{n-1} and V_{n-2} .

Fact 5. *Let $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $s, t \in \mathcal{A}^*$, then*

$$V_n(as, at) \leq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|^2} \sum_{c, c' \in \mathcal{A}} V_{n-2}(sc, tc'). \quad (5)$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} V_n(as, at) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\min_{\substack{i+j=n \\ i, j \geq 0}} d_e(asx_1x_2 \dots x_i, aty_1y_2 \dots y_j) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\min_{\substack{i+j=n \\ i, j \geq 0}} d_e(sx_1x_2 \dots x_i, ty_1y_2 \dots y_j) \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\min_{\substack{i+j=n \\ i, j \geq 1}} d_e(sx_1x_2 \dots x_i, ty_1y_2 \dots y_j) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|^2} \sum_{c, c' \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{E} \left[\min_{\substack{i+j=n \\ i, j \geq 1}} d_e(scx_2 \dots x_i, tc'y_2 \dots y_j) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|^2} \sum_{c, c' \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{E} \left[\min_{\substack{i+j=n-2 \\ i, j \geq 0}} d_e(scx_1 \dots x_i, tc'y_1 \dots y_j) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|^2} \sum_{c, c' \in \mathcal{A}} V_{n-2}(sc, tc'), \end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

Fact 6. Let $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $a \neq b$ and $s, t \in \mathcal{A}^*$, then

$$V_n(as, bt) \leq 1 + \begin{cases} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|} \sum_{c \in \mathcal{A}} V_{n-1}(sc, bt) \\ \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|} \sum_{c \in \mathcal{A}} V_{n-1}(as, tc) \\ \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|^2} \sum_{c, c' \in \mathcal{A}} V_{n-2}(sc, tc') \end{cases} .$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} V_n(as, bt) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\min_{\substack{i+j=n \\ i, j \geq 0}} d_e(asx_1x_2 \dots x_i, bty_1y_2 \dots y_j) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\min_{\substack{i+j=n \\ i, j \geq 0}} \left(1 + \min \begin{cases} d_e(sx_1x_2 \dots x_i, bty_1y_2 \dots y_j) \\ d_e(asx_1x_2 \dots x_i, t y_1y_2 \dots y_j) \\ d_e(sx_1x_2 \dots x_i, t y_1y_2 \dots y_j) \end{cases} \right) \right] \\ &\leq 1 + \min \begin{cases} \mathbb{E} \left[\min_{\substack{i+j=n \\ i, j \geq 0}} d_e(sx_1x_2 \dots x_i, bty_1y_2 \dots y_j) \right] \\ \mathbb{E} \left[\min_{\substack{i+j=n \\ i, j \geq 0}} d_e(asx_1x_2 \dots x_i, t y_1y_2 \dots y_j) \right] \\ \mathbb{E} \left[\min_{\substack{i+j=n \\ i, j \geq 0}} d_e(sx_1x_2 \dots x_i, t y_1y_2 \dots y_j) \right] \end{cases} . \end{aligned}$$

We upper bound the first term of this minimum as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\min_{\substack{i+j=n \\ i, j \geq 0}} d_e(sx_1x_2 \dots x_i, bty_1y_2 \dots y_j) \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\min_{\substack{i+j=n \\ i \geq 1, j \geq 0}} d_e(sx_1x_2 \dots x_i, bty_1y_2 \dots y_j) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|} \sum_{c \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{E} \left[\min_{\substack{i+j=n \\ i \geq 1, j \geq 0}} d_e(scx_2 \dots x_i, bty_1y_2 \dots y_j) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|} \sum_{c \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{E} \left[\min_{\substack{i+j=n-1 \\ i \geq 0, j \geq 0}} d_e(scx_1 \dots x_i, bty_1y_2 \dots y_j) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|} \sum_{c \in \mathcal{A}} V_{n-1}(sc, bt) . \end{aligned}$$

