## Contents

AbstractPage 1
Euclid's GCD Algorithm ..... 2
Theorem 1 ..... 2
Exercise: Solve $\mathrm{a} \cdot \mathrm{x} \equiv \mathrm{c} \bmod \mathrm{b}$ ..... 3
Continued Fractions ..... 3
Lamé's Theorem ..... 3
Seven More Exercises: ..... 4
Determinants of Integer Matrices ..... 5
LCM, the Least Common Multiple ..... 6
Computer Programs for GCD and LCM ..... 7
MATLAB Programs for GCD and LCM ..... 8
function $[\mathrm{g}, \mathrm{c}, \mathrm{d}]=\operatorname{gcd}(\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b})$ ..... 9
function $\mathrm{L}=\operatorname{lcm}(\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}, \mathrm{x})$ ..... 11
function $y=r 0 u n d(x)$ ..... 12
function $m=\operatorname{precn}(n)$ ..... 13
CTRL87.EXE ..... 14
gcdtest.m is a MATLAB script to test versions of gcd.m ..... 16
GCDtest Results ..... 17
lcmtest.m is a MatLaB script to test W.K.'s version of lcm.m ..... 19
LCMtest Results ..... 20


#### Abstract

The behavior of Euclid's algorithm to compute Greatest Common Divisors and its connection with continued fractions are explained advantageously in terms of products of 2-by-2 matrices. One byproduct is a quick proof of Lamé's theorem, which bounds the number of divisions the algorithm must perform, thus explaining its speed. Among other applications of the algorithm are the solution of linear congruences $a \cdot x \equiv c \bmod b$ and the quick computation of determinants of integer matrices. A GCD is needed also to compute a Least Common Multiple. Actual computer programs to compute GCDs and LCMs malfunction when their inputs or outputs are integers so big that the programs encounter overflow or roundoff. Because it is overlooked so often, roundoff incurred by floating-point arithmetic can have noxious consequences unless the programs incorporate complicated precautions exemplified by MATLAB programs supplied here. When allowed to do so, they take advantage of a little extra-precise arithmetic without which no practicable defense exists against plausible but utterly wrongly computed GCDs and LCMs.

MATLAB programs gcd and 1 cm supplied here are needed in Hilbert matrix computations in <www.cs.berkeley.edu/~wkahan/MathH110/HilbMats.pdf>


Given two positive integers $\mathrm{a} \geq \mathrm{b}>0$ we seek their Greatest Common Divisor (GCD ), which is the biggest integer d that divides both a and b leaving no remainder. Ordinary long division computes a positive integer quotient $q:=\lfloor a / b\rfloor$ and leaves a remainder $r:=a-q \cdot b$ that satisfies $0 \leq r<b$. Clearly every divisor of both a and $b$ divides $r$ too, and conversely every divisor of both b and r divides $\mathrm{a}=\mathrm{q} \cdot \mathrm{b}+\mathrm{r}$ too; therefore $\operatorname{GCD}(\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b})=\operatorname{GCD}(\mathrm{b}, \mathrm{r})$. But the pair $(\mathrm{b}, \mathrm{r})$ is smaller than the pair ( $\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}$ ) in the sense that $\mathrm{b} \leq \mathrm{a}$ and $\mathrm{r}<\mathrm{b}$. This leads to an algorithm $\ldots$

## Euclid's GCD Algorithm

Given integers $\mathrm{a} \geq \mathrm{b}>0$, set $\mathrm{r}_{0}:=\mathrm{a}$ and $\mathrm{r}_{1}:=\mathrm{b}$ and perform successive long divisions getting, for $j=1,2,3, \ldots, n$ in turn until $r_{n+1}=0$, quotients $q_{j}$ and remainders $r_{j}$ that satisfy

$$
\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{j}-1}=\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{j}} \cdot \mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{j}}+\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{j}+1} \text { with } 0 \leq \mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{j}+1}<\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{j}}
$$

( Here at step $j$ we divide $r_{j-1}$ by $r_{j}$ to get quotient $q_{j}$ and remainder $r_{j+1}$, stopping when a remainder $r_{n+1}=0$. At that point $q_{n}>1$; can you see why?) The algorithm stops because this decreasing sequence of $n+1$ positive integers, $r_{0}=a \geq r_{1}=b>r_{2}>\ldots>r_{n-1}>r_{n}>r_{n+1}=0$, cannot have $n>b$. Then $\operatorname{GCD}(a, b)=r_{n}$ because, as explained in the first paragraph,

$$
\operatorname{GCD}(\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{~b})=: \operatorname{GCD}\left(\mathrm{r}_{0}, \mathrm{r}_{1}\right)=\operatorname{GCD}\left(\mathrm{r}_{1}, \mathrm{r}_{2}\right)=\ldots=\operatorname{GCD}\left(\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{n}-1}, \mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{n}}\right)=\operatorname{GCD}\left(\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{n}}, \mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{n}+1}\right)=\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{n}} .
$$

The quotients $q_{j}$ appear to play no important role in the foregoing algorithm, but appearances can mislead. By translating the algorithm's recurrence into matrix language we find uses for $q_{j}$ : Set $\left[\begin{array}{l}r_{0} \\ r_{1}\end{array}\right]:=\left[\begin{array}{l}a \\ b\end{array}\right]$ first; then for $j=1,2,3, \ldots, n$ in turn confirm that $\left[\begin{array}{c}r_{j} \\ r_{j+1}\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{cc}0 & 1 \\ 1 & -q_{j}\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}r_{j-1} \\ r_{j}\end{array}\right]$, with $0 \leq r_{j+1}<r_{j}$ and $r_{n+1}=0$, so $\left[\begin{array}{c}r_{n} \\ 0\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{cc}0 & 1 \\ 1 & -q_{n}\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{cc}0 & 1 \\ 1 & -q_{n-1}\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{cc}0 & 1 \\ 1 & -q_{n-2}\end{array}\right] \ldots\left[\begin{array}{cc}0 & 1 \\ 1 & -q_{2}\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{cc}0 & 1 \\ 1 & -q_{1}\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}r_{0} \\ r_{1}\end{array}\right]$. Now set row $\left[\begin{array}{ll}\mathrm{B} & \mathrm{A}\end{array}\right]:=\left[\begin{array}{ll}1 & 0\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{cc}0 & 1 \\ 1 & -\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{n}}\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{cc}0 & 1 \\ 1 & -\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{n}-1}\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{cc}0 & 1 \\ 1 & -\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{n}-2}\end{array}\right] \ldots\left[\begin{array}{cc}0 & 1 \\ 1 & -\mathrm{q}_{2}\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{cc}0 & 1 \\ 1 & -\mathrm{q}_{1}\end{array}\right]$ to obtain two integers A and B (not both positive) satisfying $\operatorname{GCD}(a, b)=r_{n}=\left[\begin{array}{ll}1 & 0\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}r_{n} \\ 0\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{ll}B & A\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}a \\ b\end{array}\right]=B \cdot a+A \cdot b$. We have just found that $\operatorname{GCD}(a, b)$ is a linear combination of $a$ and $b$ with integer coefficients, thus proving (regardless of whether $a \geq b>0$ or $b \geq a>0$ ) the following ...

Theorem 1: As $\bar{A}$ and $\bar{B}$ run independently through all integers the expression $\bar{B} \cdot a+\bar{A} \cdot b$ runs through a set of integers among which the smallest positive integer is $\operatorname{GCD}(a, b)=B \cdot a+A \cdot b$.

Hard Exercise: Running $\overline{\mathrm{A}}$ and $\overline{\mathrm{B}}$ through all integers is unnecessary: Theorem 1 remains true after restrictions $|\overline{\mathrm{A}}|<\mathrm{a}$ and $|\overline{\mathrm{B}}| \leq \mathrm{b} \leq \mathrm{a}$ are imposed; why? Can you prove $|\mathrm{A}|<\mathrm{a} / \mathrm{GCD}(\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b})$ and $|\mathrm{B}| \leq \mathrm{b} / \mathrm{GCD}(\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b})$ ? See below.

