

**Démonstration 7**

À partir des corrigés de Maelle Zimmermann

**1****Question:** Suppose we have access to the following algorithms:

- `mult_k1`: multiply a polynomial of degree  $k$  with a polynomial of degree 1 in a time  $O(k)$ ,
- `mult_kk`: multiply two polynomials of degree  $k$  in a time  $O(k \log k)$ .

Let  $z_1, \dots, z_d \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Give an efficient algorithm that calculates the unique polynomial

$$p(n) = a_0 + a_1n + \dots + a_dn^d$$

such that  $a_d = 1$  and  $p(z_1) = \dots = p(z_d) = 0$ . Note that we will represent a polynomial  $a_0 + a_1n + \dots + a_dn^d$  by the array  $[a_0, a_1, \dots, a_d]$ . Analyze the effectiveness of the algorithm.**Solution:** Just calculate the polynomial

$$p(n) = (n - z_1)(n - z_2)(n - z_3) \dots (n - z_d)$$

. This polynomial actually has  $z_1, z_2, \dots, z_d$  as roots and its coefficient  $a_d = 1$ , by construction. It is therefore the only polynomial respecting the conditions requested. The question is to give an efficient algorithm to calculate this product.

The idea is to separate the product into 2 subparts on which the recursive call will be made. If necessary (if  $d$  is odd), multiply the polynomial obtained by  $(n - z_d)$ . Note that we must separate the polynomial into 2 parts of the same degree, given that we only have access to an algorithm to multiply 2 polynomials of the same size.

Voici un tel algorithme:

---

```

def zeros(Z=[z1,z2,z3,...,zd]):
    if len(Z) == 0:
        return [1]
    elif len(Z) == 1:
        return [-Z[0], 1]      #Retourne le polynome p(n) = n-z1
    else:
        m = len(Z) // 2        #Afin d'avoir 2 polynomes de meme degre
        p1 = zeros(Z[:m])      #m premieres racines
        p2 = zeros(Z[m:2*m])   #m racines suivantes
        p = mult_kk(p1,p2)
        if len(Z)%2==1:        #nombre impair de zeros
            r = [-Z[-1], 1]    #p(n) = n - zd
            p = mult_k1(p,r)
        return p

```

---

The execution time of `|zeros|` is described by the following recurrence:

$$t(d) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{si } d \leq 1, \\ 2t(\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor) + f(\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor) & \text{si } d > 1 \text{ et est pair,} \\ 2t(\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor) + t(1) + f(\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor) + g(d-1) & \text{si } d > 1 \text{ et est impair} \end{cases}$$

where  $f(d) \in O(d \log d)$  is the execution time of `|multkk|` and  $g(d) \in O(d)$  is the execution time of `|multk1|`.

Ainsi,

$$t(d) \in \begin{cases} 1 & \text{si } d \leq 1, \\ 2t(\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor) + O(d \log d) & \text{si } d > 1. \end{cases}$$

Let's apply the theorems on recurrences seen in class. We have  $a = 2, b = 2$  and  $f(d) = d \log d$ . Let's put  $\epsilon = 1$ . Since  $f(d) \in O(d \log d) = O(d^{\log_b a} (\log d)^\epsilon)$ , we conclude that  $t(d) \in O(d^{\log_b a} (\log d)^{\epsilon+1}) = O(d(\log d)^2)$ .

## 2

**Question:** An  $n$ -*tally* circuit is a circuit that takes  $n$  bits as input and produces  $1 + \lfloor \log n \rfloor$  bits as output. It counts in binary the number of bits equal to 1 in the input. For example, if  $n = 9$  and the entry is 011001011, then there are 5 bits equal to 1, and the output is 0101 (5 in binary).

A  $(i, j)$ -*adder* is a circuit that takes a number  $m$  from  $i$  bits and a number  $n$  from  $j$  bits input. It calculates  $m + n$  in binary on  $1 + \max(i, j)$  output bits. For example, if the entry is  $m = 101$  and  $n = 10111$  ( $i = 3, j = 5$ ), the exit is the sum of the two numbers, 011100.

It is always possible to construct a  $(i, j) - \text{adder}$  from exactly  $\max(i, j)$   $3 - \text{tallies}$ . In fact, adding  $m + n$  amounts to counting for each position  $k$  the number of bits equal to 1 among the  $k$  th bit of  $m$ , the  $k$  th bit of  $n$ , and the possible retaining bit. Since the calculation must be done for  $\max(i, j)$   $k$  positions we need  $\max(i, j)$   $3 - \text{tallies}$ .

