arXiv:1404.1741v13 [cs.CC] 15 Apr 2015

Tighter Fourier Transform Complexity Tradeoffs

Nir Ailon[1]

Technion Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, Israel
nailon@cs.technion.ac.il

Abstract. The Fourier Transform is one of the most important linear transformations used in science and engineering. Cooley and Tukey's Fast Fourier Transform (FFT) from 1964 is a method for computing this transformation in time $O(n \log n)$. Achieving a matching lower bound in a reasonable computational model is one of the most important open problems in theoretical computer science.
In 2014, improving on his previous work, Ailon showed that if an algorithm speeds up the FFT by a factor of $b = b(n) \geq 1$, then it must rely on computing, as an intermediate "bottleneck" step, a linear mapping of the input with condition number $\Omega(b(n))$. Our main result shows that a factor b speedup implies existence of not just one but $\Omega(n)$ b-ill conditioned bottlenecks occurring at $\Omega(n)$ different steps, each causing information from independent (orthogonal) components of the input to either overflow or underflow. This provides further evidence that beating FFT is hard. Our result also gives the first quantitative tradeoff between computation speed and information loss in Fourier computation on fixed word size architectures. The main technical result is an entropy analysis of the Fourier transform under transformations of low trace, which is interesting in its own right.

1 Introduction

The (discrete) normalized Fourier transform (DFT) is a complex mapping sending input $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$ to $Fx \in \mathbb{C}^n$, where F is a unitary matrix defined by

$$F(k,\ell) = n^{-1/2} e^{-i2\pi k\ell/n} \ . \tag{1.1}$$

The Walsh-Hadamard transform is a real orthogonal mapping in $\mathbb{R}^n$ (for n an integer power of 2) sending an input x to Fx, where

$$F(k,\ell) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(-1)^{\langle [k-1],[\ell-1]\rangle} \ ,$$

with $\langle \cdot,\cdot \rangle$ is dot-product, and $[p]$ denotes (here only) the bit representation of the integer $p \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\}$ as a vector of $\log_2 n$ bits. Both transformations are special (and most important) cases of abstract Fourier transforms defined with respect to corresponding Abelian groups. The Fast Fourier Transform (FFT) of Cooley and Tukey [7] is a method for computing the DFT of $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$ in time $O(n \log n)$. The fast Walsh-Hadamard transform computes the Walsh-Hadamard

transform in time $O(n \log n)$. Both fast transformations perform a sequence of rotations on pairs of coordinates, and are hence special cases of so-called linear algorithms, as defined in [12].

The DFT is instrumental as a subroutine in fast polynomial multiplication [**?**] (chapter 30), fast integer multiplication [8,9], cross-correlation and auto-correlation detection in images and time-series (via convolution) and, as a more recent example, convolution networks for deep learning [**?**]. Both DFT and Walsh-Hadamard are useful for fast Johnson-Lindenstrauss transform for dimensionality reduction [3,4,5,11] and the related restricted isometry property (RIP) matrix construction [14,6,11]). It is beyond the scope of this work to survey all uses of Fourier transforms in both theory of algorithms and in complexity. For the sake of simplicity the reader is encouraged to assume that F is the Walsh-Hadamard transform, and that by the acronym "FFT" we refer to the fast Walsh-Hadamard transform. The modifications required for the DFT (rather, the real embedding thereof) require a slight modification to the potential function which we mention but do not elaborate on for simplicity. Our results nevertheless apply also to DFT.

It is not known whether $\Omega(n \log n)$ operations are necessary, and this problem is one of the most important open problems in theoretical computer science [**?**]. It is trivial that a linear number of steps is necessary, because every input coordinate must be probed. Papadimitriou derives in [13] an $\Omega(n \log n)$ lower bound for DFT over finite fields using a notion of an information flow network. It is not clear how to extend that result to the Complex field. There have also been attempts [15] to reduce the constants hiding in the upper bound of $O(n \log n)$, while also separately counting the number of additions versus the number of multiplications (by constants). In 1973, Morgenstern proved that if the moduli of the constants used in the computation are are bounded by 1 then the number of steps required for computing the *unnormalized* Fourier transform, defined by $n^{1/2}F$ in the linear algorithm model is at least $\frac{1}{2}n \log_2 n$. He used a potential function related to matrix determinant, which makes the technique inapplicable for deriving lower bounds for the (normalized) F. Morgenstern's result also happens to imply that the transformation $\sqrt{n}\,\mathrm{Id}$ ($\sqrt{n}$ times the identity) has the same complexity as the Fourier transform, which is not a satisfying conclusion. Also note that stretching the input norm by a factor of $\sqrt{n}$ requires representing numbers of $\omega(\log n)$ bits, and it cannot be simply assumed that a multiplication or an addition over such numbers can be done in $O(1)$ time.

