

Integer Representations in IEEE 754, Posit, and Takum Arithmetics

Laslo Hunhold 

Parallel and Distributed Systems Group
University of Cologne
Cologne, Germany
hunhold@uni-koeln.de

Abstract—The posit and takum machine number formats have been proposed as alternatives to the IEEE 754 floating-point standard. As floating-point numbers are frequently employed to represent integral values, with certain applications explicitly relying on this capability, it is pertinent to evaluate how effectively these new formats fulfil this function compared to the standard they seek to replace. While empirical results are known for posits, this aspect has yet to be formally investigated.

This paper provides rigorous derivations and proofs of the integral representation capabilities of posits and takums, examining both the exact number of bits required to represent a given integer and the largest consecutive integer that can be represented with a specified number of bits. The findings indicate that, while posits are generally less effective than IEEE 754 floating-point numbers in this regard, takums demonstrate overall superior representational strength compared to both IEEE 754 and posits.

Index Terms—IEEE 754, floating-point numbers, posit arithmetic, takum arithmetic, largest consecutive integer

I. INTRODUCTION

Although not primarily designed for this purpose, floating-point numbers are often employed to represent integers in various applications. For instance, JavaScript uses double-precision floating-point numbers for all numerical representations, defining the second-largest consecutively representable integer as the constant `Number.MAX_SAFE_INTEGER` [1, Sections 6.1.6.1 and 21.1.2.6]. Similarly, the NIFTI image format, a standard in neuroimaging and MRI, utilises single-precision floating-point numbers to specify voxel offsets [2]. This characteristic also has implications for discrete Fourier transforms (representing discrete frequencies), statistical analyses (discrete distributions), deep learning (quantisation) and other contexts where integral and continuous quantities coexist.

The integer representation limits of a given floating-point format are, therefore, of considerable interest. One metric used to evaluate this is the *largest consecutive integer*, defined as the smallest exactly representable positive integer $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $m + 1$ is no longer exactly representable. Notably, this usually results in $m + 1$

rounding down to m , which poses challenges in scenarios where floating-point numbers are employed as indices, potentially causing loops to never terminate. This further underscores the importance of understanding the integral representation limits of a given format.

With the advent of new machine number formats, it is important to assess their ability to represent integers and determine whether they can serve as drop-in replacements, offering at least the same representational power as IEEE 754 floating-point numbers. This paper examines two such formats in particular: posits and linear takums. Neither format has been formally analysed in this context; only empirically derived formulae are available for posits. Both formats belong to the class of tapered precision number systems, in which the exponent is variable-length encoded. Consequently, the number of fraction bits varies depending on the value of the exponent, rendering the analysis significantly more complex than the straightforward proof for IEEE 754 floating-point numbers provided later.

This paper makes three primary contributions: (1) it formally derives the exact number of bits required to represent any integer in posit and takum arithmetic; (2) it formally derives the largest consecutive integer for each format; and (3) it compares the integer representation capabilities of posits and takums with those of IEEE 754 floating-point formats.


The remainder of this paper is organised as follows: Sections II and III define the posit and takum formats, respectively. Section IV presents the main results. Section V evaluates these results and compares the formats at various precisions, followed by the conclusion in Section VI. To maintain conciseness and emphasise the results, formal proofs are provided at the end in Sections VII, VIII, IX, and X.

II. POSIT ENCODING SCHEME

The posit number format, introduced by Gustafson et al. in [3], has since been extensively studied as a potential replacement for the IEEE 754 standard, both for its numerical properties [4], [5] and its applicability to hardware implementations [6], [7]. These investigations have culminated in the development of an initial standardisation effort [8]. The key design feature of posits is their variable-length

exponent coding, which allocates additional fraction bits to values close to 1 compared to IEEE 754 floating-point numbers. This improvement is achieved at the expense of reducing the fraction bits for numbers further from 1, particularly those approaching zero or infinity. The format is formally defined as follows:

Definition 1 (posit encoding[3], [8]). *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq 5$. Any n -bit MSB→LSB string $P := (S, R, \overline{R_0}, E, F) \in \{0, 1\}^n$ of the form*



with sign bit S , regime bits $R := (R_{k-1}, \dots, R_0)$, regime termination bit $\overline{R_0}$, regime

$$r := \begin{cases} -k & R_0 = 0 \\ k - 1 & R_0 = 1, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

exponent bits $E := (E_1, E_0)$, exponent $\hat{e} := 2E_1 + E_0$, fraction bit count $p := n - k - 4 \in \{0, \dots, n - 5\}$, fraction $f := 2^{-p} \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} F_i 2^i \in [0, 1)$ and ‘actual’ exponent

$$e := (-1)^S (4r + \hat{e} + S) \quad (2)$$

encodes the posit value

$$\pi(P) := \begin{cases} \begin{cases} 0 & S = 0 \\ \text{NaR} & S = 1 \end{cases} & R = \overline{R_0} = E = F = \mathbf{0} \\ [(1 - 3S) + f] \cdot 2^e & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

with $\pi: \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, \text{NaR}\} \cup \pm [2^{-4n+8}, 2^{4n-8}]$. The symbol NaR (‘not a real’) represents infinity and other non-representable forms. Without loss of generality, any bit string shorter than 5 bits is also included in the definition by assuming the missing bits to be zero bits (‘ghost bits’). The colour scheme for the different bit string segments was adopted from the standard [8].

