

# Lecture Notes: Computation Model

Yufei Tao

Department of Computer Science and Engineering

Chinese University of Hong Kong

*taoyf@cse.cuhk.edu.hk*

Computer science is a subject under mathematics. From your undergraduate study, you should have learned that, before you can even start to analyze the “running time” of an algorithm, you need to first define a computation model properly.

**The RAM Model.** This is perhaps the model you are most familiar with. In the Random Access Machine (RAM) model, the *memory* is an infinite sequence of *cells*, where each cell is a sequence of  $w$  bits for some integer  $w$ , and is indexed by an integer *address*. Each cell is also called a *word*; and accordingly, the parameter  $w$  is often referred to as the *word length*. The *CPU*, on the other hand, has a (constant) number of cells, each of which is called a *register*. The CPU can perform only the following *atomic* operations:

- Set a register to some constant, or to the content of another register.
- Compare two numbers in registers.
- Perform  $+$ ,  $-$ ,  $\cdot$ ,  $/$  on two numbers in registers.
- When an address  $x$  has been stored in a register, read the content of the memory cell at address  $x$  into a register, or conversely, write the content of a register into the memory cell.

The *time* (or *cost*) of an algorithm is measured by the number of atomic operations it performs. Note that the time is an integer.

A remark is in order about the word length  $w$ : it needs to be long enough to encode all the memory addresses! For example, if your algorithm uses  $n^2$  memory cells for some integer  $n$ , then the word length will need to have at least  $2 \log_2 n$  bits. Unless otherwise stated, we consider that  $w = \Theta(\log n)$ , where  $n$  is the “input size”, whose meaning will be clearly defined in every problem to be discussed in this course.

**The Real-RAM Model.** In the above model, the (memory/register) cells can store only integers. Next, we will slightly modify the model to deal with real values.

Note that simply “allowing” each cell to store a real value does not give a satisfactory model because it destroys the underlying rigor. For example, how many bits would you use for a real value? In fact, even if the number of bits *were* infinite, still we would not be able to represent all the real values even in a short interval like  $[0, 1]$  — the set of real values in the interval is *uncountably* infinite!

We can alleviate this issue by introducing the concept of *black box*. We still allow a (memory/register) cell  $c$  to store a real value  $x$ , but in this case, the algorithm is forbidden to look *inside*  $c$ , that is, the algorithm has no control over the representation of  $x$ . In other words,  $c$  is now a black box, holding the value  $x$  *precisely* (by magic).

A black box remains as a black box after computation. For example, suppose that two registers are both storing  $\sqrt{2}$ . We can calculate their product 2, but the product must still be understood

as a real value (even though it is an integer). This is similar to the requirement in C++ that the product of two float numbers remains as a float number.

Now we can formally extend the RAM model by introducing some additional rules:

- Each cell can store either an integer or a real value.
- For operations  $+$ ,  $-$ ,  $\cdot$ , and  $/$ , if one of the operand numbers is a real value, the result is a real value.
- We allow another atomic operation called the *floor*. If a cell contains a real value  $x$ , the operation  $\lfloor x \rfloor$  converts the cell into an integer storing  $\lfloor x \rfloor$ , provided that  $x \in [0, 2^w)$  (this condition ensures that  $\lfloor x \rfloor$  can be stored in a word).
- Every cell in the input to the algorithm must be in the range  $[0, 2^w)$ .

We will call the new model the *real RAM* model.

We must be careful not to abuse the power of real-value computation because research [1] has shown that an unconstrained real RAM model can solve NP-hard problems in polynomial time. To avoid such oddity, we will adhere to the *constant multiplication-depth* requirement. To explain the condition, let us consider any real value  $x$  that is computed during an algorithm's execution. The computation of  $x$  can be modeled as a tree  $T(x)$ . Specifically, each leaf of  $T(x)$  is either a constant or a real value in the input to the algorithm. Every internal node  $u$  of  $T(x)$  is labeled with an operation  $op(u) \in \{+, -, \cdot, /, \lfloor \rfloor\}$ . Each operand required by  $op(u)$  is stored at a child of  $u$  in  $T(x)$ , and the operation's output is stored at  $u$ . The value of  $x$  is stored at the root of  $T(x)$ . The constant multiplication-depth requirement states:

Any root-to-leaf path of  $T(x)$  can contain only a constant number of multiplications.

**Randomness.** All the atomic operations discussed so far are *deterministic*. As a result, our models currently do not permit *randomization*, which is essential to apply to certain algorithmic techniques (such as hashing).

To fix the issue, we introduce one more atomic operation for the RAM and real-RAM models. This operation, named *RAND*, takes two non-negative integer parameters  $x$  and  $y$ , and returns an integer chosen uniformly at random from  $[x, y]$ . In other words, every integer in  $[x, y]$  can be returned with probability  $1/(y - x + 1)$ . The values of  $x, y$  should be in  $[0, 2^w - 1]$  because they each need to be encoded in a word.

**Math Conventions.** We will assume that you are familiar with the notations of  $O(\cdot), \Omega(\cdot), \Theta(\cdot), o(\cdot)$ , and  $\omega(\cdot)$ . The notation  $\tilde{O}(f(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_x))$  represents the class of functions that are  $O(f(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_x) \cdot \text{polylog}(n_1 + n_2 + \dots + n_x))$ , namely,  $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$  hides a polylogarithmic factor. The symbol  $\mathbb{R}$  denotes the set of real values.

## References

- [1] A. Schonhage. On the power of random access machines. In *Proceedings of International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP)*, volume 71, pages 520–529, 1979.