There are two ways to compute A and B . The easiest is to evaluate from-left-to-right the matrix product defining [BA] after all the $\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{j}}$ 's have been computed; this gives rise to a recurrence:

$$
\mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{n}}:=1 ; \mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{n}-1}:=-\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{n}-1} ; \text { for } \mathrm{j}=\mathrm{n}-2, \mathrm{n}-3, \ldots, 2,1 \text { in turn } \mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{j}}:=\mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{j}+2}-\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{j}} \cdot \mathrm{~s}_{\mathrm{j}+1}
$$

Finally $A:=s_{1}$ and $B:=s_{2}$. Another way to compute them is to evaluate from-right-to-left the matrix product defining row $\left[\begin{array}{ll}\mathrm{B}\end{array}\right]$ simultaneously with the computation of the $\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{j}}$ 's :

$$
\left[\begin{array}{ll}
B_{0} & A_{0}
\end{array}\right]:=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
0 & 1
\end{array}\right] ;\left[\begin{array}{ll}
B_{1} & A_{1}
\end{array}\right]:=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
1 & -q_{1}
\end{array}\right] ; \text { for } j=2,3, \ldots, n-1 \text { in turn } \quad\left[\begin{array}{ll}
B_{j} & A_{j}
\end{array}\right]:=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
1 & -q_{j}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{ll}
B_{j-2} & A_{j-2} \\
B_{j-1} & A_{j-1}
\end{array}\right] .
$$

Finally $[B A]:=\left[\begin{array}{ll}B_{n-1} & A_{n-1}\end{array}\right]$. Note that $q_{n}$ never figures in the computation of $A$ and $B$.
Whichever way be chosen to compute $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$ and $\operatorname{GCD}(\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b})=\mathrm{B} \cdot \mathrm{a}+\mathrm{A} \cdot \mathrm{b}$, the algorithm is called "the Extended Euclidean Algorithm" and has important applications. Here is one of them:

Exercise: Given integers $a, c$ and $b>0$, when does " $a \cdot x \equiv c \bmod b$ " have integer solutions $x$ ? Here we pronounce " $\mathrm{p} \equiv \mathrm{q} \bmod \mathrm{b}$ " as " p is congruent to $\mathrm{q} \bmod \mathrm{b}$ " and mean that $\mathrm{p}-\mathrm{q}$ is divisible by b . Let $d:=\operatorname{GCD}(\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b})$. If $\mathrm{c} \equiv 0 \bmod \mathrm{~d}$ exhibit all d noncongruent solutions x ; otherwise prove no solution x exists.

## Continued Fractions

If $d=\operatorname{GCD}(a, b)$ then $(a / d) /(b / d)$ exhibits $a / b$ "in lowest terms" but it is not the only unique encoding of positive rational numbers. By substituting $r_{j-1} / r_{j}=q_{j}+1 /\left(r_{j} / r_{j+1}\right)$ repeatedly for $\mathrm{j}=1,2, \ldots, \mathrm{n}$ in turn we obtain a Terminating Continued Fraction

$$
\frac{\mathrm{a}}{\mathrm{~b}}=\mathrm{q}_{1}+\frac{1}{\mathrm{q}_{2}+\frac{1}{\mathrm{q}_{3}+\frac{1}{\ldots+\frac{1}{\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{n}-1}+\frac{1}{\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{n}}}}}}} .
$$

This is the continued fraction for the rational number $a / b$. Here $q_{1} \geq 1$ because $a \geq b>0$; in fact every $\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{j}} \geq 1$ and the last $\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{n}} \geq 2$ to ensure that the encoding of each rational $\mathrm{a} / \mathrm{b}>1$ by a finite sequence $\left(q_{1}, q_{2}, q_{3}, \ldots, q_{n-1}, q_{n}-1\right)$ of positive integers be unique. Euclid's algorithm converts a rational number given as a ratio of integers into its continued fraction; how do we get back? The obvious way evaluates the continued fraction "bottom-up": $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{n}+1}:=0 ; \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{n}}:=1$; for $j=n, n-1, n-2, \ldots, 2,1$ in turn $R_{j-1}:=q_{j} \cdot R_{j}+R_{j+1}$; finally $a / b=R_{0} / R_{1}$ in lowest terms. Exercise: Confirm that every integer $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{j}}=\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{j}} / \mathrm{GCD}(\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b})$.

Translating the bottom-up evaluation of the continued fraction into matrix terms yields first
$\left[\begin{array}{c}R_{j-1} \\ R_{j}\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{cc}q_{j} & 1 \\ 1 & 0\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}R_{j} \\ R_{j+1}\end{array}\right]$, then $\left[\begin{array}{c}R_{0} \\ R_{1}\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{cc}q_{1} & 1 \\ 1 & 0\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{cc}q_{2} & 1 \\ 1 & 0\end{array}\right] \ldots\left[\begin{array}{cc}q_{n-1} & 1 \\ 1 & 0\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{cc}q_{n} & 1 \\ 1 & 0\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}1 \\ 0\end{array}\right]$. This last expression offers
two interesting opportunities. One is a way to evaluate the continued fraction "top-down":
$\left[\begin{array}{l}h_{0} \\ g_{0}\end{array}\right]:=\left[\begin{array}{l}1 \\ 0\end{array}\right] ; \quad\left[\begin{array}{l}h_{1} \\ g_{1}\end{array}\right]:=\left[\begin{array}{c}q_{1} \\ 1\end{array}\right] ;$ for $j=2,3, \ldots, n$ in turn $\left[\begin{array}{l}h_{j} \\ g_{j}\end{array}\right]:=\left[\begin{array}{cc}h_{j-1} & h_{j-2} \\ g_{j-1} & g_{j-2}\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}q_{j} \\ 1\end{array}\right] ;$ finally $\left[\begin{array}{l}R_{0} \\ R_{1}\end{array}\right]:=\left[\begin{array}{l}h_{n} \\ g_{n}\end{array}\right]$.
This top-down evaluation turns out to be a good way to evaluate endless continued fractions that encode non-rational numbers; successive ratios $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{j}} / \mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{j}}$ can be shown to converge alternatingly.
Exercise: The endless continued fraction in which every $\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{j}}=1$ represents $\mu:=(1+\sqrt{ } 5) / 2$; can you see why?
Another opportunity offered by that long matrix product is a clear proof of Lamés Theorem: To compute $\mathrm{d}:=\operatorname{GCD}(\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b})$ for $\mathrm{a} \geq \mathrm{b}>0$, Euclid's algorithm needs $\mathrm{n} \leq 1+\ln (\mathrm{b} / \mathrm{d}) / \ln (\mu)$ divisions. Exercise: Prove it by showing every $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{j}}$ is at least as big as if every $\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{j}}=1$ except $\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{n}}=2$, so $\mathrm{R}_{1} \geq f_{\mathrm{n}+1}$, a Fibonacci number, and $f_{\mathrm{n}+1}=\left(\mu^{\mathrm{n}+1}-(-1 / \mu)^{\mathrm{n}+1}\right) /(\mu+1 / \mu) \geq \mu^{\mathrm{n}-1}$.

## Seven More Exercises:

Suppose given integers $M>1$ and $N>1$ have $G C D(M, N)=1=n \cdot M-m \cdot N$ for some integers $m$ and $n$ whose signs are not yet determined. Whether $\mathrm{M} \geq \mathrm{N}$ or not won't matter anymore.

1) Show why $m$ and $n$ must have the same nonzero sign.