III. TAKUM ENCODING SCHEME

A primary criticism of the posit format is its limited dynamic range and the sharp decline in precision for numbers farther from 1, which arises from the rapidly increasing length of the encoded exponent [5], [9]. In response, the takum number format has been recently proposed, featuring an alternative exponent coding scheme. This approach trades some density near 1, compared to posits, to achieve greater precision for values farther from 1 (see Figure 1). Specifically, this paper focuses on linear takums, a variant that adopts a floating-point representation, as opposed to takums, a logarithmic number system. The linear takum encoding is formally defined as follows:

Definition 2 (linear takum encoding [9, Definition 8]). *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq 12$. Any n -bit MSB→LSB string $T := (S, D, R, C, F) \in \{0, 1\}^n$ of the form*





Figure 1: Precision (number of fraction bits) depending on the respective coded exponent for takums, posits and a selection of floating-point formats.



with sign bit S , direction bit D , regime bits $R := (R_2, R_1, R_0)$, characteristic bits $C := (C_{r-1}, \dots, C_0)$, fraction bits $F := (F_{p-1}, \dots, F_0)$, regime

$$r := \begin{cases} \text{uint}(\overline{R}) & D = 0 \\ \text{uint}(R) & D = 1 \end{cases} \in \{0, \dots, 7\}, \quad (4)$$

characteristic

$$c := \begin{cases} -2^{r+1} + 1 + \text{uint}(C) & D = 0 \\ 2^r - 1 + \text{uint}(C) & D = 1 \end{cases} \in \{-255, \dots, 254\}, \quad (5)$$

fraction bit count $p := n - r - 5 \in \{n - 12, \dots, n - 5\}$, fraction $f := 2^{-p} \text{uint}(F) \in [0, 1)$ and exponent

$$e := (-1)^S (c + S) \in \{-255, 254\} \quad (6)$$

encodes the linear takum value

$$\overline{\pi}(T) := \begin{cases} \begin{cases} 0 & S = 0 \\ \text{NaR} & S = 1 \end{cases} & D = R = C = F = \mathbf{0} \\ [(1 - 3S) + f] \cdot 2^e & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

with $\overline{\pi}: \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, \text{NaR}\} \cup \pm (2^{-255}, 2^{255})$. The symbol NaR (‘not a real’) represents infinity and other non-representable forms. Without loss of generality, any bit string shorter than 12 bits is also considered in the definition by assuming the missing bits to be zero bits (‘ghost bits’). The colour scheme for the different bit string segments was adopted from the specification [9].

Takums and posits are defined for any $n \in \mathbb{N}_1$, offering a degree of flexibility not present in IEEE 754 floating-point numbers, where n is restricted to $\{16, 32, 64, \dots\}$.

IV. INTEGER REPRESENTATIONS

The analysis of integer representations in floating-point formats is governed by a straightforward principle: the integer bits are encoded within the fraction, and the exponent is adjusted to shift the decimal point sufficiently far so that all fraction bits lie to the left of it.

A key challenge arises from the role of implicit zero bits to the right of the explicit fraction bits, which may form part of the integer's binary representation. Another, more nuanced challenge pertains to the analysis of tapered-precision floating-point formats. Unlike fixed-precision formats such as IEEE 754, tapered-precision formats feature a variable number of fraction bits depending on the exponent value (see Figure 1). This variability introduces an intricate balance between exponent value and number of fraction bits that is absent in traditional fixed-precision floating-point formats.

A. IEEE 754

We begin by examining the IEEE 754 standard. Although the following result may appear elementary, it does not seem to have been explicitly documented in the existing literature. To ensure completeness, we present the result along with a proof, providing a comprehensive foundation for this paper. However, for the sake of simplicity, we refrain from providing a fully formalised proof, as this would necessitate a more extensive introduction to the IEEE 754 floating-point representation.

Proposition 1 (Consecutive IEEE 754 Integers). *Let an IEEE 754 floating-point format with n_e exponent and n_f fraction bits, and n_e sufficiently large for the exponent to assume the value $n_f + 1$. All $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ with*

$$|m| \leq 2^{n_f+1} \quad (8)$$

are exactly representable in the format.

Proof. Consider a number in the specified format where all the fraction bits are set to one and the exponent value is n_f . In this configuration, the number represents the largest explicit integer that can be formed within this format, which is $2^{n_f+1} - 1$. By observing the structure of the representation, it follows that all preceding positive integers up to $2^{n_f+1} - 1$ can also be exactly represented.

Next, consider 2^{n_f+1} . This value is exactly representable with an exponent value of $n_f + 1$ (as required to be achievable) and all fraction bits set to zero. However, note that the least significant zero bit of 2^{n_f+1} is implicit due to the encoding scheme. This implicitness has a key implication: the number $2^{n_f+1} + 1$, which would require toggling that implicit bit to one, cannot be exactly represented within the given format. Thus, $2^{n_f+1} + 1$ is not exactly representable. \square

It shall be noted that the condition on n_e being sufficiently large is met by all standard formats but included for completeness. This result will serve as the reference point for the subsequent analysis of posits and takums.

