Matrix Multiplication with Less Arithmetic Complexity and IO Complexity

Pu Wu, Huiqin Jiang, Zehui Shao, Jin Xu[§]

Abstract

After Strassen presented the first sub-cubic matrix multiplication algorithm, many Strassenlike algorithms are presented. Most of them with low asymptotic cost have large hidden leading coefficient which are thus impractical. To reduce the leading coefficient, Cenk and Hasan give a general approach reducing the leading coefficient of < 2, 2, 2; 7 >-algorithm to 5 but increasing IO complexity. In 2017, Karstadt and Schwartz also reduce the leading coefficient of < 2, 2, 2; 7 >algorithm to 5 by the Alternative Basis Matrix Multiplication method. Meanwhile, their method reduces the IO complexity and low-order monomials in arithmetic complexity. In 2019, Beniamini and Schwartz generalize Alternative Basis Matrix Multiplication method reducing leading coefficient in arithmetic complexity but increasing IO complexity.

In this paper, we propose a new matrix multiplication algorithm which reduces leading coefficient both in arithmetic complexity and IO complexity. We apply our method to Strassen-like algorithms improving arithmetic complexity and IO complexity(the comparison with previous results are shown in Tables 1 and 2). Surprisingly, our IO complexity of $\langle 3, 3, 3; 23 \rangle$ -algorithm is $14n^{\log_3 23}M^{-\frac{1}{2}} + o(n^{\log_3 23})$ which breaks Ballard's IO complexity low bound($\Omega(n^{\log_3 23}M^{1-\frac{\log_3 23}{2}})$) for recursive Strassen-like algorithms.

Keywords: Mathematic of computing, Computation on matrices, Computing methodologies, Linear algebra algorithms.

1 Introduction

Matrix Multiplication is a fundamental computation problem used in many fields. Strassen[17] presented the first non-trivial algorithm with time complexity $O(n^{\log_2 7})$ which breaks the trivial time complexity $O(n^3)$. Since then, the matrix multiplication algorithm including the design and analysis of the algorithm has attracted more and more great attention in the last five decades[17, 5, 8, 10, 12, 11, 2]. In those researches, researchers mainly improve and analyze the time complexity in two parts, arithmetic complexity and IO complexity(e.g. the costs of transferring data between the CPU and memory devices, between memory devices and disks or between parallel processors).

For arithmetic complexity, we focus on deriving asymptotic and hidden constants which are improved by reducing the exponent of the arithmetic complexity and the number of additions respectively. Many Strassen-like algorithms are presented to reduce the exponent of the arithmetic complexity [15, 13, 5, 7, 8, 18]. Recently, researchers also use computer-aided techniques[1, 4, 16] to discover new matrix multiplication algorithms with less exponent. But in practice, Srassen-Winograd's algorithm often performs better than some asymptotically faster algorithms[4] due to

^{*}School Of Computer Science, Peking University. puwu1997@126.com

[†]School Of Computer Science And Cyber Engineering, Guangzhou University. hq.jiang@hotmail.com

[‡]Institute Of Computing Science And Technology, Guangzhou University. zshao@gzhu.edu.cn

[§]Key Laboratory Of High Confidence Software Technologies (Peking University), Ministry Of Education; School Of Computer Science, Peking University. jxu@pku.edu.cn

these smaller hidden constants. This shows the importance of the second research direction in arithmetic complexity, reducing the hidden constants inside the O-notation.

For IO complexity, it often costs significant more time than its arithmetic[9], which is the reason why we are interested to analyze and reduce the IO complexity. Clearly, if we run the recursion in the Strassen-like algorithm and put the matrices into the fast memory until the matrices are sufficiently small, we can get an IO complexity of the Strassen-like algorithm which is $O((\frac{n}{\sqrt{M}})^{\log_{n_0} t} M)[2]$. Furthermore, this bound has been proved to be tight[2] for Strassen-like algorithms which means the IO complexity can not be improved by changing implementation.

1.1 Previous Research

For recursive Strassen-like algorithms, the hidden constant of arithmetic complexity is depended on the number of linear operations in the bilinear function. So, one way of reducing the hidden constant is to find the bilinear function with less linear operations. But this way is limited. Probert proved that 15 additions are necessary for any < 2, 2, 2, 2; 7 >-algorithm[14] which means that there is no bilinear function making the hidden constant less than 6 for recursive < 2, 2, 2; 7 >-algorithm. Surprisingly, this bound can be broken by doing some modification in the Strassen-like algorithm[6, 11].

Cenk and Hasan[6] split the Strassen-like algorithm to three linear divided-and-conquer algorithms where two of them transform the inputs into two vectors, followed by vector multiplication of their results, and last of three linear divided-and-conquer algorithms calculates the output. They reduce the hidden constant in arithmetic complexity of < 2, 2, 2; 7 >-algorithm to 5, whose arithmetic complexity is $5n^{\log_2 7} + 0.5n^{\log_2 6} + 2n^{\log_2 5} - 6.5n^2$ in detail. Their method can also apply in other Strassen-like algorithms, such as < 2, 3, 4; 20 >-algorithm, < 3, 3, 3; 23 >-algorithm, and < 6, 3, 3; 40 >-algorithm. However, it increases the IO cost and memory footprint, whose IO complexity of < 2, 2, 2; 7 >-algorithm is $O(n^{\log_2 7})$ in detail.

Karstadt and Schwartz[11] present the Alternative Basis Matrix Multiplication method which uses the basis transformation to pre-compute, followed by applying recursive Strassen-like algorithm on their results, and uses the basis transformation to calculate the output. They reduce the hidden constants both in arithmetic complexity and IO complexity of < 2, 2, 2; 7 >-algorithm from 6,5 to 5,4 respectively, whose arithmetic complexity and IO complexity are $5n^{\log_2 7} - 4n^2 + 3n^2 \log_2 n[11]$ and $4(\frac{\sqrt{3}n}{\sqrt{M}})^{\log_2 7}M - 12n^2 + 3n^2 \log_2(\sqrt{2}\frac{n}{\sqrt{M}}) + 5M[11]$ respectively in detail.

Beniamini and Schwartz[3] present the Sparse Decomposition method by generalizing the Alternative Basis Matrix Multiplication method with using large basis. It gets less arithmetic complexity than Alternative Basis Matrix Multiplication method in some Strassen-like algorithms, for example, the arithmetic complexity of < 3, 3, 3; 23 >-algorithm obtained by Sparse Decomposition is $2n^{\log_3 23} + 3n^{\log_3 20} + 2n^{\log_3 14} + 2n^{\log_3 12} + 2n^{\log_3 11} + 33n^{\log_3 10} - 43n^2$ [3] which is less than $6.57n^{\log_3 23} + \frac{20}{9}n^2\log_3 n - 5.57n^2$ obtained by Alternative Basis Matrix Multiplication[11]. However, it increases the IO complexity and memory footprint of < 3, 3, 3; 23 >-algorithm, whose IO complexity is $12.64n^{\log_3 23}M^{1-\log_{20} 23} + O(n^{\log_3 20})$ [11, 3] in detail.

1.2 Our Contribution

We present a new method called Algebra Decomposition method which improves both arithmetic complexity and IO complexity in some Strassen-like algorithms. For example, we improve the arithmetic complexity and IO complexity of < 3,3,3;23 >-algorithm to $2n^{\log_3 23} + 4.56n^{\log_27(23^3-4)} - 5.56n^2 + 0.77n^2\log_3 n$ and $14n^{\log_3 23}M^{-0.5} - 6n^{\frac{\log_27(23^3-4)}{3}}M^{-0.5} + 2M - 16.69n^2$

Algorithm	Complexity	Results
Original[4]	Arithmetic	$7.93n^{\log_3 23} - 6.93n^2$
	Ю	$47.62n^{\log_3 23}M^{-0.42} - 20.79n^2$
Cenk-Hasan[6]	Arithmetic	$2n^{\log_3 23} + 6.75n^{\log_3 21} - 7.75n^2$
	Ю	$n^{\log_3 23} - 1.85 n^{\log_3 20} M^{0.02} + 10.42 n^{\log_3 21} M^{-0.27} - 7.75 n^2$
Karstadt-Schwartz[11]	Arithmetic	$6.58n^{\log_3 23} + 0.33n^2 \log_3 n - 5.58n^2$
	ю	$31.5n^{\log_3 23}M^{-0.42} - 14.71n^2 + 2n^2\log_2\sqrt{2}\frac{n}{\sqrt{M}} + 2M$
Beniamini-Schwartz[3]	Arithmetic	$2n^{\log_3 23} + 3n^{\log_3 20} + 2n^{\log_3 14} + 2n^{\log_3 12} + 2n^{\log_3 11} + 33n^{\log_3 10} - 43n^2$
	ΙΟ	$\begin{array}{c} 6.32n^{log_{3}23}M^{-0.04}+n^{log_{3}20}(13.03M^{-0.11}-1)+\\ n^{log_{3}14}(18.75M^{-0.05}-10)-129n^{2}+n^{log_{3}12}(24.59M^{-0.03}-16)+\\ n^{log_{3}11}(30.84M^{-0.03}-22)+n^{log_{3}10}(133.16M^{-0.04}-29)\end{array}$
Algorithm 5(Ours)	Arithmetic	$2n^{\log_3 23} + 4.56n^{\log_2 7(23^3-4)} - 5.56n^2 + 0.33n^2\log_3 n$
	Ю	$\frac{14n^{\log_3 23}M^{-0.5} - 6n^{\frac{\log_{27}(23^3 - 4)}{3}}M^{-0.5} + \\28.07n^{\frac{\log_{27} 23^3 - 0.77}{3}}M^{-0.42} - 16.69n^2 + 2n^2\log_3\sqrt{2}\frac{n}{\sqrt{M}} + 2M$

Table 1: $\langle 3, 3, 3; 23 \rangle$ -algorithms

 Table 2: Algebra Decomposition Algorithms

Algorithm	Complexity	Leading Monomial	Leading Coefficient		
			Original	Previous	Algorithm 6(Ours)
< 3, 2, 3; 15 >	Arithmetic	$n^{3 \log_{18} 15}$	15.06[4]	7.94[11]	$5.62 + 1.73M^{-0.01} - 3.23M^{-0.405}$
	IO	$n^{3\log_{18}15}M^{1-\frac{3\log_{18}15}{2}}$	70.52[4]	37.19[11]	32.04
< 2, 3, 4; 20 >	Arithmetic	$n^{3\log_{24} 20}$	9.96[4]	7.46[11]	$3.66 + 3.37 M^{-0.011} - 7.88 M^{-0.413}$
	IO	$n^{3\log_{24}20}M^{1-\frac{3\log_{24}20}{2}}$	47.08[4]	35.27[11]	26.32
< 6, 3, 3; 40 >	Arithmetic	$n^{3 \log_{54} 40}$	55.63[16]	9.39[11]	$6.42 + 2.68M^{-0.01} - 5.08M^{-0.387}$
	IO	$n^{3\log_{54}40}M^{1-\frac{3\log_{54}40}{2}}$	255.35[16]	43.11[<mark>11</mark>]	36.58

 $+2.33n^2\log_3\sqrt{2}\frac{n}{\sqrt{M}}+28.07n^{\frac{\log_{27}23^3-0.77}{3}}M^{-0.42}$ respectively. Notice that our IO complexity seemingly contradicts Ballard's lower bound (Theorem 1)[2]. But actually, Ballard's lower bound is based on recursive Strassen-like algorithm, and our algorithm is obtained by doing modification on Strassen-like algorithm.

Theorem 1. [2] The IO complexity IO(n) of a recursive Strassen-like fast matrix multiplication algorithm with $O(n^{\omega_0})$ arithmetic operations, on a machine with fast memory of size M is

$$IO(n) = \Omega((\frac{n}{\sqrt{M}})^{\omega_0}M)$$

Comparing results of Alternative Basis Matrix Multiplication method, our result improves both arithmetic complexity and IO complexity. And our result improves IO complexity but increases arithmetic complexity in low-order monomials comparing with Sparse Decomposition method. Based on our main ideal, we will present two algorithms where Algorithm 5 improves leading coefficient both in arithmetic complexity and IO complexity and Algorithm 6 is better than Algorithm 5 in some cases but worst in other cases. We show the results of them in Tables 1 and 2.

1.3 Organization

In Section 2, we will show some useful algebra results which are mathematical foundations of our algorithms. In Section 3, we will describe our main algorithms, Algorithm 5 and Algorithm 6. In Section 4, we will analyze their complexity. Specifically, we present the arithmetic complexity in Section 4.2, and IO complexity in Section 4.3. In Section 5, we give an example, < 3, 3, 3; 23 >-algorithm, of Algorithms 5,6 and we also show the format of Appendix. In Appendix, we give the decompositions of the fast matrix multiplication algorithms showed in the Tables 1 and 2.

2 Preliminary

Let R be a ring. Once we define a linear map $\varphi : R^{p_0 \times q_0} \to R^{p_1 \times q_1}$, we correspondingly define $\varphi(A) : R^{r_1 p_0 \times r_2 q_0} \to R^{r_1 p_1 \times r_2 q_1}$ for any $A \in R^{r_1 p_0 \times r_2 q_0}$ as $\varphi(A) := \varphi(B)$ where $B = (b_{ij})_{p_0 \times q_0}$ and b_{ij} is the i-th, j-th $r_1 \times r_2$ size submatrix of A.

Definition 1. Let $a = (a_i)_{1 \times p}, b = (b_i)_{1 \times q}$. Define $a \bigoplus b = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_p, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_q), \bigoplus_{i=1}^t c_i = c_1 \bigoplus (\bigoplus_{i=2}^t c_i).$

Definition 2. Let $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{1 \times p_0} \to \mathbb{R}^{1 \times q_0}$ be a linear map. We recursively define a linear map $\varphi^{k+1} : \mathbb{R}^{1 \times p} \to \mathbb{R}^{1 \times q}$ (where $p = p_0^{k+1}, q = q_0^{k+1}$) by $\varphi^{k+1}(A) = \varphi(\varphi^k(A_{1,1}), \dots, \varphi^k(A_{1,p_0}))$), where $A = (A_{1,1}, \dots, A_{1,p_0})$ and $A_{1,j}$ are $1 \times \frac{p}{p_0}$ subvectors.

