## Algorithms – CMSC-37000

## Divide and Conquer: The Karatsuba-Ofman algorithm (multiplication of large integers)

Instructor: Laszlo Babai

The Karatsuba–Ofman algorithm provides a striking example of how the "Divide and Conquer" technique can achieve an asymptotic speedup over an ancient algorithm.

The classroom method of multiplying two n-digit integers requires  $\Theta(n^2)$  digit operations. We shall show that a simple recursive algorithm solves the problem in  $\Theta(n^{\alpha})$  digit operations, where  $\alpha = \log_2 3 \approx 1.58$ . This is a considerable improvement of the asymptotic order of magnitude of the number of digit-operations.

We describe the procedure in *pseudocode*.

Procedure KO(X,Y)

Input: X, Y: n-digit integers.

Output: the product X \* Y.

Comment: We assume  $n=2^k$ , by prefixing X,Y with zeros if necessary.

- 1. if n = 1 then use multiplication table to find T := X \* Y
- 2. **else** split X, Y in half:

3. 
$$X =: 10^{n/2} X_1 + X_2$$

4. 
$$Y =: 10^{n/2} Y_1 + Y_2$$

- 5. Comment:  $X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2$  each have n/2 digits.
- 6.  $U := KO(X_1, Y_1)$

7. 
$$V := KO(X_2, Y_2)$$

8. 
$$W := KO(X_1 - X_2, Y_1 - Y_2)$$

9. 
$$Z := U + V - W$$

10. 
$$T := 10^n U + 10^{n/2} Z + V$$

11. Comment: So  $U = X_1 * Y_1$ ,  $V = X_2 * Y_2$ ,  $W = (X_1 - X_2) * (Y_1 - Y_2)$ , and therefore  $Z = X_1 * Y_2 + X_2 * Y_1$ . Finally we conclude that  $T = 10^n X_1 * Y_1 + 10^{n/2} (X_1 * Y_2 + X_2 * Y_1) + X_2 * Y_2 = X * Y$ .

## 12. return T

Analysis. This is a recursive algorithm: during execution, it calls smaller instances of itself.

Let M(n) denote the number of digit-multiplications (line 1) required by the Karatsuba–Ofman algorithm when multiplying two n-digit integers ( $n = 2^k$ ). In lines 6,7,8 the procedure calls itself three times on n/2-digit integers; therefore

$$M(n) = 3M(n/2). \tag{1}$$

This equation is a simple recurrence which we may solve directly as follows. Applying equation (1) to M(n/2) we obtain M(n/2) = 3M(n/4); therefore M(n) = 9M(n/4). Continuing similarly we see that M(n) = 27M(n/8), and it follows by induction on i that for every i ( $i \le k$ ),

$$M(n) = 3^i M(n/2^i).$$

Setting i = k we find that  $M(n) = 3^k M(n/2^k) = 3^k M(1) = 3^k$ . Notice that  $k = \log n$  (base 2 logarithm), therefore  $\log M(n) = k \log 3$  and hence  $M(n) = 2^{\log M(n)} = 2^{k \log 3} = (2^k)^{\log 3} = n^{\log 3}$ .

It would seem that we reduced the number of digit-multiplications to  $n^{\log 3}$  at the cost of an increased number of additions (lines 9, 10). Appearances are deceptive: actually, the procedure achieves similar savings in terms of the total number of digit-operations (additions as well as multiplications).

To see this, let T(n) be the total number of digit-operations (additions, multiplications, bookkeeping (copying digits, maintaining links)) required by the Karatsuba–Ofman algorithm. Then

$$T(n) = 3T(n/2) + O(n) \tag{2}$$

where the term 3T(n/2) comes, as before, from lines 6,7,8; the additional O(n) term is the number of digit-additions required to perform the additions and subtractions in lines 9 and 10. The O(n) term also includes bookkeeping costs.

We shall learn later how to analyse recurrences of the form (2). It turns out that the additive O(n) term does not change the order of magnitude,

and the result will still be

$$T(n) = \Theta(n^{\log 3}) \approx \Theta(n^{1.58}). \tag{3}$$