B. Posit Arithmetic

In the case of tapered-precision formats such as posits, and subsequently takums, we adopt a proof strategy that proceeds in two stages. First, we establish how many bits are required to precisely represent a given integer, a result that also holds intrinsic value and utility. In the second stage, we leverage this result to determine the largest consecutive integer that can be represented for a fixed n . We begin with the following result:

Proposition 2 (Posit Integer Representation). *Let $m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ with $v := 1 + \lfloor \log_2(|m|) \rfloor$ bits and $w := \max_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0} (2^i \mid m)$ trailing zeros in $|m|$'s binary representation. There exists an $M \in \{0, 1\}^\ell$ with $\pi(M) = m$ and*

$$\ell := \left\lfloor \frac{5(v+3)}{4} - w \right\rfloor - (w = v-1) \cdot \begin{cases} 3 & v \in 4\mathbb{N}_0 + 1 \\ 1 & v \in 4\mathbb{N}_0 + 3, \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

which is the shortest possible representation.

Proof. See Section VII. \square

As can be observed, ℓ is not merely a bound on the length but represents the exact length. Although this results in a complex expression due to the special cases involving zero-bit truncation, this complexity is essential for establishing the proof of the following proposition:

Proposition 3 (Consecutive Posit Integers). *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}_3$. It holds for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ with*

$$|m| \leq 2^{\lfloor \frac{4(n-3)}{5} \rfloor} \quad (10)$$

that there exists an $M \in \{0, 1\}^n$ with $m = \pi(M)$.

Proof. See Section VIII. \square

Although the complete evaluation is deferred to Section V, it can already be noted that both IEEE 754 floating-point numbers and posits share the property that the largest consecutive posit integer is a power of two.

C. Takum Arithmetic

Following an approach analogous to that used for posits, we first establish the number of bits required to represent a given integer as a takum.

Proposition 4 (Linear Takum Integer Representation). *Let $m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ with $v := 1 + \lfloor \log_2(|m|) \rfloor$ bits and $w := \max_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0} (2^i \mid m)$ trailing zeros in $|m|$'s binary representation. There exists an $M \in \{0, 1\}^\ell$ with $\bar{\pi}(M) = m$ and*

$$\begin{aligned} \ell := & [4 + v + \log_2(v) - w] - \\ & (w = v - 1) \cdot \max_{i \in \{0, \dots, \lfloor \log_2(v) \rfloor\}} \left(2^i \mid v - 2^{\lfloor \log_2(v) \rfloor} \right) - \\ & (v \in 2^{\mathbb{N}_0}) \cdot \max_{i \in \{0, \dots, 3\}} \left(2^i \mid \lfloor \log_2(v) \rfloor \right), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

which is the shortest possible representation.

Proof. See Section IX. \square




Figure 2: The largest consecutive integers for `bfloat16`, IEEE 754, linear takums and posits relative to the bit string length n .

Compared to the posit result in Proposition 2, the expression for ℓ accounts for two special cases instead of one. This distinction arises because, in the case of posits, zero-bit truncation can occur only in the exponent bits. In contrast, for takums, truncation may occur in both the characteristic and regime bits, adding a layer of complexity to the analysis. Building on this result, we derive the following proposition.

Proposition 5 (Consecutive Linear Takum Integers). *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}_5$. It holds for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ with*

$$|m| \leq 2 \left\lceil \frac{W_0(2^{n-3} \ln(2))}{\ln(2)} - 1 \right\rceil, \quad (12)$$

where W_0 is the principal branch of the LAMBERT W function, that there exists an $M \in \{0, 1\}^n$ with $m = \overline{\tau}(M)$.

Proof. See Section X. \square

Despite the greater complexity of (12) compared to the corresponding expressions for IEEE 754 in (8) and for posits in (10)—most notably due to the inclusion of a non-analytical function—the upper bound remains a power of two, consistent with the other two formats.

V. EVALUATION

Although the proofs involve considerable complexity, the evaluation ultimately reduces to a comparison of the results—specifically, the values of the largest consecutive integers—presented in Propositions 1, 3, and 5. These results are visualised for $n \in \{5, \dots, 128\}$ in Figure 2 and tabulated for $n \in \{16, 32, 64, 128\}$ in Table I.

Takum arithmetic demonstrates a notable advantage over posit and IEEE 754 arithmetic in terms of the largest consecutive integers, with the exception of `float16`. While neither takums nor posits achieve the largest consecutive integer of `float16`, both formats outperform `bfloat16`.

type	largest consecutive integer
<code>bfloat16</code>	$2^8 = 256$
<code>float16</code>	$2^{11} = 2048$
<code>posit16</code>	$2^{10} = 1024$
<code>takum_linear16</code>	$2^9 = 512$
<code>float32</code>	$2^{24} \approx 1.678 \times 10^7$
<code>posit32</code>	$2^{23} \approx 8.389 \times 10^6$
<code>takum_linear32</code>	$2^{24} \approx 1.678 \times 10^7$
<code>float64</code>	$2^{53} \approx 9.007 \times 10^{15}$
<code>posit64</code>	$2^{48} \approx 2.815 \times 10^{14}$
<code>takum_linear64</code>	$2^{55} \approx 3.603 \times 10^{16}$
<code>float128</code>	$2^{113} \approx 1.038 \times 10^{34}$
<code>posit128</code>	$2^{100} \approx 1.268 \times 10^{30}$
<code>takum_linear128</code>	$2^{118} \approx 3.323 \times 10^{35}$

Table I: Largest consecutive integers for IEEE 754, linear takum and posit formats for $n \in \{16, 32, 64, 128\}$ and `bfloat16`.

