```
Recall our naire method (braic force):
    to End 3 cd (a,b): (suy neither a,b = 0)
         d = \min(a,b);
while (a,b) = 0 | b, d = 0) d = -;
    (ost) (in torms of a, b)
     Might take a min (n,b) stops.
Snarter re cursi ve solution
    Recall the "division also rith ":
     ya,b∈Z, 34,r∈Z with r ≤ b
     S.t. \alpha = 9b + r. (9 = 3udient, r = remainder)
Key observation: country divisors of a,b are
the same as the common divisors of b,r.
  Night be use ful: [gcd(a,b) = gcd(b,\Gamma)]
but r \leq b, so the second input is smaller.
      So it me define the "size" of an input as the
    rasnitude of the second man, it is always shrinking.
   Given the above observation as a fact, we could
```

```
gcd(6,0) = 6. V
Claim: this is way faster than the brute force also.
 why? Need to think about total # of recursive calls before we hit b == 0.
 How big could r be? (In terms of a of b)
 Bat if r was large (close to b), the h
the next call lodes like god (b, b-E) for E small.
      so the next remainder is small!
More formal claim: after 2 calls, second param & b/2.
      Say [7=1] in a= 36+5
                        Then r = a-6
                        (in our situation, r= b-(b-2)
= 2)
(orollary: gcd (a,b) only takes ~ log_b steps!
May be of interest: think about what hyppins when a = f_k, b = f_{k-1} for \{f_i\}_{i=0}^\infty = F_i boracci sequence...
```

Note: gcd(a,b) = xa +yb for x,y &Z. Question: can we modify our gcd also to compute Such x and y?