Definition 3. For a linear map $\ell : \ell(a) = (a_{i_1}, a_{i_2}, \ldots, a_{i_t})$ where $a = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_k), 1 \le i_1 < i_2 < \ldots < i_t \le k$, we call ℓ a interception map. Denote $\ell^j(a) = a_{i_j}$, identity map(I(a) = a) as I.

Definition 4. Let $\varphi : R^{1 \times p_1} \times R^{1 \times p_2} \times \ldots \times R^{1 \times p_k} \to R^{1 \times q}$ be a linear map, $a_i = (a_{i,j})_{1 \times rp_i}$ for $1 \le i \le k$, $a_{i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_t} = (a_{i_1,i_2,\ldots,i_t,j})_{\substack{t \\ 1 \le \prod_{j=1}^t p_{i_j}}}$ for $1 \le i_1 \le k, \ldots, 1 \le i_t \le k$.

Denote

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} \varphi_{i} = (\varphi(b_{1,1}, \dots, b_{k,1}), \varphi(b_{1,2}, \dots, b_{k,2}), \dots, \varphi(b_{1,r}, \dots, b_{k,r}))$$

where $b_{i,j} = (a_{i,(j-1)*p_i+1}, a_{i,(j-1)*p_i+2}, \dots, a_{i,(j-1)*p_i+p_i}),$

$$\sum_{i_1=1}^{k} \sum_{i_2=1}^{\varphi} \dots \sum_{i_t=1}^{k} a_{i_1,i_2,\dots,i_t} = \sum_{i_1=1}^{k} \sum_{i_2=1}^{\varphi} (\sum_{i_2=1}^{k} (\dots \sum_{i_t=1}^{k} a_{i_1,i_2,\dots,i_t})) \dots).$$

Observation 1. Let $\varphi : R^{1 \times p_1} \times R^{1 \times p_2} \times \ldots \times R^{1 \times p_k} \to R^{1 \times q}$ be a linear map, $a_{i,j} = (a_{i,j,z})_{1 \times r_j p_i}, b_{i,j} = (b_{i,j,z})_{1 \times r p_i}$ and λ_j be real number where $1 \le i \le k, 1 \le j \le t$. Then,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} \bigoplus_{j=1}^{\varphi} a_{i,j} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{t} \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_{i,j} \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{\varphi} \lambda_j b_{i,j} = \sum_{j=1}^{t} \lambda_j \sum_{i=1}^{k} b_{i,j}.$$

Definition 5. Let $a = (a_i)_{1 \times p^t}$, $\varphi_i : \mathbb{R}^{1 \times p_i} \to \mathbb{R}^{1 \times q_i}$ be a linear map and $\ell_i : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}^{p_i}$ be an interception map where $1 \le i \le t$. Denote

$$\varphi_1\ell_1 \circ \varphi_2\ell_2 \ldots \circ \varphi_t\ell_t(a) = \varphi_1(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{p_1} \varphi_2\ell_2 \circ \ldots \circ \varphi_t\ell_t(\ell_1^i(a')))$$

where $a' = (b_j)_{1 \times p}$ and b_j is $1 \times p^{t-1}$ subvector of a. Denote φI as φ , $I\ell$ as ℓ and $\varphi_1 \circ \varphi_2 \circ \ldots \circ \varphi_t(A)$ as $\prod_{j=1}^t \circ \varphi_j(A)$ shortly.

Observation 2. Following the definition 5, we have

$$\varphi_1\ell_1 \circ \varphi_2\ell_2 \ldots \circ \varphi_t\ell_t(a) = \varphi_1 \circ \varphi_2 \ldots \circ \varphi_k(\ell_1 \circ \ell_2 \circ \ldots \circ \ell_t(a)).$$

Lemma 1. Let $a = (a_i)_{1 \times p}, b = (b_i)_{1 \times p^k}, \psi : R^{1 \times p} \to R^{n \times m}, \varphi_i : R^{1 \times p_i} \to R^{1 \times q_i}, \varphi : R^{1 \times p_1} \times R^{1 \times p_2} \times \ldots \times R^{1 \times p_t} \to R^{n \times m}$ be linear maps and $\ell_i : R^{1 \times p} \to R^{1 \times p_i}$ be an interception map, where $1 \le i \le t$. If $\psi(a) = \varphi(\varphi_1 \ell_1(a), \varphi_2 \ell_2(a), \ldots, \varphi_t \ell_t(a))$, then

$$\psi^k(b) = \sum_{i_1=1}^t \sum_{i_2=1}^{\varphi} \cdots \sum_{i_k=1}^t \prod_{j=1}^{\varphi} \varphi_{i_j} \ell_{i_j}(b).$$

Proof. We will prove this by induction on t. First, this lemma holds when t = 1. Assume that it holds on t - 1.

Let
$$c_i = (b_{(i-1)*p^{k-1}+j})_{1 \times p^{k-1}}, c = (c_i)_{1 \times p}, d_i = \psi^{k-1}(c_i), e_i = \sum_{i_2=1}^t \cdots \sum_{i_k=1}^t \varphi_{i_2} \ell_{i_2} \circ \dots \circ \varphi_{i_k} \ell_{i_k}(c_i)$$

W.l.o.g, we assume that $\varphi_{i_1}\ell_{i_1}(A) = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{q_1} \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_{j,i}^{i_1}A_i$ where $A = (A_i)_{1 \times p}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{split} &\sum_{i_{1}=1}^{t} \sum_{i_{2}=1}^{\varphi} \cdots \sum_{i_{k}=1}^{t} \prod_{j=1}^{\varphi} \varphi_{i_{j}} \ell_{i_{j}}(b) \\ &= \sum_{i_{1}=1}^{t} \sum_{i_{2}=1}^{\varphi} \sum_{i_{2}=1}^{t} \cdots \sum_{i_{k}=1}^{t} \varphi_{i_{1}}(\bigoplus_{z=1}^{p} \prod_{j=2}^{k} \varphi_{i_{j}} \ell_{i_{j}}(\ell_{i_{1}}^{z}(c))) \\ &= \sum_{i_{1}=1}^{t} \sum_{i_{2}=1}^{\varphi} \sum_{i_{2}=1}^{t} \cdots \sum_{i_{k}=1}^{t} \varphi_{i_{1}} \ell_{i_{1}}(\prod_{j=2}^{k} \varphi_{i_{j}} \ell_{i_{j}}(c_{1}), \prod_{j=2}^{k} \varphi_{i_{j}} \ell_{i_{j}}(c_{2}), \dots, \prod_{j=2}^{k} \varphi_{i_{j}} \ell_{i_{j}}(c_{p})) \\ &= \sum_{i_{1}=1}^{t} \sum_{i_{2}=1}^{\varphi} \sum_{i_{2}=1}^{t} \cdots \sum_{i_{k}=1}^{t} \bigoplus_{j=1}^{\varphi} \sum_{i_{1}=1}^{p} \lambda_{j,i}^{i_{1}} \prod_{j=2}^{k} \varphi_{i_{j}} \ell_{i_{j}}(c_{i}). \end{split}$$

By Observation 1,

$$\sum_{i_1=1}^t \sum_{i_2=1}^{\varphi} \cdots \sum_{i_k=1}^t \bigoplus_{j=1}^{\varphi} \sum_{i=1}^{q_{i_1}} \sum_{i_1=1}^p \lambda_{j,i}^{i_1} \prod_{j=2}^k \varphi_{i_j} \ell_{i_j}(c_i)$$
$$= \sum_{i_1=1}^t \bigoplus_{j=1}^{\varphi} \sum_{i_1=1}^p \lambda_{j,i}^{i_1} \sum_{i_2=1}^t \cdots \sum_{i_k=1}^t \prod_{j=2}^{\varphi} \varphi_{i_j} \ell_{i_j}(c_i)$$
$$= \sum_{i_1=1}^t \bigoplus_{j=1}^{\varphi} \sum_{i_1=1}^p \lambda_{j,i}^{i_1} e_i.$$

By the induction hypothesis, we have $d_i = e_i$. Then, we get

$$\begin{split} &\sum_{i_1=1}^t \sum_{i_2=1}^{\varphi} \cdots \sum_{i_k=1}^t \prod_{j=1}^{\varphi} \sum_{i_j \in I_j}^{q_{i_j}} (b) \\ &= \sum_{i_1=1}^t \bigoplus_{j=1}^{\varphi} \bigoplus_{i=1}^{q_{i_1}} \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_{j,i}^{i_1} e_i \\ &= \sum_{i_1=1}^t \bigoplus_{j=1}^{\varphi} \bigoplus_{i=1}^{q_{i_1}} \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_{j,i}^{i_1} d_i \\ &= \sum_{i_1=1}^t \varphi_{i_1} \ell_{i_1} ((d_1, d_2, ..., d_p)) \\ &= \psi^k(b). \end{split}$$

Definition 6. Let $\varphi_i : R^{m_i \times n_i} \to R^{1 \times q_i}$ be a linear map where $1 \le i \le t, A \in R^{r_1} \prod_{k=1}^t m_k \times r_2 \prod_{k=1}^t n_k$ and $A_{i,j}$ be $r_1 \prod_{k=1}^{t-1} m_k \times r_2 \prod_{k=1}^{t-1} n_k$ submatrix of A. Define $\prod_{j=1}^t \varphi_j(A) = \varphi_1 * \varphi_2 * \ldots * \varphi_t(A) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{q_t} \varphi_1 * \varphi_2 * \ldots * \varphi_{t-1}(b_i)$ where $(b_i)_{1 \times q_t} = \varphi_t(A)$.

Observation 3. $\varphi_1 * \varphi_2 * \ldots * \varphi_t (\sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i A_i) = \sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i \varphi_1 * \varphi_2 * \ldots * \varphi_t (A_i).$

Lemma 2. Let $\ell_i : R^{1 \times u_i} \to R^{1 \times v_i}$ be an interception map, $\varphi_i : R^{p_i \times q_i} \to R^{1 \times u_i}$ be a linear map where $1 \le i \le k$ and $A \in R^{r_1 \prod_{i=1}^k p_i \times r_2 \prod_{i=1}^k q_i}$. We have

$$\ell_1 \circ \ell_2 \circ \ldots \circ \ell_k(\varphi_k * \varphi_{k-1} * \ldots * \varphi_1(A)) = \ell_k \varphi_k * \ell_{k-1} \varphi_{k-1} * \ldots * \ell_1 \varphi_1(A).$$

Proof. We prove this by induction on k. First, this lemma holds when k = 1. Assume this lemma holds on k - 1. W.l.o.g, we assume $\varphi_1(A) = (b_1, b_2, ..., b_{u_1})$. Thus,

$$\begin{split} \prod_{i=1}^{k} {}^{\circ} \ell_{i} (\prod_{j=k}^{1} {}^{*} \varphi_{j}(A)) = & \prod_{i=1}^{k} {}^{\circ} \ell_{i} (\bigoplus_{t=1}^{u_{1}} \prod_{j=k}^{2} {}^{*} \varphi_{j}(b_{t})) \\ = & \bigoplus_{h=1}^{v_{1}} \prod_{i=2}^{k} {}^{\circ} \ell_{i} (\ell_{1}^{h} (\bigoplus_{t=1}^{u_{1}} (\prod_{j=k}^{2} {}^{*} \varphi_{j}(b_{t})))) \\ = & \bigoplus_{h=1}^{v_{1}} \prod_{i=2}^{k} {}^{\circ} \ell_{i} (\prod_{j=k}^{2} {}^{*} \varphi_{j}(\ell_{1}^{h}(b_{1}, b_{2}, ..., b_{u_{1}}))). \end{split}$$

By the induction hypothesis, we have

$$\begin{split} \prod_{i=1}^{k} {}^{\circ} \ell_{i} (\prod_{j=k}^{1} {}^{*} \varphi_{j}(A)) &= \bigoplus_{h=1}^{v_{1}} \prod_{i=2}^{k} {}^{\circ} \ell_{i} (\prod_{j=k}^{2} {}^{*} \varphi_{j}(\ell_{1}^{h}(b_{1}, b_{2}, ..., b_{u_{1}}))) \\ &= \bigoplus_{h=1}^{v_{1}} \prod_{j=k}^{2} {}^{*} \ell_{j} \varphi_{j}(\ell_{1}^{h}(b_{1}, b_{2}, ..., b_{u_{1}})) \\ &= \bigoplus_{h=1}^{v_{1}} \prod_{j=k}^{2} {}^{*} \ell_{j} \varphi_{j}(\ell_{1}^{h}(\varphi_{1}(A))) \\ &= \prod_{j=k}^{1} {}^{*} \ell_{j} \varphi_{j}(A). \end{split}$$

Lemma 3. Let $\varphi_i : R^{m_i \times n_i} \to R^{1 \times q_i}, \phi_i : R^{m_i \times n_i} \to R^{1 \times p_i}$ and $\psi_i : R^{1 \times p_i} \to R^{1 \times q_i}$ be linear maps for $1 \le i \le k, A \in R^{r_1 \prod_{i=1}^k m_i \times r_2 \prod_{i=1}^k n_i}$. If $\psi_i \phi_i = \varphi_i$ for $1 \le i \le k$, then

$$\varphi_1 * \varphi_2 * \ldots * \varphi_k(A) = \psi_1 * \psi_2 * \ldots * \psi_k(\phi_1 * \phi_2 * \ldots * \phi_k(A)).$$