For instance, takums match IEEE 754 at $n = 32$ and surpass it by up to one order of magnitude at $n = 128$.

In comparison, posit arithmetic generally produces smaller largest consecutive integers than IEEE 754 for the same bit string length. Posits exhibit a slight advantage over takums for $n \leq 23$; however, for $n > 23$, takums increasingly outperform posits. This disparity becomes particularly pronounced at larger bit widths, with takums exceeding posits by two orders of magnitude for $n = 64$ and by five orders of magnitude for $n = 128$.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we formally analysed the ability of IEEE 754, posit, and takum arithmetics to represent integral values, with a particular focus on consecutive integer representations. Our results demonstrate that takum arithmetic offers substantial advantages over posit arithmetic in this regard. While neither takums nor posits match the largest consecutive integer representation of `float16`, this limitation is mitigated by their consistent superiority over `bfloat16`, which serves as a more practical and widely adopted reference for low-precision formats.

The formal approach adopted in this study not only corroborates the empirical findings for posits presented in [8], but also extends the analysis to takum arithmetic, where the complexity of the consecutive integer bounds would have made a purely empirical approach infeasible. Additionally, we provide a proof for IEEE 754 floating-point numbers, which, to the best of the authors' knowledge, has not previously been documented in the literature.

In conclusion, takum arithmetic has been demonstrated to at least maintain parity with IEEE 754 floating-point numbers in terms of consecutive integer representation, marking a key distinction from posit arithmetic, which

falls short in this regard. This finding is particularly significant given the extensive body of work built around IEEE 754, much of which implicitly relies on its robust integral representation capabilities. By aligning with these established properties, takum arithmetic emerges as a compelling alternative, offering enhanced flexibility without sacrificing compatibility with the expectations of existing numerical frameworks.

VII. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2

Without loss of generality we can assume $m \in \mathbb{N}_1$, because the set of n -bit posits is closed under negation. We know that m has the form

$$m = 2^{v-1} + \sum_{i=w}^{v-2} F_{i-w} 2^i \quad (13)$$

with $F \in \{0,1\}^{v-w-1}$ and $F_0 \neq 0$. Its corresponding floating-point representation follows directly as

$$m = (1 + f) \cdot 2^{v-1} \quad (14)$$

with $f := \sum_{i=w}^{v-2} F_{i-w} 2^{i-v+1} \in [0,1)$. For (14) to correspond with (3) it must hold

$$v-1 = \hat{e} = 4(k-1) + e \Leftrightarrow k = \frac{v+3-e}{4} \quad (15)$$

with $k \in \mathbb{N}_1$ and $e \in \{0, \dots, 3\}$. We set $e = (v+3) \bmod 4$ and obtain $k = \lfloor \frac{v+3}{4} \rfloor$. The posit bit representation of m follows as $M := (0, \mathbf{1}_k, 0, E, F)$ with non-reduced length

$$1 + \left\lfloor \frac{v+3}{4} \right\rfloor + 1 + 2 + (v-w-1) = \left\lfloor \frac{5(v+3)}{4} - w \right\rfloor. \quad (16)$$

We know that M is the shortest possible representation when F has non-zero length, because $F_0 \neq 0$.

Otherwise it holds $v-w-1 = 0 \Leftrightarrow w = v-1$ and with (13) it follows $m = 2^{v-1}$. We now check each possible value of E (corresponding to e) to assess the reducibility of M .

Case 1 ($e = 0$)

This implies $E = \mathbf{0}_2$, and given $\overline{R_0} = 0$ it follows that M can be reduced by 3 bits. With $e = (v+3) \bmod 4$ this case is equivalent to $v \in 4\mathbb{N}_0 + 1$.

Case 2 ($e = 1$)

This implies $E = (0,1)$, which means that M cannot be further reduced.

Case 3 ($e = 2$)

This implies $E = (1,0)$, which means that M can be reduced by 1 bit. With $e = (v+3) \bmod 4$ this case is equivalent to $v \in 4\mathbb{N}_0 + 3$.

Case 4 ($e = 3$)

This implies $E = (1,1)$, which means that M cannot be further reduced.

No further reduction is possible, as the direction bit D is always 1. The reduced length of M follows as

$$\left\lfloor \frac{5(v+3)}{4} - w \right\rfloor - (w = v-1) \cdot \begin{cases} 3 & v \in 4\mathbb{N}_0 + 1 \\ 1 & v \in 4\mathbb{N}_0 + 3, \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

which was to be shown. \square

VIII. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3

Without loss of generality we can assume $m \in \mathbb{N}_1$, because the set of n -bit posits is closed under negation and the integer zero is represented by $\mathbf{0}_n$ for any n . Let us further assume that m is an arbitrary v -bit integer with w trailing zeros in its binary representation, where $v \in \mathbb{N}_1$ and $w \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Our goal is to determine an upper bound for v that depends on n to find out the largest consecutive integer represented by an n -bit posit.