Henceforth we can assume that $\mathrm{n}>0$ and $\mathrm{m}>0$; otherwise swap M and N , etc.
2) What is $\operatorname{GCD}(\mathrm{m}, \mathrm{n})$ ?
3) Show how to replace $m$ and $n$ respectively by $\bar{m}$ and $\bar{n}$ satisfying

$$
0<\overline{\mathrm{m}}<\mathrm{M}, \quad 0<\overline{\mathrm{n}}<\mathrm{N} \text { and } 1=\mathrm{n} \cdot \mathrm{M}-\mathrm{m} \cdot \mathrm{~N}=\overline{\mathrm{n}} \cdot \mathrm{M}-\overline{\mathrm{m}} \cdot \mathrm{~N}
$$

Henceforth we can assume that $0<\mathrm{m}<\mathrm{M}$ and $0<\mathrm{n}<\mathrm{N}$ and $\mathrm{n} \cdot \mathrm{M}-\mathrm{m} \cdot \mathrm{N}=1$.
4) Exhibit instances of pairs ( $\mathrm{M}, \mathrm{N}$ ) and ( $\mathrm{m}, \mathrm{n}$ ) which satisfy these assumptions ( $\dagger$ ), but for which $\mathrm{M}>\mathrm{N}$ in one instance, and $\mathrm{M}<\mathrm{N}$ in another.
5) Given that the pairs ( $M, N$ ) and (m, n) satisfy ( $\dagger$ ), show how to obtain a pair ( $\bar{m}, \bar{n}$ ) that satisfies $0<\overline{\mathrm{m}}<\mathrm{M}$ and $0<\overline{\mathrm{n}}<\mathrm{N}$ and $\overline{\mathrm{m}} \cdot \mathrm{N}-\overline{\mathrm{n}} \cdot \mathrm{M}=1$, as if M and N had been swapped.
6) Show why ( $\dagger$ ) implies that $\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{N}$ and $\mathrm{m}-\mathrm{n}$ have the same nonzero signs unless $\mathrm{m}=1=\mathrm{n}$. (Hint: $\quad(\mathrm{m}+\mathrm{n}) \cdot(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{N})-1=(\mathrm{m}-\mathrm{n}) \cdot(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{N})+1$.
7) Any two nonzero integers $x$ and $y$ determine a family of sets $\{i, j, k, m, n\}$ of five integers satisfying $n>0,\left[\begin{array}{ll}i & j \\ k & m\end{array}\right] \cdot\left[\begin{array}{l}x \\ y\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{l}n \\ 0\end{array}\right]$ and $\operatorname{det}\left(\left[\begin{array}{ll}i & j \\ k & m\end{array}\right]\right)=1$. However $\{i, j, k, m, n\}$ may be found, which of the five integers are determined uniquely by x and y ?

Solution 7): Integers $\mathrm{k}, \mathrm{m}$ and n are determined uniquely but i and j are not. To see why, observe first from the determinant that k and m can have no nontrivial (other than $\pm 1$ ) common divisor since it has to divide the determinant 1. Next compute the inverse of the 2-by2 matrix to obtain $\left[\begin{array}{cc}m & -j \\ -k & i\end{array}\right]$ and infer $\left[\begin{array}{l}x \\ y\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{c}m \\ -k\end{array}\right] n$. This means that $m / k=-x / y$ in lowest terms, and that n is the Greatest Common Divisor of x and y . Thus are $\mathrm{k}, \mathrm{m}$ and n fixed uniquely by $x$ and $y$. However, $i$ and $j$ can be replaced respectively by $i+L \cdot k$ and $j+L \cdot m$ respectively for any integer L with no alteration to the given constraints; this amounts merely to replacing $\left[\begin{array}{ll}\mathrm{i} & \mathrm{j} \\ \mathrm{k} & \mathrm{m}\end{array}\right]$ by $\left[\begin{array}{ll}1 & \mathrm{~L} \\ 0 & 1\end{array}\right] \cdot\left[\begin{array}{ll}\mathrm{i} & \mathrm{j} \\ \mathrm{k} & \mathrm{m}\end{array}\right]$.

The foregoing solution explains all that the problem requested, namely the uniqueness of the last three integers in the set $\{\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}, \mathrm{k}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{n}\}$. To explain why integers i and j must exist is easier than explaining the Extended Euclidean Greatest-Common-Divisor algorithm that finds them.

## Determinants of Integer Matrices

What use are Exercise 7's integers $\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}, \mathrm{k}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{n}$ ? One use is in a little-known but fairly efficient algorithm to compute the determinant or inverse of a matrix of modest dimensions whose entries are all integers. Consider the determinant of a given integer matrix $E$ :

We can reduce E to an upper-triangular U whose determinant, the product of its diagonal elements, is the same as $\operatorname{det}(\mathrm{E})$. To this end we premultiply E by a sequence of matrices each with determinant 1 and different from the identity matrix only in a 2-by-2 submatrix on the diagonal. First premultiply to annihilate the lower left corner element of E; next annihilate the element above it, and so on up the first column until only its first element is nonzero. Then do the same to the second column's subdiagonal elements, and so on until all subdiagonal elements become zeros. Before each premultiplication construct a 2-by-2 matrix like the one in problem 7, using for x and y the leading (presumably nonzero) elements of adjacent rows; then the premultiplication will replace x by $\mathrm{n}>0$ and y by 0 . This n takes the place of the y in the next annihilation.

Relatively few divisions occur in this algorithm, all concerned with finding the 2-by-2 matrices, and most of these divisions have either short divisors or short quotients. Moreover annihilations starting at the bottom of each column produce a value of $n$, which becomes y at the next annihilation, that usually turns out to be 1 (or the column's greatest common divisor). Thus, in most of the 2-by-2 matrices three of the four elements are $\pm 1$ or 0 ; this is why the method is efficient despite that the integers in triangular factor $U$ can grow very big.

Hard Exercise: Compare the computational costs of the foregoing algorithm and Chio's Trick, q.v., posted for this course at <www.cs.berkleley.edu/~wkahan/MathH110/Chio.pdf>.

The foregoing algorithm is part of the reduction of E to an upper-triangular Hermite Normal Form, which is on the path towards the Smith Normal Form, but these are stories for a different course on Abstract Algebra involving not just integers but also matrices whose entries are polynomials with rational coefficients. These normal forms can entail gargantuan integers, so their efficient computation requires algorithms much more subtle than the foregoing.

## LCM, the Least Common Multiple

$\operatorname{LCM}(\mathrm{j}, \mathrm{k})=\operatorname{LCM}(\mathrm{j}|,|\mathrm{k}|)$ is the least positive integer that both nonzero integers j and k divide leaving no remainder; consequently $\operatorname{LCM}(\mathrm{j}, \mathrm{k})=|\mathrm{j}| \cdot|\mathrm{k}| / \mathrm{GCD}(\mathrm{j}, \mathrm{k})$.

Exercise: Confirm the last equation and then $\operatorname{LCM}(\mathrm{k}, \mathrm{j})=\operatorname{LCM}(\mathrm{j}, \mathrm{k}) \& \operatorname{GCD}(\mathrm{k}, \mathrm{j})=\mathrm{GCD}(\mathrm{j}, \mathrm{k})$.
Both functions GCD and LCM can be extended to sets $\left\{\mathrm{k}_{1}, \mathrm{k}_{2}, \mathrm{k}_{3}, \ldots, \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{m}}\right\}$ of $\mathrm{m}>2$ nonzero integers by defining first $\operatorname{GCD}\left(\mathrm{k}_{1}, \mathrm{k}_{2}, \mathrm{k}_{3}, \ldots, \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{n}}\right):=\operatorname{GCD}\left(\operatorname{GCD}\left(\mathrm{k}_{1}, \mathrm{k}_{2}, \ldots, \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{n}-1}\right), \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{n}}\right)$ and then $\operatorname{LCM}\left(\mathrm{k}_{1}, \mathrm{k}_{2}, \mathrm{k}_{3}, \ldots, \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{n}}\right):=\operatorname{LCM}\left(\operatorname{LCM}\left(\mathrm{k}_{1}, \mathrm{k}_{2}, \ldots, \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{n}-1}\right), \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{n}}\right)$ for $\mathrm{n}=3,4,5, \ldots, \mathrm{~m}$ in turn.

Exercise: Confirm that the order of the integers in the set $\left\{\mathrm{k}_{1}, \mathrm{k}_{2}, \mathrm{k}_{3}, \ldots, \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{m}}\right\}$ does not matter.

The functions GCD and LCM have interesting interlocking properties whose description will be eased first by temporary abbreviations $\gamma(\ldots):=\mathrm{GCD}(\ldots)$ and $\lambda(\ldots):=\operatorname{LCM}(\ldots)$, and second by the temporary assumption that all three integers i , j and k are positive. For more extensive discussion of these properties see ch. 2 of K.H. Rosen's book Elementary Number Theory and its Applications, 4th ed. (2000), Addison-Wesley, Mass.

