



Soviet-era science, translated into English

V. M. KHRAPCHENKO

1963

SovietRxiv

View the original and related papers at <https://sovietrxiv.org/items/ru-196301.35112>

Source: Math-Net.Ru and CyberLeninka. Machine translation. Verify with the original.

Abstract

Full Text

CYBERNETICS AND CONTROL THEORY

V. M. KHRAPCHENKO

ON ONE METHOD OF CONVERTING A MULTI-ROW CODE INTO A SINGLE-ROW CODE

(Presented by Academician A. I. Berg, 12 VII 1962)

In the case when, in order to specify a certain number C , the numbers A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m , satisfying the equality

$$C = \sum_{j=1}^m A_j, \quad (1)$$

are used, the set of summands A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m is called an m -row code of the number C .

In digital computing technology, multi-row codes are used mainly to speed up arithmetic operations. In this connection, as a rule, it is necessary to convert the result of an arithmetic operation into a single-row code. Any of the known methods for carrying out such a conversion is based on successively adding each summand of the m -row code to the sum of all preceding ones. This note describes a method that makes it possible to convert a multi-row code into a single-row code considerably faster than when using the methods known up to now.

We consider the case in which the summands A_j ($1 \leq j \leq m$) are represented in a positional numeral system with constant weight

$$A_j = \sum_{i=1}^n a_{ji} r^{-i}. \quad (2)$$

Here n is the number of digits of A_j ; r is the base (an integer) of the numeral system used, with $r \geq 2$; a_{ji} is one of the numbers $0, 1, \dots, r-1$.

Substituting (2) into (1) and changing the order of summation, we obtain

$$C = \sum_{i=1}^n r^{-i} \sum_{j=1}^m a_{ji}. \quad (3)$$

Let the minimum number of digits necessary for representing the digit-wise sum $\sum_{j=1}^m a_{ji}$ in the numeral system with base r be denoted by m' . Owing to the integrality of this sum, from the expression

$$\sum_{j=1}^m a_{ji} \leq m(r-1) \quad (4)$$

it follows that m' is the smallest integer satisfying the inequality

$$m(r-1) \leq r^{m'} - 1. \quad (5)$$

Solving it, we obtain:

$$m' = \lceil \log_r(m(r-1) + 1) \rceil \quad (6)$$

(the quantity $\lceil d \rceil$ is equal to the smallest integer not less than d). The digit sum $\sum_{j=1}^m a_{ji}$ can be represented in the number system with base r in the form

$$\sum_{j=1}^m a_{ji} = \sum_{j'=1}^{m'} b_{j'i} r^{j'-1}, \quad (7)$$

where $b_{j'i}$ takes one of the values $0, 1, \dots, r-1$.

Substituting (7) into (3) and setting $i = i' - (m' - j')$, we obtain

$$C = \sum_{j'=1}^{m'} A'_{j'}, \quad (8)$$

where

$$A'_{j'} = r^{m'-1} \sum_{i'=1}^{n+m'-1} a'_{j'i'} r^{-i'},$$

$$a'_{j'i'} = \begin{cases} b_{j'(i'-(m'-j'))}, & \text{for } 1 \leq i' - (m' - j') \leq n, \\ 0, & \text{in all other cases.} \end{cases}$$

Expression (8) is a representation of the number C in an m' -row code. At the next step the m' -row code of the number C can be transformed into a code with the number of summands equal to $m'' = \lceil \log_r(m'(r-1) + 1) \rceil$, and so on. After each transformation step the number of rows in the code will decrease until the next \tilde{m} is no longer a solution of the inequality

$$\tilde{m} \leq] \log_r(\tilde{m}(r-1) + 1)[. \quad (9)$$

It can be shown that no integer $\tilde{m} \geq 3$ is a solution of inequality (9). At the same time $\tilde{m}_1 = 1$ and $\tilde{m}_2 = 2$ satisfy the equality

$$\tilde{m} =] \log_r(\tilde{m}(r-1) + 1)[. \quad (10)$$

Thus the number of rows in the code will decrease until it becomes equal to two. The number of steps s required to transform an m -row code into a two-row code can be computed on the basis of expression (5). The data obtained are given in Table 1.

