

Algorithms

G. E. FORSYTHE, Editor

ALGORITHM 236

BESSEL FUNCTIONS OF THE FIRST KIND [S17]

WALTER GAUTSCHI (Recd. 10 Aug. 1963 and 10 Apr. 1964)
Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tenn.*

* Now at Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind;

real procedure $t(y)$; **value** y ; **real** y ;
comment This is an auxiliary procedure which evaluates the inverse function $t = t(y)$ of $y = t \ln t$ ($t \geq 1$) to an accuracy of about 1%. For the interval $0 \leq y \leq 10$ a fifth degree approximating polynomial was obtained by truncating a series expansion in Chebyshev polynomials. For $y > 10$ the approximation $t(y) \doteq (y/\ln(y/\alpha))(1 + (\ln\alpha - \ln\ln(y/\alpha))/(1 + \ln(y/\alpha)))^{-1}$ where $\ln \alpha = .775\dagger$ is used;

```
begin real  $p, z$ ;  
  if  $y \leq 10$  then  
    begin  
       $p := .000057941 \times y - .00176148$ ;  $p := y \times p + .0208645$ ;  
       $p := y \times p - .129013$ ;  $p := y \times p + .85777$ ;  
       $t := y \times p + 1.0125$   
    end  
  else  
    begin  
       $z := \ln(y) - .775$ ;  $p := (.775 - \ln(z))/(1+z)$ ;  
       $p := 1/(1+p)$ ;  $t := y \times p/z$   
    end  
end  $t$ ;
```

```
procedure  $J_{aplusn}(x, a, nmax, d, J)$ ; value  $x, a, nmax, d$ ;  
integer  $nmax, d$ ; real  $x, a$ ; array  $J$ ;
```

comment This procedure evaluates to d significant digits the Bessel functions $J_{a+n}(x)$ for fixed a, x and for $n = 0, 1, \dots, nmax$. The results are stored in the array J . It is assumed that $0 \leq a < 1, x > 0$, and $nmax \geq 0$. If any of these variables is not in the range specified, control is transferred to a nonlocal label called *alarm*. The procedure makes use of the real procedure t . In addition, it calls for a nonlocal real procedure $gamma$ which evaluates $\Gamma(z)$ for $1 \leq z \leq 2$. (See [2].) The method of computation is a variant of the backward recurrence algorithm of J. C. P. Miller. (See [1].) The purported accuracy is obtained by a judicious selection of the initial value ν of the recursion index, together with at least one repetition of the recursion with ν replaced by $\nu + 5$. Near a zero of one of the Bessel functions generated, the accuracy of that particular Bessel function may deteriorate to less than d significant digits. The algorithm is most efficient when x is small or moderately large;

```
begin integer  $n, nu, m, limit$ ; real  $epsilon, sum, d1, r, s, L, lambda$ ;  
array  $Japprox, Rr[0:nmax]$ ;  
if  $a < 0 \vee a \geq 1 \vee x \leq 0 \vee nmax < 0$  then go to alarm;  
 $epsilon := .5 \times 10 \uparrow (-d)$ ;  
for  $n := 0$  step 1 until  $nmax$  do  $Japprox[n] := 0$ ;
```

