

## Appendix A

### Proof of correctness for the Optimized one-instruction-update algorithm of Chapter 2

Define  $D(m)$ , where  $m$  is a memory entry, to be the depth of the longest (i.e., deepest) prefix  $p$  that covers  $m$ . Also define  $L(p)$  to be the length of a prefix  $p$ .

**Claim C1:** For all prefixes  $p$ ,  $PS(p) \leq MS(p)$ .

**Proof:** By definition.

**Claim C2:** For all prefixes  $p$ ,  $ME(p) \leq PE(p)$ .

**Proof:** By definition.

**Claim C3:** For all prefixes  $p$  and  $q$ , either of the following hold:

- (1)  $PS(p) \leq PS(q) \leq PE(q) \leq PE(p)$  i.e.  $q$  is completely contained in  $p$ .
- (2)  $PS(q) \leq PS(p) \leq PE(p) \leq PE(q)$  i.e.  $p$  is completely contained in  $q$ .
- (3)  $PS(p) \leq PE(p) \leq PS(q) \leq PE(q)$  i.e.  $p$  and  $q$  are completely non-overlapping.

**Proof:** Follows from the definitions of  $PS$  and  $PE$  and the basic *parenthesis* property of prefixes.

**Claim C4:** For all memory entries  $m$  such that  $PS(p) \leq m < MS(p)$ ,  $D(m) > L(p)$ .

**Proof:** As  $MS(p)$  is the first memory entry covered by prefix  $p$ , all memory entries between its prefix start and memory start must be covered by deeper (i.e., longer) prefixes.

**Claim C5:** If a prefix  $p$  is deeper than  $q$  and  $PS(q) \leq PS(p) < MS(q)$ , then  $MS(q) > PE(p)$ ; i.e.  $p$  has to end (prefix end) before  $MS(q)$ .

**Proof:** Follows from the fact that  $q$  cannot actually start in memory before any deeper prefix has completely ended.

Now, let the update instruction passed on to the hardware by the processor be  $Update(m, Y, Z)$ . Before any updates, as  $m$  is the first memory entry chosen to be updated by the processor,

$D(m) \leq Y$ . If while executing the algorithm, hardware encounters a start-marker marking a new prefix, say  $q$ , on a memory entry  $m2$ ,  $m2$  equals  $MS(q)$  but it may or may not equal  $PS(q)$ . We will show that  $L(q) > Y$  in both cases.

*Case (S1):*  $m2 = PS(q) = MS(q)$

*Proof:* Since the hardware is not done scanning, it has not yet encountered  $PE(p)$ . As it has encountered  $m2 (= PS(q))$ , (C3) tells us that  $q$  is wholly contained in  $p$ , and so  $L(q) > L(p) = Y$ .

*Case (S2):*  $PS(q) < m2 = MS(q)$

There are two subcases possible within this case depending upon where  $PS(q)$  lies with respect to  $m$ :

*Case(S2.1)*  $m < PS(q) < m2 = MS(q)$

Clearly in this case, prefix  $q$  is wholly contained in prefix  $p$ , and so  $L(q) > Y$ .

*Case (S2.2)*  $PS(q) \leq m < m2 = MS(q)$ . Clearly in this case,  $p$  is deeper than  $q$  (as  $m$  needs to be updated, and  $m$  lies in between  $PS(q)$  and  $MS(q)$ ). By (C3) and (C5),  $PE(p) < MS(q)$ , and therefore the hardware should have stopped scanning before reaching  $m2$ . This subcase is thus not possible at all.

The correctness of the update algorithm now follows immediately. If the hardware, while scanning memory entries encounters a start-marker, it indicates the start of a prefix which is necessarily deeper than  $Y$ , and hence is not to be updated. This is exactly what the algorithm does. By updating only when DC equals 1, it ensures that a memory entry is updated only if it had a prefix shallower than  $Y$  covering it before the update.  $\square$