

**ADDITION CHAINS WITH MULTIPLICATIVE COST**

by

**R. L. Graham**

**A. C-C. Yao**

**F-F. Yao**

**STAN-CS-76-540**

**JANUARY 1976**

**COMPUTER SCIENCE DEPARTMENT**

**School of Humanities and Sciences**

**STANFORD UNIVERSITY**



Addition Chains with Multiplicative Cost

by

R. L. Graham <sup>\*/</sup>  
Bell Laboratories  
Murray Hill, New Jersey

A. C-C. Yao <sup>\*/</sup>  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Cambridge, Massachusetts

and

F-F. Yao <sup>\*/</sup>  
Brown University  
Providence, Rhode Island

Abstract

If each step in an addition chain is assigned a cost equal to the product of the numbers added at that step, "binary" addition chains are shown to minimize total cost.

<sup>\*/</sup> The work on this paper was done by all three authors while visiting Stanford University, Stanford, California 94306. Partially supported by National Science Foundation grant DCR 72-03752 A02, by the Office of Naval Research contract NR044-402, and by IBM Corporation. Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.

Introduction.

For a positive integer  $n$ , by a chain to  $n$  we mean a sequence  $C = ((a_1, b_1), (a_2, b_2), \dots, (a_r, b_r))$  where  $a_k$  and  $b_k$  are positive integers satisfying:

- (i)  $a_r + b_r = n$ ,
- (ii) for all  $k$ , either  $a_k = 1$  or  $a_k = a_i + b_i$  for some  $i < k$ , with the same also holding for  $b_k$ .

The cost of  $C$ , denoted by  $\$(C)$ , is defined by

$$\$(C) = \sum_{k=1}^r a_k b_k .$$

The minimum cost required among all chains to  $n$  is denoted by  $f(n)$ . (In the case of ordinary addition chains  $\$(C)$  is just equal to  $r$ ; e.g., see [1].) A few small values of  $f(n)$  are given in Table 1.

$n =$	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
$f(n) =$	0	1	3	5	9	12	18	21	29	34

Table 1

The **function**  $f$  arises in connection with determining the optimal multiplication chain for computing the  $n$ -th power of a number by ordinary multiplication. If a number  $x$  has  $d$  digits, then computing  $x^{a_k}$  from  $x^{a_1}$  and  $x^{b_i}$  requires  $(a_i b_i) \cdot d^2$  digitwise multiplications in general. Let  $g$  be defined by

$$\begin{aligned} g(1) &= 0, \\ g(2n) &= g(n) + n^2 \\ g(2n+1) &= g(n) + n^2 + 2n \end{aligned} \quad , \quad n \geq 1 .$$

It was conjectured by D. P. McCarthy [2] that  $f(n) = g(n)$  for all  $n$ . In this note we prove his conjecture.

## Two Properties of $g$ .

We first establish several facts concerning the function  $g$  which will be used later.

Fact 1. For  $m, t \geq 0$  with  $m$  odd we have

$$(1) \quad g(2^t m) - g(2^{t-1} m) = t + m - 1 .$$

Proof. For  $t = 0$  , (1) follows at once from the definition of  $g$  .  
Assume  $t > 0$  . Then

$$\begin{aligned} g(2^t m) &= g(2^{t-1} m) + (2^{t-1} m)^2 , \\ g(2^t m) - g(2^{t-1} m) &= g(2^{t-1} m) + (2^{t-1} m)^2 - g(2^{t-1} m) \\ &= (2^{t-1} m)^2 . \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$g(2^t m) - g(2^{t-1} m) = (2^{t-1} m)^2 - (2^{t-1} m) + 1$$

and consequently, (1) holds by induction on  $t$  .  $\square$

Fact 2.

$$(2) \quad g(n) - g(x) \geq (n-x)^2 + 2x - n , \quad \text{for } x+2 \leq n \leq 2x+1 .$$

Proof. Note that for  $n = 2x$  and  $2x+1$  , this is just the definition of  $g$  . The validity of (2) for  $x = 1, 2, 3$  is immediate. We assume by induction on  $x$  that (2) holds for all values less than some  $x > 3$  . The proof of (2) can be most easily accomplished by splitting it into 4 cases, depending on the parity of  $n$  and  $x$  .

Case 1.  $n = 2N$  ,  $x = 2X$  .

By hypothesis

$$2X+2 \leq 2N < 4X+1$$

i.e.,

$$X+1 \leq N < 2X .$$

For  $N = X+1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} g(2N) - g(2X) &= g(X+1) + (X+1)^2 - g(X) - X^2 \\ &= g(X+1) - g(X) + 2X+1 \\ &\geq 2x+2 = (2x+2 - 2X)^2 + 4X-2(X+1). \end{aligned}$$

by Fact 1 and (2) is proved in this case. For  $N \geq X+2$ , the induction hypothesis applies and

$$\begin{aligned} g(2N) - g(2X) &= g(N) - g(X) + N^2 - X^2 \\ &\geq (N-X)^2 + 2X-N + N^2 - X^2 \end{aligned}$$

and so (2) will hold in this case provided

$$(N-X)^2 + N^2 - X^2 + 2X-N \geq (2N-2X)^2 + 4X-2N.$$

However, this equality can be rewritten as

$$(2N - 2X - 1)(2X - N) \geq 0$$

which certainly holds for  $X+2 \leq N \leq 2X$ .