Proof. We prove this by induction on k. First, this lemma holds when k = 1. Assume this lemma holds on k - 1. W.l.o.g, we assume $\varphi_k(A) = \bigoplus_{r=1}^{q_k} \sum_{i,j} \lambda_{ij}^r A_{ij}$ where $A = (A_{ij})_{m_k \times n_k}$, $\psi_k(B) = \bigoplus_{r=1}^{q_k} \sum_{z=1}^{p_k} \nu_z^r B_z$ where $B = (B_z)_{1 \times p_k}$, and $\phi_k(A) = \bigoplus_{z=1}^{q_k} \sum_{i,j} \mu_{ij}^z A_{ij}$ where $A = (A_{ij})_{m_k \times n_k}$. Since $\varphi_k = \psi_k \phi_k$, we have $\sum_{i,j} \lambda_{ij}^r A_{ij} = \sum_{z=1}^{p_k} \nu_z^r \sum_{i,j} \mu_{ij}^z A_{ij}$. By the induction hypothesis, we have

$$\varphi_{1} * \varphi_{2} * \dots * \varphi_{k}(A) = \bigoplus_{r=1}^{q_{i}} \varphi_{1} * \varphi_{2} * \dots * \varphi_{k-1}(\sum_{i,j} \lambda_{ij}^{r} A_{ij})$$

$$= \bigoplus_{r=1}^{q_{i}} \psi_{1} * \psi_{2} * \dots * \psi_{k-1}(\phi_{1} * \phi_{2} * \dots * \phi_{k-1}(\sum_{z=1}^{p_{k}} \nu_{z}^{r} \sum_{i,j} \mu_{ij}^{z} A_{ij}))$$

$$= \bigoplus_{r=1}^{q_{i}} \psi_{1} * \psi_{2} * \dots * \psi_{k-1}(\sum_{z=1}^{p_{k}} \nu_{z}^{r} \phi_{1} * \phi_{2} * \dots * \phi_{k-1}(\sum_{i,j} \mu_{ij}^{z} A_{ij}))$$

$$= \psi_{1} * \psi_{2} * \dots * \psi_{k}(\bigoplus_{z=1}^{p_{k}} \phi_{1} * \phi_{2} * \dots * \phi_{k-1}(\sum_{i,j} \mu_{ij}^{z} A_{ij}))$$

$$= \psi_{1} * \psi_{2} * \dots * \psi_{k}(\phi_{1} * \phi_{2} * \dots * \phi_{k}(A)).$$

3 The Design Of Algorithm

We refer to the $\langle U_{t \times n_0 m_0}, V_{t \times m_0 k_0}, W_{t \times n_0 k_0} \rangle$ of a $\langle n_0, m_0, k_0; t \rangle$ -algorithm as its encoding/decoding matrices[4] (where U, V are encoding matrices and W is the decoding matrix). An

encoding/decoding matrix is corresponding to a bilinear function $f: R^{1 \times n_0 m_0} \times R^{1 \times m_0 k_0} \to R^{1 \times n_0 k_0}$ with

$$f(x,y) = W^T((U \cdot x) \odot (V \cdot y))$$

where $x \in R^{1 \times n_0 m_0}$, $y \in R^{1 \times m_0 k_0}$ and \odot is element-wise vector product(Hadamard product). Let $\psi(A) = U \cdot x$, $\phi(B) = V \cdot y$, $\varphi(C) = W^T C$ where $A = (a_{ij})_{n_0 \times m_0}$, $B = (b_{ij})_{m_0 \times k_0}$, $C = (c_{ij})_{1 \times t}$, $x = (a_{ij})_{1 \times n_0 m_0}$, $y = (b_{ij})_{1 \times m_0 k_0}$.

Now, we will decompose the linear maps φ, ψ, ϕ to get the faster algorithm. Let $\varphi_i : R^{1 \times p_i} \to R^{1 \times q_i}, \psi_i : R^{n_0 \times m_0} \to R^{1 \times p_i}, \psi_{i,1} : R^{n_0 \times m_0} \to R^{1 \times p_{i,1}}, \psi_{i,2} : R^{1 \times p_{i,1}} \to R^{1 \times p_i}, \phi_i : R^{m_0 \times k_0} \to R^{1 \times p_i'}, \phi_{i,1} : R^{m_0 \times k_0} \to R^{1 \times p_i',1}, \phi_{i,2} : R^{1 \times p_i',1} \to R^{1 \times p_i}$ be linear maps and ℓ_i be interception maps which satisfy that $\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^{h} \varphi_i \ell_i, \ \psi_i = \ell_i \psi, \ \phi_i = \ell_i \phi$ and $\psi_i = \psi_{i,2} \psi_{i,1}, \phi_i = \phi_{i,2} \phi_{i,1}$, where $1 \le i \le h$.

In this paper, we consider the situation that $\varphi_i = \psi_{i,2} = \phi_{i,2} = I$, $p_i = q_i = p_{i,1} = p'_{i,1} = 1$ for $2 \le i \le h$, $p_{1,1} \ge 2$, $p'_{1,1} \ge 2$, $q_1 \ge 2$, $t - p_1 > \max\{m_0 n_0, m_0 k_0, n_0 k_0\}$ and $h = t - p_1 + 1$.

Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n_0^q \times m_0^q}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m_0^q \times k_0^q}$ be the input of $\langle m_0, n_0, k_0; t \rangle$ -algorithm and C be the output. Then, we have [6, 11, 3]

$$C = \varphi^q (\prod_{i=1}^q {}^*\psi(A) \odot \prod_{i=1}^q {}^*\phi(B)).$$

Further more, by Lemma 1, and Observation 2, we have

$$C = \sum_{i_{1}=1}^{h} \sum_{i_{2}=1}^{\varphi_{0}} \dots \sum_{i_{q}=1}^{h} \prod_{j=1}^{\varphi_{0}} \varphi_{i_{j}}\ell_{i_{j}}(\prod_{i=1}^{q} \psi(A) \odot \prod_{i=1}^{q} \phi(B))$$

$$= \sum_{i_{1}=1}^{h} \sum_{i_{2}=1}^{\varphi_{0}} \dots \sum_{i_{q}=1}^{h} \prod_{j=1}^{\varphi_{0}} \varphi_{i_{j}}(\prod_{z=1}^{q} \ell_{i_{z}}(\prod_{i=1}^{q} \psi(A) \odot \prod_{i=1}^{q} \phi(B)))$$

$$= \sum_{i_{1}=1}^{h} \sum_{i_{2}=1}^{\varphi_{0}} \dots \sum_{i_{q}=1}^{h} \prod_{j=1}^{\varphi_{0}} \varphi_{i_{j}}(\prod_{z=1}^{q} \ell_{i_{z}}(\prod_{i=1}^{q} \psi(A)) \odot \prod_{j=1}^{q} \ell_{i_{z}}(\prod_{i=1}^{q} \phi(B))).$$

By Lemma 2, we have

$$\begin{split} C = &\sum_{i_1=1}^{h} \sum_{i_2=1}^{\varphi_0} \dots \sum_{i_q=1}^{h} \prod_{z=1}^{\varphi_0} \varphi_{i_z}((\prod_{j=q}^{1} \ell_{i_j}\psi(A)) \odot (\prod_{j=q}^{1} \ell_{i_j}\phi(B))) \\ = &\sum_{i_1=1}^{h} \sum_{i_2=1}^{\varphi_0} \dots \sum_{i_q=1}^{h} \prod_{z=1}^{\varphi_0} \varphi_{i_z}((\prod_{j=q}^{1} \psi_{i_j}(A)) \odot (\prod_{j=q}^{1} \phi_{i_j}(B))) \\ = &\sum_{i_1=1}^{h} \sum_{i_2=1}^{\varphi_0} \dots \sum_{i_q=1}^{h} \prod_{z=1}^{\varphi_0} \varphi_{i_z}((\prod_{j=q}^{1} \psi_{i_j,2}\psi_{i_j,1}(A)) \odot (\prod_{j=q}^{1} \phi_{i_j,2}\phi_{i_j,1}(B))). \end{split}$$

By Lemma 3, we have

$$C = \sum_{i_1=1}^{h} \sum_{i_2=1}^{\varphi_0} \dots \sum_{i_q=1}^{h} \prod_{z=1}^{\varphi_0} \varphi_{i_z} (\prod_{j=q}^{1} \psi_{i_j,2}(\prod_{j=q}^{1} \psi_{i_j,1}(A)) \odot (\prod_{j=q}^{1} \phi_{i_j,2}(\prod_{j=q}^{1} \phi_{i_j,1}(B)))).$$
(1)

Let $S = (s_1, s_2, ..., s_u), T = (t_1, t_2, ..., t_v)$ where s_i, t_j are matrices for $1 \le i \le u, 1 \le j \le v$. When u = 1, v = 1, t = 1, Equation 1 is equivalent following formula:

$$\sum_{i_t=1}^{h} \sum_{i_{t+1}=1}^{\varphi_0} \dots \sum_{i_q=1}^{h} \prod_{k=1}^{\varphi_0} \prod_{k=1}^{q} \varphi_{i_k} (\prod_{j=q}^{1} \psi_{i_j,2}(\bigoplus_{z=1}^{u} \prod_{j=q}^{t} \psi_{i_j,1}(s_z)) \odot \prod_{j=q}^{1} \psi_{i_j,2}(\bigoplus_{z=1}^{v} \prod_{j=q}^{t} \psi_{i_j,1}(t_z)))$$
(2)

where $i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_{t-1}$ are specified numbers with $1 \le i_j \le h$ for $1 \le j \le t - 1$. Then, we compute Formula 2.

First, we compute the situation that t - 1 = q, i.e., compute the following formula:

$$\prod_{k=1}^{q} \, {}^{\circ}\varphi_{i_k} (\prod_{j=q}^{1} \, {}^{*}\psi_{i_j,2}(S) \odot \prod_{j=q}^{1} \, {}^{*}\phi_{i_j,2}(T)). \tag{3}$$

(4)

Let x be the number of j with $i_j = 1$ for $1 \le j \le q$. Since $\varphi_i = \psi_{i,2} = \phi_{i,2} = I$ for $2 \le i \le t - p_1$, it equals to compute the following equation:

$$\prod_{k=1}^{x} \varphi_{1}(\prod_{j=1}^{x} \psi_{1,2}(S) \odot \prod_{j=1}^{x} \phi_{1,2}(T)).$$
Let $\psi_{1,2}(S) = (s'_{1}, s'_{2}, ..., s'_{p_{1}}), \phi_{1,2}(T) = (t'_{1}, t'_{2}, ..., t'_{p_{1}}).$ Then,

$$\prod_{k=1}^{x} \varphi_{1}(\prod_{j=1}^{x} \psi_{1,2}(S) \odot \prod_{j=1}^{x} \phi_{1,2}(T)) = \prod_{k=1}^{x} \varphi_{1}(\bigoplus_{z=1}^{p_{1}} \prod_{j=1}^{x-1^{*}} \psi_{1,2}(s'_{z}) \odot \prod_{j=1}^{x-1^{*}} \phi_{1,2}(t'_{z}))$$

$$= \varphi_{1}(\bigoplus_{z=1}^{p_{1}} \prod_{k=1}^{x-1^{\circ}} \varphi_{1}(\prod_{j=1}^{x-1^{*}} \psi_{1,2}(s'_{z}) \odot \prod_{j=1}^{x-1^{*}} \phi_{1,2}(t'_{z})).$$

The Algorithm 1 is designed to compute Formula 3 by Equation 4.

ALGORITHM 1: AC

Input: S,T **1** if length of S and T equal one then return $S \odot T$ $\mathbf{2}$ 3 else Let $(s'_1, s'_2, ..., s'_{p_1})$ be $\psi_{1,2}(S)$; 4 Let $(t'_1, t'_2, ..., t'_{p_1})$ be $\phi_{1,2}(T)$; $\mathbf{5}$ for i = 1 to p_1 do 6 Compute s'_i, t'_i ; $\mathbf{7}$ $z_i = AC(s'_i, t'_i);$ 8 Add z_i to re as $re = \varphi_1(z_1, z_2, ..., z_{p_1})^*$; 9 10 return re

Now, we show how to compute Formula 2. First, for a specified i_t and $1 \le z \le u$, let

$$\psi_{i_t,1}(s_z) = (s_{i_t,(z-1)*p_{i_t,1}+1}, s_{i_t,(z-1)*p_{i_t,1}+2}, \dots, s_{i_t,(z-1)*p_{i_t,1}+p_{i_t,1}})$$

^{*:} Add z_i to re as $re = \varphi_1(z_1, z_2, ..., z_{p_1})$ means that renew re as $re = re + \varphi_1(z_1, z_2, ..., z_{p_1})$ with setting $z_1 = z_2 = ... = z_{i-1} = z_{i+1} = ... = z_{p_1} = 0$.

and

$$\phi_{i_t,1}(t_z) = (t_{i_t,(z-1)*p'_{i_t,1}+1}, t_{i_t,(z-1)*p'_{i_t,1}+2}, \dots, t_{i_t,(z-1)*p_{i_t,1}+p'_{i_t,1}}).$$

Then, for a specified i_t , we have

$$\bigoplus_{z=1}^{u} \prod_{j=q}^{t} \psi_{i_j,1}(s_z) = \bigoplus_{z=1}^{up_{i_t,1}} \prod_{j=q}^{t+1} \psi_{i_j,1}(s_{i_t,z})$$

and

$$\bigoplus_{z=1}^{v} \prod_{j=q}^{t} \phi_{i_j,1}(t_z) = \bigoplus_{z=1}^{vp'_{i_t,1}} \prod_{j=q}^{t+1^*} \phi_{i_j,1}(t_{i_t,z})$$

Let A_{i_t} be

$$\sum_{i_{t+1}=1}^{h} \cdots \sum_{i_{q}=1}^{\mu} \prod_{k=1}^{\varphi_{0}} \varphi_{i_{k}} (\prod_{j=q}^{*} \psi_{i_{j},2} (\bigoplus_{z=1}^{up_{i_{t},1}} \prod_{j=q}^{t+1^{*}} \psi_{i_{j},1}(s_{i_{t},z})) \odot \prod_{j=q}^{1} \bigoplus_{i_{j},2}^{*} (\bigoplus_{z=1}^{vp'_{i_{t},1}} \prod_{j=q}^{t+1^{*}} \phi_{i_{j},1}(t_{i_{t},z}))).$$

Then,
$$\sum_{i_{t}=1}^{h} \bigoplus_{i_{t}=1}^{\varphi_{0}} A_{i_{t}} \text{ equals Formula } 2.$$