Similar computations for the two other terms of this minimum yields

$$V_n(as, bt) \leq 1 + \begin{cases} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|} \sum_{c \in \mathcal{A}} V_{n-1}(sc, bt) \\ \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|} \sum_{c \in \mathcal{A}} V_{n-1}(as, tc) \\ \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|^2} \sum_{c, c' \in \mathcal{A}} V_{n-2}(sc, tc') \end{cases} ,$$

as desired. □

Let T be the function given by these bounds such that

$$\vec{V}_n \leq T(\vec{V}_{n-1}, \vec{V}_{n-2}), \quad (6)$$

where \geq is taken component-wise. Moreover, T is *translationally invariant*, that is, for all real r ,

$$T(\vec{v} + r, \vec{v}' + r) = T(\vec{v}, \vec{v}') + r, \quad (7)$$

where the sum of a vector with a real is taken component-wise. Finally, T is also *monotonic*, that is,

$$\vec{u} \leq \vec{u}' \text{ and } \vec{v} \leq \vec{v}' \implies T(\vec{u}, \vec{v}) \leq T(\vec{u}', \vec{v}'). \quad (8)$$

We are now ready to prove the main Lemma for the computation of α'_k .

Lemma 7. *If there exists a vector \vec{v} and a real r such that*

$$T(\vec{v}, \vec{v} - r) \leq \vec{v} + r, \quad (9)$$

then there exists a real c such that

$$\forall n \geq 0, \vec{V}_n \leq \vec{v} + nr + c. \quad (10)$$

In particular, this implies that $\alpha'_k \leq r$.

Proof. We take any c large enough such that (10) holds for $n \in \{0, 1\}$. We proceed by induction on n . The base case is covered by the choice of c . For the inductive step, assume that (10) holds for all $i < n$. Then using (6), the induction hypothesis, (8), (7) and (9), in this order, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{V}_n &\leq T(\vec{V}_{n-1}, \vec{V}_{n-2}) \\ &\leq T(\vec{v} + (n-1)r + c, \vec{v} + (n-2)r + c) \\ &\leq T(\vec{v}, \vec{v} - r) + (n-1)r + c \\ &\leq \vec{v} + r + (n-1)r + c = \vec{v} + nr + c, \end{aligned}$$

which concludes our induction. □

2.3 Implementation and bounds

If we can find a vector \vec{v} and real r satisfying (9), this implies $\alpha_k \leq 2r$. We use a computer program to verify the existence of such a vector. To find \vec{v} and r , we simply start with two vectors $\vec{w}_0 = \vec{w}_1 = 0$, and we iterate $\vec{w}_n = T(\vec{w}_{n-1}, \vec{w}_{n-2})$. It seems to be the case that $\vec{w}_n - \vec{w}_{n-1}$ converges to a uniform vector, but we do not need to prove it. We simply take $\vec{v} = \vec{w}_n$ for some n large enough, and we take r to be the largest component of $w_n - w_{n-1} + \varepsilon$. We then check that (9) is satisfied with this choice of \vec{v} and r .

The implementation relies on fixed point arithmetic (that is, we fix some positive integer p , and we work with numbers of the form a/p where $a \in \mathbb{N}$). We do all the rounding in the appropriate direction and in particular for the final step, we can formally verify with exact computation that (9) holds with the choice of \vec{v} and r .

In the implementation¹, every pair of strings (u, v) is manipulated as the corresponding number uv written in base k (every considered pair is stored in a 64 bits integers). We also use the fact that a permutation of the alphabet does not change the result. That is, for every function f that permutes the letters of the alphabet and for all strings u, v of length h , $V_n(u, v) = V_n(f(u), f(v))$. For every pair u, v , we consider the f that minimizes the string uv for the lexicographic order (and we call $f(uv)$ the *normalization* of uv). This allows us to divide the size of the considered vector by $\sim k!$. However, it can be costly to recompute the renaming of the strings, so we provide three different versions of the code that provide different optimizations that are better for different values of k .

