

# Algorithms

H. J. WEGSTEIN, Editor

ALGORITHM 112  
POSITION OF POINT RELATIVE TO POLYGON  
M. SHIMRAT  
University of Alberta, Calgary, Alberta, Canada

**Boolean procedure** *POINT IN POLYGON* ( $n, x, y, x0, y0$ );  
**value**  $n, x0, y0$ ; **integer**  $n$ ; **array**  $x, y$ ; **real**  $x0, y0$ ;  
**comment** if the points  $(x[i], y[i])$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ) are—in this cyclic order—the vertices of a simple closed polygon and  $(x0, y0)$  is a point not on any side of the polygon, then the procedure determines, by setting “point in polygon” to **true**, whether  $(x0, y0)$  lies in the interior of the polygon;  
**begin integer**  $i$ ; **Boolean**  $b$ ;  
 $x[n+1] := x[1]$ ;  $y[n+1] := y[1]$ ;  $b := \text{true}$ ;  
**for**  $i := 1$  **step 1 until**  $n$  **do**  
  **if**  $(y < y[i] \equiv y > y[i+1]) \wedge$   
     $x0 - x[i] - (y0 - y[i]) \times (x[i+1] - x[i]) / (y[i+1] - y[i]) < 0$   
  **then**  $b := \neg b$ ;  
   $\text{POINT IN POLYGON} := \neg b$ ;  
**end** *POINT IN POLYGON*

ALGORITHM 113  
TREESORT  
ROBERT W. FLOYD  
Computer Associates, Inc., Woburn, Mass.

**procedure** *TREESORT* (*UNSORTED*,  $n$ , *SORTED*,  $k$ ); **value**  $n, k$ ;  
**integer**  $n, k$ ; **array** *UNSORTED*, *SORTED*;  
**comment** *TREESORT* sorts the smallest  $k$  elements of the  $n$ -component array *UNSORTED* into the  $k$ -component array *SORTED* (the two arrays may be the same). The number of operations is on the order of  $2 \times n + k \times \log_2(n)$ . The number of auxiliary storage cells required is on the order of  $2 \times n$ . It is assumed that procedures are available for finding the minimum of two quantities, for packing one real number and one integer into a word, and for obtaining the left and right half of a packed word. The value of infinity is assumed to be larger than that of any element of *UNSORTED*;  
**begin integer**  $i, j$ ; **array**  $m[1:2 \times n - 1]$ ;  
**for**  $i := 1$  **step 1 until**  $n$  **do**  $m[n+i-1] := \text{pack}(\text{UNSORTED}[i], n+i-1)$ ;  
**for**  $i := n-1$  **step -1 until 1 do**  $m[i] := \text{minimum}(m[2 \times i], m[2 \times i + 1])$ ;  
**for**  $j := 1$  **step 1 until**  $k$  **do**  
  **begin** *SORTED* [ $j$ ] := *left half* ( $m[1]$ );  $i := \text{right half}(m[1])$ ;  
   $m[i] := \text{infinity}$ ;  
  **for**  $i := i \div 2$  **while**  $i > 0$  **do**  $m[i] := \text{minimum}(m[2 \times i], m[2 \times i + 1])$   
  **end**  
**end** *TREESORT*

ALGORITHM 114  
GENERATION OF PARTITIONS WITH CONSTRAINTS  
FRANK STOCKMAL  
System Development Corp., Santa Monica, Calif.