† In an earlier version of this procedure the author used $\alpha = 1$. The value $\ln \alpha = .775$ was found empirically by H. C. Thacher, Jr. to yield somewhat better approximations.

```
 $sum := (x/2) \uparrow a/gamma(1+a)$ ;  
 $d1 := 2.3026 \times d + 1.3863$ ;  
if  $nmax > 0$  then  $r := nmax \times t(.5 \times d1/nmax)$  else  $r := 0$ ;  
 $s := 1.3591 \times x \times t(.73576 \times d1/x)$ ;  
 $nu := 1 + entier(\text{if } r \leq s \text{ then } s \text{ else } r)$ ;  
 $L0: m := 0$ ;  $L := 1$ ;  $limit := entier(nu/2)$ ;  
 $L1: m := m + 1$ ;  
 $L := L \times (m+a)/(m+1)$ ;  
if  $m < limit$  then go to  $L1$ ;  
 $n := 2 \times m$ ;  $r := s := 0$ ;  
 $L2: r := 1/(2 \times (a+n)/x - r)$ ;  
comment Conceivably, but very unlikely, division by an exact zero, or overflow, may take place here. The user may wish to test the divisor for zero, and, if necessary, enlarge it slightly to avoid overflow, before this statement is carried out. As such a test depends on the particular machine used, it was not included here;  
if  $entier(n/2) \neq n/2$  then  $lambda := 0$  else  
  begin  
     $L := L \times (n+2)/(n+2 \times a)$ ;  
     $lambda := L \times (n+a)$   
  end;  
 $s := r \times (lambda + s)$ ; if  $n \leq nmax$  then  $Rr[n-1] := r$ ;  
 $n := n - 1$ ; if  $n \geq 1$  then go to  $L2$ ;  
 $J[0] := sum/(1+s)$ ;  
for  $n := 0$  step 1 until  $nmax - 1$  do  $J[n+1] := Rr[n] \times J[n]$ ;  
for  $n := 0$  step 1 until  $nmax$  do  
  if  $abs((J[n] - Japprox[n])/J[n]) > epsilon$  then  
    begin  
      for  $m := 0$  step 1 until  $nmax$  do  $Japprox[m] := J[m]$ ;  
       $nu := nu + 5$ ; go to  $L0$   
    end  
end  $J_{aplusn}$ ;  
procedure  $J_{aplusn}(x, a, nmax, d, I)$ ; value  $x, a, nmax, d$ ;  
integer  $nmax, d$ ; real  $x, a$ ; array  $I$ ;  
comment This procedure evaluates to  $d$  significant digits the modified Bessel functions  $I_{a+n}(x)$  for fixed  $a, x$ , with  $0 \leq a < 1, x > 0$ , and for  $n = 0, 1, \dots, nmax$ . The results are stored in the array  $I$ . For the setup of the procedure, and the method of computation used, see the comment in  $J_{aplusn}$ ;  
begin integer  $n, nu, m$ ; real  $epsilon, sum, d1, r, s, L, lambda$ ;  
array  $Iapprox, Rr[0:nmax]$ ;  
if  $a < 0 \vee a \geq 1 \vee x \leq 0 \vee nmax < 0$  then go to alarm;  
 $epsilon := .5 \times 10 \uparrow (-d)$ ;  
for  $n := 0$  step 1 until  $nmax$  do  $Iapprox[n] := 0$ ;  
 $sum := exp(x) \times (x/2) \uparrow a/gamma(1+a)$ ;  
 $d1 := 2.3026 \times d + 1.3863$ ;  
if  $nmax > 0$  then  $r := nmax \times t(.5 \times d1/nmax)$  else  $r := 0$ ;  
 $s := \text{if } x < d1 \text{ then } 1.3591 \times x \times t(.73576 \times (d1-x)/x) \text{ else } 1.3591 \times x$ ;  
 $nu := 1 + entier(\text{if } r \leq s \text{ then } s \text{ else } r)$ ;  
 $L0: n := 0$ ;  $L := 1$ ;  
 $L1: n := n + 1$ ;  
 $L := L \times (n+2 \times a)/(n+1)$ ;  
if  $n < nu$  then go to  $L1$ ;  
 $r := s := 0$ ;
```

```

L2: r := 1/(2*(a+n)/x+r);
L := L * (n+1)/(n+2*a);
lambda := 2 * (n+a) * L;
s := r * (lambda+s); if n ≤ nmax then Rr[n-1] := r;
n := n - 1; if n ≥ 1 then go to L2;
I[0] := sum/(1-r);
for n := 0 step 1 until nmax - 1 do I[n+1] := Rr[n] * I[n];
for n := 0 step 1 until nmax do
  if abs((I[n]-Iapprox[n])/I[n]) > epsilon then
    begin
      for m := 0 step 1 until nmax do Iapprox[m] := I[m];
      nu := nu + 5; go to L0
    end
end Iaplns;

procedure Jaminusn(x, a, nmax, d, J); value x, a, nmax, d;
integer nmax, d; real x, a; array J;
comment This procedure evaluates to d significant digits the
Bessel functions  $J_{a-n}(x)$  for fixed a, x, with  $0 < a < 1$ ,  $x > 0$ ,
and for  $n = 0, 1, \dots, nmax$ . The results are stored in the array
J. The procedure makes use of the real procedure t, and the
procedure Japlns. In addition, it calls for a nonlocal real pro-
cedure gamma which evaluates  $\Gamma(z)$  for  $1 \leq z \leq 2$ . (See [2].) The
accuracy may deteriorate to less than d significant digits if a is
close to 0 or 1;
begin integer n; array J[0:1];
if a = 0 then go to alarm;
Japlns(x, a, 1, d, J);
J[0] := J[0];
J[1] := 2 * a * J[0]/x - J[1];
for n := 1 step 1 until nmax - 1 do
  J[n+1] := 2 * (a-n) * J[n]/x - J[n-1]
end Jaminusn;

procedure Iaminusn(x, a, nmax, d, I); value x, a, nmax, d;
integer nmax, d; real x, a; array I;
comment This procedure evaluates to d significant digits the
modified Bessel functions  $I_{a-n}(x)$  for fixed a, x, with  $0 < a < 1$ ,
 $x > 0$ , and for  $n = 0, 1, \dots, nmax$ . The results are stored in the
array I. The procedure makes use of the real procedure t, and
the procedure Iaplns. In addition, it calls for a nonlocal real
procedure gamma which evaluates  $\Gamma(z)$  for  $1 \leq z \leq 2$ . (See [2].)
The accuracy may deteriorate to less than d significant digits if
a is close to 0 or 1;
begin integer n; array I[0:1];
if a = 0 then go to alarm;
Iaplns(x, a, 1, d, I);
I[0] := I[0];
I[1] := 2 * a * I[0]/x + I[1];
for n := 1 step 1 until nmax - 1 do
  I[n+1] := 2 * (a-n) * I[n]/x + I[n-1]
end Iaminusn;

procedure Complex Japlns(x, y, a, nmax, d, u, v); value x, y, a,
nmax, d;
integer nmax, d; real x, y, a; array u, v;
comment This procedure evaluates to d significant digits the
Bessel functions  $J_{a+n}(z) = u_n + iv_n$  for fixed real a, fixed complex
 $z = x + iy$ , and for  $n = 0, 1, \dots, nmax$ . The real parts  $u_0$ ,
 $u_1, \dots, u_{nmax}$  of the results are stored in the array u, the imagi-
nary parts  $v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{nmax}$  in the array v. It is assumed that
 $0 \leq a < 1$ ,  $nmax \geq 0$ , and that z is not on the negative real axis
 $x \leq 0, y = 0$ . Otherwise, control is transferred to the nonlocal
label alarm upon entry of the procedure. The procedure makes
use of the real procedure t. In addition, it calls for a nonlocal
real procedure gamma which evaluates  $\Gamma(z)$  for  $1 \leq z \leq 2$ . (See
[2].) The method of computation is a complex extension of the
method used in the procedure Japlns. The algorithm is most
efficient when  $|z|$  is small or moderately large;
begin integer n, nu, m; real epsilon, y1, r02, r0, phi, c, c1, c2,