Exercise: Confirm the following identities:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \gamma(i \cdot j, i \cdot k)=\mathrm{i} \cdot \gamma(\mathrm{j}, \mathrm{k}) \quad \text { and } \quad \lambda(\mathrm{i} \cdot \mathrm{j}, \mathrm{i} \cdot \mathrm{k})=\mathrm{i} \cdot \lambda(\mathrm{j}, \mathrm{k}) . \\
& \gamma(\lambda(\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}), \mathrm{k})=\lambda(\gamma(\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}), \gamma(\mathrm{j}, \mathrm{k})) \quad \text { and } \quad \lambda(\gamma(\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}), \mathrm{k})=\gamma(\lambda(\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}), \lambda(\mathrm{j}, \mathrm{k})) . \\
& \gamma(\lambda(\mathrm{i} \cdot \mathrm{j}), \lambda(\mathrm{j} \cdot \mathrm{k}), \lambda(\mathrm{k} \cdot \mathrm{i}))=\lambda(\gamma(\mathrm{i} \cdot \mathrm{j}), \gamma(\mathrm{j} \cdot \mathrm{k}), \gamma(\mathrm{k} \cdot \mathrm{i})) . \\
& \gamma(\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}, \mathrm{k}) \cdot \lambda(\mathrm{i} \cdot \mathrm{j}, \mathrm{j} \cdot \mathrm{k}, \mathrm{k} \cdot \mathrm{i})=\lambda(\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}, \mathrm{k}) \cdot \gamma(\mathrm{i} \cdot \mathrm{j}, \mathrm{j} \cdot \mathrm{k}, \mathrm{k} \cdot \mathrm{i})=\mathrm{i} \cdot \mathrm{j} \cdot \mathrm{k} . \\
& \mathrm{i} \cdot \mathrm{j} \cdot \mathrm{k} \cdot \gamma(\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}, \mathrm{k})=\lambda(\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}, \mathrm{k}) \cdot \gamma(\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}) \cdot \gamma(\mathrm{j} \cdot \mathrm{k}) \cdot \gamma(\mathrm{k} \cdot \mathrm{i}) .
\end{aligned}
$$

They are not all easy to prove.

## Computer Programs for GCD and LCM

Every computer has limited extent in space and time. Preoccupation with the limits distinguishes computer scientists from mathematicians. When we write a program to compute a mathematical function, we choose, perhaps unwittingly, to reconcile our expectations with those limits. A conscientious choice poses mathematical challenges some of which are sampled in what follows.

First we must decide how the programs shall handle boundary integers, namely 0 and $\infty$. If you prefer to exclude $\infty$ from the set of integers, you are in good company. Computer programs cannot be so picky; they must handle in a reasonable manner whatever input comes their way. The only alternative is to stop the computer when a program refuses to accept some input deemed invalid; but the consequences of stopping a computer are difficult to predict, always annoying, and sometimes dangerous. A program should refuse to accept data only if refusal is the least unreasonable option after all others have been considered and found to cause worse confusion.

Therefore convention assigns $\operatorname{GCD}(\mathrm{k}, 0):=\operatorname{GCD}(\mathrm{k}, \infty):=\mathrm{k}$ except $\operatorname{GCD}(0, \infty):=0$, and then $\operatorname{LCM}(\mathrm{k}, 0):=0$ and $\operatorname{LCM}(\mathrm{k}, \infty):=\infty$ except $\operatorname{LCM}(0, \infty):=N a N$, which stands for "Not a Number". It is an unacceptable input whose creation from non-NaN inputs raises an Invalid Operation flag that the program's user can detect subsequently at his/her/its convenience. This flag exists in hardware conforming to IEEE Standard 754 for Floating-Point Arithmetic but, alas, is inaccessible through most programming languages like MATLAB and Java.

Computers cope with at most finitely many distinct integers; the rest are too big. This limitation afflicts $\operatorname{LCM}(\ldots)$ because its output is usually bigger than its inputs. If too big, the output must either Overflow or get Rounded Off to something else. Many programming languages cannot detect the altered result of Integer Overflow; and it stops the computer with an error message for many of the others, like MAPLE and Prof. Yuji Kida's UBASIC. Some languages, MatLab and early versions of BASIC among them, represent all but their smallest integers as floatingpoint variables with some preassigned number of so-called Significant Digits. Any integer wider than that gets rounded off to a represenatable value or else, if extremely big, overflows to $\infty$. Either Procrustean action raises an Inexact Operation flag in standard-conforming hardware but, alas, this flag too is inaccessible from MATLAB and most other programming languages.

In short, integer inputs and outputs bigger than some obscure thresholds can invalidate computed GCDs and LCMs. In floating-point arithmetic GCDs are threatened, despite that no integers in the Euclidean algorithm need be bigger than its inputs, because some of those integers, though smaller in magnitude, may require an extra significant digit beyond the inputs'. LCMs may need more significant digits than the arithmetic affords. Extra-precise intermediate arithmetic, when available, produces correct GCDs and helps warn of LCMs too big. Even so, the following MATLAB programs are complicated almost grotesquely by their attempts to cope with all threats.

## MatLab Programs for GCD and LCM

MATLAB's own programs for these functions can be exhibited by the commands type gcd and type 1 cm . Partly because MATLAB's own gcd and 1 cm programs do not make fuller use of the floating-point hardware they run on, they malfunction for some inputs. For instance, they compute $\operatorname{gcd}(3,2 \wedge 80)=3 \neq 1$ and $\operatorname{gcd}\left(28059810762433,2^{\wedge} 53\right)=28059810762433 \neq 1$. They abort if $\infty$ is an input. They cannot handle more than pairs of inputs, so $\operatorname{LCM}(\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}, \mathrm{k})$ must be obtained from the expression $1 \mathrm{~cm}(1 \mathrm{~cm}(i, j), k)$. Its value should not depend upon the order of $\{\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}, \mathrm{k}\}$ but does for $\{12647423,712176643,12658905\}$, giving $1 \mathrm{~cm}(\mathrm{lcm}(\ldots)$...) two values 1.14021279681837 e 23 and 1.98608743567039 e 19 of which one is the true LCM 19860874356703880745 rounded correctly to 53 sig. bits.

MATLAB's roundoff threshold for its 53-sig.-bit floating-point variables is eps $=2^{-52}$. They can hold the consecutive integers $0,1,2,3, \ldots, 2^{53}=9007199254740992$. Numbers bigger than this 16 -digit integer get rounded off to 53 -sig.-bit integers. Because current versions of MATLAB display at most 15 sig. dec. instead of 17 , distinct big integers may look the same on screen unless displayed in a 16 -digit hexadecimal format eschewed here.

By exploiting arithmetic capabilities accessible through some versions of MATLAB on some computers, the functions gcd and 1 cm provided below either malfunction far less often than MATLAB's own, or offer easy ways to detect almost all practically unavoidable malfunctions.

Without those capabilities, the functions gcd and 1 cm provided below are slightly faster than MATLAB's own but no more reliable. Some of their malfunctions are exposed by the two test programs gcdtest and lcmtest provided below along with some of their results.