With Proposition 2 we know there exists an $M \in \{0,1\}^\ell$ with $\pi(M) = m$ and ℓ as in (9). It holds with $v \in \mathbb{N}_1$ (operation 1) that

$$\ell \leq n \Leftrightarrow \left\lfloor \frac{5(v+3)}{4} - w \right\rfloor - (w = v-1) \cdot \begin{cases} 3 & v \in 4\mathbb{N} + 1 \\ 1 & v \in 4\mathbb{N} + 3 \end{cases} \leq n \quad (18)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \left\lfloor \frac{5(v+3)}{4} \right\rfloor \leq n \quad (19)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \frac{5(v+3)}{4} < n+1 \quad (20)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow v < \frac{4(n+1)}{5} - 3 \quad (21)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow v < \frac{4n-11}{5} \quad (22)$$

$$\stackrel{!}{\Leftrightarrow} v \leq \left\lfloor \frac{4n-11}{5} - 1 \right\rfloor \quad (23)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow v \leq \left\lfloor \frac{4n-16}{5} \right\rfloor \quad (24)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow v \leq \left\lfloor \frac{4n-16+(5-1)}{5} \right\rfloor \quad (25)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow v \leq \left\lfloor \frac{4(n-3)}{5} \right\rfloor. \quad (26)$$

Thus we have found an upper bound on v such that arbitrary v -bit integers are represented by an n -bit posit. Given the step from (18) to (19) this upper bound is not tight and only a starting point for the next stage of the proof.

Let $v = \left\lfloor \frac{4(n-3)}{5} \right\rfloor$ and $m = 2^v - 1$, namely a v -bit saturated integer and thus the largest consecutive integer value representable with an n -bit posit that we know of. Now let us take a look at $m+1 = 2^v$, a $v+1$ -bit integer with v trailing zeros in its binary representation. With Proposition 2 we know that there exists $M' \in \{0,1\}^{\ell'}$ with $\pi(M') = m+1$ and

$$\ell' := \left\lfloor \frac{5((v+1)+3)}{4} - v \right\rfloor - \quad (27)$$

$$(v = (v+1) - 1) \cdot \begin{cases} 3 & v+1 \in 4\mathbb{N}_0 + 1 \\ 1 & v+1 \in 4\mathbb{N}_0 + 3, \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

$$\leq \left\lfloor \frac{v}{4} + 5 \right\rfloor - \begin{cases} 3 & v \in 4\mathbb{N}_0 \\ 1 & v \in 4\mathbb{N}_0 + 2, \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

$$= \left\lfloor \frac{n-3}{5} + 5 \right\rfloor - \begin{cases} 3 & v \in 4\mathbb{N}_0 \\ 1 & v \in 4\mathbb{N}_0 + 2, \end{cases} \quad (30)$$

$$\begin{cases} = 2 & n = 4 \\ = 5 & n = 5 \\ < \frac{n-3}{5} + 5 & n \geq 6 \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

$$\leq n. \quad (32)$$

As we can see $m+1$ has a posit representation that fits within n bits, which means that it is also part of the set of representable consecutive integers.

Let us now take a look at $m+2 = 2^v + 1$, a $(v+1)$ -bit integer with zero trailing zeros in its binary representation ($w = 0$). With Proposition 2 we know that there exists $M'' \in \{0,1\}^{\ell''}$ with $\pi(M'') = m+2$ and, with $\mathbb{N}_1 \ni v \neq 0$ (operation 1),

$$\ell'' := \left\lfloor \frac{5((v+1)+3)}{4} \right\rfloor - \quad (33)$$

$$(0 = (v+1) - 1) \cdot \begin{cases} 3 & v+1 \in 4\mathbb{N}_0 + 1 \\ 1 & v+1 \in 4\mathbb{N}_0 + 3, \end{cases} \quad (34)$$

$$\stackrel{1}{=} \left\lfloor \frac{5v}{4} + 5 \right\rfloor \quad (35)$$

$$= \lfloor n - 3 + 5 \rfloor \quad (36)$$

$$= n + 2 \quad (37)$$

$$> n. \quad (38)$$

Here we can see that $m+2$'s posit representation does not fit within n bits. Thus $m+1 = 2^v$ is the largest representable consecutive integer, as was to be shown. \square

IX. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4

Without loss of generality we can assume $m \in \mathbb{N}_1$, because the set of n -bit takums is closed under negation. We know that m has the form

$$m = 2^{v-1} + \sum_{i=w}^{v-2} F_{i-w} 2^i \quad (39)$$

with $F \in \{0,1\}^{v-w-1}$ and $F_0 \neq 0$. Its corresponding floating-point representation follows directly as

$$m = (1 + f) \cdot 2^{v-1} \quad (40)$$

with $f := \sum_{i=w}^{v-2} F_{i-w} 2^{i-v+1} \in [0,1)$. For (40) to correspond with (7) it must hold $S = 0$ and

$$v-1 = e = (-1)^S (c + S) = c \Leftrightarrow v = c + 1. \quad (41)$$

As $v \geq 1$ it follows $c \geq 0$ and thus $D = 1$. This yields with (5) that

$$v = c + 1 = 2^r - 1 + \text{uint}(C) + 1 = 2^r + \text{uint}(C), \quad (42)$$

and we can deduce

$$r = \lfloor \log_2(v) \rfloor. \quad (43)$$

The takum bit representation of m follows as $M := (0, 1, R, C, F)$ with non-reduced length

$$\begin{aligned} & 1 + 1 + 3 + \lfloor \log_2(v) \rfloor + (v - w - 1) \\ & = \lfloor 4 + v + \log_2(v) - w \rfloor \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

We know that M is the shortest possible representation when F has non-zero length, because $F_0 \neq 0$.