Definition 7. Let ξ_1, ξ_2 be two maps with two inputs, $S = (s_i)_{1 \times u}, T = (t_i)_{1 \times v}, a_i = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{u} \psi_{i,1}(s_i), b_i =$ $\bigoplus_{j=1}^{v} \phi_{i,1}(t_j) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq h, \text{ and } c_1 = \xi_1(a_1, b_1), c_i = \xi_2(a_i, b_i) \text{ for } 2 \leq i \leq h. \text{ Define } \mathcal{F}(\xi_1, \xi_2, S, T) = \xi_1(a_1, b_1), c_i = \xi_2(a_i, b_i) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq h. \text{ Define } \mathcal{F}(\xi_1, \xi_2, S, T) = \xi_1(a_1, b_1), c_i = \xi_2(a_i, b_i) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq h. \text{ Define } \mathcal{F}(\xi_1, \xi_2, S, T) = \xi_2(a_i, b_i) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq h. \text{ Define } \mathcal{F}(\xi_1, \xi_2, S, T) = \xi_2(a_i, b_i) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq h. \text{ Define } \mathcal{F}(\xi_1, \xi_2, S, T) = \xi_2(a_i, b_i) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq h. \text{ Define } \mathcal{F}(\xi_1, \xi_2, S, T) = \xi_2(a_i, b_i) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq h. \text{ Define } \mathcal{F}(\xi_1, \xi_2, S, T) = \xi_2(a_i, b_i) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq h. \text{ Define } \mathcal{F}(\xi_1, \xi_2, S, T) = \xi_2(a_i, b_i) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq h. \text{ Define } \mathcal{F}(\xi_1, \xi_2, S, T) = \xi_2(a_i, b_i) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq h. \text{ Define } \mathcal{F}(\xi_1, \xi_2, S, T) = \xi_2(a_i, b_i) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq h. \text{ Define } \mathcal{F}(\xi_1, \xi_2, S, T) = \xi_2(a_i, b_i) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq h. \text{ Define } \mathcal{F}(\xi_1, \xi_2, S, T) = \xi_2(a_i, b_i) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq h. \text{ Define } \mathcal{F}(\xi_1, \xi_2, S, T) = \xi_2(a_i, b_i) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq h. \text{ Define } \mathcal{F}(\xi_1, \xi_2, S, T) = \xi_2(a_i, b_i) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq h. \text{ Define } \mathcal{F}(\xi_1, \xi_2, S, T) = \xi_2(a_i, b_i) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq h. \text{ Define } \mathcal{F}(\xi_1, \xi_2, S, T) = \xi_2(a_i, b_i) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq h. \text{ Define } \mathcal{F}(\xi_1, \xi_2, S, T) = \xi_2(a_i, b_i) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq h. \text{ Define } \mathcal{F}(\xi_1, \xi_2, S, T) = \xi_2(a_i, b_i) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq h. \text{ Define } \mathcal{F}(\xi_1, \xi_2, S, T) = \xi_2(a_i, b_i) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq h. \text{ Define } \mathcal{F}(\xi_1, \xi_2, S, T) = \xi_2(a_i, b_i) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq h. \text{ Define } \mathcal{F}(\xi_1, \xi_2, S, T) = \xi_2(a_i, b_i) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq h. \text{ Define } \mathcal{F}(\xi_1, \xi_2, S, T) = \xi_2(a_i, b_i) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq h. \text{ Define } \mathcal{F}(\xi_1, \xi_2, S, T) = \xi_2(a_i, b_i) \text{ for } 1 \leq h. \text{ Define } \mathcal{F}(\xi_1, \xi_2, S, T) = \xi_2(a_i, b_i) \text{ for } 1 \leq h. \text{ Define } \mathcal{F}(\xi_1, \xi_2, S, T) = \xi_2(a_i, b_i) \text{ for } 1 \leq h. \text{ Define } \mathcal{F}(\xi_1, \xi_2, S, T) = \xi_2(a_i, b_i) \text{ for } 1 \leq h. \text{ Define } \mathcal{F}(\xi_1, \xi_2, S, T) = \xi_2(a_i, b_i) \text{ for } 1 \leq h. \text{ Define } \mathcal{F}(\xi_1, \xi_2, S, T) = \xi_2(a_i,$ $\sum_{i=1}^{h} c_i.$

Let $BC(\bigoplus_{z=1}^{up_{i_t,1}}(s_{i_t,z}), \bigoplus_{z=1}^{vp'_{i_t,1}}(t_{i_t,z})) := A_{i_t}$. Notice that $\sum_{i_t=1}^{h} \varphi_0 A_{i_t}$ equals $\mathcal{F}(BC, BC, S, T)$.

Let $\varphi_1(\psi_{1,2} \odot \phi_{1,2})(A', B')$ be the map $\varphi_1(\psi_{1,2}(A') \odot \phi_{1,2}(B'))$ where $A' \in \mathbb{R}^{m_0 \times n_0}, B' \in \mathbb{R}^{n_0 \times k_0}, \mathcal{A}$ be an algorithm computing $\mathcal{F}(\varphi_1(\psi_{1,2} \odot \phi_{1,2}), \odot, A', B')$. Let $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}(\xi_1, \xi_2, S, T)$ be an algorithm obtained by replacing $a'_i = \psi_{i,1}(A'), b'_i = \phi_{i,1}(B')$ with $a_i = \bigoplus_{j=1}^u \psi_{i,1}(s_j), b_i = \bigoplus_{j=1}^v \phi_{i,1}(t_j)$ $1 \le i \le h$, $c'_i = \psi_{i,1}(A') \odot \phi_{i,1}(B')$ with $c_i = \xi_2(a_i, b_i)$ for $2 \le i \le h$, $c'_1 = \varphi_1(\psi_{1,2}(a'_1) \odot \phi_{1,2}(b'_1))$ with $c_1 = \xi_1(a_1, b_1)$, and $\sum_{i=1}^h c'_i$ with $\sum_{i=1}^h c_i$. We present the Algorithm 2 to compute Formula 2.

We will present another algorithms (Algorithm 3,4), where Algorithm 3 is obtained from Algorithm 2 by modifying the recursive exit and Algorithm 4 is similar with Algorithm 1. In Algorithm 3, we call Algorithm 4 when $BC(s_1, t_1)$ can be computed within memory M. In next section, we will give the needed memory size of BC(S,T).

ALGORITHM 2: BC	
Input: S,T	ALGORITHM 4: DC
1 if s_1 of S is a number	Input: S,T
instead of a matrix then	1 if length of S and T equal
2 re = AC(S,T);	$one {f then}$
3 else	2 return $BC((S), (T));$
4 $re = \mathcal{F}_A(BC, BC, S, T)$	3 else
5 return re	4 Let $(s'_1, s'_2,, s'_{p_1})$ be
	$\psi_{1,2}(S);$
ALGORITHM 3: CC	5 Let $(t'_1, t'_2,, t'_{p_1})$ be
Input: S,T	$\phi_{1,2}(T);$
1 if $BC(s_1, t_1)$ can be	6 for $i = 1$ to p_1 do
computed within memory	7 Computing s'_i, t'_i ;
M then	8 $z_i = DC(s'_i, t'_i);$
2 re = DC(S,T);	9 Add z_i to re as $re =$
3 else	$\varphi_1(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n_1});$
4 $re = \mathcal{F}_A(CC, CC, S, T)$	10 return re
5 return re	10 100000 /C

3.1 Combine with alternative basis

It is clear that our method can be combined with Karstadt-Schwartz's method[11]. Let $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$ be the basis transformation functions. We give the combined algorithms as following:

ALGORITHM 5: BC*	ALGORITHM 6: CC*
Input: $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}, B \in$	Input: $A \in R^{n \times m}, B \in$
$R^{m imes k}$	$R^{m imes k}$
1 $\tilde{A} = \gamma_1(A);$	1 $\tilde{A} = \gamma_1(A);$
$2 \ \tilde{B} = \gamma_2(B);$	2 $\tilde{B} = \gamma_2(B);$
3 $\tilde{C} = BC((\tilde{A}), (\tilde{B}));$	3 $\tilde{C} = CC((\tilde{A}), (\tilde{B}));$
4 $C = \gamma_3^{-1}(\tilde{C});$	4 $C = \gamma_3^{-1}(\tilde{C});$
5 return re	5 return re

4 complexity

Recall that $\varphi_i = \psi_{i,2} = \phi_{i,2} = I$, $p_i = q_i = p_{i,1} = p'_{i,1} = 1$ for $2 \le i \le h$, $h = t - p_1 + 1$, and $A \in R^{n_0^q \times m_0^q}$, $B \in R^{m_0^q \times k_0^q}$, $C \in R^{n_0^q \times k_0^q}$.

For convenient, we assume that there are $\ell_{1,1}, \ell_{2,1}, \ell_{3,1}$ linear operations in $\psi_{1,2}, \phi_{1,2}$ and φ_1 respectively. Let $\ell_{1,3} = p_{1,1}, \ell_{2,3} = p'_{1,1}, \ell_{3,3} = q_1, \ell_{1,4} = m_0 n_0, \ell_{2,4} = n_0 k_0, \ell_{3,4} = m_0 k_0, u_0 = \max\{m_0 n_0, n_0 k_0, m_0 k_0\}, r = \max\{p_{1,1}, p'_{1,1}, q_1\}.$

Let \mathcal{A} be an algorithm to compute $\mathcal{F}(\psi_{1,2} \odot \phi_{1,2}, \odot, A', B')$ where $A' \in \mathbb{R}^{m_0 \times n_0}, B' \in \mathbb{R}^{n_0 \times k_0}$ and $C' = \mathcal{F}(\psi_{1,2} \odot \phi_{1,2}, \odot, A', B')$. And let $\ell_{1,2}$ be total linear operations of \mathcal{A} in computing $a'_i = \psi_{i,1}(A')$ for $1 \leq i \leq h$, $\ell_{2,2}$ be total linear operations of \mathcal{A} in computing $b'_i = \phi_{i,1}(B')$ for $1 \leq i \leq h$ and $\ell_{3,2}$ be linear operations of \mathcal{A} in computing $\sum_{i=1}^{h} c'_i$ where $c'_1 = \psi_{1,2}(a'_1) \odot \phi_{1,2}(b'_1), c'_2 = a'_i \odot b'_i$ for $2 \leq i \leq h$. We assume that \mathcal{A} needs additional $\alpha_1 z_1 + \alpha_2 z_2 + \alpha_3 z_3$ size of memory to compute

 $\mathcal{F}(\psi_{1,2} \odot \phi_{1,2}, \odot, A', B')$ where z_1, z_2, z_3 are the size of elements in A', B' and C' respectively.

Observation 4. The arithmetic complexity of Algorithm 5(Algorithm 6) is the sum of arithmetic complexity in Algorithm 2(Algorithm 3) and basis transformations. The IO complexity of Algorithm 5(Algorithm 6) is the sum of IO complexity in Algorithm 2(Algorithm 3) and basis transformations.

Lemma 4. [11] Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\psi : \mathbb{R}^{n_0 \times n_0} \to \mathbb{R}^{n_0 \times n_0}$ be a basis transformation. The arithmetic complexity and IO complexity of ψ on A are $\frac{q}{n_0^2}n^2 \log_{n_0} n$ and $\frac{3q}{n_0^2}n^2 \log_{n_0}(\sqrt{2}\frac{n}{\sqrt{M}}) + 2M$ respectively where q is the number of linear operations of ψ .

By Observation 4 and Lemma 4, we will only study the arithmetic complexity and IO complexity of Algorithms 2, 3.

For convenient, define a (h, x)-instance as $(S = (s_i)_{1 \times \ell_{1,3}^x}, T = (t_i)_{1 \times \ell_{2,3}^x})$ where $s_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_0^h \times m_0^h}$ for $1 \le i \le \ell_{2,3}^x$. Specially, we call a (0, x)-instance as x-instance.

4.1 Preliminary Of Complexity

In this subsection, we discuss how much memory size it needs to compute Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2.

Lemma 5. Algorithm 1 can compute an *x*-instance within memory $M = \sum_{i=1}^{3} \frac{\ell_{i,3}^{x+1}}{\ell_{i,3}-1}$.

Proof. We prove this by induction on x. When x = 1, since $\frac{\ell_{i,3}^2}{\ell_{i,3}-1} \ge \ell_{i,3} + 1$ for $1 \le i \le 3$, there are space storing s'_i for $1 \le i \le p_1$ where $(s'_1, s'_2, \dots, s'_{p_1}) = \psi_{1,2}(S)$. Similarly, there is space storing t'_i and $s'_i \odot t'_i$ for $1 \le i \le p_1$. By Algorithm 1, it holds when x = 1. With assuming that it holds on x - 1, we prove that it holds on x. By Algorithm 1, we need to compute $s'_i, t'_i, z_i = AC(s'_i, t'_i)$ and add z_i to re as $re = \varphi_1(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{p_1})$ for $1 \le i \le p_1$. Since length of S is $\ell_{1,3}^x$, length of T is $\ell_{2,3}^x$ and length of AC(S,T) is $\ell_{3,3}^x$, there is $\sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{\ell_{i,3}^x}{\ell_{i,3}-1}$ memory size after storing S, T, AC(S,T). By the induction hypothesis, it is enough for computing $AC(s_i, t_i)$ for $1 \le i \le p_1$. So it holds on x. This lemma holds.

Let
$$\beta_i = \max\{\frac{\alpha_i}{\ell_{i,4} - \ell_{i,3}}, \frac{1}{\ell_{i,3} - 1}\}, \beta = \sum_{i=1}^3 (1 + \beta_i)$$

Lemma 6. Algorithm 2 can compute a (h, x)-instance within memory $M = \sum_{i=1}^{3} (\ell_{i,4}^{h} \ell_{i,3}^{x} + \beta_{i} \ell_{i,4}^{h} \ell_{i,3}^{x})$.

