

CS 405/511: Algorithm Analysis
Winter, 2013
Ternary FFT, due March 8, 2013

In lecture we discussed how to construct a $\Theta(n \lg n)$ algorithm for the discrete Fourier transform of a coefficient vector by breaking the underlying polynomial into two components with interlaced coefficients. This method is appropriate for coefficient vectors with length equal to a power of 2. You are to develop a similar algorithm for coefficient vectors of length equal to a power of 3. Padding the input to the next power of 2 would trivially generate such an algorithm, but you are *not* to use that expedient for this exercise. Instead, you are to invent an approach that divides the underlying polynomial into three components with appropriately interlaced components. This extension is relatively straightforward once you understand the process that delivered the binary version. Specifically, you need to submit the following items.

1. A short explanation of your ternary approach, including a discussion as to why the algorithm is $\Theta(n \lg n)$.
2. An observation that enables a slight modification to produce the reverse transform. This discovery is again very similar to that of the binary case.
3. Two programs: the ternary FFT and its inverse (reverse) transform.
4. A run showing the operation on the data in file ternary81.txt. The output should follow the example below, which processes a vector of length 27, available from file ternary27.txt.

```
>> a
a =
83.0829
58.5264
54.9724
91.7194
28.5839
75.7200
75.3729
38.0446
56.7822
7.5854
5.3950
53.0798
77.9167
93.4011
12.9906
56.8824
46.9391
1.1902
33.7123
16.2182
79.4285
31.1215
52.8533
16.5649
60.1982
26.2971
65.4079

>> b = ternaryFFT(a, 1);

>> c = reverseTernaryFFT(b);
```

My algorithm accepts a coefficient column vector and a mode parameter. Mode 1 generates the FFT; mode -1 generates the reverse transform, except for the final division by n , the vector length. Consequently, reverseTernaryFFT simply calls ternaryFFT(**b**, -1) and divides the result by the length of **b**. Although **a** is a real vector, both **b** and **c** are complex. Of course, **c** should have zero imaginary part because it should reproduce **a**. The utility printParallel prints the rows of the various vectors for easy comparison. For a correct implementation, we verify that $\mathbf{a} = \text{real}(\mathbf{c})$. The second two columns constitute the real and imaginary parts of the transform.

```
>> printParallel([a real(b) imag(b) real(c) imag(c)]);
```

83.0829	1299.9869	0.0000	83.0829	0.0000
58.5264	120.2144	103.6418	58.5264	0.0000
54.9724	115.1924	57.4766	54.9724	0.0000
91.7194	-127.6611	78.2311	91.7194	0.0000
28.5839	193.2861	-80.8503	28.5839	0.0000
75.7200	36.4226	60.5759	75.7200	-0.0000
75.3729	-103.0484	-68.4275	75.3729	0.0000
38.0446	104.1139	66.6526	38.0446	0.0000
56.7822	-23.6266	-105.4736	56.7822	-0.0000
7.5854	126.3941	-43.1954	7.5854	0.0000
5.3950	115.3098	-63.8910	5.3950	0.0000
53.0798	56.7067	175.0255	53.0798	0.0000
77.9167	14.0347	-125.0840	77.9167	-0.0000
93.4011	-155.7129	-41.5878	93.4011	-0.0000
12.9906	-155.7129	41.5878	12.9906	0.0000
56.8824	14.0347	125.0840	56.8824	-0.0000
46.9391	56.7067	-175.0255	46.9391	-0.0000
1.1902	115.3098	63.8910	1.1902	0.0000
33.7123	126.3941	43.1954	33.7123	0.0000
16.2182	-23.6266	105.4736	16.2182	0.0000
79.4285	104.1139	-66.6526	79.4285	-0.0000
31.1215	-103.0484	68.4275	31.1215	0.0000
52.8533	36.4226	-60.5759	52.8533	-0.0000
16.5649	193.2861	80.8503	16.5649	0.0000
60.1982	-127.6611	-78.2311	60.1982	-0.0000
26.2971	115.1924	-57.4766	26.2971	0.0000
65.4079	120.2144	-103.6418	65.4079	-0.0000