Otherwise it holds $v - w - 1 = 0 \Leftrightarrow w = v - 1$ and with (39) it follows $m = 2^{v-1}$. In this case we must check if the characteristic bits C have trailing zeros that can be reduced. With (42) and (43) we know that

$$\text{uint}(C) = v - 2^r = v - 2^{\lfloor \log_2(v) \rfloor}. \quad (45)$$

The number of trailing zeros in the $r = \lfloor \log_2(v) \rfloor$ characteristic bits is obtained with

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{i \in \{0, \dots, r\}} (2^i \mid v - 2^r) = \\ & \max_{i \in \{0, \dots, \lfloor \log_2(v) \rfloor\}} (2^i \mid v - 2^{\lfloor \log_2(v) \rfloor}), \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

namely the largest integer i such that 2^i divides $\text{uint}(C)$.

In the extreme case that all characteristic bits are zero, implying $\text{uint}(C) = 0$, we might also be able to reduce trailing zeros in the regime. Using (45) this case is equivalent to

$$0 = v - 2^{\lfloor \log_2(v) \rfloor} \Leftrightarrow v = 2^{\lfloor \log_2(v) \rfloor} \Leftrightarrow v \in 2^{\mathbb{N}_0}. \quad (47)$$

The number of trailing zero bits in the 3 regime bits is, analogous to the trailing zero bits in the characteristic bits, the largest integer $i \in \{0, \dots, 3\}$ such that 2^i divides r , formally

$$\max_{i \in \{0, \dots, 3\}} (2^i \mid r) = \max_{i \in \{0, \dots, 3\}} (2^i \mid \lfloor \log_2(v) \rfloor). \quad (48)$$

No further reduction is possible, as the direction bit D is always 1. The reduced length of M follows as

$$\begin{aligned} & \lfloor 4 + v + \log_2(v) - w \rfloor - \\ & (w = v - 1) \cdot \max_{i \in \{0, \dots, \lfloor \log_2(v) \rfloor\}} (2^i \mid v - 2^{\lfloor \log_2(v) \rfloor}) - \\ & (v \in 2^{\mathbb{N}_0}) \cdot \max_{i \in \{0, \dots, 3\}} (2^i \mid \lfloor \log_2(v) \rfloor), \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

which was to be shown. \square

X. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 5

Without loss of generality we can assume $m \in \mathbb{N}_1$, because the set of n -bit linear takums is closed under negation and the integer zero is represented by $\mathbf{0}_n$ for any n . Let us further assume that m is an arbitrary v -bit integer with w trailing zeros in its binary representation, where $v \in \mathbb{N}_1$ and $w \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Our goal is to determine an upper bound for v that depends on n to find out the largest consecutive integer represented by an n -bit linear takum.

With Proposition 4 we know there exists an $M \in \{0, 1\}^\ell$ with $\pi(M) = m$ and ℓ as in (11). It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \ell \leq n &\Leftrightarrow \lfloor 4 + v + \log_2(v) - w \rfloor - \\ &\quad (w = v - 1) \cdot \max_{i \in \{0, \dots, \lfloor \log_2(q) \rfloor\}} \left(2^i \mid v - 2^{\lfloor \log_2(q) \rfloor} \right) - \\ &\quad (v \in 2^{\mathbb{N}_0}) \cdot \max_{i \in \{0, \dots, 3\}} (2^i \mid \lfloor \log_2(v) \rfloor) \leq n \quad (50) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \lfloor 4 + q + \log_2(v) \rfloor \leq n \quad (51) \\ &\Leftrightarrow 4 + v + \log_2(v) < n + 1 \quad (52) \\ &\Leftrightarrow v + \log_2(v) < n - 3 \quad (53) \\ &\Leftrightarrow 2^{v + \log_2(v)} < 2^{n-3} \quad (54) \\ &\Leftrightarrow v \cdot 2^v < 2^{n-3} \quad (55) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \frac{\ln(2)}{\ln(2)} v \cdot \exp(\ln(2)v) < 2^{n-3} \quad (56) \\ &\Leftrightarrow (\ln(2)v) \exp(\ln(2)v) < 2^{n-3} \ln(2). \quad (57) \end{aligned}$$

If we set $\tilde{v} := \ln(2)v$ we obtain

$$\ell \leq n \Leftrightarrow \tilde{v} \cdot \exp(\tilde{v}) < 2^{n-3} \ln(2). \quad (58)$$

We know that v can be expressed using the LAMBERT W function. Given $2^{n-3} \ln(2) > 0$ we only need to consider its principal branch W_0 . As W_0 is monotonically increasing it holds with $v \in \mathbb{N}_1$ (operation 1)

$$\tilde{v} \cdot \exp(\tilde{v}) < 2^{n-3} \ln(2) \Leftrightarrow \tilde{v} < W_0(2^{n-3} \ln(2)) \quad (59)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow v < \frac{W_0(2^{n-3} \ln(2))}{\ln(2)} \quad (60)$$

$$\stackrel{1}{\Leftrightarrow} v \leq \left\lfloor \frac{W_0(2^{n-3} \ln(2))}{\ln(2)} - 1 \right\rfloor. \quad (61)$$

Thus we have found an upper bound on v such that arbitrary v -bit integers are represented by an n -bit takum. Given the step from (50) to (51) this upper bound is not tight and only a starting point for the next stage of the proof.