The binary case. A first version was written specifically for the binary alphabet. In this case, exchanging the letters of the string for the normalization is simply taking the bitwise negation of the string, and we can use bit-shifts and other bit manipulation to produce a faster code. In this code, the transformation T is computed on the fly for every iteration, and we only store the vectors. The results obtained with this program are given in Table 2. The source code is in the file `EditDistance_binary_alphabet.cpp` from the GIT repository. This is the only version that uses parallelization (the optimal number of cores seems to be 2 as using more cores seems to increase considerably the number of cache misses).

We obtain $\alpha_2 \leq 0.315514$. In [14], the author uses other symmetries that one might be able to adapt here to push the computations to $h = 18$ instead of $h = 17$ with the same machine (which, based on the difference between $h = 16$ and $h = 17$, would not improve the bound by much). Let us mention that the results obtained by Lueker have been very recently improved by optimizing the implementation and some of the techniques used might be applicable in our case as well [11].

h	Upper bound	Memory consumption	Computation time
14	0.319052	1.6Gb	1m19s
15	0.317752	6.2Gb	6m
16	0.31658	25Gb	17m
17	0.315514	100Gb	1h32m

Table 2: Our results for the binary case. The number of iterations of T before choosing $\vec{v} = w_n$ is $n = 150$. We used a laptop for $h \leq 15$ and a more powerful computer for $h > 15$. All the times here (and in futur tables) are purely indicative and do not constitute a proper benchmarking.

The general case. The second version of the code precomputes the transformation T and stores it. In the general setting of an alphabet of size k the normalization is more costly to compute, so we only compute it once for every pair of strings. Storing T increases the memory consumption (by a factor of order k), but saves a lot of computation time. The results obtained with this program are given in Table 3, and the source code is in the file `EditDistance_general_case.cpp` from the GIT repository.

¹The code is available on <https://gite.lirmm.fr/mrosenfeld/expected-edit-distance>.

k	Upper bound	h used	Memory consumption	Computation time	Iterations
3	0.47276	9	20Gb	17m	100 iterations
4	0.56578	8	58Gb	1h06	100 iterations
5	0.6325	7	28Gb	32m	100 iterations

Table 3: Our results for the small alphabets using the second version of the code.

Large alphabets. In the third version we slightly change the data structure used to store the transformation T . This data structure uses maps instead of vectors and is more costly for small alphabets, but the cost is now linear in $\max(k, 2h)$ instead of k which means that for fixed h we can compute a lower bound for very large values of k . The results obtained with this program are given in Table 4, and the source code is in the file `EditDistance_rally_large_alphabets.cpp` from the GIT repository.

3 Longest common subsequence

The technique that we use to compute bounds on γ_k is the same as in [14], and is moreover almost identical to what we did in the previous section. For the sake of completeness, we provide the definitions and the corresponding statement, but we do not repeat the proofs.

For any strings u, v , $\text{LCS}(u, v)$ is the size of the longest common subsequence of u and v . Remember, that given two strings $u, v \in \mathcal{A}^*$, and letters $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$, we have

$$\text{LCS}(au, bv) = \begin{cases} 1 + \text{LCS}(u, v) & \text{if } a = b \\ \max(\text{LCS}(u, bv), \text{LCS}(au, v)) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

and for all u , $\text{LCS}(u, \varepsilon) = \text{LCS}(\varepsilon, u) = 0$, where ε is the empty string. For any strings u, v, u', v' , we have

$$\text{LCS}(uv, u'v') \geq \text{LCS}(u, u') + \text{LCS}(v, v'). \quad (12)$$

For the rest of this section, the X_i and Y_i are independent uniform random variables from $\mathcal{A} = \{1, \dots, k\}$. For all k , the quantity γ_k is defined as

$$\gamma_k = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{LCS}(X_1 \dots X_n, Y_1 \dots Y_n)]}{n}.$$

Linearity of expectation and equation (12) imply that the sequence is subadditive which by Feketes's lemma implies that α_k is well-defined.