Function precn below is not used by gcd nor 1 cm , but is called by gcdtest and lcmtest only to uncover the precision of arithmetic MATLAB uses to accumulate matrix products. Early versions on PCs and old 680x0-based Macintoshes accumulated these products extra-precisely, to 64 sig. bits, before rounding them down to 53 as they were stored. MATLAB 6.5 on PCs can be commanded to do that when the factors and products fit into the computer's cache-memory. On Power-Macs and iMacs the accumulation benefits (rarely by much) from Fused MultiplyAdds that commit only one 53 sig . bit rounding error per expression of the form " $\mathrm{x} \pm \mathrm{y} \cdot \mathrm{z}$ ". Most users of Matlab ignore whatever precn exposes, though occasionally such details matter crucially; e.g., see <www.cs.berkeley.edu/~wkahan/MxMulEps.pdf>. And the test results below show how such details determine whether gcd and 1 cm pass all their tests.

```
function [g,c,d] = gcd (a,b)
%GCD Greatest Common Divisor.
% G = gcd(A,B) is an array of Greatest Common Divisors of the
% corresponding elements of A and B . These arrays must contain
% only integers and must have the same size unless one is a scalar.
% By convention gcd (x, 0) = gcd(x, Inf) = |x| ; gcd(0, Inf) = 0.
% Otherwise gcd is a finite positive integer computed correctly,
% despite roundoff no matter how big elements of }A\mathrm{ and }B\mathrm{ may be,
% only under circumstances discussed in the fourth paragraph below.
% Correct values of gcd(3, 2^80) = gcd(28059810762433, 2^53) = 1.
%
% G = gcd(A) is a row of which each element is the GCD of the
% corresponding column of the array A of integers.
%
% [G,C,D] = gcd(A,B) also returns C and D so that A.*C + B.*D = G
% and |C|.*G <= |B| and |D|.*G <= |A| with equality only rarely.
% [C, D] is useful for solving Diophantine equations and computing
% Hermite transformations. Note that another possibility for pair
% [C, D] is [C, D] - [S.*B./G, -S.*A./G] where S = sign(B.*C) ;
% one pair [C,D] may suit your application better than the other.
%
% Roundoff can spoil A.*C + B.*D = G unless |A.*C| < 2/eps and
% |B.*D| < 2/eps . Wherever max(|A|,|B|) > 2/eps there [G,C,D]
% MAY BE WRONG except on Power Macs, whose G is always correct
% even if [C,D] is not. If max(|A|,|B|) <= 2048/eps , or if
% min(|A|,|B|) <= 2048, then G (if not [C,D]) is correct also
% on old 680x0-based Macs, and also on Intel-based PCs with
% 64-sig.-bit accumulation of matrix products enabled via Matlab
% 6.x's invocation " system_dependent('setprecision', 64) " .
% See also LCM and, for Matlab 3.5, reshape, isinf and, for
% 386-Matlab 3.5 & PC-Matlab 4.2, rOund, all as modified by W.K.
% Algorithm: See Knuth Volume 2, Section 4.5.2, Algorithm X sped up
% Original Author: John Gilbert, Xerox PARC; sped up by W. Kahan
% Original Copyright (c) 1984-98 by The MathWorks, Inc.
% Original Revision: 5.9 Original Date: 1997/11/21 23:45:38
% First modified by W.K. in 1990 to fix gcd(3, 2^80) = 3 .
% $Revision: 6.5.W.K. $ $Date: 2008/09/14 06:09:59 $
if (nargin == 2) %... Case gcd(a,b)
% Do scalar expansion if necessary
sza = size(a) ; szb = size(b) ; %... Matlab 3.5 - 6.5 compatible
if (sza == 1), a = a*ones(szb(1),szb(2)) ; %... " " "
    elseif (szb == 1), b = b*ones(sza(1),sza(2)) ; end
sza = size(a) ; if any(sza - size(b))
        error('Arrays input to gcd(A,B) must have the same size.')
    else
        a = a(:) ; b = b(:) ;
    end;
if any(round(a) ~= a)|any(round(b) ~= b)|any(imag(a))|any(imag(b))
        error('gcd(A,B) requires all inputs to be real integers.')
    end %... Inf is deemed an integer, but NaN is not.
```

```
if (nargout < 2) % ... save time by omitting c and d
        Y = [a, b]' ; g= b ; L = [0, 1; 1, 0] ;
        for k = 1:length(a)
            x = Y(:,k) ; %... = [a(k); b (k)]
            if any(isinf(x)), g(k) = min(abs(x(:))) ;
            else %... finite operands
            while x(2) % ... ~= 0 ; MOD(x(1),x(2)) and REM(...) could
                L(2,2) = -round(x(1)/x(2)) ; % be wrong if x(1) is huge
                x = L*x ; % ... new |x(2)| <= old |x(2)|/2
                end % ... of inner loop traversed fewer than 40 times
                g(k) = abs(x(1)) ; end %... of usual finite case
            end % ... of k
        g = reshape(g, sza) ;
        return
    end % ... of Case gcd(A,B) with nargout < 2
% Case [G,C,D] = gcd(A,B) with nargout == 3 , presumably.
Y = [a, b, b] ; % ... initialized to the right size
I = eye(2) ; L = flipud(I) ;
for k = 1:length(a)
    X = [I, Y(k,1:2)'] ; % ... = [1, 0, a(k); 0, 1, b (k)].
        if isinf(X(1,3)), X = flipud(X) ; elseif ~isinf(X(2,3))
                while X(2,3) % ... ~= 0 and everything is finite ...
                L}(2,2)=-round(X(1,3)/X(2,3)) ; 
                X = L*X ; % ... new |X(2,3)| <= old |X(2,3)|/2
            end % ... of inner loop traversed fewer than 40 times.
        end % ... of finite a(k) and b(k)
        if (X(1,3)<0), X = -X ; end % ... invert g(k)<0.
        Y(k,:) = X(1,:) ;
    end % ... of k
g = reshape(Y(:,3), sza) ;
c = reshape(Y(:,1), sza) ;
d = reshape(Y(:,2), sza) ;
return
% end of Case [G,C,D] = gcd(A,B)
elseif (nargin == 1) %... Case gcd(A) treated recursively
if (nargout > 1)
    error('G = gcd(A) has just one output.'), end
g = a(1,:) ; [isr, isc] = size(a) ;
for }k=2:isr, g=gcd(g, a(k,:)) ; en
return
% end of Case gcd(A)
else error('gcd(A,B) accepts just one or two arguments.')
% For Matlab 3.5, isinf(x) = ~( finite(x)|isnan(x) ) , and
% retrofitted reshape(X, size(...)) works. And for
% 386-Matlab 3.5 & PC-Matlab 4.2, use r0und instead of buggy round.
end %... of gcd
```

```
function L = lcm(a,b,x)
%LCM Least Common Multiple, with optional correctness test.
% L = lcm(A,B) = lcm(abs(A), abs(B)) >= 0 is an array of Least
% Common Multiples of corresponding elements of integer arrays
% A and B. They must have the same size unless one is a scalar.
% WARNING: Roundoff may have spoiled L wherever L >= 2/eps .
%
% L = lcm(A,B,x) substitutes the scalar x for any element of
% L >= 2/eps that fails an optional appended correctness test.
% Among plausible choices x are 0, Inf and NaN, depending
% upon how lcm's user will respond to these error-indicators.
%
% Alas, some errors can evade detection by the test. It works
% best when Matlab accumulates matrix products either with
% Fused Multiply-Adds, as it does on Power Macs, or else
% extra-precisely as do versions 3.5-5.2 on 680x0-based Macs,
% and versions 3.5-4.2 on a PC, and version 6.5 on a PC after
% it executes the command system_dependent('setprecision',64).
% Then lcm(A,B,x) should detect any erroneous L < 2048/eps.
% L = lcm(A) is a row whose every element is the LCM of the
% corresponding column of the array A of integers. WARNING:
% Wherever L >= 2/eps roundoff may make L utterly erroneous
% though lcm(A) tries to substitute Inf for each such error
% unless aborted by a NaN produced by lcm(0,Inf) . Wherever
% lcm(flipud(A)) differs from lcm(A) , both may be wrong.
%
% Requires gcd(...) as modified by W.K. after 1990.
%
                                    W. Kahan, 1990 - 14 Sept. 2008
if any(imag(a(:)))
    error('lcm(A,...) accepts no complex argument.'), end
a = abs(a) ;
if (nargin > 1) %... Cases lcm(a,b) and lcm(a,b,x)
if any(imag(b(:)))
    error('lcm(A,B,...) accepts no complex argument.'), end
b = abs(b) ;
% Do scalar expansion if necessary
sza = size(a) ; szb = size(b) ; %... Matlab 3.5 - 6.5 compatible
if (sza == 1), a = a(ones(szb(1),szb(2))) ;
    elseif (szb == 1), b = b(ones(sza(1),sza(2))) ; end
% Gcd(A,B) will expose other erroneous inputs, namely ...
% input arrays A and B of different sizes, or
% any element in |A| or |B| not an integer.
% Gcd deems Inf an integer, but not NaN.
g = gcd(a,b) ; g = g+(g==0) ; Lg = isinf(g) ;
if any(Lg(:)), g(Lg) = Lg(Lg) ; end %... lcm(inf, inf) = inf.
a =a./g ; L = a.*b ;
if (nargin == 2), return, end %... of Case lcm(a,b)
% Case lcm(a,b,x)'s test:
if (L(~Lg) < 2/eps), return, end %... no further test needed
if (length(x(:)) ~= 1), x = x
    error('x in lcm(A,B,x) must be a scalar, not array.'), end
```

```
% What follows substitutes poorly for IEEE 754's INEXACT flag:
g=g(:) ; b = b(:)./g ; a = a(:) ; Lg = isinf(a)|isinf(b) ;
[m,n] = size(L) ; mn = m*n ;
L = L(:) ; q = round(L./g) ;
for j = 1:mn %... seek erroneous finite L(j) only where ...
    if ~Lg(j) %... both a(j) and b(j) are finite:
        if ([L(j), q(j)]*[-1; g(j)]~=0 ), L(j) = x ; %... L is wrong
        elseif ([q(j), a(j)]*[-1; b (j)]~=0 ), L(j) = x ; end %... " "
        end, end %... of finite a(j) and b(j) , and of j
L = reshape(L, m,n) ; return
end %... of Case lcm(a,b,x)
% Case lcm(A) treated tail-recursively:
L = a(1,:) ; [isr, isc] = size(a) ;
for k = 2:isr , L = lcm(L, a(k,:), Inf) ; end
% end of Case lcm(A)
% For Matlab 3.5, isinf(x) = ~( finite(x)|isnan(x) ) . For
% 386-Matlab 3.5, use W.K's round instead of buggy round.
% ===================================================================
```

