

CSCE 411
Design and Analysis of Algorithms



Andreas Klappenecker

Motivation



Motivation



In 2004, a mysterious billboard showed up

- in the Silicon Valley, CA
- in Cambridge, MA
- in Seattle, WA
- in Austin, TX

and perhaps a few other places. The question on the billboard quickly spread around the world through numerous blogs. The next slide shows the billboard.

Recall Euler's Number e

$$\begin{aligned} e &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(1 + \frac{1}{n} \right)^n \\ &\approx 2.718281828459045235 \dots \end{aligned}$$

Billboard Question

So the billboard question
essentially asked: Given that $e =$
2.718281828459045235

Is 2718281828 prime?

Is 7182818284 prime?

...

The first affirmative answer
gives the name of the website

Strategy



1. Compute the digits of e
2. $i := 0$
3. while true do {
4. Extract 10 digit number p at position i
5. return p if p is prime
6. $i := i+1$
7. }

What needs to be solved?



Essentially, two questions need to be solved:

- How can we create the digits of e ?
- How can we test whether an integer is prime?

Computing the Digits of e

- First Approach: Use the fact that

$$\left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^n \leq e < \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^{n+1}$$

- Drawback: Needs rational arithmetic with long rationals
- Too much coding unless a library is used.

Extracting Digits of e



Extracting Digits of e



We can extract the digits of e in base 10

Extracting Digits of e



We can extract the digits of e in base 10
by

Extracting Digits of e

We can extract the digits of e in base 10

by

$d[0] = \text{floor}(e);$ (equals 2)

Extracting Digits of e

We can extract the digits of e in base 10

by

$d[0] = \text{floor}(e);$ (equals 2)

$e1 = 10^*(e-d[0]);$

Extracting Digits of e

We can extract the digits of e in base 10
by

$$d[0] = \text{floor}(e); \quad (\text{equals } 2)$$

$$e1 = 10 * (e - d[0]);$$

$$d[1] = \text{floor}(e1); \quad (\text{equals } 7)$$

Extracting Digits of e

We can extract the digits of e in base 10
by

$$d[0] = \text{floor}(e); \quad (\text{equals } 2)$$

$$e1 = 10*(e-d[0]);$$

$$d[1] = \text{floor}(e1); \quad (\text{equals } 7)$$

$$e2 = 10*(e1-d[1]);$$

Extracting Digits of e

We can extract the digits of e in base 10
by

$$d[0] = \text{floor}(e); \quad (\text{equals } 2)$$

$$e1 = 10*(e-d[0]);$$

$$d[1] = \text{floor}(e1); \quad (\text{equals } 7)$$

$$e2 = 10*(e1-d[1]);$$

$$d[2] = \text{floor}(e2); \quad (\text{equals } 1)$$

Extracting Digits of e

We can extract the digits of e in base 10
by

$$d[0] = \text{floor}(e); \quad (\text{equals } 2)$$

$$e1 = 10*(e-d[0]);$$

$$d[1] = \text{floor}(e1); \quad (\text{equals } 7)$$

$$e2 = 10*(e1-d[1]);$$

$$d[2] = \text{floor}(e2); \quad (\text{equals } 1)$$

Unfortunately, e is a transcendental number, so there is **no pattern** to the generation of the digits in base 10.

Extracting Digits of e

We can extract the digits of e in base 10
by

$$d[0] = \text{floor}(e); \quad (\text{equals } 2)$$

$$e1 = 10*(e-d[0]);$$

$$d[1] = \text{floor}(e1); \quad (\text{equals } 7)$$

$$e2 = 10*(e1-d[1]);$$

$$d[2] = \text{floor}(e2); \quad (\text{equals } 1)$$

Unfortunately, e is a transcendental number, so there is **no pattern** to the generation of the digits in base 10.

Extracting Digits of e

We can extract the digits of e in base 10 by

$$d[0] = \text{floor}(e); \quad (\text{equals } 2)$$

$$e1 = 10*(e-d[0]);$$

$$d[1] = \text{floor}(e1); \quad (\text{equals } 7)$$

$$e2 = 10*(e1-d[1]);$$

$$d[2] = \text{floor}(e2); \quad (\text{equals } 1)$$

Unfortunately, e is a transcendental number, so there is **no pattern** to the generation of the digits in base 10.

Idea: Use a **mixed-radix representation** that leads to a more regular pattern of the digits.

Mixed Radix Representation

$$a_0 + \frac{1}{2} \left(a_1 + \frac{1}{3} \left(a_2 + \frac{1}{4} \left(a_3 + \frac{1}{5} \left(a_4 + \frac{1}{6} (a_5 + \dots) \right) \right) \right) \right) \right)$$

The digits a_i are nonnegative integers.