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s, t \in \mathcal{A}^*$, we let

$$W_n(s, t) = \mathbb{E} \left[\min_{\substack{i+j=n \\ i, j \geq 0}} \text{LCS}(sX_1X_2 \dots X_i, tY_1Y_2 \dots Y_j) \right].$$

The following Lemma can be proven by following the same proof as for Lemma 4.

k	Upper bound	h used	Memory consumption	Computation time	Iterations
3	0.47626	8	6.4Gb	1m28s	50 iterations
4	0.57552	6	0.9Gb	14s	50 iterations
5	0.63792	6	3.4Gb	1m10s	50 iterations
6	0.68424	6	7.2Gb	2m46s	50 iterations
7	0.72016	6	9.4Gb	4m03s	50 iterations
8	0.74896	6	10.3Gb	4m23s	50 iterations
9	0.77264	6	10.4Gb	4m43s	50 iterations
10	0.7925	6	10.5Gb	5m14s	50 iterations
11	0.8095	6	10.5Gb	5m43s	50 iterations
12	0.82432	6	10.5Gb	6m15s	50 iterations
13	0.83744	6	10.5Gb	6m57s	50 iterations
14	0.84646	6	10.5Gb	9m45s	150 iterations
15	0.85608	6	10.5Gb	10m54s	150 iterations
16	0.86462	6	10.5Gb	10m54s	150 iterations
17	0.87228	6	10.5Gb	10m50s	150 iterations
18	0.87916	6	10.5Gb	10m47s	150 iterations
19	0.88536	6	10.5Gb	10m54s	150 iterations
20	0.89102	6	10.5Gb	10m49s	150 iterations
21	0.89614	6	10.5Gb	10m55s	150 iterations
22	0.90084	6	10.5Gb	10m47s	150 iterations
23	0.90514	6	10.5Gb	10m46s	150 iterations
24	0.90912	6	10.5Gb	10m35s	150 iterations
25	0.91278	6	10.5Gb	10m52s	150 iterations
32	0.93228	6	10.5Gb	10m44s	150 iterations
100	0.97946	6	10.5Gb	28m	500 iterations
1000	0.9982	6	10.5Gb	3h40m	5000 iterations

Table 4: Our results for larger alphabets using the third version of the code. The results are all obtained using a laptop.

Lemma 8. *For any fixed $s, t \in \mathcal{A}^*$, we have*

$$\gamma_k = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{W_n(s, t)}{n}.$$

We let \vec{W}_n be the vector whose components are the $W_n(s, t)$ where s and t range over all strings of length h for a given h . Equation (11) implies lower bounds on the components of \vec{W}_n based on \vec{W}_{n-1} and \vec{W}_{n-2} .

Fact 9. *Let $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $s, t \in \mathcal{A}^*$, then*

$$W_n(as, at) \geq 1 + \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|^2} \sum_{c, c' \in \mathcal{A}} W_{n-2}(sc, tc'). \quad (13)$$

Fact 10. Let $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $a \neq b$ and $s, t \in \mathcal{A}^*$, then

$$W_n(as, bt) \geq \begin{cases} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|} \sum_{c \in \mathcal{A}} W_{n-1}(sc, bt) \\ \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|} \sum_{c \in \mathcal{A}} W_{n-1}(as, tc) \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

Let T be the function given by bounds (13) and (14) such that

$$\vec{W}_n \geq T(\vec{W}_{n-1}, \vec{W}_{n-2}),$$

where \geq is taken component-wise. We are now ready to state the main Lemma behind the computation of the upper bounds for γ_k .

Lemma 11. *If there exists a vector \vec{w} and real r such that*

$$T(\vec{w}, \vec{w} - r) \geq \vec{w} + r,$$

then there exists a real c such that

$$\forall n \geq 0, \vec{W}_n \geq \vec{w} + nr + c.$$

In particular, this implies that $\gamma_k \geq 2r$.