Proof. We also prove this by induction on h. When h = 0, Algorithm 2 calls Algorithm 1. Since $\sum_{i=1}^{3} (\ell_{i,3}^{x} + \beta_{i}\ell_{i,3}^{x}) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,3}^{x} \frac{\ell_{i,3}}{\ell_{i,3}-1}$, it holds by Lemma 5. With assuming that it holds on h-1, we prove that it holds on h. Recall that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}(\xi_{1},\xi_{2},S,T)$ is obtained from \mathcal{A} by replacing $a_{i} = \psi_{i,1}(\mathcal{A}'), b_{i} = \phi_{i,1}(\mathcal{B}')$ with $a_{i} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{u} \psi_{i,1}(s_{j}), b_{i} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{v} \phi_{i,1}(t_{j})$ for $1 \leq i \leq t-p_{1}+1, c_{1} = \varphi_{1}(\psi_{1,2} \odot \phi_{1,2})(a_{1},b_{1})$ with $c_{1} = \xi_{1}(a_{1},b_{1}), \text{ and } c_{i} = a_{i} \odot b_{i}$ with $c_{i} = \xi_{2}(a_{i},b_{i})$ for $2 \leq i \leq t-p_{1}+1$. Since \mathcal{A} needs additional $\alpha_{1}z_{1} + \alpha_{2}z_{2} + \alpha_{3}z_{3}$ memory size to compute $\mathcal{F}(\psi_{1,2} \odot \phi_{1,2}, \odot, \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}')$ where z_{1}, z_{2}, z_{3} are the size of elements in $\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}'$ and \mathcal{C}' respectively, $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}(\varphi_{1}(\psi_{1,2} \odot \phi_{1,2}), \odot, S, T)$ needs additional $\sum_{i=1}^{3} \alpha_{i}\ell_{i,4}^{h-1}\ell_{i,3}^{x}$

memory size. Since S, T and $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}(\varphi_1(\psi_{1,2} \odot \phi_{1,2}), \odot, S, T)$ can be stored within $\sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,4}^{h} \ell_{i,3}^{x}$ memory size, $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}(\varphi_1(\psi_{1,2} \odot \phi_{1,2}), \odot, S, T)$ can be computed within $\sum_{i=1}^{3} (\ell_{i,4}^{h} \ell_{i,3}^{x} + \alpha_i \ell_{i,4}^{h-1} \ell_{i,3}^{x})$ memory size. Comparing $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}(\varphi_1(\psi_{1,2} \odot \phi_{1,2}), \odot, S, T)$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}(BC, BC, S, T), \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}(BC, BC, S, T)$ replaces $\varphi_1(\psi_{1,2} \odot \phi_{1,2}), \odot$ operations with BC operation. Notice that $\varphi_1(\psi_{1,2} \odot \phi_{1,2})(a_1, b_1), a_1 \odot b_1$ need at least $\sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,4}^{h-1} \ell_{i,3}^{x+1}$ memory size and $\varphi_1(\psi_{1,2} \odot \phi_{1,2})(a_j, b_j), a_j \odot b_j$ need at least $\sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,4}^{h-1} \ell_{i,3}^{x+1}$ memory size and $\varphi_1(\psi_{1,2} \odot \phi_{1,2})(a_j, b_j), a_j \odot b_j$ need at least $\sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,4}^{h-1} \ell_{i,3}^{x+1} + \beta_i \ell_{i,4}^{h-1} \ell_{i,3}^{x+1})$ memory size and $BC(a_i, b_1)$ can be computed within $\sum_{i=1}^{3} (\ell_{i,4}^{h-1} \ell_{i,3}^{x} + \beta_i \ell_{i,4}^{h-1} \ell_{i,3}^{x+1})$ memory size and $BC(a_j, b_j)$ can be computed within $\sum_{i=1}^{3} (\ell_{i,4}^{h-1} \ell_{i,3}^{x} + \beta_i \ell_{i,4}^{h-1} \ell_{i,3}^{x+1})$ memory size for $2 \le j \le t - p_1 + 1$ by induction hypothesis, $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}(BC, BC, S, T)$ can be computed within $\sum_{i=1}^{3} (\ell_{i,4}^{h-1} \ell_{i,3}^{x})$ memory size for $2 \le j \le t - p_1 + 1$ by induction hypothesis, $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}(BC, BC, S, T)$ can be computed within $\sum_{i=1}^{3} (\ell_{i,4}^{h} \ell_{i,3}^{x} + \alpha_i \ell_{i,4}^{h-1} \ell_{i,3}^{x}) - \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,4}^{h-1} \ell_{i,3}^{x+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{3} (\ell_{i,4}^{h-1} \ell_{i,3}^{x+1} + \beta_i \ell_{i,4}^{h-1} \ell_{i,3}^{x+1}) \le \sum_{i=1}^{3} (\ell_{i,4}^{h-1} \ell_{i,3}^{x+1} + \beta_i \ell_{i,4}^{h-1} \ell_{i,3}^{x+1}) \le \sum_{i=1}^{3} (\ell_{i,4}^{h-1} \ell_{i,3}^{x+1} + \beta_i \ell_{i,4}^{h-1} \ell_{i,3}^{x+1}) \le \sum_{i=1}^{3} (\ell_{i,4}^{h} \ell_{i,3}^{x} + \beta_i \ell_{i,4}^{h} \ell_{i,3}^{x+1})$, this lemma holds.

Let $h' = \frac{\ln M - \ln \beta}{\ln u_0}$. Notice that Algorithm 2 can be compute a (h, 0)-instance within memory M when $h \leq h'$.

4.2 Arithmetic Complexity

Lemma 7. The arithmetic complexity of computing a *x*-instance by Algorithm 1 is $\mathcal{T}(x) = p_1^x + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,1} \sum_{j=0}^{x-1} \ell_{i,3}^{x-1-j} p_1^j$.

Proof. We prove this by induction on x. When x = 0, we have $\mathcal{T}(x) = 1$. This lemma holds. With assuming it holds on x - 1, we prove that it holds on x. By Algorithm 1, we have $\mathcal{T}(x) = p_1 \mathcal{T}(x-1) + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,1} \ell_{i,3}^{x-1}$. It deduces that $\mathcal{T}(x) = p_1^x + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,1} \sum_{j=0}^{x-1} \ell_{i,3}^{x-1-j} p_1^j$. This lemma holds. \Box

Now, denote following equations:

$$P_{1,h,x} = t^{h} \mathcal{T}(x)$$

$$P_{2,h,x} = \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,1} \ell_{i,3}^{x} \sum_{j=0}^{h-1} t^{j} (t - p_{1} + \ell_{i,3})^{h-1-j}$$

$$P_{3,h,x} = \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,2} \ell_{i,3}^{x} \sum_{j=0}^{h-1} \ell_{i,4}^{j} (t - p_{1} + \ell_{i,3})^{h-1-j}$$

Theorem 1. The arithmetic complexity of computing a (h, x)-instance by Algorithm 2 is $\mathcal{T}(h, x) = P_{1,h,x} + P_{2,h,x} + P_{3,h,x}$.

Proof. We prove this by induction on h. Since Algorithm 2 calls Algorithm 1 when h = 0, this lemma holds when h = 0.

With assuming it holds on h - 1, we prove that it holds on h. Notice that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}(BC, BC, S, T)$ will compute $a_i = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{\ell_{1,3}^x} \psi_{i,1}(s_j), b_i = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{\ell_{2,3}^x} \phi_{i,1}(t_j), c_i = BC(a_i, b_i)$ for $1 \le i \le t - p_1 + 1$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{t-p_1+1\varphi_0} c_i$. Since the length of a_1, b_1 are $\ell_{1,3}^{x+1}, \ell_{2,3}^{x+1}$ respectively and the length of a_i, b_i are $\ell_{1,3}^x, \ell_{2,3}^x$ respectively for $2 \le i \le t - p_1 + 1$, the arithmetic complexity of computing $BC(a_i, b_i)$ for $1 \le i \le t - p_1 + 1$ is $(t - p_1)\mathcal{T}(h - 1, x) + \mathcal{T}(h - 1, x + 1)$. And the arithmetic complexity of computing $a_i, b_i, \sum_{i=1}^{t-p_1+1} c_i$ are $\ell_{1,2}\ell_{1,3}^x\ell_{1,4}^{h-1}, \ell_{2,2}\ell_{2,3}^x\ell_{2,4}^{h-1}, \ell_{3,2}\ell_{3,3}^x\ell_{3,4}^{h-1}$ respectively. Then,

$$\mathcal{T}(h,x) = (t-p_1)\mathcal{T}(h-1,x) + \mathcal{T}(h-1,x+1) + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,2}\ell_{i,3}^x \ell_{i,4}^{h-1}$$

First, we have

$$(t - p_1)P_{1,h-1,x} + P_{1,h-1,x+1}$$

= $(t - p_1)t^{h-1}\mathcal{T}(x) + t^{h-1}\mathcal{T}(x+1)$
= $(t - p_1)t^{h-1}\mathcal{T}(x) + p_1t^{h-1}\mathcal{T}(x) + t^{h-1}\sum_{i=1}^{3}\ell_{i,1}\ell_{i,3}^x$
= $t^h\mathcal{T}(x) + t^{h-1}\sum_{i=1}^{3}\ell_{i,1}\ell_{i,3}^x$
= $P_{1,h,x} + t^{h-1}\sum_{i=1}^{3}\ell_{i,1}\ell_{i,3}^x$

Second, we have

$$(t - p_1)P_{2,h-1,x} + P_{2,h-1,x+1} + t^{h-1} \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,1}\ell_{i,3}^x$$
$$= \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,1}\ell_{i,3}^x \sum_{j=0}^{h-2} t^j (t - p_1 + \ell_{i,3})^{h-1-j} + t^{h-1} \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,1}\ell_{i,3}^x$$
$$= P_{2,h,x}$$

Last, we have

$$(t - p_1)P_{3,h-1,x} + P_{3,h-1,x+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,2}\ell_{i,3}^x \ell_{i,4}^{h-1}$$

= $\sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,2}\ell_{i,3}^x \sum_{j=0}^{h-2} \ell_{i,4}^j (t - p_1 + \ell_{i,3})^{h-2-j} + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,2}\ell_{i,3}^x \ell_{i,4}^{h-1}$
= $P_{3,h,x}$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}(h,x) &= (t-p_1)\mathcal{T}(h-1,x) + \mathcal{T}(h-1,x+1) + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,2}\ell_{i,3}^{x}\ell_{i,4}^{h-1} \\ &= (t-p_1)\sum_{i=1}^{3} P_{i,h-1,x} + \sum_{i=1}^{3} P_{i,h-1,x+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,2}\ell_{i,3}^{x}\ell_{i,4}^{h-1} \\ &= P_{1,h,x} + t^{h-1}\sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,1}\ell_{i,3}^{x} + (t-p_1)\sum_{i=2}^{3} P_{i,h-1,x} + \sum_{i=2}^{3} P_{i,h-1,x+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,2}\ell_{i,3}^{x}\ell_{i,4}^{h-1} \\ &= P_{1,h,x} + P_{2,h,x} + (t-p_1)P_{3,h-1,x} + P_{3,h-1,x+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,2}\ell_{i,3}^{x}\ell_{i,4}^{h-1} \\ &= P_{1,h,x} + P_{2,h,x} + (t-p_1)P_{3,h-1,x} + P_{3,h-1,x+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,2}\ell_{i,3}^{x}\ell_{i,4}^{h-1} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, this lemma holds.

Corollary 1. The leading coefficient of arithmetic complexity for Algorithm 2 with a (h, 0)-instance is $\sum_{i=1}^{3} \frac{\ell_{i,1}}{p_1 - \ell_{i,3}} + 1$ only depended on $\varphi_1, \phi_{1,1}, \psi_{1,1}$.

Lemma 8. The arithmetic complexity of computing a (h, x)-instance by Algorithm 4 is $\mathcal{B}(h, x) = \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,1} \ell_{i,4}^{h} \sum_{j=0}^{x-1} \ell_{i,3}^{x-1-j} p_1^j + p_1^x \mathcal{T}(h, 0).$

Proof. We prove this by induction on x. Since Algorithm 4 calls Algorithm 2 when x = 0, this lemma holds when x = 0. With assuming it holds on x - 1, we prove that it holds on x. By Algorithm 4, we have $\mathcal{B}(h, x) = p_1 \mathcal{B}(h, x - 1) + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,1} \ell_{i,4}^h \ell_{i,3}^{x-1}$. It deduces that $\mathcal{B}(h, x) = \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,1} \ell_{i,4}^h \sum_{j=0}^{x-1} \ell_{i,3}^{x-j-1} p_1^j + p_1^x \mathcal{T}(h, 0)$. This lemma holds.

Let
$$P'_{1,h+h',x} = t^h \mathcal{B}(h',x), P'_{2,h+h',x} = \ell^{h'}_{i,4} P_{2,h,x} \cdot P'_{3,h+h',x} = \ell^{h'}_{i,4} P_{3,h,x}$$

Theorem 2. The arithmetic complexity of computing a (h, x)-instance by Algorithm 3 is $C(h, x) = P'_{1,h,x} + P'_{2,h,x} + P'_{3,h,x}$.

Proof. The proof is similar with the proof of Theorem 1.

Corollary 2. The leading coefficient of arithmetic complexity for Algorithm 3 with input $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m_0^h \times n_0^h}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n_0^h \times k_0^h}$ is $1 + \frac{P_{3,h',0}}{t^{h'}} + \sum_{i=1}^3 (1 - (\frac{t-p_1+\ell_{i,3}}{t})^{h'} + (\frac{\ell_{i,4}}{t})^{h'}) \frac{\ell_{i,1}}{p_1-\ell_{i,3}}$.

4.3 IO Complexity

Let $x' = \frac{\ln M(r-1) - \ln 3r}{\ln r}$. Notice that Algorithm 1 can compute an *x*-instance within *M* memory when $x \le x'$ by Lemma 5.

Lemma 9. The IO complexity of computing a *x*-instance with $x \ge x'$ by Algorithm 1 is $M(x) = p_1^{x-x'}M + 3\sum_{i=1}^3 \ell_{i,1}\ell_{i,3}^{x'} \frac{p_1^{x-x'} - \ell_{i,3}^{x-x'}}{p_1 - \ell_{i,3}}$.