**procedure** *CP GENERATOR* ( $N, K, H, p, F, Z$ ); **integer**  $N, K, H$ ; **integer array**  $p$ ; **Boolean**  $F, Z$ ;  
**comment** *CP GENERATOR* generates a partition of  $N$  into  $K$  parts, no part greater than  $H$ . Each partition is represented by the array of parts  $p[1]$  thru  $p[K]$ , where  $p[1] \geq p[2] \geq \dots \geq p[K]$ . Initial entry is made with  $F = \text{true}$  and  $Z = \text{true}$  if parts = 0 are allowable, or  $F = \text{true}$  and  $Z = \text{false}$  if only nonzero parts are desired. Upon initial entry, **procedure** ignores the input array  $p$ , sets  $F = \text{false}$ , and generates the initial partition. Subsequent calls made with  $F = \text{false}$  will cause **procedure** to operate upon the input partition to produce another partition if one exists, so that all possible unpermuted partitions with the specified constraints will be produced if *CP GENERATOR* is allowed to operate upon its previous output. When this scheme is followed, and initial entry is made with  $F = \text{true}$ ,  $Z = \text{true}$ ,  $K = N$ ,  $H = N$ , all possible unpermuted partitions of  $N$  will be produced. Upon generating the last partition, **procedure** resets  $F$  to **true**. The input parameters are restricted as follows:  $K \geq 1$ ,  $H \geq 1$ ,  $p[1] \geq p[2] \geq \dots \geq p[K]$ . For  $Z = \text{true}$ ,  $N$  is restricted to the range  $0 \leq N \leq KH$ , and for  $Z = \text{false}$ ,  $K \leq N \leq KH$ . A call should not be made with  $p[1] - p[K] < 2$  and  $F = \text{false}$ ;  
**begin integer**  $a, b, i, j, q, r$ ;  
  **if**  $F$  **then go to** *first*;  
   $a := p[1] - p[2] - 2$ ;  $j := 2$ ;  
*test*: **if**  $p[1] - p[j] \geq 2$  **then go to** *divide*;  
   $a := a - 1 + j \times (p[j] - p[j+1])$ ;  $j := j + 1$ ; **go to** *test*;  
*first*: **if**  $Z$  **then go to** *alpha*;  
   $a := N - K$ ;  $p[K] := 0$ ; **go to** *beta*;  
*alpha*:  $a := N$ ;  $p[K] := -1$ ;  
*beta*:  $F := \text{false}$ ;  $j := K$ ;  
*divide*:  $b := H - 1 - p[j]$ ;  $q := \text{entier}(a/b)$ ;  $r := a - b \times q$ ;  
  **for**  $i := 1$  **step 1 until**  $q$  **do**  $p[i] := H$ ;  
  **if**  $q = K$  **then go to** *last*;  
  **for**  $i := q + 1$  **step 1 until**  $j$  **do**  $p[i] := 1 + p[j]$ ;  
   $p[q+1] := r + p[q+1]$ ;  
  **if**  $p[1] - p[K] \geq 2$  **then go to** *exit*;  
*last*:  $F := \text{true}$ ;  
*exit*: **end** *CP GENERATOR*

ALGORITHM 115  
PERM  
H. F. TROTTER  
Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.

**procedure** *PERM* ( $x, n$ ); **value**  $n$ ;  
**integer**  $n$ ; **array**  $x$ ;  
**comment** This algorithm was inspired by the procedure *PERMUTE* of Peck and Schrack (Algorithm 86, *Comm. ACM*

Apr. 1962) and performs the same function. Each call of *PERM* changes the order of the first  $n$  components of  $x$ , and  $n!$  successive calls will generate all  $n!$  permutations. A nonlocal Boolean variable '*first*' is assumed, which must be **true** when *PERM* is first called, to cause proper initialization. The first call of *PERM* makes '*first*' **false**, and it remains so (unless changed by the external program) until the exit from the ( $n!$ )th call of *PERM*. At that time  $x$  is restored to its original order and '*first*' is made **true**.

The excuse for adding *PERM* to the growing pile of permutation generators is that, at the expense of some extra **own** storage, it cuts the manipulation of  $x$  to the theoretical minimum of  $n!$  transpositions, and appears to offer an advantage in speed. It also has the (probably useless) property that the permutations it generates are alternately odd and even;

```

begin own integer array  $p, d[2:n]$ ; integer  $k, q$ ; real  $t$ ;
if first then initialize:
begin for  $k := 2$  step 1 until  $n$  do
  begin  $p[k] := 0$ ;  $d[k] := 1$  end;
  first := false
end initialize;
 $k := 0$ ;
INDEX:  $p[n] := q := p[n] + d[n]$ ;
  if  $q = n$  then
    begin  $d[n] := -1$ ; go to LOOP end;
  if  $q \neq 0$  then go to TRANSPOSE;
   $d[n] := 1$ ;  $k := k + 1$ ;
  LOOP: if  $n > 2$  then begin
    comment Note that  $n$  was called by value;
     $n := n - 1$ ; go to INDEX end LOOP;
  Final exit:  $q := 1$ ; first := true;
  TRANSPOSE:  $q := q + k$ ;  $t := x[q]$ ;
   $x[q] := x[q + 1]$ ;  $x[q + 1] := t$ 
end PERM;

```

## ALGORITHM 116 COMPLEX DIVISION

ROBERT L. SMITH

Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.

```

procedure complexdiv ( $a, b, c, d$ ) results: ( $e, f$ );
value  $a, b, c, d$ ; real  $a, b, c, d$ ;
comment complexdiv yields the complex quotient of  $a + ib$ 
  divided by  $c + id$ . The method used here tends to avoid arithmetic
  overflow or underflow. Such spills could otherwise occur when
  squaring the component parts of the denominator if the usual method
  were used;
begin real  $r, den$ ;
if  $abs(c) \geq abs(d)$  then
  begin  $r := d/c$ ;
     $den := c + r \times d$ ;
     $e := (a + b \times r)/den$ ;
     $f := (b - a \times r)/den$ ;
  end
else
  begin  $r := c/d$ ;
     $den := d + r \times c$ ;
     $e := (a \times r + b)/den$ ;
     $f := (b \times r - a)/den$ ;
  end
end complexdiv