Let $v = \left\lfloor \frac{W_0(2^{n-3} \ln(2))}{\ln(2)} - 1 \right\rfloor$ and $m = 2^v - 1$, namely a v -bit saturated integer and thus the largest consecutive integer value representable with an n -bit takum that we know of. Now let us take a look at $m + 1 = 2^v$, a $(v + 1)$ -bit integer with v trailing zeros in its binary representation. With Proposition 4 we know that there

exists $M' \in \{0, 1\}^{\ell'}$ with $\tau(M') = m + 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \ell' &:= \lfloor 4 + (v+1) + \log_2(v+1) - v \rfloor - \\ &\quad (v = (v+1) - 1) \cdot \\ &\quad \max_{i \in \{0, \dots, \lfloor \log_2(v+1) \rfloor\}} \left(2^i \mid (v+1) - 2^{\lfloor \log_2(v+1) \rfloor} \right) - \\ &\quad (v+1 \in 2^{\mathbb{N}_0}) \cdot \max_{i \in \{0, \dots, 3\}} (2^i \mid \lfloor \log_2(v+1) \rfloor) \quad (62) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \lfloor 5 + \log_2(v+1) \rfloor - \\ (v+1 \in 2^{\mathbb{N}_0}) \cdot \max_{i \in \{0, \dots, 3\}} (2^i \mid \lfloor \log_2(v+1) \rfloor) \quad (63)$$

$$= \left\lfloor 5 + \log_2 \left(\left\lceil \frac{W_0(2^{n-3} \ln(2))}{\ln(2)} - 1 \right\rceil + 1 \right) \right\rfloor - \\ (v+1 \in 2^{\mathbb{N}_0}) \cdot \max_{i \in \{0, \dots, 3\}} (2^i \mid \lfloor \log_2(v+1) \rfloor) \quad (64)$$

$$= \left\lfloor 5 + \log_2 \left(\left\lceil \frac{W_0(2^{n-3} \ln(2))}{\ln(2)} \right\rceil \right) \right\rfloor - \\ (v+1 \in 2^{\mathbb{N}_0}) \cdot \max_{i \in \{0, \dots, 3\}} (2^i \mid \lfloor \log_2(v+1) \rfloor) \quad (65)$$

$$\leq \left\lfloor 5 + \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{W_0(2^{n-3} \ln(2))}{\ln(2)} \right) \right\rfloor - \\ (v+1 \in 2^{\mathbb{N}_0}) \cdot \max_{i \in \{0, \dots, 3\}} (2^i \mid \lfloor \log_2(v+1) \rfloor). \quad (66)$$

Using a result from Hoorfar et al. from [10, Theorem 2.7] that holds for $x > e$ (operation 1) we obtain the bound

$$W_0(x) \stackrel{1}{\leq} \ln \left(\frac{x}{\ln(x)} \right) + \frac{e}{e-1} \frac{\ln(\ln(x))}{\ln(x)} \quad (67)$$

$$= \ln \left(\frac{x}{\ln(x)} \right) + \frac{e}{(e-1)\ln(x)} \ln(\ln(x)) \quad (68)$$

$$= \ln \left(\frac{x}{\ln(x)} \right) + \ln \left((\ln(x))^{\frac{e}{(e-1)\ln(x)}} \right) \quad (69)$$

$$= \ln \left(x \cdot (\ln(x))^{\frac{e}{(e-1)\ln(x)} - 1} \right). \quad (70)$$

In our case $x := 2^{n-3} \ln(2) > e$ holds for $n \in \mathbb{N}_5$, as $2^2 \ln(2) \approx 2.77 > e$. This means that we can use the bound (operation 1). It also holds $\frac{e}{(e-1)\ln(x)} - 1 \in (0, 1)$ (operation 2), given $\ln(x) > 1$ is never negative and the expression is smaller than one if and only if $\ln(x) > \frac{e}{2(e-1)} \approx 0.79$, which is the case as for $n = 5$ we know $\ln(x) = (5 - 3) \ln(2) + \ln(\ln(2)) \approx 1.02 > 0.79$ and $\ln(x)$ is strictly monotonically increasing in n . It follows with $\ln(\ln(2)) < 0$ (operation 3) that

$$W_0(2^{n-3} \ln(2)) \stackrel{1}{\leq} \ln \left(x \cdot (\ln(x))^{\frac{e}{(e-1)\ln(x)} - 1} \right) \quad (71)$$

$$< \ln(x \cdot \ln(x)) \quad (72)$$

$$= \ln(2^{n-3} \ln(2) \cdot \\ [(n-3) \ln(2) + \ln(\ln(2))]) \quad (73)$$

$$< \ln(2^{n-3} \cdot \ln(2) \cdot (n-3) \cdot \ln(2)) \quad (74)$$

$$= (n-3) \ln(2) + \ln(n-3) + \\ 2 \ln(\ln(2)) \quad (75)$$

We insert (75) into (66) and obtain

$$\ell' \leq \left\lfloor 5 + \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{(n-3)\ln(2) + \ln(n-3) + 2\ln(\ln(2))}{\ln(2)} \right) \right\rfloor - \max_{i \in \{0, \dots, 3\}} (2^i \mid \lfloor \log_2(v+1) \rfloor) \quad (76)$$

$$= \left\lfloor 5 + \log_2 \left(n - 2 + \frac{\ln(n-3) + 2\ln(\ln(2))}{\ln(2)} \right) \right\rfloor - \max_{i \in \{0, \dots, 3\}} (2^i \mid \lfloor \log_2(v+1) \rfloor) \quad (77)$$

$$\begin{cases} = 6 - 1 = 5 & n = 5 \\ = 7 - 1 = 6 & n = 6 \\ = 7 & n = 7 \\ < n & n \geq 8 \end{cases} \quad (78)$$

$$\leq n, \quad (79)$$

where the last case is handled by noting that (77) is at most 7 for $n = 8$ and the first summand grows in the order of $\mathcal{O}(\ln(n))$.