```

```

sum1, sum2, d1, r, s, lambda1, lambda2, L, r1, r2, s1, s2; array
uapprox, vapprox, Rr1, Rr2[0:nmax];
if a < 0  $\vee$  a ≥ 1  $\vee$  (x ≤ 0  $\wedge$  y = 0)  $\vee$  nmax < 0 then go to alarm;
epsilon := .5 * 10 ↑ (-d);
for n := 0 step 1 until nmax do uapprox[n] := vapprox[n] := 0;
y1 := abs(y); r02 := x ↑ 2 + y ↑ 2; r0 := sqrt(r02);
phi := if x = 0 then 1.5707963268 else if x > 0 then arctan(y1/x)
else 3.1415926536 + arctan(y1/x);
comment The two constants  $\pi/2$  and  $\pi$  in the preceding state-
ment are to be supplied with the full accuracy desired in the
final results;
c := exp(y1) * (r0/2) ↑ a/gamma(1+a);
sum1 := c * cos(a*phi-x); sum2 := c * sin(a*phi-x);
d1 := 2.3026 * d + 1.3863;
if nmax > 0 then r := nmax * t(.5*d1/nmax) else r := 0;
s := if y1 < d1 then 1.3591 * r0 * t(.73576*(d1-y1)/r0) else
1.3591 * r0;
nu := 1 + entier (if r ≤ s then s else r);
L0: n := 0; L := 1; c1 := 1; c2 := 0;
L1: n := n + 1;
L := L * (n+2*a)/(n+1);
c := -c1; c1 := c2; c2 := c;
if n < nu then go to L1;
r1 := r2 := s1 := s2 := 0;
L2: c := (2*(a+n)-x*r1+y1*r2) ↑ 2 + (x*r2+y1*r1) ↑ 2;
r1 := (2*(a+n)*x-r02*r1)/c;
r2 := (2*(a+n)*y1+r02*r2)/c;
L := L * (n+1)/(n+2*a); c := 2 * (n+a) * L;
lambda1 := c * c1; lambda2 := c * c2;
c := c1; c1 := -c2; c2 := c;
s := r1 * (lambda1+s1) - r2 * (lambda2+s2);
s2 := r1 * (lambda2+s2) + r2 * (lambda1+s1);
s1 := s;
if n ≤ nmax then begin Rr1[n-1] := r1; Rr2[n-1] := r2 end;
n := n - 1;
if n ≥ 1 then go to L2;
c := (1+s1) ↑ 2 + s2 ↑ 2;
u[0] := (sum1*(1+s1)+sum2*s2)/c;
v[0] := (sum2*(1+s1)-sum1*s2)/c;
for n := 0 step 1 until nmax - 1 do
  begin
    u[n+1] := Rr1[n] * u[n] - Rr2[n] * v[n];
    v[n+1] := Rr1[n] * v[n] + Rr2[n] * u[n]
  end;
if y < 0 then for n := 0 step 1 until nmax do v[n] := -v[n];
for n := 0 step 1 until nmax do
  if sqrt(((u[n]-uapprox[n]) ↑ 2 + (v[n]-vapprox[n]) ↑ 2)
/(u[n] ↑ 2 + v[n] ↑ 2)) > epsilon
then
  begin
    for m := 0 step 1 until nmax do
      begin uapprox[m] := u[m]; vapprox[m] := v[m] end;
    nu := nu + 5; go to L0
  end
end Complex Japlns