Proof. For an *x*-instance with x < x', it can be computed within memory M by Lemma 5. Then, when $x \le x'$, the IO complexity is $\sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,3}^{x}$ less than M. When x > x', $M(x) = p_1 M(x-1) + 3\sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,1} \ell_{i,3}^{x-1}$. Thus $M(x) = p_1^{x-x'}M + 3\sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,1} \sum_{j=x'}^{x-1} p_1^{x-1-j} \ell_{i,3}^{j} = p_1^{x-x'}M + 3\sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,1} \ell_{i,3}^{x'} \frac{p_1^{x-x'} - \ell_{i,3}^{x-x'}}{p_1 - \ell_{i,3}}$.

For convenient, we denote

$$M(x) = \begin{cases} p_1^{x-x'}M + 3\sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,1}\ell_{i,3}^{x'} \frac{p_1^{x-x'} - \ell_{i,3}^{x-x'}}{p_1 - \ell_{i,3}}, & x \ge x'\\ p_1^{x-x'}M, & x < x' \end{cases}$$

Note that M(x) is not the IO complexity of Algorithm 1 when x < x'.

Lemma 10. The IO complexity of computing a (h', x)-instance by Algorithm 4 is $M'(x) = p_1^x \sum_{i=1}^3 \ell_{i,4}^{h'} + 3 \sum_{i=1}^3 \ell_{i,1} \ell_{i,4}^{h'} \sum_{j=0}^{x-1} \ell_{i,3}^j p_1^{x-1-j}$.

Proof. By Lemma 6, $M'(0) = \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,4}^{h'} \leq M$, since Algorithm 4 calls Algorithm 2 when x = 0. And $M'(x) = p_1 M'(x-1) + 3 \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,1} \ell_{i,3}^{x-1} \ell_{i,4}^{h'}$ when x > 0. Then $M'(x) = p_1^x \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,4}^{h'} + 3 \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,1} \ell_{i,4}^{h'} \sum_{j=0}^{x-1} \ell_{i,2}^{j} p_1^{x-1-j}$.

Theorem 3. The IO complexity of computing a (h, x)-instance by Algorithm 3 is $M'(h, x) = t^{h-h'}M'(x) + 3\sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,3}^{x} \ell_{i,4}^{h'} \sum_{j=0}^{h-1-h'} (t-p_1+\ell_{i,3})^{h-h'-1-j} (\ell_{i,1}t^j+\ell_{i,2}\ell_{i,4}^j).$

Proof. When $h \le h'$, Algorithm 3 calls Algorithm 4, then the IO complexity is M'(x). When h > h', $M'(h, x) = (t - p_1)M'(h - 1, x) + M'(h - 1, x + 1) + 3\sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,2}\ell_{i,3}^x \ell_{i,4}^{h-1}$. Similarly with the proof of Theorem 1, $M'(h, x) = t^{h-h'}M'(x) + 3\sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,3}^x \ell_{i,4}^{h'} \sum_{j=0}^{h-1-h'} (t - p_1 + \ell_{i,3})^{h-h'-1-j} (\ell_{i,1}t^j + \ell_{i,2}\ell_{i,4}^j)$. □

Let

$$\begin{split} Z(h,x) &= \sum_{i=1}^{3} (\ell_{i,4}^{h} \ell_{i,3}^{x} + \beta_{i} \ell_{i,3}^{x} \ell_{i,4}^{h}), \\ M_{1}(h,x) &= 3 \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,1} \ell_{i,3}^{x} \sum_{j=0}^{h-1} (t-p_{1}+\ell_{i,3})^{h-1-j} t^{j}, \\ M_{2}(h,x) &= 3 \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,1} \ell_{i,3}^{x} (\frac{\ell_{i,3}}{p_{1}})^{x'-x} \sum_{j=0}^{h-1} (t-p_{1}+\ell_{i,3})^{h-1-j} t^{j}, \\ T_{x}(h,j) &\leq \begin{cases} 3 \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,2} \binom{h}{x-j} \frac{(t-p_{1})^{h-x+j}}{t-p_{1}+\ell_{i,3}-\ell_{i,4}} \ell_{i,3}^{x}, & Z(0,x) \geq M \\ 3 \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,2} \binom{h}{x-j} (\frac{\ell_{i,4}}{t-p_{1}})^{h'-\frac{\ln x}{\ln u_{0}}x} \frac{(t-p_{1})^{h-x+j}}{t-p_{1}+\ell_{i,3}-\ell_{i,4}} \ell_{i,3}^{x}, & Z(0,x) < M \end{cases} \\ M_{3}(h,x) &= \sum_{i=x}^{h+x} T_{i}(h,x) - 3 \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,3}^{x} \ell_{i,2} \frac{\ell_{i,4}^{h}}{t-p_{1}+\ell_{i,3}-\ell_{i,4}}, \\ R(h,x) &= \begin{cases} t^{h}M(x) + M_{1}(h,x) + M_{3}(h,x), & x \geq x' \\ t^{h}M(x) + M_{2}(h,x) + M_{3}(h,x), & x < x' \end{cases} . \end{split}$$

Observation 5. $R(h,x) \ge (t-p_1)R(h-1,x) + R(h-1,x+1) + 3\sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,2}\ell_{i,3}^x \ell_{i,4}^{h-1}.$

Proof. It is clear to check that $T_i(h-1,x+1) + (t-p_1)T_i(h-1,x) = T_i(h,x)$ for $1+x \le i \le h+x-1$. Then, $(t-p_1)\sum_{i=x}^{h+x-1}T_i(h-1,x) + \sum_{i=x+1}^{h+x}T_i(h-1,x+1) = \sum_{i=x}^{h+x}T_i(h,x)$. Since $(t-p_1)\sum_{i=1}^{3}\ell_{i,3}^x\ell_{i,2}\frac{\ell_{i,4}^{h-1}}{t-p_1+\ell_{i,3}-\ell_{i,4}} + \sum_{i=1}^{3}\ell_{i,3}^{x+1}\ell_{i,2}\frac{\ell_{i,4}^{h-1}}{t-p_1+\ell_{i,3}-\ell_{i,4}} - \sum_{i=1}^{3}\ell_{i,2}\ell_{i,3}^x\ell_{i,4}^{h-1} = \sum_{i=1}^{3}\ell_{i,3}^x\ell_{i,2}\frac{\ell_{i,4}^{h}}{t-p_1+\ell_{i,3}-\ell_{i,4}},$ $(t-p_1)M_3(h-1,x) + M_3(h-1,x+1) + 3\sum_{i=1}^{3}\ell_{i,2}\ell_{i,3}^x\ell_{i,4}^{h-1} = M_3(h,x).$ Case 1: $x \ge x'$.

First, we have $(t - p_1)t^{h-1}M(x) + t^{h-1}M(x+1) = t^h M(x) + 3t^{h-1} \sum_{i=1}^3 \ell_{i,1}\ell_{i,3}^{x-1}$. Second, we have $(t - p_1)M_1(h - 1, x) + M_1(h - 1, x+1) + 3t^{h-1} \sum_{i=1}^3 \ell_{i,1}\ell_{i,3}^{x-1} = M_1(h, x)$. Then, we have $R(h, x) = (t - p_1)R(h - 1, x) + R(h - 1, x+1) + 3\sum_{i=1}^3 \ell_{i,2}\ell_{i,3}^x\ell_{i,4}^{h-1}$. **Case 2:** x < x'.

First, $p_1 M(x) = M(x+1)$ for $x \le x' - 1$. Then, $(t-p_1)t^{h-1}M(x) + t^{h-1}M(x+1) = (t-p_1)t^{h-1}M(x) + p_1t^{h-1}M(x) = t^h M(x)$ for $x \le x' - 1$. Second,

$$\begin{aligned} &(t-p_1)M_2(h-1,x) + M_2(h-1,x+1) \\ \leq 3\sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,1}\ell_{i,3}^x (\frac{\ell_{i,3}}{p_1})^{x'-x-1} ((t-p_1)\frac{\ell_{i,3}}{p_1} + \ell_{i,3}) \sum_{j=0}^{h-2} (t-p_1 + \ell_{i,3})^{h-2-j} t^j \\ \leq 3\sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,1}\ell_{i,3}^x (\frac{\ell_{i,3}}{p_1})^{x'-x-1} ((t-p_1)\frac{\ell_{i,3}}{p_1} + \ell_{i,3}\frac{\ell_{i,3}}{p_1} + \ell_{i,3}\frac{p_1 - \ell_{i,3}}{p_1}) \sum_{j=0}^{h-2} (t-p_1 + \ell_{i,3})^{h-2-j} t^j \\ \leq 3\sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,1}\ell_{i,3}^x (\frac{\ell_{i,3}}{p_1})^{x'-x-1} (\frac{\ell_{i,3}}{p_1}\sum_{j=0}^{h-2} (t-p_1 + \ell_{i,3})^{h-1-j} t^j + \ell_{i,3}\frac{p_1 - \ell_{i,3}}{p_1}\sum_{j=0}^{h-2} (t-p_1 + \ell_{i,3})^{h-2-j} t^j) \\ \leq 3\sum_{i=1}^{3} (\ell_{i,1}\ell_{i,3}^x (\frac{\ell_{i,3}}{p_1})^{x'-x-1} (\frac{\ell_{i,3}}{p_1}\sum_{j=0}^{h-2} (t-p_1 + \ell_{i,3})^{h-1-j} t^j + \frac{\ell_{i,3}}{p_1}t^{h-1}) \\ \leq 3\sum_{i=1}^{3} (\ell_{i,1}\ell_{i,3}^x (\frac{\ell_{i,3}}{p_1})^{x'-x-1} (\frac{\ell_{i,3}}{p_1}\sum_{j=0}^{h-2} (t-p_1 + \ell_{i,3})^{h-1-j} t^j + \frac{\ell_{i,3}}{p_1}t^{h-1}) \\ = M_2(h, x) \end{aligned}$$

Then, $(t-p_1)R(h-1,x) + R(h-1,x+1) + 3\sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,2}\ell_{i,3}^x \ell_{i,4}^{h-1} \le R(h,x)$ for $x \le x'-1$. It is clear to check that $t^{h-1}M(x+1) + M_1(h-1,x+1) + (t-p_1)(t^{h-1}M(x) + M_2(h-1,x)) \le t^h M(x) + M_2(h,x)$ for x' > x > x'-1. Then, $R(h,x) \ge (t-p_1)R(h-1,x) + R(h-1,x+1) + 3\sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,2}\ell_{i,3}^x \ell_{i,4}^{h-1}$ for x < x'. So this observation holds.

Theorem 4. The IO complexity of computing a (h, x)-instance which can not computed within memory M by Algorithm 2 is $M(h, x) \leq R(h, x)$.

Proof. We prove this by induction on h. First, we show that it holds in the base case for each x.

• For x with $Z(0,x) \ge M$, the IO complexity is the IO complexity of Algorithm 1 when h = 0, since Algorithm 2 calls Algorithm 1 when h = 0. If $x \ge x'$, the base case is the (0,x)-instance. By Lemma 9, IO complexity of Algorithm 1 is M(x). It holds, since $R(0,x) \ge M(x)$. If x < x', the (0,x)-instance can be computed within memory M by Lemma 5. Then, the base case is the

(1, x)-instance. Let $S = (s_i)_{1 \times \ell_{1,3}^x}, T = (t_i)_{1 \times \ell_{2,3}^x}$ be this (1, x)-instance and $a_i = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{\ell_{1,3}^x} \psi_{i,1}(s_j), b_i = \psi_{i,1}(s_j)$

 $\bigoplus_{j=1}^{\ell_{2,3}^{*}} \phi_{i,1}(s_j) \ 1 \le i \le t - p_1 + 1.$ Then, IO complexity of $BC(a_i, b_i)$ is 0 for $2 \le i \le t - p_1 + 1$, since

 (a_i, b_i) is (0, x)-instance for $2 \le i \le t - p_1 + 1$ and it can be within memory M. If x + 1 < x', $BC(a_1, b_1)$ can be computed within memory M by Lemma 5. Then, either the IO complexity of $BC(a_1, b_1)$ is less than R(0, x + 1) (when $x + 1 \ge x'$), or it is 0 (when x + 1 < x'). Thus, $M(1, x) \le (t - p_1)R(0, x) + R(0, x + 1) + 3\sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,2}\ell_{i,3}^x \ell_{i,4}^{h-1}$, since $R(0, x) \ge 0, R(0, x + 1) \ge 0$ for x

with $Z(0,x) \ge M$. What's more, $M(1,x) \le R(1,x)$ by observation 5.

• For x with Z(0, x) < M, let h satisfy that Z(h, x) = M. The base case is the (h+1, x)-instance. Let $S = (s_i)_{1 \times \ell_{1,3}^x}$, $T = (t_i)_{1 \times \ell_{2,3}^x}$ be this (h+1, x)-instance and $a_i = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{\ell_{1,3}^x} \psi_{i,1}(s_j)$, $b_i = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{\ell_{2,3}^x} \phi_{i,1}(s_j)$ $1 \le i \le t-p_1+1$. Since Z(h, x) = M, $BC(a_i, b_i)$ can be computed within memory M for $2 \le i \le t-p_1+1$ by Lemma 6. Then, IO complexity of $BC(a_i, b_i)$ is 0 for $2 \le i \le t-p_1+1$. Since Z(h, x+1) > M, the IO complexity of $BC(a_1, b_1)$ is less than R(h, x+1) by the induction hypothesis. Then, $M(h+1, x) \le M$.
$$\begin{split} R(h, x+1) + &3\sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,2}\ell_{i,3}^{x}\ell_{i,4}^{h}. \text{ Since } Z(h, x) = M, \\ (3 + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \beta_{i})u_{0}^{h}r^{x} \geq Z(h, x) = M, \\ \text{e.q.} h \geq h' - \frac{\ln r}{\ln u_{0}}x. \\ \text{Since } t - p_{1} > \ell_{i,4} \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq 3, \\ T_{x}(h, x) \geq 3\sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,3}^{x}\ell_{i,2}\frac{\ell_{i,4}^{h}}{t - p_{1} + \ell_{i,3} - \ell_{i,4}}. \\ \text{Then, } M_{3}(h, x) \geq 0. \\ \text{Thus,} \\ R(h, x) \geq 0. \\ \text{Therefore, } M(h+1, x) \leq (t - p_{1})R(h, x) + R(h, x+1) + 3\sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,2}\ell_{i,3}^{x}\ell_{i,4}^{h}. \\ \text{By observation} \\ 5, M(h+1, x) \leq R(h+1, x). \\ \text{Then it holds in the base case. In other cases, by Algorithm 2, \\ M(h, x) \leq (t - p_{1})M(h - 1, x) + \frac{3}{4} \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,2}\ell_{i,3}^{x}\ell_{i,4}^{h}. \\ \text{By observation} \\ \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,2}\ell_{i,3}^{x}\ell_{i,4}^{h}. \\ \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,3}\ell_{i,4}^{x}\ell_{i,4}^{h}. \\ \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,3}\ell_{i,4}^{x}\ell_{i,4}^{h}. \\ \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,4}^{h}\ell_{i,4}^{h}. \\ \frac{1}{3}$$

 $M(h-1, x+1) + 3\sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,2}\ell_{i,3}^{x}\ell_{i,4}^{h-1}.$ Since (h, x)-instance is not the base case, $Z(h-1, x) \ge M$. Then, $M(h-1, x) \le R(h-1, x), M(h-1, x+1) \le R(h-1, x+1)$ by the induction hypothesis. By Observation 5, $M(h, x) \le R(h, x)$.