Implementation and results Our implementation is obtained by adapting the code used in the setting of the edit distance. There are a couple of lines to change for the recurrence relations and a few other lines to change because the direction of the inequality is different (in particular, the rounding for division is already as desired in this case while we had to be careful in the edit distance setting). We have three different codes optimized for the binary case, the small alphabets and arbitrarily large alphabets. The results are respectively given in Table 5, Table 6, and Table 7.

h	Upper bound	Memory consumption	Computation time
15	0.78806	6.3Gb	5m48s
16	0.78901	25Gb	23m01s
17	0.789872	100Gb	2h2m

Table 5: Our results for the binary case. The number of iterations of T before choosing $\vec{v} = \vec{W}_n$ is $n = 150$. Our result improves on the bound given by [14], but fail to improve on the bound given by [11].

The computation of upper bounds on γ_k for really large k might be of limited interest. Indeed, general lower bounds given by simple explicit closed-form formulas will be better for large k . If we limit ourselves to windows of size $h = 6$, for k large enough all the letters in

²The discrepancy between 0.6821 and the bound 0.682218 from [11] which is obtained with same algorithm and the same value h can be explained by the choice of $p = 100000$ and $\varepsilon = 0.00005$ used for the exact computation of v and r in fixed arithmetic precision.

k	Lower bound	h used	Memory consumption	Computation time	Iterations
3^2	0.6821	9	12.7Gb	9m33s	100 iterations
3	0.68422	10	114b	2h44m29s	100 iterations
4	0.61046	7	2.2Gb	1m03	50 iterations
4	0.61422	8	35.2Gb	29m	100 iterations
5	0.56206	7	14.3Gb	8m33s	50 iterations

Table 6: Our results for the small alphabets using the second version of the code.

k	Lower bound	h used	Memory consumption	Computation time
3	0.67932	8	4.1Gb	54s
4	0.61046	7	7.0Gb	1m54s
5	0.55686	6	1.7Gb	26s
6	0.51850	6	3.0Gb	55s
7	0.48712	6	3.8Gb	1m14s
8	0.46074	6	4.0Gb	1m22s
9	0.43806	6	4.0Gb	1m30s
10	0.41826	6	4.0Gb	1m35s
11	0.40072	6	4.0Gb	1m43s
12	0.38504	6	4.0Gb	1m47s
13	0.37088	6	4.0Gb	1m58s
14	0.35798	6	4.0Gb	1m55s
15	0.34616	6	4.0Gb	1m56s
16	0.33528	6	4.0Gb	1m58s
17	0.32518	6	4.0Gb	1m56s
18	0.31580	6	4.0Gb	2m02s
19	0.30702	6	4.0Gb	1m55s
20	0.29880	6	4.0Gb	1m57s
21	0.29106	6	4.0Gb	1m55s
22	0.28376	6	4.0Gb	1m56s
23	0.27686	6	4.0Gb	1m57s
24	0.27032	6	4.0Gb	2m5s
25	0.26412	6	4.0Gb	1m59s
50	0.16930	6	4.0Gb	1m52s
100	0.0991	6	4.0Gb	1m59s
1000	0.01164	6	4.0Gb	2m6s

Table 7: Our results for larger alphabets using the third version of the code. The results are all obtained using a laptop. The number of iterations of T before choosing $\vec{v} = \vec{W}_n$ is $n = 50$.

the window are different with really high probability, and it is not hard to verify that the lower bounds that this technique can establish then behave in $O(1/k)$. On the other hand, it is known that γ_k behaves in $2/\sqrt{k} + o(1/\sqrt{k})$ [13]. It is claimed in [2] that [6] contains a proof of $\gamma_k \geq 1/\sqrt{k}$, but the only result in [6] that resembles this is $\gamma_k \geq \frac{2k^2}{k^3+2k-1}$. An explicit lower bound in $\Theta(\sqrt{k})$ can probably be adapted from the asymptotic lower bound of [9]. Assuming that the claimed lower bound of $\gamma_k \geq 1/\sqrt{k}$ is true, it is a better bound that what can be done with our software on modern machines for any $k \geq k_0$ for some k_0 between 50 and 100.