The other three cases are similar and will be omitted.

### The Main Result.

Theorem. For all  $n$ ,

$$f(n) \leq g(n).$$

Proof. It is clear that  $f(n) \leq g(n)$  for all  $n$  since the definition of  $g(n)$  determines a unique chain to  $n$  with cost  $g(n)$ . Hence, it will suffice to show that  $f(n) \geq g(n)$ . In fact, it will be enough to establish the following analogue of (2) for  $f$ :

$$(2') \quad f(n) - f(x) \geq (n-x)^2 + 2x-n, \quad \text{for } x+2 \leq n \leq 2x+1.$$

For this implies

$$f(2x) - f(x) \geq x^2, \quad f(2x+1) - f(x) \geq x^2+2x,$$

and so, by induction,

$$f(2x) \geq f(x) + x^2 \geq g(x) + x^2 = g(2x) ,$$

$$f(2x+1) \geq f(x) + x^2 + 2x \geq g(x) + x^2 + 2x = g(2x+1) .$$

From Table 1, (2') certainly holds for  $x = 1, 2, 3$  . Assume that for some  $X > 3$  , (2') holds for all  $x < X$  and all  $n$  with  $x+2 \leq n \leq 2x+1$  . In particular, this implies  $f(m) = g(m)$  for  $1 \leq m \leq 2X-1$  . Suppose  $N$  satisfies  $X+2 \leq N \leq 2X+1$  . If  $N \leq 2X-1$  then in fact,

$$f(N) - f(X) \geq (N-X)^2 + 2X-N$$

holds by applying (2') with  $x = X-1$  . Hence, we are left with the two cases  $N = 2X$  and  $N = 2X+1$  .

(i)  $N = 2X$  . Suppose the last step in some arbitrary chain  $C$  to  $N$  is  $(a, b)$  with  $a+b = N$  and  $X \leq b < 2X$  .

Thus,

$$f(C) \geq f(b) + ab = f(b) + b(2X-b) \geq f(X) + X^2$$

since the last inequality is immediate for  $b = X$  , and follows by induction from (1) and (2) for  $b \geq X+1$  . Since  $C$  was arbitrary then

$$f(2X) \geq f(X) + X^2$$

which is the desired inequality.

(ii)  $N = 2X+1$  . Again, assume the last step in some chain  $C$  to  $N$  is  $(a, b)$  with  $a+b = N$  and  $X+1 \leq b < 2X+1$ .

(a) If  $b > X+1$  then

$$\begin{aligned} f(C) &\geq f(b) + b(2X+1-b) \\ &> f(X) + X^2 + 2X \end{aligned}$$

since

$$f(b) - f(X) \geq (b-X)^2 + 2X-b$$

holds for  $X+2 \leq b < 2X-1$  by induction and for  $b = 2X$  by the preceding case (i).

(b) If  $b = X+1$  then  $a = X$ . Consider the step  $(a', b')$  of  $C$  for which  $a'+b' = b$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \$(C) &\geq f(x) + a'b' + ab \\ &= f(X) + b'(X+1-b') + X^2 + X \\ &\geq f(X) + X^2 + 2x \end{aligned}$$

since for  $1 < b' \leq X-1$ ,

$$b'(X+1-b') \geq X.$$

Hence

$$f(2X+1) \geq f(X) + X^2 + 2X.$$

This completes the induction step and the Theorem is proved.  $\square$

#### Concluding Remarks.

We should note that the optimal chains to  $n$  are not unique. This is due to the fact that

$$f(2n+1) = f(n) + n^2 + 2n$$

can be realized in going from  $n$  to  $2n+1$  by either

$$(n, n), (2n, 1) \text{ with additional cost } n \cdot n + 2n \cdot 1 = n^2 + 2n$$

or

$$(n, 1), (n+1, n) \text{ with additional cost } n \cdot 1 + (n+1) \cdot n = n^2 + 2n.$$

One might consider generalizations of the problem in which the cost of a chain  $C = ((a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_r, b_r))$  is given by

$$\$_\lambda(C) = \sum_{k=1}^r \lambda(a_k, b_k),$$

where  $\lambda$  maps  $Z \times Z \rightarrow R$ . It would be interesting to know for which  $\lambda$  the "binary representation" chain to  $n$  is always optimal. This is the case for example for  $\lambda(x, y) = (x+1)(y+1)$ , but it is not the case for  $\lambda(x, y) = x+y$ .

## References

- [1] Knuth, D. E., The Art of Computer Programming, Volume II, Seminumerical Algorithms, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass. (1969).
- [2] McCarthy, D. P., "An Optimal Algorithm to Evaluate  $x^n$  over Integers and Polynomials Module  $M$ ," to appear in Mathematics of Computation.