```

REFERENCES

- GAUTSCHI, W. Recursive computation of special functions. U. Mich. Engineering Summer Conferences, Numerical Analysis, 1963.
- . Algorithm 221—Gamma function. *Comm. ACM* 7 (Mar. 1964), 143.

62

ALGORITHM 237

GREATEST COMMON DIVISOR [A1]

J. E. L. PECK (Recd. 16 Dec. 1963)

University of Alberta, Calgary, Alberta, Canada

integer procedure *Euclidean* (*a*) dimension : (*n*) linear coefficients : (*x*); **value** *a*; **integer array** *a*, *x*; **integer** *n*;

comment This procedure finds the greatest common divisor of the *n* nonnegative elements of the vector *a*, and produces values for *x*_{*i*} in the expression $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) = a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + \dots + a_nx_n$;

begin integer array *M*[1:*n*, 1:*n*];

integer *i*, *j*, *min*, *max*, *imin*, *imax*, *q*, *t*;

comment We set up *M* as an identity matrix;

INITIALISE:

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

for *j* := 1 **step** 1 **until** *n* **do** *M*[*i*, *j*] := 0;

for *i* := 1 **step** 1 **until** *n* **do** *M*[*i*, *i*] := 1; *max* := 0;

comment We search for the least nonzero integer in the array *a*. Note that this step need not be repeated at every iteration (see statement labelled *DIVIDES*);

MINIMUM:

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

begin *t* := *a*[*i*];

if *t* ≠ 0 ∧ (*max* = 0 ∨ *t* < *max*) **then**

begin *max* := *t*; *imax* := *i* **end**

end of minimum search. If the use of the identifier *max* is confusing, observe the two statements following the label *MAXIMUM*, where the confusion is resolved;

if *max* = 0 **then go to** *ERROR*; **comment** *ERROR* is a global label;