1. Use  $3 - \text{tallies}$  and  $(i, j) - \text{adders}$  to build an effective  $n - \text{tally}$ .
2. Give a recurrence (with initial condition) that describes the number of  $3 - \text{tallies}$  needed to build the  $n - \text{tally}$ , including the  $3 - \text{tallies}$  that are part of the  $(i, j) - \text{adders}$ .
3. Solve the recurrence exactly.

**Solution:**

1. Assume access to algorithms  $|3\_tally|$  and  $|ij\_adder|$ . We build a  $|n\_tally|$  recursively as follows :

---

```
def n_tally(x):
    n = len(x)
    if 1 <= x <= 3:
        return 3_tally(x)
    else:
        m = n//2                # m = floor(n/2)
        x1 = n_tally(x[:m])     # taille floor(n/2)
        x2 = n_tally(x[m:])     # taille ceil(n/2)
        x3 = ij_adder(x1, x2)
        return x3
```

---

The basic case is when  $1 \leq n \leq 3$ , because we can directly use a  $3\_tally$  in that case. In other cases, the entry is separated into 2 (respectively of sizes  $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$  and  $\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$ ), each counting the number of bits "1" in their input. The result of these two  $tallies$  is summed by a  $(i, j) - \text{adder}$  where  $i = 1 + \lfloor \log \lfloor n/2 \rfloor \rfloor$  and  $j = 1 + \lfloor \log \lceil n/2 \rceil \rfloor$ .

2. Let  $t(n)$  be the number of  $3 - \text{tallies}$  used to construct a  $n - \text{tally}$  in the construct given in (1). When  $1 \leq n \leq 3$ , only one  $3 - \text{tally}$  is used. When  $n > 3$  the number of  $3 - \text{tallies}$  used is  $t(\lceil n/2 \rceil) + t(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor)$ , plus the number of  $3 - \text{tallies}$  used in order to build the  $(i, j) - \text{adder}$ , that is,  $\max(i, j)$ . Since  $i = 1 + \lfloor \log \lfloor n/2 \rfloor \rfloor$  and  $j = 1 + \lfloor \log \lceil n/2 \rceil \rfloor$ , we get

$$t(n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{si } 1 \leq n \leq 3, \\ \underbrace{t(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor)}_{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - \text{tally}} + \underbrace{t(\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil)}_{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil - \text{tally}} + \underbrace{1 + \lfloor \log \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil \rfloor}_{(i,j) - \text{adder}} & \text{si } n > 3 \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

3. Let's put  $s_i = t(2^i)$ , then we have

$$s_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{si } 0 \leq i \leq 1, \\ 2s_{i-1} + i & \text{si } i > 1 \end{cases}$$

The characteristic polynomial of the recurrence  $s$  is  $p(x) = (x-2)(x-1)^2$  and so  $s_i = c_1 2^i + c_2 + c_3 i$ . Solving the system (for  $i = 0, 1, 2$ )

$$\begin{array}{rcccccl} s_0 & = & c_1 & + & c_2 & + & & = & 1 \\ s_1 & = & 2c_1 & + & c_2 & + & c_3 & = & 1 \\ s_2 & = & 4c_1 & + & c_2 & + & 2c_3 & = & 4 \end{array}$$

we get  $c_1 = 3, c_2 = -2$  and  $c_3 = -3$ . So  $s_i = 3 \cdot 2^i - 3i - 2$  and so  $t(n) = s_{\log n} = 3n - 3 \log n - 2$  when  $n$  is a power of 2.

So we have  $t(n) \in \Theta(n : n \text{ is a power of } 2)$ . Since  $t(n)$  is possibly nondecreasing (we can prove it), we conclude by the rule of harmony that  $t(n) \in \Theta(n)$ .

Alternatively, if one simply seeks to obtain the order of  $t$  and not its exact form, one can use the theorem seen in class (first case). We have  $a = 2, b = 2$ , and  $f(n) = \log(n) \in O(n^{\log 2 - \epsilon})$  taking any  $\epsilon$  small enough (eg 0.1). We also conclude that  $t(n) \in \Theta(n : n \text{ is a power of } 2)$ .

### 3

**Question:** Soient  $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$  et  $d = \text{pgcd}(a, b)$ .

1. Show that there are  $s, t \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $sa + tb = d$ .
2. Give an efficient algorithm to compute  $s, t$  and  $d$  from  $a$  and  $b$ . The algorithm should not calculate  $d$  before calculating  $s$  and  $t$ .
3. Let  $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $b > 1$  and  $\text{pgcd}(a, b) = 1$ . Give an efficient algorithm that calculates  $s \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $sa \bmod b = 1$ .

**Solution:**

1. It is assumed that the property of Euclid

$$\text{pgcd}(a, b) = \text{pgcd}(b, a \bmod b)$$

is true for the moment (proof below).

