

Analysis of algorithms

We have written algorithms for addition and multiplication of multi-digit numbers as we learnt to do in school in term of the basic operations `add_mac` and `mul_mac` that do arithmetic with digits.

Addition. This algorithm was represented by the following pseudo-code:

```
define add1(a, b, c):  
    r = add_mac(a0, b0)  
    s = add_mac(r0, c)  
    t = add_mac(r1, s1)  
    if a and b are of size 1:  
        return (s0, t0)  
    return list with first entry s0 and remaining entries from add1(a', b', t0)  
  
define add(a, b):  
    Find the maximum m of lengths of a and b.  
    Pad a and b by 0's on the right to make them of length m.  
    return add1(a, b, 0)
```

Multiplication. This algorithm was represented by the following pseudo-code:

```
define mul1(a, b, c):  
    r = mul_mac(a, b0)  
    s = add_mac(r0, c)  
    t = add_mac(r1, s1)  
    if b is of size 1:  
        return (s0, t0)  
    return list with first entry s0 and remaining entries from mul1(a, b', t0)  
  
define mul(a, b):  
    r = mul1(a0, b, 0)  
    if a is of size 1:  
        return r  
    s' = mul(a', b)  
    Extend s' by a 0 on the left to get s.  
    return add(r, s, 0)
```

Our next task is to *analyse* these algorithms with two goals in mind:

Correctness: We must ensure that these algorithms give the *mathematically correct* answer in all cases.

Efficiency: We must count the amount of time (and possibly space) that these algorithms use.

Proof of Correctness

It is reasonably clear that **add** works correctly if **add1** complies with the following specification:

add1($\underline{a}, \underline{b}, c$) adds the multi-digit numbers \underline{a} and \underline{b} of the *same* length with the single digit number c .

As before, if $\underline{a} = (a_0, \dots, a_n)$ and $\underline{b} = (b_0, \dots, b_n)$, then as before we define $\underline{a}' = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and $\underline{b}' = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$. We then verify the following identities.

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{a} + \underline{b} + c &= (a_0 + b_0 + c) + (\underline{a}' + \underline{b}') \cdot B \\ &= (r_0 + r_1 \cdot B + c) + (\underline{a}' + \underline{b}') \cdot B \\ &= (s_0 + s_1 \cdot B + r_1 \cdot B) + (\underline{a}' + \underline{b}') \cdot B \\ &= s_0 + (t_0 + t_1 \cdot B) \cdot B + (\underline{a}' + \underline{b}') \cdot B \\ &= s_0 + (t_1 \cdot B) \cdot B + (\underline{a}' + \underline{b}' + t_0) \cdot B \end{aligned}$$

Now $s_0 + (\underline{a}' + \underline{b}' + t_0) \cdot B$ is what the **add1** program reduces the calculation to. Thus, the given method for calculation works correctly by induction on n *provided* $t_1 = 0$ for *all* possible choices of a_0, b_0 and c in the range $[0, B - 1]$. Clearly, $t_1 = 0$ if $a_0 + b_0 + c_0 < B^2$. Now, the maximum value of $a_0 + b_0 + c_0$ is $3(B - 1)$. So we need the inequality $3(B - 1) < B^2$ which we check holds for all $B \geq 2$.

Thus, we have verified the correctness of **add1** and **add**.

With notation as above, the following formula holds.

$$\underline{a} \cdot \underline{b} == a_0 \cdot \underline{b} + (\underline{a}' \cdot \underline{b}) \cdot B$$

The **mul** algorithm calculates the first term using **mul1** as \underline{r} and the parenthesised part of the second term using **mul** inductively as \underline{s}' . The two terms are then added using **add**. It then follows by induction on the length of \underline{a} that **mul** works correctly if **add** works correctly and **mul1** complies with the following specification:

mul1(a, \underline{b}, c) multiplies the multi-digit number \underline{b} by the digit a and adds the single digit number c to the product.

We now verify the following identities.

$$\begin{aligned} a \cdot \underline{b} + c &= (a \cdot b_0 + c) + (a \cdot \underline{b}') \cdot B \\ &= (r_0 + r_1 \cdot B + c) + (a \cdot \underline{b}') \cdot B \\ &= (s_0 + s_1 \cdot B + r_1 \cdot B) + (a \cdot \underline{b}') \cdot B \\ &= s_0 + (t_0 + t_1 \cdot B) \cdot B + (a \cdot \underline{b}') \cdot B \\ &= s_0 + (t_1 \cdot B) \cdot B + (a \cdot \underline{b}' + t_0) \cdot B \end{aligned}$$

Now $s_0 + (a \cdot \underline{b}' + t_0) \cdot B$ is what the **mul1** program reduces the calculation to. Thus, the given method for calculation works correctly by induction on n

provided $t_1 = 0$ for all possible choices of a_0 , b_0 and c in the range $[0, B - 1]$. Clearly, $t_1 = 0$ if $a_0 \cdot b_0 + c_0 < B^2$. Now, the maximum value of $a_0 \cdot b_0 + c_0$ is $(B - 1)^2 + (B - 1) = B(B - 1)$. So we need the inequality $B(B - 1) < B^2$ which we check holds for all $B \geq 2$.