MAXIMUM: *imin* := *imax*; *min* := *max*;

comment We search for the greatest element of *a*;

max := *a*[1]; *imax* := 1;

for *i* := 2 **step** 1 **until** *n* **do if** *a*[*i*] > *max* **then**

begin *max* := *a*[*i*]; *imax* := *i* **end** of maximum search;

if *max* ≠ *min* **then**

REDUCTION:

begin comment Note that the identity $a_i = \sum_{j=1}^n m_{ij}a_j$ holds at each stage of the reduction;

q := *max* ÷ *min*; *a*[*imax*] := *max* := *max* - *q* × *min*;

for *j* := 1 **step** 1 **until** *n* **do**

M[*imax*, *j*] := *M*[*imax*, *j*] - *q* × *M*[*imin*, *j*];

DIVIDES: **go to if** *max* = 0 **then** *MINIMUM* **else** *MAXIMUM* **end** of the reduction. Note that if *max* ≠ 0 then *max* now contains the new nonzero minimum.

If *max* = *min* then we are ready with the results;

for *j* := 1 **step** 1 **until** *n* **do** *x*[*j*] := *M*[*imin*, *j*];

Euclidean := *min*

end of procedure *Euclidean*

REFERENCE

1. BLANKINSHIP, W. A. A new version of the Euclidean algorithm. *Amer. Math. Mon.* 70 (1963), 742-745.

ALGORITHM 238

CONJUGATE GRADIENT METHOD [F4]

C. M. REEVES (Recd. 18 Nov. 1963)

Electronic Computing Lab., Univ. of Leeds, England

procedure *conjugate gradients* (*x*, *r*, *n*, *matmult*);

value *n*; **real array** *x*, *r*; **integer** *n*; **procedure** *matmult*;

comment The method of conjugate gradients [cf: BECKMAN, F. S. *Mathematical Methods for Digital Computers*. Ch. 4, Ralston, A., and Wilf, H. S., (Eds.), Wiley 1960.] is applied to solve the equations $Ax = b$ where *A* is a general nonsingular matrix of

order *n*, and *x* and *b* are vectors. At entry *x* contains an initial approximation to the solution, and *r* contains *b*, the vector of constants. Both *x* and *r* have bounds [1:*n*]. Up to *n*+1 iterations are carried out and at exit the solution is in *x* and the corresponding residuals $r = b - Ax$ are in *r*.

The procedure *matmult* has the following heading, with semicolons which must now be omitted:

procedure *matmult* (*transpose*, *dat*, *res*)

Boolean *transpose* **real array** *dat*, *res*

comment The datum vector *dat* is premultiplied by the matrix *B* and the result formed in *res* where, denoting the transpose of *A* by *At*,

$$B = \text{if } \textit{transpose} \text{ then } \textit{At} \text{ else } A$$

The body of *matmult* will depend upon whether *A* is stored on magnetic tape, and whether all or only its nonzero elements are stored. The products should be accumulated in double precision, if possible.;

begin integer *iterations*; **real** *alpha*, *beta*, *At r sq*;

real array *p*, *temp* [1:*n*];

real procedure *dot* (*u*, *v*);

real array *u*, *v*;

comment *dot* is the scalar product of the vectors *u* and *v*;

begin integer *i*; **real** *sum*; *sum* := 0;

for *i* := 1 **step** 1 **until** *n* **do** *sum* := *sum* + *u*[*i*] × *v*[*i*];

dot := *sum*

end of *dot*;

procedure *combine* (*f*) plus: (*c*) times: (*g*) to form: (*h*);

value *c*;

real *c*; **real array** *f*, *g*, *h*;

comment *f* + *c**g* is formed in *h*;

begin integer *i*;

for *i* := 1 **step** 1 **until** *n* **do** *h*[*i*] := *f*[*i*] + *c* × *g*[*i*]

end of *combine*;

Start:

for *iterations* := 0 **step** 1 **until** *n* **do**

begin if *iterations* = 0

then begin *matmult* (**false**, *x*) in : (*temp*);

combine (*r*, -1, *temp*) in : (*r*);

matmult (**true**, *r*) in : (*p*);

At r sq := *dot* (*p*, *p*);

end of forming $r = b - Ax$, $p = At r$, and *At r sq*

else begin *matmult* (**true**, *r*) giving *At r* in : (*temp*);

beta := *dot* (*temp*, *temp*) / *At r sq*;

combine (*temp*, *beta*, *p*) in : (*p*);