The built-in function round (x) in 386-Matlab 3.5k and in PC-Matlab 4.2 has a bug:
If odd integer $|x|>1 /$ eps $=2^{52}$ (in which case $|x|<2^{53}$ too)
then round $(x)-x==\operatorname{sign}(x)$ instead of 0 .
This bug is fixed, albeit slowly, by r0und.m:

```
function y = r0und(x)
%ROUND Round to a nearest integer; ONLY for PCs Matlab 3.5 & 4.2
% rOund(x) = integer "nearest" x , fixing a bug in round.m:
% 386-Matlab 3.5's and PC-Matlab 4.2's buggy round(x) yields
% x + sign(x) whenever odd |x|> 2^52 (and therefore
% |x| < 2^53 too). This fixes gcd.m, lcm.m, etc.
% W. Kahan 22 Sept. }199
y = round(x) ;
J = (abs(x) > 1/eps) ;
if any(J(:)), y(J) = x(J) ; end
```

\%

```
function m = precn(n)
%PRECN senses precision carried while accumulating matrix products
% m = precn(n) uses only add, subtract and multiply operations
% (no divisions) upon a few artfully chosen integers (no loops)
% to sense the current precision |m| sig. bits in which MATLAB
% accumulates matrix multiplications of not too big dimensions
% before storing the product in 53 sig. bits. This m depends
% upon the version ( < 7) of MATLAB, the computer's hardware,
% and possibly some control bits in the processor, as follows:
% v. 3.5 on PCs & 680x0-based Macs: m = 24, 53 or 64 (default)
% v. 4.2 - 5.2 on 680x0-based Macs: m = 64
% v. 5.2 on Power-Macs & iMacs (Fused Multiply-Adds): m = -53
% v. 4.2 on PCs: m = 64
% v. 5.3 on PCs & every v. on SUN SPARCS: m = 53
v. 6.5 on PCs: m = 24, 53 (default) or 64
Argument n of precn(n) can be omitted and is ignored except
by versions of precn running on PCs under MATLAB 3.5 & 6.5
with appropriate leading "%" characters deleted from the file.
Then m = precn(n) is determined after the precision is reset
to n by an invocation appropriate to the version.
                                    Revised 21 Sept. 2008. W. Kahan
f (nargin == 0), n = 0 ; else
    For 386-Matlab 3.5 on PCs delete leading "%" in this block:
    if (n == 64)
        ! CTRL87 33D
    elseif (n == 53) %:
        ! CTRL87 23D
    elseif (n == 24) %:
                ! CTRL87 03D
    else N = n %:
                error(' precn(N) requires N = 24, 53 or 64 .') %:
            end
    For Matlab 6.5 on PCs delete leading "%" in this block:
    if ~( (n==24)|(n==53)|(n==64) ), N = n %:
            error(' precn(N) requires N = 24, 53 or 64 .') %:
        end
    system_dependent('setprecision', n) %:
    n = 1 ; end % ... to impede compiler over-optimization
a = 409891 ; ab = 2731 + n ; a = [ab, -a]*[a; n] ;
b = 7623851 ; ab = 1441 + n ; b = [ab, -b]*[b; n] ;
ab = a*b ; % ... = (2^65 + 1)/3 rounded to min(m, 53) sig. bits
c = 2761 ; d = 4051+n ; cd = [c, -n]*[d; c] ; %... = (2^25 + 1)/3
t11 = 2048 ; t15 = 16*t11 ; t40 = t15*t15*1024 ; %... tk = 2^k
e = ([c, -c, a]*[(d-n)*t15; (d-n)*t40; b])*3 - t15 ; %... = 1 ?
f = ([a, -c, c]*[b; (d-n)*t40; (d-n)*t15])*3 - t15 ; %... = 1 ?
ef = [e, f] ;
```

```
if (ef == [1, 1]), m = 64 ;
elseif (ef == [1, -t11]), m = -53 ;
elseif (ef == [-t11, -t11]), m = 53 ;
elseif (ef == [-t15, t40]), m = 24 ;
else Version = ver, Machine = computer, EF = ef
        error(' Why does precn malfunction on this machine?')
    end
```