Suppose without loss of generality that  $a \geq b$  and show the induction proposition on  $b$ . Base case:  $b = 0$ : We have  $1 \cdot a + 0 \cdot b = a = \text{pgcd}(a, b)$  Induction step:  $b > 0$ :

The induction hypothesis is: If we have two numbers  $a', b'$  such that (SPDG)  $a' \geq b'$  and that  $b' < b$ , then there exists  $s', t' \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $is' + t'b' = \text{pgcd}(a', b')$ .

We want to show that for  $a \geq b$ , there exists  $s, t \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that

$$sa + tb = \text{pgcd}(a, b).$$

By induction hypothesis, note that, for the numbers  $b$  and  $(a \bmod b)$ , there exist  $s', t' \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that

$$s'b + t'(a \bmod b) = \text{pgcd}(b, a \bmod b),$$

because  $(a \bmod b) < b$ . Now put  $s = t'$  and  $t = s' - (a//b)t'$ .

Nous obtenons:

$$\begin{aligned} sa + tb &= t'a + (s' - (a//b)t')b && \text{par définition de } s \text{ et } t \\ &= s'b + t'(a - (a//b)b) && \text{réarrangement des termes} \\ &= s'b + t'(a \bmod b) && a - (a//b)b \text{ est le reste de la division de } a \text{ par } b \\ &= \text{pgcd}(b, a \bmod b) && \text{par hypothèse d'induction} \\ &= \text{pgcd}(a, b) && \text{par propriété d'Euclide} \\ &= d && \text{par définition de } a \text{ et } b. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have indeed shown that, for any pair of positive integers  $a$  and  $b$ , there exist integers  $s, t$  such that

$$sa + tb = d = \text{pgcd}(a, b).$$

■

Now prove that the **property of Euclid** is true:

$$\text{pgcd}(a, b) = \text{pgcd}(b, a \bmod b).$$

Soit  $d = \text{pgcd}(a, b)$  et  $d' = \text{pgcd}(b, a \bmod b)$ . Par contradiction, supposons que  $d \neq d'$ . Il y a 2 choix:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(a) } d < d'. & \text{ Puisque } d' = \text{pgcd}(b, a \bmod b) \\ & \Rightarrow d' | b \text{ et } d' | (a \bmod b) && \text{par définition du pgcd} \\ & \Rightarrow d' | a && \text{car } a = kb + (a \bmod b) \text{ pour un certain } k \in \mathbb{Z} \\ & && \text{et } d' \text{ doit diviser les 2 côtés de l'équation} \\ & \Rightarrow d' | a \text{ et } d' | b \end{aligned}$$

We therefore have that  $d'$  is a common divisor of  $a$  and  $b$ , strictly greater than the greatest common divisor of  $a$  and  $b$ , that is  $d$ . Contradiction.

(b)  $d > d'$ . Puisque  $d = \text{pgcd}(a, b)$

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow d|a \text{ et } d|b & \quad \text{par définition du pgcd} \\ \Rightarrow d|(a \bmod b) & \quad \text{car } a - kb = (a \bmod b) \text{ pour un certain } k \in \mathbb{Z} \\ & \quad \text{et } d \text{ doit diviser les 2 côtés de l'équation} \\ \Rightarrow d|b \text{ et } d|(a \bmod b) \end{aligned}$$

We therefore have that  $d$  is a common divisor of  $b$  and  $(a \bmod b)$ , strictly greater than the greatest common divisor of  $b$  and  $(a \bmod b)$ , which is  $d'$ . Contradiction.

In both cases, we come to a contradiction. As a result, we have  $d = d'$  and

$$\text{pgcd}(a, b) = \text{pgcd}(b, a \bmod b)$$

■

2. We directly obtain a recursive algorithm from the previous proof:

---

```
def pgcd_etendu(a, b):
    if b == 0:
        return (1, 0, a) #Cas de base de l'induction
    else:
        #Etape d'induction avec b et (a mod b)
        (s1, t1, d) = pgcd_etendu(b, a % b)
        s = t1
        t = s1 - (a//b)*t1
    return (s, t, d)
```

---

3. Just calculate  $s, t \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $sa + tb = \text{pgcd}(a, b)$  thanks to the previous algorithm. We are getting

$$\begin{aligned} sa \bmod b &= (sa + tb) \bmod b & \text{car } tb \bmod b &= 0 \\ &= \text{pgcd}(a, b) \bmod b & \text{par déf. de } s, t \\ &= 1 \bmod b & \text{par hypothèse} \\ &= 1 & \text{car } b > 1. \end{aligned}$$