At r sq := *beta* × *At r sq*

end;

if *At r sq* = 0 **then go to** *finish*;

matmult (**false**, *p*) giving *Ap* in : (*temp*);

alpha := *dot* (*temp*, *temp*);

if *alpha* = 0 **then go to** *finish*;

alpha := *dot* (*r*, *temp*) / *alpha*;

combine (*x*, *alpha*, *p*) in : (*x*);

combine (*r*, -*alpha*, *temp*) in : (*r*)

end of iterative loop;

finish :

end of *conjugate gradients*;

ALGORITHM 239

FREE FIELD READ [I5]

W. M. McKEEMAN (Recd. 12 Dec. 63 and 1 May 1964)

Computation Center, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.

procedure *inreal* (*channel*, *destination*); **value** *channel*;

integer *channel*; **real** *destination*;

begin comment Each invocation of *inreal* will read one (number) [Revised Report ... ALGOL 60, section 2.5.1] from the input

medium designated by the parameter *channel* and convert it into the internal machine representation appropriate for real numbers. Successive data values within the data string are separated by the blank character *u*. Integer values from the input medium are converted into values of type real. A nonlocal procedure *error* is invoked whenever a non-(number) is encountered in the input string. The action of *error* is left undefined;

real *sig, fp, d*;

integer *esig, ep, ip, ch*;

integer procedure *CHAR*;

begin comment The value of *CHAR* is the integer representing the next character from the input string. *insymbol* is defined in the "Report on Input-Output Procedure for ALGOL 60," *ALGOL Bull.* No. 16 (May 1964), 9-13; *Comm. ACM*, to appear. Characters occurring in the second parameter of *insymbol* are mapped onto the integers corresponding to their position, left-to-right, within the string. Other basic symbols map onto the integer 0.

The present procedure *inreal* differs from the *inreal* of the referenced Report on Input-Output Procedures for ALGOL 60 in the following ways:

(a) The report does not specify what values may be presented in its *inreal*, only that whatever is presented will be assigned to the second parameter of *inreal*. I demand that a (number) be presented.

(b) No separator of values on the foreign medium is specified. I demand an ALGOL string blank.;

real *c*;

insymbol (*channel*, '0123456789.-+10u' , *c*);

if *c* ≤ 0 **then** *error*; **comment** an illegal character;

CHAR := *c* - 1

end *CHAR*;

integer procedure *unsigned integer*;

begin comment (unsigned integer) ::= (digit) | (unsigned integer) (digit);

integer *u*;

u := 0;

K: *u* := 10 × *u* + *ch*;

ch := *CHAR*;

if *ch* < 10 **then** **go to** *K*;

unsigned integer := *u*

end *unsigned integer*;

sig := 1.0; *ep* := 0; *fp* := 0;

L: *ch* := *CHAR*;

if *ch* = 14 **then** **go to** *L*; **comment** suppress initial blanks;
comment (number) ::= (unsigned number) | +(unsigned number) | -(unsigned number);

if *ch* = 12 **then** *ch* := *CHAR*

else if *ch* = 11 **then**

begin comment 12 = "+" and 11 = "-";

sig := -1.0;

ch := *CHAR*

end;

comment (unsigned number) ::= (decimal number) | (exponent part) | (decimal number)(exponent part);

if *ch* ≤ 10 **then**

begin comment (decimal number) ::= (unsigned integer) | (decimal fraction) | (unsigned integer)(decimal fraction);

if *ch* < 10 **then** *ip* := *unsigned integer* **else** *ip* := 0;

if *ch* = 10 **then**

begin comment (decimal fraction) ::= .(unsigned integer);

ch := *CHAR*;

if *ch* ≥ 10 **then** *error*; **comment** a digit must follow the ".";

fp := 0; *d* := 0.1;