```

## ALGORITHM 117

### MAGIC SQUARE (EVEN ORDER)

D. M. COLLISON

Elliott Brothers (London) Limited, Borehamwood, Herts.,  
England

```

procedure magiceven ( $n, x$ ); value  $n$ ; integer array  $x$ ; integer  $n$ ;
comment the method of Devedec for even  $n$  is described in
  "Mathematical Recreations" by M. Kraitchik, pp. 150-2. Enter
  with side of square  $n$  to produce a magic square of the integers
   $1 - n \uparrow 2$  in  $x$ , where  $n \geq 4$ ;
begin integer  $a, b, n2, nn$ ; Boolean  $p, q, r$ ;
   $n2 := n \div 2$ ;  $nn := n \times n$ ;
  begin
    procedure alpha ( $p, q, a, h$ ); value  $p, q, a, h$ ; integer  $p, q, a$ ;
      Boolean  $h$ ;
      Comment pattern 0/0/0/... ;
      begin integer  $r$ ;
        for  $r := p$  step 1 until  $q$  do begin
           $x[r, a] :=$  if  $h$  then  $(a \times n - n + r)$  else  $(nn - a \times n + 1 + n - r)$ ;  $h := \neg h$  end;
        end alpha;
      procedure beta ( $p, q, a, h$ ); value  $p, q, a, h$ ; integer  $p, q, a$ ;
        Boolean  $h$ ;
        comment pattern 1 - 1 - 1 - ... ;
        begin integer  $r$ ;
          for  $r := p$  step 1 until  $q$  do begin
             $x[r, a] :=$  if  $h$  then  $(nn - a \times n + r)$  else  $(a \times n + 1 - r)$ ;
             $h := \neg h$  end;
          end beta;
        procedure gamma ( $p, q, a, h$ ); value  $p, q, a, h$ ; integer  $p, q, a$ ;
          Boolean  $h$ ;
          comment pattern /-/-/-... ;
          begin integer  $r$ ;
            for  $r := p$  step 1 until  $q$  do begin
               $x[r, a] :=$  if  $h$  then  $(nn - a \times n + n - r + 1)$  else  $(a \times n + 1 - r)$ ;
               $h := \neg h$  end;
            end gamma;
          comment program begins;
           $p := q := (n - (n \div 4) \times 4 = 0)$ ;  $r :=$  true;
          for  $a := 1$  step 1 until  $(n2 - 1)$  do begin
             $beta(1, a - 1, a, r)$ ;  $alpha(a, n2 - 1, a, \text{true})$ ;
             $x[n2, a] :=$  if  $q$  then  $(nn - a \times n + n2 + 1)$  else  $(nn - a \times n + n2)$ ;
             $alpha(n2 + 1, n, a, \neg q)$ ;
             $q := \neg q$ ;  $r := \neg r$  end;
           $alpha(1, n2 - 1, n2, \neg p)$ ;  $alpha(n2 + 2, n, n2, \text{false})$ ;
           $gamma(1, n2 - 1, n2 + 1, p)$ ;  $gamma(n2 + 2, n, n2 + 1, \text{true})$ ;
           $q := p$ ;  $r :=$  true;
          for  $a := (n2 + 2)$  step 1 until  $n$  do begin
             $beta(1, n - a, a, q)$ ;  $x[n - a + 1, a] := a \times n - a + 1$ ;
             $beta(n - a + 2, n2 - 1, a, \text{true})$ ;
            if  $r$  then for  $b := n2, n2 + 1$  do  $x[b, a] := nn - a \times n + n - b + 1$ 
              else begin  $x[n2, a] := nn - a \times n + n2$ ;
                 $x[n2 + 1, a] := a \times n - n2 + 1$  end;
             $beta(n2 + 2, a - 1, a, \neg r)$ ;  $alpha(a, n, a, \text{true})$ ;
             $q := \neg q$ ;  $r := \neg r$  end;
          for  $a := n2, n2 + 1$  do for  $b := n2, n2 + 1$  do
             $x[b, a] :=$  if  $p$  then  $(a \times n - n + b)$  else  $(nn - a \times n + n - b + 1)$ ;
          if  $\neg p$  then begin
            for  $a := n2, n2 + 1$  do  $x[n2 - 1, a] := a \times n - n2 + 2$ ;
            for  $b := n2, n2 + 1$  do  $x[b, n2 + 2] := n \times n2 - 2 \times n + b$  end;
          end end magiceven

```

## ALGORITHM 118

### MAGIC SQUARE (ODD ORDER)

D. M. COLLISON

Elliott Brothers (London) Limited, Borehamwood, Herts.,  
England

```

procedure magicodd (n, x); value n; integer n; integer
  array x;
comment for given side n the procedure generates a magic
  square of the integers  $1 - n \uparrow 2$ . For the method of De la
  Loubère, see M. Kraitchik, "Mathematical Recreations," p.
  149. n must be odd and  $n \geq 3$ ;
begin integer i, j, k;
  for i := 1 step 1 until n do
    for j := 1 step 1 until n do x[i, j] := 0;
  i := (n + 1) ÷ 2; j := n;
  for k := 1 step 1 until n × n do begin
    if x[i, j] ≠ 0 then begin i := i - 1; j := j - 2;
      if i < 1 then i := i + n; if j < 1 then j := j + n end;
    x[i, j] := k;
    i := i + 1; if i > n then i := i - n;
    j := j + 1; if j > n then j := j - n;
  end;
end magicodd