References

- [1] K. S. Alexander. “The Rate of Convergence of the Mean Length of the Longest Common Subsequence”. In: *The Annals of Applied Probability* 4.4 (1994), pp. 1074–1082.
- [2] R. A. Baeza-Yates, R. Gavaldà, G. Navarro, and R. Scheihing. “Bounding the Expected Length of Longest Common Subsequences and Forests”. In: *Theory Comput. Syst.* 32.4 (1999), pp. 435–452.
- [3] G. Bilardi and M. Schimd. “Computable Bounds and Monte Carlo Estimates of the Expected Edit Distance”. In: *arXiv* (2022). eprint: 2211.07644.
- [4] B. Bukh and C. Cox. “Periodic words, common subsequences and frogs”. In: *The Annals of Applied Probability* 32.2 (2022), pp. 1295–1332.
- [5] R. Bundschuh. “High precision simulations of the longest common subsequence problem”. In: *Eur. Phys. J. B* 22.4 (2001), pp. 533–541.
- [6] V. Chvátal and D. Sankoff. “Longest Common Subsequences of Two Random Sequences”. In: *J. Appl. Probab.* 12.2 (1975), pp. 306–315.
- [7] V. Dancík. “Expected length of longest common subsequences”. PhD thesis. 1994.
- [8] V. Dancík and M. Paterson. “Upper Bounds for the Expected Length of a Longest Common Subsequence of Two Binary Sequences”. In: *STACS 94*. Vol. 775. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. 1994, pp. 669–678.
- [9] J. G. Deken. “Some limit results for longest common subsequences”. In: *Discrete Mathematics* 26.1 (1979), pp. 17–31.
- [10] S. Ganguly, E. Mossel, and M. Z. Rácz. “Sequence assembly from corrupted shotgun reads”. In: *2016 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. 2016, pp. 265–269.
- [11] G. T. Heineman, C. Miller, D. Reichman, A. Salls, G. Sárközy, and D. Soiffer. “Improved Lower Bounds on the Expected Length of Longest Common Subsequences”. In: *arXiv* (July 2024). eprint: 2407.10925.
- [12] M. Kiwi and J. Soto. “On a Speculated Relation Between Chvátal–Sankoff Constants of Several Sequences”. In: *Comb. Probab. Comput.* 18.4 (July 2009), pp. 517–532. ISSN: 1469-2163.

- [13] M. Kiwi, M. Loeb, and J. Matoušek. “Expected length of the longest common subsequence for large alphabets”. In: *Adv. Math.* 197.2 (2005), pp. 480–498.
- [14] G. S. Lueker. “Improved bounds on the average length of longest common subsequences”. In: *J. ACM* 56.3 (2009), pp. 1–38.
- [15] C. McDiarmid. “On the method of bounded differences”. In: *Surveys in Combinatorics, 1989: Invited Papers at the Twelfth British Combinatorial Conference*. Cambridge, England, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1989, pp. 148–188.
- [16] A. Rubinfeld. “Hardness of approximate nearest neighbor search”. In: *STOC 2018: Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing* (2018), pp. 1260–1268.
- [17] M. Schmid and G. Bilardi. “Bounds and Estimates on the Average Edit Distance”. In: *String Processing and Information Retrieval*. Oct. 2019, pp. 91–106.
- [18] A. Tiskin. “The Chvátal-Sankoff problem: Understanding random string comparison through stochastic processes”. In: *arXiv* (Dec. 2022). eprint: 2212.01582.