M: *fp* := *fp* + *ch* × *d*;

d := *d* × 0.1;

comment a table of reciprocal powers of ten is preferable to the statement *d* := *d* × 0.1;

ch := *CHAR*;

if *ch* < 10 **then** **go to** *M*

end

end else if *ch* = 13 **then** *ip* := 1 **else** *error*;

if *ch* = 13 **then**

begin comment (exponent part) ::= 10(integer);

ch := *CHAR*; *esig* := 1;

comment (integer) ::= (unsigned integer) | +(unsigned integer) | -(unsigned integer);

if *ch* = 12 **then** *ch* := *CHAR*

else if *ch* = 11 **then**

begin comment negative exponent;

esig := -1;

ch := *CHAR*

end;

if *ch* < 10 **then** *ep* := *unsigned integer* × *esig* **else** *error*

end;

if *ch* ≠ 14 **then** *error*; **comment** the required "u" separator;

destination := *sig* × (*ip* + *fp*) × 10.0 ↑ *ep*

end *inreal*

REMARK ON ALGORITHM 162 [J6]

XYMOVE PLOTTING [F. G. Stockton, *Comm. ACM* 6

(Apr. 1963), 161; 6 (Aug. 1963), 450]

D. K. CAVIN (Recd. 10 Feb. 1964)

Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tenn.

The following modifications were made to Algorithm 162 to decrease the average execution time. The last nine lines of Algorithm 162 are replaced by the following:

move := *code*(*I*-1); *I* := *code*(*I*);

repeat: *A* := *D* + *E*; *B* := *T* + *E* + *A*;

if *B* ≥ 0 **then** **begin** *E* := *A*; *F* := *F* - 2; *plot*(*I*) **end**

else **begin** *E* := *E* + *T*; *F* := *F* - 1; *plot*(*move*) **end**;

if *F* > 0 **then** **go to** *repeat*;

return:

end

It is obvious that on any movement containing more than two elemental pen movements the use of the code procedure in the loop is redundant, since no more than two of the eight permitted pen movements are necessary for the approximation of any line. Therefore moving the call of the code procedure outside of the basic loop reduces the execution time whenever the X, Y movement requires more than two elemental pen movements. The procedures were coded in CODAP, the assembly language for the CDC 1604-A, and this modified version was approximately 40 percent faster in the loop than the original version. The timing comparisons used numbers in the range -2000 to 2000 with heavy emphasis on the subrange -150 to 150. The typographical error noted in the certification (*Comm. ACM*, August 1963) was corrected in both codes.

[A referee verifies that Algorithm 162 does indeed run, as changed.—G.E.F.]

CERTIFICATION OF ALGORITHM 209 [S15]

GAUSS [D. Ibbetson, *Comm. ACM* 6, Oct. 1963, 616]

M. C. PIKE

Statistical Research Unit of the Medical Research Council,
University College Hospital Medical School, London,
England

This procedure was tested on an Elliott 803 computer using the

Please turn to page 485

ADDITIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

Date	Title (or Subject)	Prepared By	Date	Title (or Subject)	Prepared By
3/9/64	Proposed American Standard for Bit Sequencing of ASCII in Serial-by-Bit Data Transmission	X3.3/4	4/10/64	Letter to C. A. Phillips re. Letter Ballot on Publication of Proposed Standard for Bit Order Sequencing of ASCII	R. W. Ferguson
3/10/64	Letter Ballot on Publication of Proposed Standard for Bit Order Sequencing of ASCII	C. A. Phillips	4/10/64	Letter to C. A. Phillips re. Letter Ballot on Publication of Proposed Standard for Bit Order Sequencing of ASCII	R. W. Ferguson
3/19/64	Statement of Position (UNIVAC)	E. H. Clamons	(undated)	Explanation for Negative Vote on Acceptability for Publication of Proposed Standard for Bit Sequencing of ASCII	L. Wolff
3/20/64	Analysis of the Report of the Select Committee on ASCII Bit Order of Data Transmission	{L. W. Claussen F. C. White S. N. Alexander			
3/26/64	ASCII				
4/2/64	Letter to E. H. Clamons re. Clamon's memorandum to X3, March 19, 1964	V. G. Grey	4/14/64	Results of Ballot on Acceptability for Publication of Proposed Standard on Bit Sequencing of ASCII and Approval of Publication Period	L. W. Claussen
4/9/64	Reply to ASA letter of April 2, 1964	E. H. Clamons			
(undated)	Letter to C. A. Phillips re. Letter Ballot on Publication of Proposed Standard for Bit Order Sequencing of ASCII	G. L. Bowlby			C. A. Phillips