```

## ALGORITHM 119

### EVALUATION OF A PERT NETWORK

BURTON EISENMAN AND MARTIN SHAPIRO

United Nuclear Corp., White Plains, N. Y.

```

procedure pert (nmax, i, j, te, st, emax, l, es, at);

```

**comment** An algorithm describing an iterative procedure for evaluating a PERT network that permits the use of arbitrarily ordered activities and event identifiers such that an upper triangular matrix type of solution is unnecessary.

It has been observed by investigations of PERT networks, that an  $N \times N$  matrix whose rows are designated as predecessor and whose columns are designated as successor events, has an entry in the (*i*, *j*)-element representing the activity time required in going from event *i* to event *j*. By elementary transformations, the matrix is transformed generally into an upper triangular matrix. The resultant upper triangular matrix is well ordered (i.e. any activity time appearing in a column is not dependent upon those activity times which appear in columns to the right of it).

This precise manipulation generally demands considerable running time. By direct evaluation not requiring a collection of elementary transformations, it is possible to evaluate the network with considerable reduction of running time;

```

integer nmax, emax;

```

```

real st;

```

```

integer array i, j, l;

```

```

real array te, es, at;

```

**comment** Given the total number of activities, *nmax*, the preceding and succeeding event identifiers, *i<sub>n</sub>* and *j<sub>n</sub>*, the corresponding expected time, *te*, for each activity, and the starting time, *st*, of the network, this procedure computes the early start and late finish times, *es<sub>e</sub>* and *at<sub>e</sub>*, for each event, *l<sub>e</sub>*, in the network;

```

begin

```

```

  procedure scan (e, t, l);

```

```

  integer e, t;

```

```

  integer array l;

```

**comment** Given the number of events, *e*-1, contained thus far in vector array, *l*, and an event identifier *i<sub>n</sub>* or *j<sub>n</sub>*, stored in *t*,

this procedure scans the existing array, *l*, to determine whether the event should be added to the list or not. If it is to be added, it becomes *l<sub>e</sub>* and *e* replaces the event identifier. If it is not added, *k* replaces the event identifier.;

```

begin

```

```

  integer k;

```

```

  if e = 1 then go to add;

```

```

  for k := e-1 step -1 until 1 do

```

```

  begin if t = l[k] then

```

```

  begin t := k;

```

```

    go to out;

```

```

  end

```

```

end;

```

```

  add: l[e] := t;

```

```

        t := e;

```

```

        e := e + 1;

```

```

  out:

```

```

end scan;

```

```

  integer n, e, s, t, k;

```

```

  real a, x;

```

```

  e := 1;

```

```

  for n := 1 step 1 until nmax do

```

```

  begin t := j[n];

```

```

    scan (e, t, l);

```

```

    j[n] := t;

```

```

    t := i[n];

```

```

    scan (e, t, l);

```

```

    i[n] := t

```

```

  end;

```

**comment** By means of the switch, *s*, we will either compute the activity times, *at<sub>e</sub>*, and transfer the values to the early start vector, *es<sub>e</sub>*, or we will compute *at<sub>e</sub>* without any transfer process, in which case the late finish times will be obtained.;

```

  emax := e - 1;

```

```

  s := 1;

```

```

  a := st;

```

```

s1: k := emax;

```

```

  for e := 1 step 1 until emax do

```

```

  at[e] := a;

```

```

s2: for n := 1 step 1 until nmax do

```

```

begin if l[i[n]] > 0 then

```

```

begin switch s := b1, b2;

```

```

b1: x := abs (at[i[n]]) + te[n];

```

```

  if x > abs (at[j[n]]) then go to l1;

```

```

  go to l2;

```

```

b2: x := abs (at[i[n]]) - te[n];

```

```

  if x < abs (at[j[n]]) then

```

```

  l1: at[j[n]] := - x;

```

```

  l2:

```

```

end

```

```

end;

```

```

  for e := 1 step 1 until emax do

```

```

begin if l[e] < 0 then

```

```

begin if at[e] < 0 then

```

```

begin l[e] := abs (l[e]);

```

```

        k := k + 1;

```

```

s3: at[e] := abs (at[e]);

```

```

  go to l3

```

```

end;

```

```

  go to l3

```

```

end;

```

```

  if at[e] ≥ 0 then

```

```

begin l[e] := - l[e];

```

```

        k := k - 1;

```

```

  go to l3

```

```

end;

```

```

  go to s3;