Table 1

| Number of steps s required to transform an m -row code into a two-row code | Maximum value of $m, r = 2$ | Maximum value of $m, r = 3$ | Maximum value of $m, r = 4$ |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2 | 7 | 40 | 341 |
| 3 | 127 | $\frac{1}{2}(3^{40} - 1)$ | $\frac{1}{3}(4^{341} - 1)$ |
| 4 | $2^{127} - 1$ | — | — |

The block diagram of the device implementing the described method is given in Fig. 1.

To each k -th step of transforming an m -row code into a two-row code there corresponds a group of blocks which performs this step and constitutes the k -th tier of the device. The transformation of the two-row code into a single-row code is carried out by a parallel $(n + m')$ -digit adder, which is the $(s + 1)$ -st tier of the device. The first tier contains n blocks, each of which performs the transformation

$$\sum_{j=1}^m a_{ji} \rightarrow \sum_{j'=1}^{m'} b_{j'i} r^{j'-1}.$$

Analogous transformations are performed by the blocks of the remaining tiers.

The functional dependences $b_{i'i}$ ($1 \leq i' \leq m'$) on a_{ji} ($1 \leq j \leq m$) are determined by the chosen radix of the number system. In the most common case, when $r = 2$, these dependences have the form

Fig. 1

Figure 1: Fig. 1

$$b_{i' i} = \bigvee_{c_{j'}=1} S_l(a_{1i}, \dots, a_{ji}, \dots, a_{mi}). \quad (11)$$

Here $S_l(a_{1i}, \dots, a_{ji}, \dots, a_{mi})$ denotes the elementary symmetric function of Boolean algebra, equal to 1 if and only if exactly l

Fig. 1

of its arguments are equal to 1; $0 \leq l \leq m$; $c_{j'}$ is the j' -th digit in the binary notation of the number l :

$$l = \sum_{j'=1}^{m'} c_{j'} 2^{j'-1}. \quad (12)$$

Considerably greater freedom in choosing an optimal circuit for the device is possible with a modification of the method described, which consists in the following. Let m_k be the number of rows in the code obtained after carrying out the k -th step of the transformation (here we take $m_0 = m$). In accordance with the representation of the number m_k in the form

$$m_k = p_k u_k + v_k, \quad (13)$$

where $0 \leq v_k < u_k$, the summands of the m_k -row code are divided into groups of u_k summands in each group, except for one group, which may contain a smaller number of summands. Then the u_k -row code of each group is transformed into a code with the number of summands equal to $u'_k = \lceil \log_r(u_k(r-1) + 1) \rceil$, while the v_k -row code of the additional group (if such a group exists) is transformed into a code with the number of summands equal to $v'_k = \lceil \log_r(v_k(r-1) + 1) \rceil$. As a result of carrying out the $(k+1)$ -st transformation step, the number of rows in the code is reduced to the value

$$m_{k+1} = p_k u'_k + v'_k. \quad (14)$$

This operation is repeated until a two-row code is obtained. The latter is transformed into a one-row code by a parallel $(n + m')$ -digit adder.

Let us consider the case where $u_0 = \dots = u_k = \dots = u$ (respectively, $u'_0 = \dots = u'_k = \dots = u'$). Using expressions (13) and (14), we estimate from above the number of steps s necessary for transforming an m -row code

into a two-row one:

$$s < \log_{u'} \left(\frac{m}{u+1} \right) + D, \quad (15)$$

where D is a certain constant depending on the chosen r and u . Note that D does not exceed 6 if $u \leq 2^{127} - 1$.

It also follows from expressions (13) and (14) that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{s-1} p_k \leq \frac{m-2}{u-u'}. \quad (16)$$

Thus, in the given variant, for one digit of the device no more than $\frac{m-2}{u-u'}$ blocks are required that implement a u' -digit sum of u single-digit addends, no more than s less complex blocks, and one single-digit adder.

The proposed method of converting a multi-row code can be used to speed up multiplication. In the case of using a parallel adder based on one of the methods of accelerated addition¹, the described variant with $m = n = 30-60$ (as is usual in computing machines) and $r = 2$, $u = 3$ makes it possible to increase the speed of performing multiplication by a factor of 3-4 in comparison with the known second-order method of accelerating multiplication, and does not require additional equipment for its implementation.

Institute of Electronic Control Machines
Academy of Sciences of the USSR

Received
12 VII 1962

REFERENCES

¹ O. L. MacSorley, Proc. IRE, **49**, No. 1, 67 (1961).

Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.

Source: Math-Net.Ru and CyberLeninka. Machine translation. Verify with the original.