The base of this representation is $(1/2, 1/3, 1/4, \dots)$.

The representation is called **regular** if

$a_i \leq i$ for $i \geq 1$.

Number is written as $(a_0; a_1, a_2, a_3, \dots)$

Computing the Digits of e

- Second approach:

$$\begin{aligned} e &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} \\ &= 1 + \frac{1}{1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{3} \left(1 + \dots \right) \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

- In mixed radix representation

$$e = (2; 1, 1, 1, 1, \dots)$$

where the digit 2 is due to the fact that both $k=0$ and $k=1$ contribute to the integral part.

Mixed Radix Representations

- In mixed radix representation

$$(a_0; a_1, a_2, a_3, \dots)$$

a_0 is the integer part and $(0; a_1, a_2, a_3, \dots)$ the fractional part.

- **10** times the number is $(10a_0; 10a_1, 10a_2, 10a_3, \dots)$, but the representation is not regular anymore. The first few digits might exceed their bound. Remember that the i th digit is supposed to be i or less.
- Renormalize the representation to make it regular again
- The algorithm given for base 10 now becomes feasible; this is known as the spigot algorithm.

Spigot Algorithm

- `#define N (1000) /* compute N-1 digits of e, by brainwagon@gmail.com */`

- `main(i, j, q) {`

- `int A[N];`

- `printf("2.");`

- `for (j = 0; j < N; j++)`

- `A[j] = 1;`

here the i th digit is represented by $A[i-1]$, as the integral part is omitted
set all digits of nonintegral part to 1.

- `for (i = 0; i < N - 2; i++) {`

- `q = 0;`

- `for (j = N - 1; j >= 0;) {`

- `A[j] = 10 * A[j] + q;`

- `q = A[j] / (j + 2);`

compute the amount that needs to be carried over to the next digit
we divide by $j+2$, as regularity means here that $A[j] \leq j+1$
keep only the remainder so that the digit is regular

- `A[j] %= (j + 2);`

- `j--;`

- `}`

- `putchar(q + 48);`

- `}`

- `}`

Revisiting the Question



For mathematicians, the previous algorithm is natural, but it might be a challenge for computer scientists and computer engineers to come up with such a solution.

Could we get away with a simpler approach?

After all, the billboard only asks for the **first** prime in the 10-digit numbers occurring in e .

Probability to be Prime

Let $\pi(x)$ = # of primes less than or equal to x .

$\Pr[\text{number with } \leq 10 \text{ digits is prime}]$

$$= \pi(9999999999) / 9999999999$$

$$= 0.045 \text{ (roughly)}$$

Thus, the probability that **none** of the first k 10-digits numbers in e are prime is roughly

$$0.955^k$$

This probability rapidly approaches 0 for $k \rightarrow \infty$, so we need to compute just a few digits of e to find the first 10-digit prime number in e .

Google it!



Since we will likely need just few digits of Euler's number e , there is no need to reinvent the wheel.

We can simply

- google e or
 - use the GNU bc calculator
- to obtain a few hundred digits of e .

State of Affairs



We have provided two solutions to the question of generating the digits of e

- An elegant solution using the mixed-radix representation of e that led to the spigot algorithm
- A crafty solution that provides enough digits of e to solve the problem at hand.

How do we check Primality?

The second question concerning the testing of primality is simpler.

If a number x is not prime, then it has a divisor d in the range $2 \leq d \leq \sqrt{x}$.

Trial divisions are fast enough here!

Simply check whether any number d in the range $2 \leq d < 100\,000$ divides a 10-digit chunk of e .

A Simple Script

<http://discuss.fogcreek.com/joelonsoftware/default.asp?cmd=show&ixPost=160966&ixReplies=23>

- `#!/bin/sh`
- `echo "scale=1000; e(1)" | bc -l | \`
- `perl -0777 -ne '`
- `s/[^0-9]//g;`
- `for $i (0..length($_)-10)`
- `{`
- `$j=substr($_,$i,10);`
- `$j +=0;`
- `print "$i\t$j\n" if is_p($j);`
- `}`
- `sub is_p {`
- `my $n = shift;`
- `return 0 if $n <= 1;`
- `return 1 if $n <= 3;`
- `for (2 .. sqrt($n)) {`
- `return 0 unless $n % $_;`
- `}`
- `return 1;`
- `}`

What was it all about?



The billboard was an ad paid for by Google. The website

<http://www.7427466391.com>

contained another challenge and then asked people to submit their resume.

Google's obsession with e is well-known, since they pledged in their IPO filing to raise e billion dollars, rather than the usual round-number amount of money.