Thus, we have verified the correctness of `mul1` and `mul`.

Calculating the complexity

We make the simplifying assumption that we *only* need to calculate the calls to `add_mac` and `mul_mac`. In other words, the remaining tasks of labelling data and moving it around are treated as “instantaneous”.

Addition algorithm. Looking at `add`, we see that it results in a call to `add1` where \underline{a} and \underline{b} are padded by 0's to size m which is the maximum of their sizes. If $m = 1$, then `add1` returns the answer after exactly 3 calls to `add_mac`. On the other hand, if $m > 1$, then after these three calls we again call `add1` with numbers of size $m - 1$. Thus, if $A(m)$ denotes the number of `add_mac` calls in order to complete the execution of `add1` on numbers of size m , we have

$$A(1) = 3 \text{ and } A(m) = 3 + A(m - 1) \text{ for } m > 1$$

We easily see that this means that $A(m) = 3m$.

Note that m is the maximum of the size of the inputs, Note also that this is roughly the logarithm to the base B of the *integers* that \underline{a} and \underline{b} represent. This is a common aspect of the study of complexity of semi-numerical algorithms, which is that we study this as a function of the logarithm of the integers that are represented.

Secondly, we note that there may be cases where `add1` is called with $c = 0$. In that case, we can avoid the second and third calls to `add_mac`. This can be used to “squeeze” the maximum optimality of the algorithm if really required. However, this will only reduce the 3 in equation $A(m) = 3m$ to a smaller constant. For us the important thing is:

The time complexity of the addition algorithm grows *linearly* as a function of the logarithm of the numbers being added.

Multiplication algorithm. We note that the multiplication algorithm makes use of `add_mac` and `mul_mac`. So we need to count the calls to each of them. Secondly, we are *not* padding \underline{a} or \underline{b} , so we need to write functions that depend on each of their lengths' say these are p and q respectively. Thus, we wish to compute two functions:

$M_a(p, q)$: The number of calls to `add_mac` while carrying out the algorithm `mul` on inputs of size p and q .

$M_m(p, q)$: The number of calls to `mul_mac` while carrying out the algorithm `mul` on inputs of size p and q .

These will depend on corresponding functions for `mul1`. (Note that the only input of variable length to `mul1` is \underline{b} .)

$N_a(q)$: The number of calls to `add_mac` while carrying out the algorithm `mul1` when input \underline{b} is of size q .

$N_m(p, q)$: The number of calls to `mul_mac` while carrying out the algorithm `mul1` when input \underline{b} is of size q .

Looking at `mul`, we see that it results in a call to `mul1` if $p = 1$. Thus, to begin with we see that $M_a(1, q) = N_a(q)$ and $M_m(1, q) = N_m(q)$. When $p > 1$, we will, in addition call `mul` with input of size $p - 1$ and q and also call `add` at the end. What is the size of the inputs to `add`? We note that the product of a p digit number and a q digit number is at most $p + q$ digits. Thus, \underline{r} is of length $1 + p$ and \underline{s} is of length $1 + (p - 1) + q = p + q$. The maximum of these is $p + q$. Thus, we get the following equations for $p > 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} M_a(p, q) &= N_a(q) + M_a(p - 1, q) + A(p + q) \\ M_m(p, q) &= N_m(q) + M_m(p - 1, q) \end{aligned}$$

Looking at `mul1` we see that for $q = 1$ it has one call to `mul_mac` and 2 calls to `add_mac`. When $q > 1$, it also recursively calls itself with input of size $q - 1$. Thus, we get the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} N_m(1) &= 1 \\ N_a(1) &= 2 \\ N_m(q) &= 1 + N_m(q - 1) \text{ for } q > 1 \\ N_a(q) &= 2 + N_a(q - 1) \text{ for } q > 1 \end{aligned}$$

Using these equations, we see that $N_m(q) = q$ and $N_a(q) = 2q$. Plugging these values and the value for $A(p + q)$ in the previous equations, we get

$$\begin{aligned} M_m(1, q) &= q \\ M_a(1, q) &= 2q \\ M_m(p, q) &= q + M_m(p - 1, q) \text{ for } p > 1 \\ M_a(p, q) &= 2q + M_a(p - 1, q) + 3(p + q) \text{ for } p > 1 \end{aligned}$$

Using these equations, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} M_m(p, q) &= p \cdot q \\ M_a(p, q) &= 2p \cdot q + 3(p^2 + p - 2)/2 + 3(p - 1)q \end{aligned}$$

(Note that this uses the formula $p + (p - 1) + \dots + 2 = (p^2 + p + 2)/2$.) The key point to note is that the growth is *quadratic*.