Corollary 3. Let $m_0 = n_0 = k_0 = t_0$. The IO complexity of Algorithm 2 with input $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is no more than $O(n^{\log_{t_0} t} M^{1 - \log_r p_1})$.

Proof. By Theorem 4, we have $M(h,0) \leq t^h M(0) + M_2(h,0) + M_3(h,0)$. Since $M_3(h,0) = \sum_{i=0}^h T_i(h,0) - 3\sum_{i=1}^3 \ell_{i,3}^x \ell_{i,2} \frac{\ell_{i,4}^h}{t-p_1+\ell_{i,3}-\ell_{i,4}}$ and $T_x(h,0) \leq 3\sum_{i=1}^3 \ell_{i,2} \binom{h}{x} \frac{(t-p_1)^{h-x}}{t-p_1+\ell_{i,3}-\ell_{i,4}} \ell_{i,3}^x$ for $0 \leq x \leq h$. We have $M_3(h,0) \leq 3\sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{(t-p_1+\ell_{i,3})^h - \ell_{i,4}^h}{t-p_1+\ell_{i,3}-\ell_{i,4}}$. It is clear that $t^h M(0) + M_2(h,0) = O(n^{\log_{t_0} t} M^{1-\log_r p_1})$. Then, it holds.

Corollary 4. Let $m_0 = n_0 = k_0 = t_0$. The IO complexity of Algorithm 2 with input $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is no more than

$$(\frac{r-1}{3r})^{-\frac{\ln p_1}{\ln r}} n^{\log_{t_0} t} M^{1-\frac{\ln p_1}{\ln r}} + 3 \sum_{i=1}^{3} \frac{\ell_{i,1} (n^{\log_{t_0} t} - n^{\log_{t_0} t} - n^{\log_{t_0} t} - p_1 + \ell_{i,3})}{p_1 - \ell_{i,3}} (\frac{r-1}{3r})^{\frac{\ln \ell_{i,3} - \ln p_1}{\ln r}} M^{\frac{\ln \ell_{i,3} - \ln p_1}{\ln r}} + 3 \sum_{i=1}^{3} \frac{\ell_{i,2}}{t - p_1 + \ell_{i,3} - t_0^2} ((\frac{M}{\beta})^{1-\frac{\ln t-p_1}{2\ln t_0}} n^{\log_{t_0} (t-p_1 + \ell_{i,3} (\frac{t_0^2}{t-p_1})^{-\frac{\ln r}{2\ln t_0}})} - n^2)$$

Proof. By Theorem 4, we have $M(h,0) \leq t^h M(0) + M_2(h,0) + M_3(h,0)$. First, we have

$$t^{h}M(0) \le (\frac{r-1}{3r})^{-\frac{\ln p_{1}}{\ln r}} n^{\log_{t_{0}} t} M^{1-\frac{\ln p_{1}}{\ln r}}$$

and

$$M_2(h,0) \le 3\sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{\ell_{i,1}(n^{\log_{t_0}t} - n^{\log_{t_0}t - p_1 + \ell_{i,3}})}{p_1 - \ell_{i,3}} (\frac{r-1}{3r})^{\frac{\ln \frac{\ell_{i,3}}{p_1}}{\ln r}} M^{\frac{\ln \ell_{i,3} - \ln p_1}{\ln r}}$$

For Z(0, x) < M, we have

$$T_x(h,0) = 3\sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_{i,2} \binom{h}{x} \left(\frac{t_0^2}{t-p_1}\right)^{h'} \frac{(t-p_1)^{h-x}}{t-p_1+\ell_{i,3}-t_0^2} \left(\ell_{i,3} \left(\frac{t_0^2}{t-p_1}\right)^{-\frac{\ln r}{2\ln t_0}}\right)^x,$$

For $Z(0, x) \ge M$, we have

$$T_x(h,0) \le 3\sum_{i=1}^3 \ell_{i,2} \binom{h}{x} (\frac{t_0^2}{t-p_1})^{h'} \frac{(t-p_1)^{h-x}}{t-p_1+\ell_{i,3}-t_0^2} (\ell_{i,3}(\frac{t_0^2}{t-p_1})^{-\frac{\ln r}{2\ln t_0}})^x,$$

Then, we have

$$M_{3}(h,0) \leq 3\sum_{i=1}^{3} \frac{\ell_{i,2}}{t-p_{1}+\ell_{i,3}-t_{0}^{2}} \left(\left(\frac{M}{\beta}\right)^{1-\frac{\ln t-p_{1}}{2\ln t_{0}}} n^{\log_{t_{0}}(t-p_{1}+\ell_{i,3}(\frac{t_{0}^{2}}{t-p_{1}})^{-\frac{\ln r}{2\ln t_{0}}}) - n^{2}\right)$$

Then, it holds.

Example 5

Lemma 11. [10] Let $\langle U_{n_0 \times m_0}, V_{m_0 \times k_0}, W_{n_0 \times k_0} \rangle$ be an encoding/decoding matrix. Then, $\langle V_{n_0 \times k_0}, V_{n_0 \times k_0}, V_{n_0 \times k_0} \rangle$ $U \otimes V \otimes W, V \otimes W \otimes U, W \otimes U \otimes V >$ is an encoding-decoding matrix (\otimes is the kronecker product).

Thus, we only need to give the basis transformations and algebra decomposition for $\langle U, V, W \rangle$. Now, we give an example of $\langle 3, 3, 3; 23 \rangle$ -algorithm.

Basis Transformations: In Appendix I, we give basis transformation matrices η_1, η_2, η_3 of

the encoding/deconding matrices $\langle U_{23\times9}, V_{23\times9}, W_{23\times9} \rangle$. **Algebra Decomposition:** Let $U' = U\eta_1^{-1}, V' = V\eta_2^{-1}, W' = W\eta_3^{-1}, \psi_1'(A) = U'x, \psi_2'(B) = V'y, \psi_3'(C) = W'z, \phi_1'(B) = V'y, \phi_2'(C) = W'z, \phi_3'(A) = U'x, \varphi_1'(z) = W'^Tz, \varphi_2'(x) = U'^Tx, \varphi_3'(y) = U'^Tx, \psi_3'(x) = U'x$ $V'^T y$ where $A = (a_{i,j})_{3 \times 3}, B = (a_{i,j})_{3 \times 3}, C = (c_{i,j})_{3 \times 3}, x = (a_{i,j})_{1 \times 9}, y = (b_{i,j})_{1 \times 9}, z = (c_{i,j})_{1 \times 9}.$ In Appendix I, we give the corresponding matrices of linear maps $\varphi'_{j,0}$ and $\ell'_{j,i}, \phi'_{j,i,1}, \phi'_{j,i,2}$

 $\psi'_{j,i,1}, \psi'_{j,i,2}, \varphi'_{j,i}$ for $1 \le j \le 3, 1 \le i \le 22$ which satisfy that $\varphi'_j = \sum_{i=1}^{22} \varphi'_{j,0} \varphi'_{j,i} \ell'_{j,i}$ and $\psi'_{j,i,2} \psi'_{j,i,1} = \ell'_{j,i} \psi'_{j,i} \psi'_{j,i} \psi'_{j,i} \psi'_{j,i}$ $\ell'_{j,i}\psi'_j, \ \phi'_{j,i,2}\phi'_{j,i,1} = \ell'_{j,i}\phi'_j, \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq 3, 1 \leq i \leq 22, \text{ and specially, } \phi'_{j,i,2} = \psi'_{j,i,2} = \varphi'_{j,i} = I \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq 3, 2 \leq i \leq 22.$ Denote $\psi'_{j,i} = \ell'_{j,i}\psi'_j, \phi'_{j,i} = \ell'_{j,i}\phi'_j \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq 3, 1 \leq i \leq 22.$ Combine Algebra Decomposition: We get an algebra decomposition of $\langle U' \otimes V' \otimes W', V' \otimes U' \otimes V' \otimes W'$

 $W' \otimes U', W' \otimes U' \otimes V' >$ by combining $\varphi'_{i,0}$ and $\ell'_{i,i}, \phi'_{i,i,1}, \phi'_{i,i,2}, \psi'_{i,i,1}, \psi'_{i,i,2}, \varphi'_{i,i}$ for $1 \leq j \leq 3, 1 \leq j \leq 3, j \leq 3,$ i < 22

Let $\psi = \psi'_3 * \psi'_2 * \psi'_1, \phi = \phi'_3 * \phi'_2 * \phi'_1, \varphi = \varphi'_1 \circ \varphi'_2 \circ \varphi'_3, \psi_{i,2} = \phi_{i,2} = \varphi_i = I$ for $2 \le i \le 12160$, $\ell_1 = \ell_{3,1} * \ell_{2,1} * \ell_{1,1}, \ \psi_{1,i} = \psi'_{3,1,i} * \psi'_{2,1,i} * \psi'_{1,1,i}, \ \phi_{1,i} = \phi'_{3,1,i} * \phi'_{2,1,i} * \phi'_{1,1,i} \text{ for } 1 \le i \le 2, \text{ and } \psi_{i,1}, \phi_{i,1}$ be other components of ψ, ϕ for $2 \le i \le 12160$ respectively, φ_0, ℓ_i be the corresponding linear maps for $2 \le i \le 12160$. We give them as following in detail:

Let \mathcal{E}_i be an interception map with returning the *i*-th element, $\ell_{4j+i-7} = \mathcal{E}_i * \ell_{2,1} * \ell_{1,1}, \psi_{4j+i-7,1} = \ell_i + \ell_{2,1} + \ell$ Let \mathcal{E}_i be an interception map with returning the *i*-th element, $\ell_{4j+i-7} = \mathcal{E}_i * \ell_{2,1} * \ell_{1,1}, \psi_{4j+i-7,1} = \mathcal{E}_i \psi'_{3,j} * \psi'_{2,1} * \psi'_{1,1}, \phi_{i,1} = \phi'_{3,i} * \phi'_{2,1} * \phi'_{1,1}$ for $1 \le i \le 4, 2 \le j \le 22, \ell_{46j+i-7} = \mathcal{E}_i * \ell_{2,j} * \ell_{1,1}, \psi_{46j+i-7,1} = \mathcal{E}_i \psi'_3 * \psi'_{2,j} * \psi'_{1,1}, \phi_{23j+i-24,1} = \mathcal{E}_i \phi'_3 * \phi'_{2,j} * \phi'_{1,1}$ for $1 \le i \le 46, 2 \le j \le 22, \ell_{529j+i-7} = \mathcal{E}_i * \ell_{1,j}, \psi_{529j+i-7,1} = \mathcal{E}_i \psi'_3 * \psi'_2 * \psi'_{1,j}, \phi_{529j+i+505,1} = \mathcal{E}_i \phi'_3 * \phi'_{2,j} * \phi'_{1,1}$ for $1 \le i \le 529, 2 \le j \le 22$, and $c_1 = d_1, c_i = \varphi'_1 \circ \varphi'_2 (\bigoplus_{j=1}^4 d_{i*4+j-7})$ for $2 \le i \le 22, b_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{22} \varphi^{3,0}, c_i, b_i = \varphi'_{1,1} (\bigoplus_{j=1}^2 \varphi'_3 (\bigoplus_{k=-29+23j+46i}^{-7+23j+46i} d_k))$ for $2 \le i \le 22, a_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{22} \varphi^{2,0}, b_i, a_i = \varphi'_2 \circ \varphi'_3 (\bigoplus_{j=-6+529*i}^{522+529*i} d_j)$ for $2 \le i \le 22, \sum_{i=1}^{12160\varphi_0} d_i = \sum_{i=1}^{22} \varphi^{1,0}, a_i$. Note that $\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^{12160^{\varphi_0}} \varphi_i \ell_i$ and $\psi_{i,2} \psi_{i,1} = \ell_i \psi$, $\phi_{i,2} \phi_{i,1} = \ell_i \phi$ for $1 \le i \le 12160$ (This is the assumption)

tion when we design the algorithm). Notice that giving $\varphi'_{j,0}$ and $\ell'_{j,i}, \phi'_{j,i,1}, \phi'_{j,i,2}, \psi'_{j,i,1}, \psi'_{j,i,2}, \varphi'_{j,i}$ for $1 \leq j \leq 3$ is enough. Then, in Appendix II, we present the $\varphi'_{j,0}$ and $\ell'_{j,i}, \phi'_{j,i,1}, \phi'_{j,i,2}, \psi'_{j,i,1}, \psi'_{j,i,2}, \varphi'_{j,i}$ matrices with $1 \le j \le 3, 1 \le i \le t - p_1 + 1$ for other < n, m, k; t >-algorithms.