```

```

l3:
end;
    if  $k \neq 0$  then go to s2;
    switch s := g1, g2;
g1:   s := 2;
    for n := 1 step 1 until nmax do
begin
    t := i[n];
    i[n] := j[n];
    j[n] := t
end;
    a := 0;
    for e := 1 step 1 until emax do
begin
    es[e] := at[e];
    l[e] := abs (l[e]);
    if at[e] > a then
    a := at[e]
end;
    go to s1;
g2:   for e := 1 step 1 until emax do
    l[e] := abs (l[e]);
end pert

```

```

    a[j, k] := a[j, i];
    a[j, i] := - c[j] × y;
    b[j] := a[i, j] := a[i, j] × y
end;
a[i, i] := y;
j := z[i];
z[i] := z[k];
z[k] := j;
for k := 1 step 1 until l, p step 1 until n do
    for j := 1 step 1 until l, p step 1 until n do
        a[k, j] := a[k, j] - b[j] × c[k]
    end;
for i := 1 step 1 until n do
begin
REPEAT: k := z [i];
    if k=i then go to ADVANCE;
    for j := 1 step 1 until n do
begin
        w := a [i, j];
        a [i, j] := a [k, j];
        a [k, j] := w
end;
        p := z [i];
        z [i] := z [k];
        z [k] := p;
        delta := - delta;
        go to REPEAT;
ADVANCE: end;
end

```

## ALGORITHM 120 MATRIX INVERSION II

RICHARD GEORGE\*

Particle Accelerator Division Argonne National Laboratory  
Argonne, Illinois

\* Work supported by the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.

```

procedure INVERSION II (n, a, epsilon, ALARM, delta);
comment This is a revision of Algorithm 58. It accomplishes inversion of the matrix a, with the result stored in matrix a. The order of the matrix is n. If in the process of calculating, any pivot element has an absolute value less than epsilon, there will be a jump to the non-local label ALARM. The variable delta will contain the value of the determinant of the original matrix on normal exit, zero or a very small number on exit to ALARM.;
value n;
array a;
real epsilon, delta;
integer n;
begin
    array b, c[1:n]; real w, y;
    integer array z[1:n]; integer i, j, k, l, p;
    delta := 1.0;
    for j := 1 step 1 until n do
        z[j] := j;
    for i := 1 step 1 until n do
begin
        k := i; y := a[i, i]; l := i-1; p := i+1;
        for j := p step 1 until n do
begin
            w := a[i, j];
            if abs(w) > abs(y) then
begin
                k := j;
                y := w
            end;
        end;
        delta := delta × y;
        if abs(y) < epsilon then go to ALARM;
        y := 1.0 / y;
        for j := 1 step 1 until n do
begin
            c[j] := a[j, k];

```

## CERTIFICATION OF ALGORITHM 18 RATIONAL INTERPOLATION BY CONTINUED FRACTIONS

[R. W. Floyd, *Comm. ACM.*, Sept. 1960]

HENRY C. THACHER, JR.\*

Reactor Engineering Div., Argonne National Lab.,  
Argonne, Ill.

\* Work supported by the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission

The body of procedure *confr* was tested with the ALGOL translator system written for the LGP-30 computer by the Dartmouth College Computer Center. No syntactical errors were found in the procedure body, except for a missing semicolon after the array declaration. The translated algorithm gave satisfactory results when tested on values of  $(4x+1)/(x+4)$  at any three of the points  $x = 1, 2, 3, 4$ . When all four points were used, a division overflow occurred in the statement **for**  $i := 1$  **step** 1 **until**  $j-1$  **do**  $aa := (xx - x[i])/(aa - a[i])$ ; which forms the reciprocal differences. An overflow of this type will occur whenever  $y[j]$  is approximated to high accuracy by one of the continued fractions based only on the points  $x[i]$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$  with  $k$  less than  $j$ . Unless  $i = j-1$ , the difficulty may be overcome by setting  $aa$  equal to the largest real representable in the computer whenever division overflow would occur. When  $i = j-1$ , the difficulty is irretrievable, and the data points must be reordered.

CERTIFICATION OF ALGORITHM 19  
BINOMIAL COEFFICIENTS [Richard R. Kenyon,  
*Comm. ACM* Oct., 1960]

RICHARD GEORGE\*

Particle Accelerator Div., Argonne National Lab., Ar-  
gonne, Ill.

\* Work supported by the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.

This procedure was tested on the LGP-30, using the compiler  
ALGOL-30 from Dartmouth College Computation Center. The fol-  
lowing changes were found necessary:

(1) Within the **comment**, the line

$$C_{i+1}^n = (n - 1)C_i^n / (i + 1)$$

should be

$$C_{i+1}^n = (n - i)C_i^n / (i + 1)$$

(2) The line defining the iteration loop

**for**  $i := 0$  **step** 1 **until**  $b$  **do**

should be

**for**  $i := 0$  **step** 1 **until**  $b - 1$  **do**

(3) The sequence

**end**  $C := a$  **end**

should be

**end;**  $C := a$  **end**

CERTIFICATION OF ALGORITHM 35  
SIEVE [T. C. Wood, *Comm. ACM*, Mar. 1961]

J. S. HILLMORE

Elliott Bros. (London) Ltd., Borehamwood, Herts.,  
England

The statement:

**go to if**  $n/p[i] = n \div p[i]$  **then**  $b1$  **else**  $b2$ ;

was changed to the statement:

**go to if**  $(n \div p[i]) \times p[i] = n$  **then**  $b1$  **else**  $b2$ ;

This avoids any inaccuracy that might result from introducing  
real arithmetic into the evaluation of the relation.