Editor's Note

Publication of the following proposed American Standards, developed by a Subcommittee of ASA Sectional Committee X3, has been authorized by the American Standards Association for the purpose of obtaining comment, criticism and general public reaction, with the understanding that such proposed American Standards have not been finally accepted by ASA as standards and, therefore, are subject to change, modification or withdrawal in whole or in part. Comments should be addressed to the Secretary, Business Equipment Manufacturers Association, 235 East 42 Street, New York 17, N. Y.—E.L.

PROPOSED AMERICAN STANDARDS

Interchangeable Perforated Tape Variable Block Formats for Positioning and Straight Cut (RS-273) and Contouring and Contouring/Positioning (RS-274) Numerically Controlled Machine Tools

These standards are intended to serve as guides in the coordination of system design, to minimize the variety of program manuscripts required and the number of word and block format systems used, to promote uniformity of programming techniques, and to foster interchangeability of input tapes between numerically controlled machine tools of the same classification by type, process function, size and accuracy. It is intended that simple numerically controlled machine tools be programmed using a simple format which is systematically extensible for more complex machine tools.

These standards apply wherever a variable block format is used on perforated tape to control positioning and straight cut and contouring or contouring/positioning numerically controlled machine tools. These formats will usually be used with tape read row-by-row.

Perforated tape with variable block format as described shall be usable interchangeably among numerically controlled machine tools which conform to the same format classification as described in the standards. (Note: The degree of interchangeability will depend upon the conformity of the machines with respect to function, capacity, range, horsepower, geometric relationship of axes, preparatory, miscellaneous, and tooling functions, and use of absolute or incremental dimensions.)

The interchangeable tape described in these standards is a combination of word address and tab sequential format, and includes both tab and address characters.

These standards cover interchangeable perforated tape variable block format only, and are not intended to specify machine tool design. In certain cases provisions must be included by the control system builder and machine tool builder, in order to gain full use of interchangeable perforated tape.

[Full texts of these two standards are available from Electronic Industries Association, Engineering Department, 11 West 42 Street, New York 36, N. Y.: RS-273, \$1.10; RS-274, \$1.30.]

ALGORITHMS—Cont'd from page 482

standard Elliott ALGOL compiler. The expression

$$2 \times Gauss(x) - 1$$

was evaluated for $x = 0.(01)6$ and the answers checked with those given in *Tables of Probability Functions, vol. II*, U.S. National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D.C., 1942, where they are given to 15 decimal places. There was a maximum error of 1 in the 8th decimal place.

REMARK ON REMARKS ON ALGORITHM 48 [B3] LOGARITHM OF A COMPLEX NUMBER [John R. Herndon, *Comm. ACM* 4 (Apr. 1961), 179; 5 (Jun. 62), 347; 5 (Jul. 62), 391]

DAVID S. COLLENS (Recd. 24 Jan. 1964 and 1 Jun. 1964) Computer Laboratory, The University, Liverpool 3, England

This procedure was designed to compute $\log_e(a+bi)$, namely $c+di$, and although some very necessary precautions about its use have already been stated, some points seem to have escaped notice. In particular, A. P. Relph [*Comm. ACM*, June 1962, 347] remarked that if $a = 0$, then c becomes '—infinity', but this is only the case if $b = 0$ also. Margaret L. Johnson and Ward Sangren [*Comm. ACM*, July 1962, 391] conceded that $a = b = 0$ was a special case, but wrongly gave zero as the result. The only reasonable way of dealing with this case is to exit to some nonlocal label and to let the user decide whether to terminate his program or to assign particular values to c and d . The obvious values to use here are, for c , a negative number, larger than the largest which would be given by the procedure, and possibly zero for d . (In an implementation where 2^{-129} is the smallest representable nonzero number, the largest negative value of c possible is -89.416 .) Finally, in the Johnson-Sangren version of the procedure, the last conditional statement should read

```
if a = 0 & b < 0 then begin c := ln(abs(b));
d := -1.570963; go to RETURN end;
```

the omission of the minus sign in the original being probably typographical in origin.