A Simple Implementation of Dynamical Memory Allocation in Old-fashioned Singleton’s Mixed-radix Fast Fourier Transformation Code
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We propose a simple prescription for resolving the general-N problem existing in the old-fashioned mixed-radix fast Fourier transformation FORTRAN subroutine by Singleton in 1968. After a brief investigation on the problem, we discuss our prescription with the worst case analysis within the dynamical allocation. The analysis reveals that our implementation is superior, at least for multi-variate data set, than previously proposed data copying methods.
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The rediscovery of an algorithm for fast Fourier transforms (FFT) [1] has opened a very efficient way for manipulating large data set, especially in scientific and engineering computing area. FFT algorithms are based on divide-and-conquer strategy, which factorizes an input data vector of length \( N \) out into the terms of multiples of factors \( f_i \). The factored vector is subjected into the factorization procedure again until the input vector has only single term, and then performs a discrete Fourier transform (DFT) on a single term before the factored terms merged together. This divide-and-conquer strategy improves the speed of calculation of the DFT of \( O(N \log N) \) scale instead of \( O(N^2) \) scale if one performs the direct DFT. Generally speaking, the algorithms of FFT fall into two categories of the Cooley-Tukey algorithms (CTA) and the prime factor algorithm (PFA), depending on their factorization methods. A full review of various FFT methods is given by Burrus and Parks [2].

Most FFT algorithms in practice have a severe obstacle that the length of the input data set has to follow a given rule, \( e.g., N = 2^m \) for radix-2 algorithms. Since many practical problems to be solved restrict the size of data set, for example, \( N = 562 \), one has to copy the data into a relevant size of vector with a larger \( N = 1024 \) or smaller \( N = 512 \) elements. The latter case loses the information from input data so it is not appropriate when the problem requires high precision. The former case needs extra memory padded by zeros, and more critically increases the time scale for transforms of \( O(2\log(M/N)^{1/2}) \) if one adapts next power of 2 for the new size of the zero-
padded array. In addition, the manipulating data set to fit the existing library routine gives rise to another overhead of \(O(N)\), prior and posterior to transform for copying and restoring between the original data vector and the temporary one. To resolve the general-\(N\) problem, two algorithms have been proposed: the PFA [3] and the mixed-radix algorithms [4]. The PFA has a very simple indexing scheme, but it only works in the case where all factors of \(N\) are mutually prime.

The Singleton’s mixed-radix algorithm [4] resolves the general-\(N\) problem in such a way that the size \(N\) of the data set is factored into prime numbers, and each factored subset is subjected to a well-developed radix-\(n\) subroutine, for example, with \(n\) equals 2, 3, 4, or 5. The set factored by higher prime numbers is transformed by an \(O(N^2)\) algorithm. Because most \(N\) below the integer limit of a given machine can be factored into small prime numbers, the mixed-radix method works with reasonable performance, hence so the Singleton’s implementation written in the old-fashioned FORTRAN Y has been spread widely to date. However, there were limitations of memory and speed of computers as well as FORTRAN compilers, in the age of the Singleton’s code implemented. Such limitations forced Singleton to make his code being limited by maximum prime factor to be 23. Although Singleton’s code is translated into FORTRAN 90 by Miller [5], the limitation was not removed, i.e., no dynamical allocation for the temporary storages is applied. Here we suggest a solution to break out of this limitation of the Singleton’s codes with a very simple method.

Let us investigate, first of all, the Singleton’s original code [4, 5]. The Singleton’s code has the interface of

\[
\text{call sfft}(a, b, \text{n}, n, \text{nspan}, \text{isgn})
\]

A tri-variate transform with \(a(n1, n2, n3)\) and \(b(n1, n2, n3)\) is computed by a series of calls

\[
\text{call sfft}(a, b, n1*n2*n3, n1, n2, \text{isgn})
\]

The interface greatly simplifies the user routines in which multi-variate data set has to be transformed.

However, the fixed-memory allocation functionality in old-fashioned FORTRAN languages limits on the dimension of the current data set values \(n\): (i) the number of factors of \(n\) should be smaller than a given maximum number of factors \(\text{maxr}\), (ii) the maximum prime factor of \(n\) has to be smaller than a given prime number \(\text{maxp}\), and (iii) the square-free portion of \(n\) must be smaller than a given prime number multiple \(\text{maxp}\) minus one.

Regarding the limitation (i), the smallest number with 16 factors is 12,754,584 (= \(2^3 \times 3^3\)) [4], so that it does not occasionally occur such situation, but we would like to give freedom on it. On the limitation (ii), Singleton fixed \(\text{maxp}\) as 23, because of most numbers allowed in usual 4-byte long integer can be factorized into the prime numbers less than 23. However, if \(n\) is a large prime number itself or it contains a larger prime factor than 23, the data set of this size is not allowed. The limitation (iii) makes the situation messy as described below.

Suppose a dimension of the data set values \(N\) is factored by several prime factors, i.e., \(N = p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r p_{s_1} \cdots p_{s_m} \cdots p_{m_s}\), where \(p_i\) is the \(i\)th prime number factoring \(N\). We may factor out the squared factors, i.e., we factor out \(p_i p_j\) from \(N\) to get a new number \(M\), if \(p_i = p_j\); and we perform this procedure repeatedly on \(M\) until we obtain the final number \(M = P = f_1 f_2 \cdots f_m\) where no factor \(f_i\) appears more than twice. The number \(P\) is then called the ‘multiple of square-free factors’ of \(N\), and \(f_j\) is called the ‘square-free factor’. Let us consider two positive integers \(r\) and \(s\), such that \(r > s\), which contain the square free factors \(P_i < P_s\). If \(P_s\) is greater than the given maximum square free portion \(\text{maxp}\), the data set of larger size \(r\) is allowed if \(P_s\) is smaller than \(\text{maxp}\). A simple example on this situation is given by Kirby [6].