As we can see $m+1$ has a takum representation that fits within n bits, which means that it is also part of the set of representable consecutive integers.

Let us now take a look at $m+2 = 2^v + 1$, a $v+1$ -bit integer with zero trailing zeros in its binary representation ($w = 0$). With Proposition 4 we know that there exists $M'' \in \{0, 1\}^{\ell''}$ with $\tau(M'') = m+2$ and, with $\mathbb{N}_1 \ni v \neq 0$ (operation 1),

$$\begin{aligned} \ell'' &:= \lfloor 4 + (v+1) + \log_2(v+1) \rfloor - \\ &\quad (0 = (v+1) - 1) \cdot \\ &\quad \max_{i \in \{0, \dots, \lfloor \log_2(v+1) \rfloor\}} \left(2^i \mid (v+1) - 2^{\lfloor \log_2(v+1) \rfloor} \right) - \\ &\quad (v+1 \in 2^{\mathbb{N}_0}) \cdot \max_{i \in \{0, \dots, 3\}} (2^i \mid \lfloor \log_2(v+1) \rfloor) \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

$$\stackrel{1}{=} \lfloor 4 + (v+1) + \log_2(v+1) \rfloor \quad (81)$$

$$= \lfloor 5 + v + \log_2(v+1) \rfloor \quad (82)$$

$$> 4 + v + \log_2(v+1) \quad (83)$$

$$= 4 + \left\lfloor \frac{W_0(2^{n-3}\ln(2))}{\ln(2)} - 1 \right\rfloor + \log_2 \left(\left\lfloor \frac{W_0(2^{n-3}\ln(2))}{\ln(2)} \right\rfloor \right) \quad (84)$$

$$\geq 3 + \frac{W_0(2^{n-3}\ln(2))}{\ln(2)} + \log_2 \left(\frac{W_0(2^{n-3}\ln(2))}{\ln(2)} \right) \quad (85)$$

$$= 3 + \frac{\ln(2^{n-3})}{\ln(2)} \quad (86)$$

$$= 3 + n - 3 \quad (87)$$

$$= n. \quad (88)$$

Here we can see that $m+2$'s posit representation does not fit within n bits. Thus $m+1 = 2^v$ is the largest representable consecutive integer, as was to be shown. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] *ECMA-262, ECMAScript® 2024 language specification*, 15th ed. Geneva, Switzerland: Ecma International, Jun. 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://web.archive.org/web/20240725084559/https://ecma-international.org/ecma-262/>
- [2] R. W. Cox *et al.*, 'A (sort of) new image data format standard: Nifti-1,' in *10th Annual Meeting of the Organization for Human Brain Mapping*, Budapest, Hungary, Jun. 2004. [Online]. Available: <https://web.archive.org/web/20060212093023/https://nifti.nim.nih.gov/nifti-1/>
- [3] J. L. Gustafson and I. Yonemoto, 'Beating floating point at its own game: Posit arithmetic,' *Supercomputing Frontiers and Innovations*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 71–86, Jun. 2017. DOI: 10.14529/jsfi170206.
- [4] Z. Carmichael *et al.*, 'Deep positron: A deep neural network using the posit number system,' in *2019 Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition (DATE)*, 2019, pp. 1421–1426. DOI: 10.23919/DATE.2019.8715262.
- [5] F. de Dinechin *et al.*, 'Posits: The good, the bad and the ugly,' ser. CoNGA'19, Singapore, Singapore: Association for Computing Machinery, 2019. DOI: 10.1145/3316279.3316285.
- [6] A. Ramachandran *et al.*, 'Algorithm-hardware co-design of distribution-aware logarithmic-posit encodings for efficient DNN inference,' pp. 1–6, Mar. 2024. arXiv: 2403.05465 [cs.HA].
- [7] D. Mallasén *et al.*, 'Big-PERCIVAL: Exploring the native use of 64-bit posit arithmetic in scientific computing,' *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, vol. 73, no. 6, pp. 1472–1485, Jun. 2024. DOI: 10.1109/TC.2024.3377890.
- [8] J. L. Gustafson *et al.*, 'Standard for Posit™ arithmetic,' Mar. 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://web.archive.org/web/20220603115338/https://posithub.org/>
- [9] L. Hunhold, 'Beating posits at their own game: Takum arithmetic,' in *Next Generation Arithmetic, 5th International Conference, CoNGA 2024, Sydney, NSW, Australia, February 20–21, 2024, Proceedings*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 14666, Sydney, NSW, Australia: Springer Nature Switzerland, Oct. 2024. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-031-72709-2_1.
- [10] A. Hoorfar and M. Hassani, 'Inequalities on the lambert W function and hyperpower function,' *Journal of Inequalities in Pure and Applied Mathematics (JIPAM)*, vol. 9, no. 2, 2008. [Online]. Available: <https://eudml.org/doc/130024>.