\%

## CTRL87.EXE was compiled from the following Borland Turbo-Pascal program:

```
{$R-,S-,I-,D-,T-,F-,V-,B-,N-,L+ }
{$M 1024,0,1024 }
program ctrl87;
{ CTRL87 <ctl<, msk>> uses two 3-hex-digit parameters ctl and msk
    to set as many as 9 bits in the ix87 Control-Word as follows:
            New CW := (msk AND ctl) OR (NOT (msk) AND Old CW) .
    If msk is omitted, 0FOO is used in its place. If both msk
    and ctl are omitted, or if either is " ? " or not hexadecimal
    they will be prompted from the keyboard after the display of
    DOC below, which explains how they affect subsequent floating-
    point arithmetic operations. To do nothing, [Enter] nothing.
    To prevent mishaps, msk is filtered thus: msk := msk AND 0F3D
====================================================================
}
const
    n = 19 ; { n = current number of lines in DOC }
    DOC: array[1..n] of string[55] = (
        CTRL87 <ctl<, msk>> sets the ix87 Control-Word ',
        C-W := (msk AND ctl) OR (NOT(msk) AND C-W) from 2',
        3-hex-digit parameters ctl and msk. C-W''s bits ',
        are OR''d to affect floating-point thus: C-W ',
        TRAPS: (default) Disable All traps ... _3D ',
            or Disable trap for INVALID OP ... _01 ',
                and Disable trap for DIV by ZERO ... _04 ',
                and Disable trap for OVERFLOW ... _08 ',
                and Disable trap for UNDERFLOW ... _10',
                and Disable trap for INEXACT ... _20',
            PRECISION: (default) Round to REAL*10 ... 3__',
                        or else Round to REAL*8 ... 2__ ',
                            or else Round to REAL*4 ... 0__ ',
        DIRECTION: (default) Round to Nearest ... 0__
                        or else Round Down ... 4__ ',
                    or else Round Up ... 8__ ',
                    or else Round to Zero ... C__ ',
            Initial Control-Word ctl set by FINIT ... 33D ',
            Default msk = 0FOO . Maximal effective msk = F3D ' );
Sctl = ' Current setting of Control-Word ctl ... ' ;
S3H = ' Enter 3 hex digits for ' ;
msx = $0F3D ; { ... maximal msk }
var
        ctl, i, j, k, L, msk : word ; s : string ;
    function Wrd2Str( i : word ) : string ;
```

```
        { ... converts word i to its string of 4 hex digits.}
        var j, k : word ; s : string[4] ;
        begin
            s := '' ;
            for k := 0 to 3 do begin
                j := i AND $F ;
                i := i shr 4 ;
                if j > 9 then j := j + $37
                    else j := j + $30 ;
                s := Concat( Chr(j), s ) ;
                end ; { k }
            Wrd2Str := s
        end; { Wrd2Str }
    procedure GetHex( var j, k : word; s : string );
        begin { converts string s to 4-hex-digit word j }
            Val( ConCat('$',s), j, k ) ; { j = value of $s if k = 0 }
            if k > 0 then Writeln(s, ' is not hexadecimal.') ;
            end ; { GetHex }
    begin
        inline( $9B/$D9/$3E/i/$9B ) ; { fstcw i ; old Control-Word }
        L := ParamCount ;
        if L = 0 then k := 1 else begin
            s := ParamStr(1) ; { = first parameter on DOS command line }
            if Copy(s,1,1) = '?' then k := 1 else GetHex(ctl, k, s) ;
            if k = 0 then
                if L < 2 then msk := $0F00
                    else GetHex(msk, k, ParamStr(2)) ;
            end ; { L > 0 }
        while k > 0 do begin { Prompt for ctl and msk .}
            for j := 1 to n do Writeln( DOC[j] ) ;
            Writeln( Sctl, Wrd2Str( i AND msx ) ) ;
            Writeln( S3H, 'new ctl :' ) ;
            Readln(s) ;
            if (s = '') or (s = ' ') or (s = ' ')
                    then Exit ; { Do nothing.}
            if Copy(s,1,1) = '?' then k := 1 else GetHex(ctl, k, s) ;
            if k = 0 then { Prompt for msk .}
                repeat
                    Writeln( S3H, ' msk or accept 0F00 :' ) ;
                    Readln(s) ;
                    if (s = '') or (s = ' ') or (s = ' ')
                        then msk := $0F00
                        else GetHex(msk, k, s) ;
                until k = 0 ; { Prompted for msk .}
            L := 0 ;
            end ; { Prompted values for ctl and msk .}
        msk := msk and msx ; { Don't change 8087 vs. }387\mathrm{ C-W .}
        ctl := (msk and ctl) or ((not msk) and i) ;
        inline( $9B/$D9/$2E/ctl/$9B ) ; { fldcw ctl }
        if L = 0 then Writeln( Sctl, Wrd2Str( ctl AND msx ) ) ;
    end.
{ ========================================================================== }
```

```
% gcdtest.m is a Matlab script to test versions of gcd.m
format compact, format long g
diary gcdtest.txt
disp (' GCDtest puts its results into GcdTest.txt')
DateTime = round(clock)
Machine = computer, ver
MatMultPrecn = precn
disp( ' ')
disp (' 1st test: G = gcd(A, B) and gcd(B, A) :')
p = 28059810762433 ; %... a prime
t53 = 2^53 ;
A = [77, 77, 77, 0; 3, 15, t53, t53-1 ] ;
B = [132, 0, Inf, Inf; 2^80, 2+2^52, p, p ] ;
G = 11, 77, 77, 0; 1, 3, 1, 1 1 ;
G0 = gcd(A, B) ;
G1 = gcd(B,A) ;
K = (G ~= GO)|(G ~= G1) ;
if ~any(K(:))
        disp(' 1st test passed.')
    else %... when matrix mult'n is not accumulated extra-precisely ...
                disp(' 1st test failed in these cases:')
        F = [A(K)'; B(K)'; G0(K)'; G1(K)'; G(K)'] ;
        disp(' A;B;gcd(A,B);gcd(B,A);trueGCD = '), F
    end %... of 1st test
disp(' ')
disp(' 2nd test: [G, C, D] = gcd(A,B) and gcd(B, A) :')
f80 = 2^40 ;
f80 = ((f80 - 1)/3)*(f80 + 1) ; %... = (2^80 - 1)/3 rounded
A = [77, 77, 77, 0; 3, -15, t53, t53-1 ] ;
B = [132, 0, Inf, Inf; 2^80, 2+2^52, p, p ;
G = [ 11, 77, 77, 0; 1, 3, 1, 1 1 ;
C = [ 7, 1, 1, 1; -f80, 300239975158033, -1, -14029905381217 ] ;
D = [ -4, 0, 0, 0; 1, 1, 321, 4503599627370656 ] ;
[G0, C0, D0] = gcd(A, B) ;
[G1, C1, D1] = gcd(B, A) ;
K=(G0~=G)|(G1~=G)|(C0~=C)|(C1~=D)|(D0~=D)|(D1~=C) ;
if ~any(K(:))
            disp(' 2nd test passed.')
    else %... when matrix mult'n is not accumulated extra-precisely ...
        disp(' 2nd test failed in these cases:')
        F = [A(K)'; B(K)'; G0(K)'; C0(K)'; D0(K)'; G1(K)'; C1(K)'; D1(K)'] ;
        disp(' A;B;[gcd(A,B);C0;D0];[gcd(B,A);C1;D1];trueGCD;C;D = ')
        F = [F; G(K)'; C(K)'; D(K)']
    end %... of 2nd test
disp(' ')
disp(' 3rd test: G = gcd(E) and gcd(flipud(E)) :')
g = [1, 3, 11, 17] ; e = [77; 132; 144] ; E = e*g ;
E = [E, [124+t53; t53-19; t53+254]] ; g = [g, 13] ;
g0 = gcd(E) ; g1 = gcd(flipud(E)) ;
k = (g0~=g)|(g1~=g) ;
if ~any(k(:))
```

```
    disp(' 3rd test passed.')
else %... when matrix mult'n is not accumulated extra-precisely ...
    disp(' 3rd test failed in these cases:')
    disp(' E;gcd(E):gcd(flipud(E));trueGCD = ')
    F = [E(:,k); g0(k); g1(k); g(k)]
end %... of 3rd test
disp(' '), disp(' ')
%
```

The following GCDtest results were obtained from an IBM T21 laptop running MS Windows 2000, and were replicated on a Dell Optiplex running MS Windows XP. As expected, the tests failed when run with the default MatMultPrecn $=53$ and passed with MatMultPrecn $=64$.

As expected, the failures for MatMultPrecn $=53$ were replicated by PC MATLAB 5.3, and the passed tests for MatMultPrecn $=64$ were replicated by PC MATLABs 3.5 and 4.2, and by Mac Matlabs 3.5, 4.2 and 5.2 on a 68040-based Mac Quadra 950. Passed tests were replicated also by Mac MatLab 5.2 with MatMultPrecn $=-53$ revealing Fused Multiply-Adds on a Power Mac 8600 and on an iMac.

```
    GCDtest puts its results into GcdTest.txt
DateTime = 2008 9 14 14:16:15
Machine = PCWIN
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
MATLAB & & Version 6.5
\end{tabular}
```

| 3 | $9.00719925474099 \mathrm{e}+015$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| $1.20892581961463 \mathrm{e}+024$ | 28059810762433 |
| 3 | 28059810762433 |
| 3 | 28059810762433 |
| 1 | 1 |


| 3 | $9.00719925474099 \mathrm{e}+015$ | $9.00719925474099 \mathrm{e}+015$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $1.20892581961463 \mathrm{e}+024$ | 28059810762433 | 28059810762433 |
| 3 | 28059810762433 | 1 |
| 1 | 0 | -1 |
| 0 | 1 | 321 |
| 3 | 28059810762433 | 1 |
| 0 | 1 | 321 |
| 1 | 0 | -1 |
| 1 | 1 | -14029905381217 |
| $-4.02975273204876 \mathrm{e}+023$ | -1 | $4.50359962737066 \mathrm{e}+015$ |

```
```

    1st test: G = gcd(A, B) and gcd(B, A) :
    ```
    1st test: G = gcd(A, B) and gcd(B, A) :
    1st test failed in these cases:
    1st test failed in these cases:
    A;B;gcd(A,B);gcd(B,A);trueGCD =
    A;B;gcd(A,B);gcd(B,A);trueGCD =
F =
F =
    2nd test: [G, C, D] = gcd(A,B) and gcd(B, A) :
    2nd test: [G, C, D] = gcd(A,B) and gcd(B, A) :
    2nd test failed in these cases:
    2nd test failed in these cases:
    A;B;[gcd(A,B);C0;D0];[gcd(B,A);C1;D1];trueGCD;C;D =
    A;B;[gcd(A,B);C0;D0];[gcd(B,A);C1;D1];trueGCD;C;D =
F =
```

F =