The modified algorithm was successfully run using the Elliott  
ALGOL translator on the National-Elliott 803.

CERTIFICATION OF ALGORITHM 37  
TELESCOPE 1 [K. A. Brons, *Comm. ACM*, Mar., 1961]

HENRY C. THACHER, JR.\*

Reactor Engineering Div., Argonne National Lab.,  
Argonne, Ill.

\* Work supported by the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.

The body of *Telescope 1* was compiled and tested on the LGP-30  
using the ALGOL 60 translator system developed by the Dartmouth  
College Computer Center. No syntactical errors were found, and  
the program ran satisfactorily. The 10th degree polynomial ob-  
tained by truncating the exponential series was telescoped using  
 $\lim = .1_{10} - 2$  and  $L = 1.0$ . The result was  $N = 3$ ,  $\epsilon =$   
.2103005<sub>10</sub> - 3, and coefficients +.9997892, -.9930727, +.4636493,  
-.1026781. The error curve for the telescoped polynomial was  
computed for  $x = 0(.02)1.0$ . The error extrema were bounded by  
 $\epsilon$ s to within 0.5%. The discrepancy is within the range of input  
conversion and round-off error.

CERTIFICATION OF ALGORITHM 52  
A SET OF TEST MATRICES [J. R. Herndon, *Comm.*  
*ACM*, Apr. 1961]

J. S. HILLMORE

Elliott Bros. (London) Ltd., Borehamwood, Herts.,  
England

The algorithm was corrected as recommended by H. E. Gilbert  
in his certification [*Comm. ACM*, Aug. 1961] and then successfully  
run using the Elliott ALGOL translator on the National-Elliott 803.  
The matrices so generated were used to test the matrix inversion  
procedure GJR given by H. R. Schwarz in his article "An Intro-  
duction to ALGOL" [*Comm. ACM*, Feb. 1962].

CERTIFICATION OF ALGORITHM 57  
BER OR BEI FUNCTION [John R. Herndon, *Comm.*  
*ACM*, Apr. 1961]

HENRY C. THACHER, JR.\*

Reactor Engineering Div., Argonne National Lab.,  
Argonne, Ill.

\* Work supported by the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.

The body of Algorithm 57 was tested on the LGP-30 using the  
ALGOL 60 translator developed by the Dartmouth College Com-  
puter Center. No syntactical errors were found. For  $z = 0.1(0.1)1.0$ ,  
with a 7+ significant decimal arithmetic routine, the program  
gave results with errors less than 5 (and for  $z = 1(1)5$  less than 12)  
in the seventh digit. For large values of  $z$ , serious cancellation  
errors may occur. For example, for  $z = 20$ , more than 2 decimals  
of significance can be lost in this way.

REMARK ON ALGORITHM 58  
MATRIX INVERSION [Donald Cohen, *Comm. ACM*,  
May, 1961]

GEORGE STRUBLE

University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon

For the last seven lines, beginning with  $a[k, j] := a[k, i]$ , substi-  
tute:

$a[k, j] := a[k, j] - b[j] \times c[k]$  **end;**

$l := 0$ ;

**back:**  $l := l + 1$ ;

**again:**  $k := z[l]$ ;

**if**  $k \neq l$  **then**

**begin for**  $i := 1$  **step** 1 **until**  $n$  **do**

**begin**  $w := a[l, i]$ ;

$a[l, i] := a[k, i]$ ;

$a[k, i] := w$  **end;**

$z[l] := z[k]$ ;

$z[k] := k$ ;

**go to again end;**

**else if**  $l \neq n$  **go to back**

**end invert**

CERTIFICATION OF ALGORITHM 58  
MATRIX INVERSION [Donald Cohen, *Comm. ACM*,  
May, 1961]

RICHARD GEORGE\*

Particle Accelerator Div., Argonne National Lab.,  
Argonne, Ill.

\* Work supported by the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.

This procedure was programmed in FORTRAN and reduced to machine code mechanically. It was run on the Argonne-built computing machine, GEORGE. A floating-point routine was used which allows maximum accuracy to 31 bits.

There are a number of errors of various types:

- (1) There are eight **begin**'s and only seven **end**'s.
- (2) The line

```
a[k, j] := a[k, i] - b[j] × c[k] end;
```

should be

```
a[k, j] := a[k, j] - b[j] × c[k] end;
```

(3) The permutation of rows of the inverted matrix and permutation of elements of the integer array  $z$  must be carried out simultaneously. This algorithm fails to do this, and consequently the matrix at the time of exit from the procedure is left in a permuted condition.