Algorithm \mathcal{A} : We give Algorithm \mathcal{A} (Algorithm 7) to compute $\mathcal{F}(\varphi_1(\psi_{1,2} \odot \phi_{1,2}), \odot, A', B')$ where $\mathcal{A}((A'), (B'), 0)$ equals $\mathcal{F}(\varphi_1(\psi_{1,2} \odot \phi_{1,2}), \odot, A', B')$. Notice that \mathcal{A} depends on $\psi'_i, \phi'_i, \varphi'_i, \varphi'_{i,0}, \varphi'_i, \varphi'_i,$

ALGORITHM 7: AInput: S,T,level 1 if level == 3 then $\mathbf{return} \, \prod_{i=1}^{3} \circ \varphi_{i,1}' (\prod_{j=3}^{1} * \psi_{j,1,2}'(S) \odot \prod_{i=3}^{1} * \phi_{j,1,2}'(T))$ $\mathbf{2}$ 3 else Let R = 0; $\mathbf{4}$ for i = 2 to 22 do $\mathbf{5}$ Compute $s' = \psi'_{level+1,i,1}(s)$ for $s \in S$; 6 Compute $t' = \psi'_{level+1,i,1}(t)$ for $t \in T$; 7 Denote S' = (s'), T' = (t');8 9 if $level \geq 1$ then Compute $S' = \prod_{j=level}^{1} {}^{*}\psi'_{j,1,2}(S'), T' = \prod_{j=level}^{1} {}^{*}\psi'_{j,1,2}(T');$ 10if $level \leq 1$ then 11 Compute $c' = \prod_{k=level+2}^{3} {}^{\circ} \varphi'_k (\prod_{j=3}^{level^*} \psi'_j(s') \odot \prod_{j=3}^{level^*} \phi'_j(t'));$ $\mathbf{12}$ else 13 $c' = s' \odot t';$ 14 Denote C' = (c');15 if $level \ge 1$ then $C' = \prod_{j=1}^{level^{\circ}} \varphi'_{j,1}(C);$ 16 $\mathbf{17}$ Compute C' and add it to R as $\varphi'_{level+1,0}$; $\mathbf{18}$ Compute $s' = \psi'_{level+1,1,1}(s)$ for $s \in S$; 19 Compute $t' = \psi'_{level+1,1,1}(t)$ for $t \in T$; $\mathbf{20}$ Denote S' = (s'), T' = (t'); $\mathbf{21}$ Compute $\mathcal{A}(S', T', level + 1)$ and add it to R as $\varphi_{level+1.0}$; $\mathbf{22}$ 23 return R

 $\psi'_{i,1,j}, \phi'_{i,1,j}$ for $q \leq i \leq 3, 1 \leq j \leq 2$ and $\psi'_{i,j,1}, \phi'_{i,j,1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq 3, 1 \leq j \leq t - p_1 + 1$. Then, we don't provide \mathcal{A} in Appendix II for other < n, m, k; t >-algorithms.

Needed Memory of Algorithm \mathcal{A} : Assume that $\psi'_{i,1,1}(x), \phi'_{i,1,1}(x), \varphi'_{i,1,1}$ gets $\lambda_{i,1}, \lambda_{i,2}, \lambda_{i,3}$ length vector for $1 \leq i \leq 3$ respectively. Let $u_1 = n_0 m_0, u_2 = m_0 k_0, u_3 = n_0 k_0$. Notice that lines 4-22 can be computed in $\sum_{i=1}^{3} (u_1 u_2 u_2 z_i + \frac{u_1 u_2 u_3}{u_i} z_i + z_i) + u_3 z_1 + u_1 z_2 + u_2 z_3$ memory size when level = 0, Line 24 needs additional $\lambda_{1,1} u_2 u_3 z_1$ memory size when level = 0. Since S will not be used after Line 24, line 25 needs additional $\max\{0, \lambda_{1,2} u_1 u_3 z_2 - u_1 u_2 u_3 z_1\}$ memory size when level = 0. Similarly with this, we can get the needed memory size. We give it in detail as following:

Let
$$\lambda_{0,i} = 1, e_{1,i} = \frac{u_1 u_2 u_3}{u_i} z_i, e_{3,z} = z_i$$
 for $1 \le i \le 3, 1 + \sum_{x=1}^{i-1} \prod_{y=0}^{2} \lambda_{y,x} \le z \le \sum_{x=1}^{i} \prod_{y=0}^{2} \lambda_{y,x}, \mu_{i,z} = \lambda_{i,j}$
for $1 \le i \le 3, 1 \le j \le 3, 1 + \sum_{x=1}^{j-1} \prod_{y=0}^{i-1} \lambda_{y,x} \le z \le \sum_{x=1}^{j} \prod_{y=0}^{i-1} \lambda_{y,x}, e_{0,j} = u_1 u_2 u_3 z_j$ for $1 \le j \le 3, 1 \le j \le 3$

 $e_{2,z} = u_3 z_1 \text{ for } 1 \le z \le \lambda_{1,1}, \ e_{2,z} = u_1 z_2 \text{ for } 1 + \lambda_{1,1} \le z \le \lambda_{1,2}, \ e_{2,z} = u_2 z_3 \text{ for } 1 + \lambda_{1,2} \le z \le \lambda_{1,2}$

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{1,3}, \ \delta_{1,0} &= \sum_{i=1}^{3} u_1 u_2 u_3 z_i, \\ \Delta_{1,0} &= u_1 u_2 u_3 z_i, \\ \delta_{i,j} &= \delta_{i,j-1} + \max\{0, \mu_{i,j-1} e_{i,j} - \delta_{i,j-1} + \Delta_{i,j-1}\} \text{ for } 1 \\ 1 &\leq j \\ \leq \sum_{x=1}^{3} \prod_{y=0}^{i-1} \lambda_{y,x}, \\ 1 &\leq i \\ \leq 3, \\ \Delta_{i,j} &= \Delta_{i,j} + \mu_{i,j} e_{i,j} \text{ for } 1 \\ \leq i \\ \leq 3, \\ 1 \\ \leq i \\ \leq 3, \\ 1 \\ + \\ \sum_{x=1}^{2} \prod_{y=0}^{i-1} \lambda_{y,x} \\ \leq j \\ \leq \sum_{x=1}^{3} \prod_{y=0}^{i-1} \lambda_{y,x}, \\ \delta_{i,0} &= \delta_{i-1,j}, \\ \Delta_{i,0} &= \Delta_{i-1,j} \\ \delta_{i,j} &= \Delta_{i,j} + \mu_{i,j} e_{i,j} \text{ for } 1 \\ \leq i \\ \leq 3, \\ 1 \\ + \\ \sum_{x=1}^{3} \prod_{y=0}^{i-1} \lambda_{y,x} \\ \leq j \\ \leq \sum_{x=1}^{3} \prod_{y=0}^{i-1} \lambda_{y,x}, \\ \delta_{i,0} &= \delta_{i-1,j}, \\ \Delta_{i,0} &= \Delta_{i-1,j} \\ \delta_{i,0} &= \Delta_{i-1,j} \\ \delta_{i,0} &= \Delta_{i,0} \\ + \\ \Delta_{i,0} &= \sum_{x=1}^{3} \prod_{y=0}^{i-1} \lambda_{y,x}, \\ \delta_{i,0} &= \delta_{i,0} \\ + \\ \Delta_{i,0} &= \sum_{x=1}^{3} \prod_{y=0}^{i-1} \lambda_{y,x}, \\ \delta_{i,0} &= \delta_{i,0} \\ + \\ \Delta_{i,0} &= \sum_{x=1}^{3} \prod_{y=0}^{i-1} \lambda_{y,x}, \\ \delta_{i,0} &= \delta_{i,0} \\ + \\ \Delta_{i,0} &= \sum_{x=1}^{3} \prod_{y=0}^{i-1} \lambda_{y,x}, \\ \delta_{i,0} &= \sum_{x=1}^{3} \sum_{y=0}^{i-1} \lambda_{y,x}, \\ \delta_{i,0} &= \sum_{x=1}^{3} \sum_{y=0}^{i-1} \lambda_{y,x}, \\ \delta_{i,0} &= \sum_{x=1}^{3} \sum_{y=0}^{i-1} \lambda_{y,x}, \\ \delta_{i,0} &= \max\{\delta_{i,0}, \delta_{i,0}, \sum_{x=1}^{3} \sum_{y=0}^{i-1} \lambda_{y,x}, \\ \delta_{i,0} &= \sum_{x=1}^{3} \sum_{y=0}^{i-1} \lambda_{y,x}, \\ \delta_{i,$$

10 complexity: By Corollary 4, Observation 4, and Lemma 4, the IO complexity of Algorithm 5 is $14n^{\log_3 23}M^{-0.5} - 6n^{\frac{\log_{27}(23^3-4)}{3}}M^{-0.5} + 28.07n^{\frac{\log_{27}23^3-0.77}{3}}M^{-0.42} - 16.69n^2 + 2.33n^2\log_3\sqrt{2}\frac{n}{\sqrt{M}} + 2M$. And by Theorem 3, Observation 4, and Lemma 4, the IO complexity of Algorithm 6 is $10.08n^{\log_3 23}M^{-0.42} + 23.02n^{\log_{27}(23^3-4)}M^{-0.42} - 16.69n^2 + 2.33n^2\log_3\sqrt{2}\frac{n}{\sqrt{M}} + 2M$.

Arithmetic complexity: By Theorem 1, Observation 4, and Lemma 4, the arithmetic complexity of Algorithm 5 is $2n^{\log_3 23} + 4.56n^{\log_{27}(23^3-4)} - 5.56n^2 + 0.77n^2\log_3 n$. By Theorem 2, Observation 4, and Lemma 4, the arithmetic complexity of Algorithm 6 is $(2 + 4.56M^{\frac{\ln(23^3-4) - \ln 23}{6\ln 3}} - 4.58M^{\frac{2\ln 3 - \ln 23}{2\ln 3}})n^{\log_3 23} + 5.56n^2 + 0.77n^2\log_3 n + (9.35M^{1-\frac{\ln(23^3-4)}{6\ln 3}} - M^{\frac{\ln(23^3-4) - 3\ln 23}{6\ln 3}})n^{\log_{27}(23^3-4)}$.

6 Acknowledgments

This work was supported by National key research and development program of China(Grant No.2019YFA0706401) and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No.62172116, No.62172014, No.62172015, No.61872166, No.62002002(Youth Foundation)).

References

- Valerii Borisovich Alekseev and A. V. Smirnov. On the exact and approximate bilinear complexities of multiplication of 4 × 2 and 2 × 2 matrices. *Proceedings of the Steklov Institute of Mathematics*, 282(1):123–139, 2013.
- [2] Grey Ballard, James Demmel, Olga Holtz, and Oded Schwartz. Graph expansion and communication costs of fast matrix multiplication. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 59(6):1–23, 2013. 1, 2, 3
- [3] Gal Beniamini and Oded Schwartz. Faster matrix multiplication via sparse decomposition. In The 31st ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures, pages 11–22, 2019.
 2, 3, 8
- [4] Austin R Benson and Grey Ballard. A framework for practical parallel fast matrix multiplication. ACM SIGPLAN Notices, 50(8):42–53, 2015. 1, 3, 7

- [5] Dario Bini, Milvio Capovani, Francesco Romani, and Grazia Lotti. O(n^{2.7799}) complexity for n×n approximate matrix multiplication. Information Processing Letters, 8(5):234–235, 1979.
 1
- [6] Murat Cenk and M Anwar Hasan. On the arithmetic complexity of strassen-like matrix multiplications. Journal of Symbolic Computation, 80:484–501, 2017. 2, 3, 8
- [7] Don Coppersmith and Shmuel Winograd. On the asymptotic complexity of matrix multiplication. SIAM Journal on Computing, 11(3):472–492, 1982. 1
- [8] Don Coppersmith and Shmuel Winograd. Matrix multiplication via arithmetic progressions. In Proceedings of the 19th annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing, pages 1–6, 1987.
 1
- [9] Susan L. Graham, Marc Snir, and Cynthia A. Patterson. Getting up to speed: The future of supercomputing. *National Academies Press Washington Dc*, 149(1):147–153, 2004. 2
- [10] John. Hopcroft and J. Musinski. Duality applied to the complexity of matrix multiplication and other bilinear forms. SIAM Journal on Computing, 2(3):159–173, 1973. 1, 20
- [11] Elaye Karstadt and Oded Schwartz. Matrix multiplication, a little faster. Journal of the ACM (JACM), 67(1):1–31, 2020. 1, 2, 3, 8, 11, 12
- [12] François Le Gall. Powers of tensors and fast matrix multiplication. In Proceedings of the 39th international symposium on symbolic and algebraic computation, pages 296–303, 2014.
- [13] Victor Ya Pan. Strassen's algorithm is not optimal trilinear technique of aggregating, uniting and canceling for constructing fast algorithms for matrix operations. In 19th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (sfcs 1978), pages 166–176. IEEE, 1978. 1
- [14] Robert L Probert. On the additive complexity of matrix multiplication. SIAM Journal on Computing, 5(2):187–203, 1976. 2
- [15] A. Schönhage. Partial and total matrix multiplication. SIAM Journal on Computing, 10(3):434–455, 1981. 1
- [16] Alexey V Smirnov. The bilinear complexity and practical algorithms for matrix multiplication. Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics, 53(12):1781–1795, 2013. 1, 3
- [17] Volker Strassen. Gaussian elimination is not optimal. Numerische mathematik, 13(4):354–356, 1969. 1
- [18] Virginia Vassilevska Williams. Multiplying matrices faster than coppersmith-winograd. In Proceedings of the 44th annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing, pages 887–898, 2012. 1

7 Appendix

Appendix I:

 $\eta_1 = \eta_2 = I.$



Figure 1: Algebra Decomposition of $\langle 3, 3, 3; 23 \rangle$. Note $:\varphi'_{2,0}(z_1, z_2, ..., z_{22}) := A^T \bigoplus_{i=1}^{22} z_i$. The definitions of other linear maps are similar.

All the data of Appendix I and Append II can be found at https://github.com/wp-hhh/Algebra-decomposition-Algorithm.