```
```

    3rd test: G = gcd(E) and gcd(flipud(E)) :
    3rd test failed in these cases:
E;gcd(E):gcd(flipud(E));trueGCD =
F =
9.00719925474112e+015
9.00719925474097e+015
9.00719925474125e+015
1
1 3
1 3

```
```

system_dependent('setprecision', 64)

```
system_dependent('setprecision', 64)
gcdtest
gcdtest
    GCDtest puts its results into GcdTest.txt
    GCDtest puts its results into GcdTest.txt
DateTime = 2008 9 14 14:16:52
DateTime = 2008 9 14 14:16:52
Machine = PCWIN
Machine = PCWIN
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
MATLAB
Version 6.5
(R13)
MatMultPrecn =
    6 4
    1st test: G = gcd(A, B) and gcd(B, A) :
    1st test passed.
    2nd test: [G, C, D] = gcd(A,B) and gcd(B, A) :
    2nd test passed.
    3rd test: G = gcd(E) and gcd(flipud(E)) :
    3rd test passed.
quit
%
```

```
% lcmtest.m is a Matlab script to test W.K.'s version of lcm.m
format compact, format long g
diary lcmtest.txt
disp (' lcmtest puts its results into diary lcmtest.txt')
DateTime = round(clock)
Machine = computer, ver
MatMultPrecn = precn
disp( ' ')
disp (' 1st test: L = lcm(A, B) and lcm(B, A) :')
p = 28059810762433 ; i = 712176643 ; %... primes
j1 = 2203 ; j2 = 5741 ; %... primes
k1 = 2205 ; k = k1*j2 ; j = j1*j2 ;
t52 = 2^52 ; t53 = 2* t52 ; t80 = 2^80 ;
A = [ 77, j, i, i; 3, 15, t53, t53-1 ] ;
B = [132, k, j, k; t80, 2+t52, p, p ] ;
L = [924, j*k1, i*j, i*k; 3*t80, 10+5*t52, p*t53, t53*p-p ] ;
L0 = lcm(A, B) ;
L1 = lcm(B, A) ;
K = (L ~= LO)|(L ~= L1) ;
if ~any(K(:))
        disp(' 1st test passed.')
    else %... when matrix mult'n is not accumulated extra-precisely ...
                disp(' 1st test failed in these cases:')
        F = [A(K)'; B(K)'; L0(K)'; L1(K)'; L(K)'] ;
        disp(' A;B;lcm(A,B);lcm(B,A);trueLCMrounded = '), F
    end %... of 1st test
disp(' ')
disp(' 2nd test: L = lcm(A, B, Inf) and lcm(B, A, Inf) :')
A = [ 77, j, i, i; 3, 15, t53, t53-1 ] ;
B = [132, k, j, k; t80, 2+t52, p, p ] ;
L = [924, j*k1, i*j, Inf; 3*t80, Inf, p*t53, Inf ] ;
LO = lcm(A, B, Inf) ;
L1 = lcm(B, A, Inf) ;
K = (L ~= LO)|(L ~= L1) ;
if ~any(K(:))
        disp(' 2nd test passed.')
    else %... when matrix mult'n is not accumulated extra-precisely ...
        disp(' 2nd test failed in these cases:')
        F = [A(K)'; B(K)'; L0 (K)'; L1 (K)'; L(K)'] ;
        disp(' A;B;lcm(A,B,Inf);lcm(B,A,Inf);expectedLCMchecked = '), F
    end %... of 2nd test
disp(' ')
disp(' 3rd test: L = lcm(E) and lcm(flipud(E)) :')
g = [1, 3, 11, 17] ; e = [77; 132; 144; 11088] ; E = e*g ;
l = E(4,:) ; E = E(1:3,:) ;
E = [E, [i, j; j, i; k, k]] ; l = [l, Inf, Inf] ;
l0 = lcm(E) ; l1 = lcm(flipud(E)) ;
k = (l0~=l)|(l1~=l) ;
if ~any(k(:))
    disp(' 3rd test passed.')
    else %... when matrix mult'n is not accumulated extra-precisely ...
```

```
        disp(' 3rd test failed in these cases:')
        disp(' E;lcm(E):lcm(flipud(E));expectedLCM = ')
        F = [E(:,k); lO(k); ll(k); l(k)]
    end %... of 3rd test
disp(' ')
disp(' 4th test: lcm(0, x), lcm(Inf, x) and lcm(Inf, 0) :')
a = [ 77, 0, Inf, 0, Inf, Inf ] ;
b = [ 132, 77, 77, 0, Inf, 0 ] ;
L = [ 924, 0, Inf, 0, Inf, NaN ] ;
L0 = lcm(a,b) ; L1 = lcm(b,a) ; L2 = lcm(a,b,99) ;
K = [0,0,0,0,0, isnan(L0(6))&isnan(L1 (6))&isnan(L2(6))] ;
K = ((L0==L) & (L1==L) & (L2==L)) | K ;
if all(K(:))
            disp(' 4th test passed.')
    else
        disp(' 4th test failed in these cases:')
        disp(' a;b;lcm(a,b);lcm(b,a);lcm(a,b,99);expectedLCM = ')
        F = [a(~K); b(~K); LO(~K); L1 (~K); L2(~K); L(~K)]
    end %... of 4th test
disp(' '), disp(' ')
```

\%
The following LCMtest results were obtained from an IBM T21 laptop running MS Windows 2000, and were replicated on a Dell Optiplex running MS Windows XP. As expected, the tests failed when run with the default MatMultPrecn $=53$ and passed with MatMultPrecn $=64$.
As expected, the failures for MatMultPrecn $=53$ were replicated by PC MATLAB 5.3, and the passed tests for MatMultPrecn $=64$ were replicated by PC MATLABs 3.5 and 4.2, and by Mac MATLABs 3.5, 4.2 and 5.2 on a 68040-based Mac Quadra 950. Passed tests were replicated also by Mac MATLAB 5.2 with MatMultPrecn $=-53$ revealing Fused Multiply-Adds on a Power Mac 8600 and on an iMac.


```
    A;B;lcm(A,B,Inf);lcm(B,A,Inf);expectedLCMchecked =
F =
    Columns 1 through 3
                3
                    9.00719925474099e+015
                        28059810762433
                            9.015376466955
            1.20892581961463e+024
            1.20892581961463e+024
            1.20892581961463e+024
            Inf
                        9.01537646695592e+015
            3.62677745884389e+024
    Column 4
                9.00719925474099e+015
                    28059810762433
            2.5274030658756e+029
            2.5274030658756e+029
                    Inf
    3rd test: L = lcm(E) and lcm(flipud(E)) :
    3rd test failed in these cases:
    E;lcm(E):lcm(flipud(E));expectedLCM =
F =
\begin{tabular}{rr}
712176643 & 12647423 \\
12647423 & 712176643 \\
12658905 & 12658905
\end{tabular}
            1.98608743567039e+019 1.98608743567039e+019
            1.98608743567039e+019 1.14021279681837e+023
                    Inf Inf
    4th test: lcm(0, x), lcm(Inf, x) and lcm(Inf, 0) :
    4th test passed.
```

```
system_dependent('setprecision', 64)
```

system_dependent('setprecision', 64)
lcmtest
lcmtest puts its results into diary lcmtest.txt
DateTime = 2008 9 14 14:18:54
Machine = PCWIN

```
```

MATLAB Version 6.5 (R13)

```
MATLAB Version 6.5 (R13)
MatMultPrecn = 64
    1st test: L = lcm(A, B) and lcm(B, A) :
    1st test passed.
    2nd test: L = lcm(A, B, Inf) and lcm(B, A, Inf) :
    2nd test passed.
    3rd test: L = lcm(E) and lcm(flipud(E)) :
    3rd test passed.
    4th test: lcm(0, x), lcm(Inf, x) and lcm(Inf, 0) :
    4th test passed.
quit
```