- (4) The algorithm permits the statement

```
k := z[l];
```

to be executed even though the declarations place an upper limit of  $n$  on the integer array  $z$ , and the test for  $l \leq n$  has not yet been made. Obviously, Mr. Cohen's compiling system would allow an out-of-bounds array look-up. One could easily incorporate into an ALGOL compiler a guard against such illicit array references, and therefore the published algorithm might be considered machine dependent.

- (5) This algorithm requires  $3n^2$  divisions, most of which are unnecessary. By inserting the statement

```
y := 1.0/y;
```

at the proper place, one may accomplish the obvious economy of reducing this to only  $n$  divisions plus  $2n^2$  multiplications.

(6) If a matrix should be singular (or nearly so), some pivot element will be zero (or very small), and a test should be made, with provision for a jump to *ALARM*, a non-local label.

(7) The identifiers  $w$  and  $y$  should be declared within this procedure, to avoid trouble.

(8) This algorithm omits calculation of the determinant of the matrix. This could be computed with very little extra effort.

The revised algorithm was then tested on the LGP-30 computer, using ALGOL-30, a small subset of ALGOL. Within the restrictions of this subset, the program worked satisfactorily on test matrices.

#### CERTIFICATION OF ALGORITHMS 63, 64, 65 PARTITION, QUICKSORT, FIND [C. A. R. Hoare, *Comm. ACM*, July 1961]

J. S. HILLMORE

Elliott Bros. (London) Ltd., Borehamwood, Herts.,  
England

The body of the procedure find was corrected to read:

```
begin integer I, J;
if M < N then begin partition (A, M, N, I, J);
    if K ≤ I then find (A, M, J, K)
    else if J ≤ K then find (A, I, N, K)
    end
end find
```

and the trio of procedures was then successfully run using the Elliott ALGOL translator on the National-Elliott 803.

The author's estimate of  $\frac{1}{3}(N-M)1n(N-M)$  for the number of exchanges required to sort a random set was found to be correct. However, the number of comparisons was generally less than  $2(N-M)1n(N-M)$  even without the modification mentioned below.

The efficiency of the procedure quicksort was increased by changing its body to read:

```
begin integer I, J;
if M < N-1 then begin partition (A, M, N, I, J);
    quicksort (A, M, J);
    quicksort (A, I, N)
    end
else if N-M = 1 then begin if A[N] < A[M] then
    exchange (A[M], A[N])
    end
end quicksort
```

This alteration reduced the number of comparisons involved in sorting a set of random numbers by 4-5 percent, and the number of entries to the procedure partition by 25-30 percent.

#### CERTIFICATION OF ALGORITHM 71 PERMUTATION [R. R. Coveyou and J. G. Sullivan, *Comm. ACM*, Nov. 1961]

J. S. HILLMORE

Elliott Bros. (London) Ltd., Borehamwood, Herts.,  
England

The algorithm was successfully run using the Elliott ALGOL translator on the National-Elliott 803. The integer array  $x$  was made a parameter of the procedure in order to avoid having an own array with variable bounds.

#### CERTIFICATION OF ALGORITHM 72 COMPOSITION GENERATOR [L. Hellerman and S. Ogden, *Comm. ACM*, Nov. 1961]

D. M. COLLISON

Elliott Bros. (London) Ltd., Borehamwood, Herts.,  
England

After

```
for j := 1 step 1 until k do d[j] := c[j]-1;
```

the statement

```
j := k;
```

should be inserted (see ALGOL 60 report, para 4.6.5). With this alteration, the algorithm was successfully run using the Elliott ALGOL translator on the National-Elliott 803.

#### CERTIFICATION OF ALGORITHM 75 FACTORS [J. E. L. Peck, *Comm. ACM*, Jan. 1962]

J. S. HILLMORE

Elliott Bros. (London) Ltd., Borehamwood, Herts.,  
England

The following changes had to be made to the algorithm:

- (1) For **if**  $q > 1 \wedge p = 1$  **then**  
    **put** **if**  $q > 1 \wedge p = q$  **then**
  - (2) For **begin**  $c := c \times a0$ ;  $a0 := 1$  **end**  
    **put** **begin**  $c := c \times a[0]$ ;  $a[0] := 1$  **end**
  - (3) For **if**  $q = 0 \vee (an \div q) \times q = an$  **then**  
    **put** **if** (**if**  $q = 0$  **then true** **else**  $(an \div q) \times q = an$ ) **then**
- This change is necessary to ensure that the term  $(an \div q)$  is not evaluated when  $q = 0$ .

The algorithm, thus modified, was successfully run using the Elliott ALGOL translator on the National-Elliott 803.