The simplest and best way to avoid these problems without modifying the existing code is to predict the size of the data set before calling the FFT routine. However, it is difficult to know \textit{a priori} and optimal size of data sets in many practical situations, because the size of data set is occasionally evaluated dynamically be the given problem.

There are three ways to resolve the general-\(N\) problem with dynamical memory allocation (DMA) ability in FORTRAN 90/95, or with the other programming languages supporting the DMA. First of all, the ultimate method is that one may invent wheel again, i.e., one may implement a new mixed-radix FFT subroutine with the same interface and functionality as the Singleton’s code does. To date there is at least one FORTRAN 90 implementation for the one dimensional case by Steffens [7], which treats the higher dimensional data set by decomposing it into one dimensional one prior to performing a mixed-radix FFT subroutine. Although the Steffen’s implementation has many desirable features of software engineering, e.g., data
encapsulation, structured programming, etc., overheads of \( O(N) \) required again for copy-in-copy-out procedures prior and posterior to manipulating the given multi-dimensional data sets. Second one is proposed by Kirby [6], such that one may add a routine that calculated a safe size of the data set within the only 59 lines long subroutine, allocates a temporal data vector with the safe size, and then pads zeros at the attached dummy elements of the data set before calling the Singleton’s subroutine. However, the treatment of Kirby increases complexity in caller routines when the multi-dimensional data set is subjected to the FFT, as well as the requirement for the data copying overhead. The third way, what we describe here, is just to make the Singleton’s code dynamic itself. Surprisingly, this very simple solution has never been introduced in public domain so far!

In order to make the Singleton’s code dynamic, it is required to calculate, in an additional subroutine, the limit parameters, \( \text{maxn} \), \( \text{maxf} \), and \( \text{maxp} \) before allocating the temporary storage. The additional routine is very simple. The dynamic Singleton subroutine invokes, at the beginning, another subroutine \( \text{primfact}(n, \text{maxn}, \text{maxf}, \text{maxp}) \), which calculates \( \text{maxn} \), \( \text{maxf} \), and \( \text{maxp} \) from the input number of \( n \) of the data set size. The subroutine \( \text{primfact} \)

1. tabulates the prime numbers below \( n \) by using the Sieve of Eratosthenes,
2. factorizes \( n \) into prime numbers and stores the prime factors into another table,
3. and obtains the square-free factors and calculates their products.

As seen from the procedure given above, \( \text{maxn} \) and \( \text{maxf} \) are obtained at the stage (2), while \( \text{maxp} \) is evaluated at the stage (3). With these values \( \text{sfft} \) allocates the corresponding temporary storages in the dynamic Singleton routine. One has to be careful that the Singleton’s code assumes that the number of prime factors is odd. So if \( \text{maxn} \) is even, \( \text{maxn} \) must be increased by one to be odd.

Once the prime numbers below a given \( N \) are tabulated at the stage (1), the procedures for factorization and calculating the multiples of square-free factors are direct and negligible in time. Note that the time scale of the Sieve of Eratosthenes is \( O(\sqrt{N}) \), which is superior to the other treatments with copying input vectors of \( O(N) \) for the one-dimensional case. However, one may ask that “How long does it take with the overhead?”

The worst case for the above overhead in practice occurs when the data set is extremely large and it is one-dimensional. For a 4-byte long integer variable, the maximum number is \( 2^{31} - 1 = 2,147,483,647 = O(10^9) \), which is even much larger than the smallest size with 16 factors of \( O(10^5) \). The Sieve of Eratosthenes takes steps of \( O(10^5) \) for this size. A two-dimensional case with the size of \( N \times N \) data set, the treated Singletons code invokes \( \text{primfact} \) with \( n = N - 65,536 = O(10^4) \), where the Sieve of Eratosthenes takes only \( O(10^5) \) steps. The same argument for the three-dimensional cases gives \( O(10) \) steps for the Sieve of Eratosthenes. Hence, the overhead for higher-variate data sets is negligible. Since the Singleton’s code is applied for FFT of multi-variate—mostly in three dimensional complex data sets in most practical applications, this treatment will work in reasonable speed.

Another type of worst case arises by the mixed-Radix algorithm itself. Below the maximum integer number of 4-byte long, the largest prime number and the multiples of square-free factors is \( 2^{31} - 1 \). Note that no multiple of square-free factor can exceed the largest prime number. Such a large data set with the length which contains a large prime factor in one dimension, the time scale is dominated by \( O(N^5) \). In this case, one may cut-off the last datum to make the size of the data set being \( N - 1 \), which is no more a prime number, hence so is less dangerous, because Fourier transform is not susceptible to the inclusion of the last datum for large \( N \).

The suggested subroutine was coded in the full-potential linearized augmented plane wave (FLAPW) method implemented in the QMD-FLAPW package [8]. During the implementation, we modified the main Singleton’s FFT subroutine \( \text{sfft} \) within the modern structural programming paradigm, i.e., we eliminated the \( \text{goto} \) statements from the subroutine. The realistic test was done on ferromagnetic body-centered cubic iron as given in Ref. [9]. We confirmed that the new subroutines, \( \text{primfact} \) and \( \text{sfft} \) reproduce exactly the same results of Ref. [9]. It is also found that there are no significant increments in running time with these new subroutines. This result is essential in developing new subroutines.

In summary, we have proposed a simple method to allow general-\( N \) data set for the well-known mixed-radix FFT method developed by Singleton in 1968. It seems like a prescription of an oxygen-mask to a dying patient. However, the analysis has shown that this prescription will work efficiently until an ultimate solution appears.
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