REMARK ON ALGORITHM 78  
RATIONAL ROOTS OF POLYNOMIALS WITH  
INTEGER COEFFICIENTS [C. Perry, *Comm. ACM*,  
Feb. 1962]

D. M. COLLISON  
Elliott Bros. (London) Ltd., Borehamwood, Herts.,  
England

The algorithm was successfully run using the Elliott ALGOL translator on the National-Elliott 803. It was noticed that a multiple rational root will only be printed once by the procedure.

REMARK ON ALGORITHM 84  
SIMPSON'S INTEGRATION [Paul E. Hennion. *Comm. ACM*, Apr. 1962]

RICHARD GEORGE\*  
Particle Accelerator Div., Argonne National Lab.,  
Argonne, Ill.

\* Work supported by the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.

In performing integration by the use of Simpson's rule, it is well known that the interval  $[a, b]$  must be divided evenly into  $n$  equal parts, and that *it is essential for  $n$  to be an even number.*

In the published algorithm, there is neither a comment on this important restriction, nor a programmed test for the parity of  $n$ . It is therefore a potential trap for the unwary programmer.

CERTIFICATION OF ALGORITHM 85  
JACOBI [T. G. Evans, *Comm. ACM*, Apr. 1962]

J. S. HILLMORE  
Elliott Bros. (London) Ltd., Borehamwood, Herts.,  
England

The statement  
 $\omega := (\text{if } \mu = 0.0 \text{ then } 1 \text{ else } \text{sign}(\mu))$   
 $\quad \times (-V2)/\text{sqrt}(V2 \uparrow 2 + \mu \uparrow 2);$

was changed to  
 $\omega := \text{if } \mu = 0.0 \text{ then } -1.0 \text{ else } -\text{sign}(\mu)$   
 $\quad \times V2/\text{sqrt}(V2 \uparrow 2 + \mu \uparrow 2);$

When  $\mu = 0$ , the original statement reduces to  
 $\omega := -V2/\text{sqrt}(V2 \uparrow 2);$   
and a truncation error in the evaluation of the square root can make the magnitude of  $\omega$  slightly greater than unity. As a result, an error stop occurs during execution of the next statement when an attempt is made to evaluate  $\text{sqrt}(1 - \omega \uparrow 2)$ .

In its modified form the algorithm has been successfully run using the Elliott ALGOL translator on the National-Elliott 803. Matrices of order up to fifteen have been solved, yielding eigenvalues and eigenvectors with an overall accuracy of seven decimal places.

CERTIFICATION OF ALGORITHM 86  
PERMUTE [J. E. L. Peck and G. F. Schrock, *Comm. ACM*, Apr. 1962]

D. M. COLLISON  
Elliott Bros. (London) Ltd., Borehamwood, Herts.,  
England

The algorithm was successfully run using the Elliott ALGOL translator on the National-Elliott 803. Values of  $n$  used were 0, 1, 2, 3, 4.

Contributions to this department must be in the form stated in the Algorithms Department policy statement (*Communications*, February, 1960) except that ALGOL 60 notation should be used (see *Communications*, May 1960). Contributions should be sent in duplicate to J. H. Wegstein, Computation Laboratory, National Bureau of Standards, Washington 25, D. C. Algorithms should be in the Reference form of ALGOL 60 and written in a style patterned after the most recent algorithms appearing in this department. For the convenience of the printer, please underline words that are delimiters to appear in boldface type.

Although each algorithm has been tested by its contributor, no warranty, expressed or implied, is made by the contributor, the editor, or the Association for Computing Machinery as to the accuracy and functioning of the algorithm and related algorithm material, and no responsibility is assumed by the contributor, the editor, or the association for Computing Machinery in connection therewith.

The reproduction of algorithms appearing in this department is explicitly permitted without any charge. When reproduction is for publication purposes, reference must be made to the algorithm author and to the *Communications* issue bearing the algorithm.

CERTIFICATION OF ALGORITHM 87  
PERMUTATION GENERATOR [John R. Howell,  
*Comm. ACM*, Apr. 1962]

D. M. COLLISON  
Elliott Bros. (London) Ltd., Borehamwood, Herts.,  
England

The array  $N$  was removed from the value list in order that the permutations might be available outside the procedure. The algorithm was then run successfully with the Elliott ALGOL translator on the National-Elliott 803. It was rather slower than Algorithm 86.

CERTIFICATION OF ALGORITHMS 117 AND 118  
MAGIC SQUARE (ODD AND, EVEN ORDERS)  
[D. M. Collison, *Comm. ACM*, Aug. 1962]

D. M. COLLISON  
Elliott Bros. (London) Ltd., Borehamwood, Herts.,  
England

Both algorithms were checked and timed, using a special ALGOL program, with the Elliott ALGOL translator on the National-Elliott 803. The procedure for odd orders was the slower:

Procedure	Size of Square	Time
Odd order	9	10 sec.
	19	45 sec.
Even order	10	7 sec.
	20	23 sec.

Because of the different methods used and the length of the even order procedure it was decided not to combine the two. The smallest square of even order generated is given below:—

13	3	2	16
8	10	11	5
12	6	7	9
1	15	14	4