Ailon [1] studied the complexity of the (normalized) Fourier transform in a computational model allowing only orthogonal transformations acting on (and replacing in memory) two intermediates at each step. He showed that at least $\Omega(n \log n)$ steps were required. The proof was done by defining a potential function on the matrices $M^{(t)}$ defined by composing the first t gates. The potential function is simply the sum of Shannon entropy of the probability distributions defined by the squared modulus of elements in the matrix rows. (Due to orthogonality, each row, in fact, thus defines a probability distribution). That result had two shortcomings: (i) The algorithm was assumed not to be allowed to use

extra memory in addition to the space used to hold the input. In other words, the computation was done *in place*. (ii) The result was sensitive to the normalization of F, and was not useful in deriving any lower bound for γF for $\gamma \notin \{\pm 1\}$.

In [2], Ailon took another step forward by showing a lower bound for computing *any scaling* of the Fourier transform in a stronger model of computation which we call *uniformly well conditioned*. At each step, the algorithm can perform a nonsingular linear transformation on at most two intermediates, as long as the matrix $M^{(t)}$ defining the composition of the first t steps must have condition number at most κ, for all i. We remind the reader that condition number of a matrixis defined as the ratio between its largest and smallest (nonzero) singular values. Otherwise stated, the result implies that if an algorithm computes the Fourier transform in time $(n \log n)/b$ for some $b > 1$, then some $M^{(t)}$ must have condition number at least $\Omega(b)$. This means that the computation output relies on an ill conditioned intermediate step. The result in [2] made a qualitative claim about compromise of numerical stability due to a ill condition.

1.1 Our Contribution

Here we establish (Theorem 51) that a b-factor speedup of FFT for $b = b(n) = \omega(1)$ either *overflows* at $\Omega(n)$ different time steps due to $\Omega(n)$ pairwise orthogonal input directions, or *underflows* at $\Omega(n)$ different time steps, losing accuracy of order $\Omega(b)$ at n orthogonal input directions. Note that achieving this could not be simply done by a more careful analysis of [2], but rather requires an intricate analysis of the entropy of Fourier transform under transformations of small trace. This analysis (Lemma 61) is interesting in its own right.

2 Computational Model and Notation

We remind the reader of the computational model discussed in [1,2], which is a special case of the linear computational model. The machine state represents a vector in $\mathbb{R}^\ell$ for some $\ell \geq n$, where it initially equals the input $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ (with possible padding by zeroes, in case $\ell > n$). Each step (gate) is either a *rotation* or a *constant*. A rotation applies a 2-by-2 rotation mapping on a pair of machine state coordinates (rewriting the result of the mapping to the two coordinates). We remind the reader that a 2-by-2 rotation mapping is written in matrix form as $\begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta & \sin\theta \\ -\sin\theta & \cos\theta \end{pmatrix}$ for some real (angle) θ. A constant gate multiplies a single machine state coordinate (rewriting the result) by a nonzero constant. In case the constant equals -1, we call it a reflection gate.

In case $\ell = n$ we say that we are in the in-place model. Any nonsingular linear mapping over $\mathbb{R}^n$ can be decomposed into a sequence of rotation and constant gates in the in-place model, and hence our model is, in a sense, universal. FFT works in the in-place model, using rotations (and possibly reflections) only. A restricted method for dealing with $\ell > n$ was developed in [2], and can be applied

here too in a certain sense (see Section 7 for a discussion). We focus in this work on the in-place model only.

Since both rotations and constants apply a linear transformation on the machine state, their composition is a linear transformation. If $\mathcal{A}_n$ is an in-place algorithm for computing a linear mapping over $\mathbb{R}^n$, it is convenient to write it as $\mathcal{A}_n = (M^{(0)} = \mathrm{Id}, M^{(1)}, \ldots, M^{(m)})$ where m is the number of steps (gates), $M^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is the mapping that satisfies that for input $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ (the initial machine state), $M^{(t)}x$ is the machine state after t steps. (Id is the identity matrix). The matrix $M^{(m)}$ is the target transformation, which will typically be F in our setting. In fact, due to the scale invariance of the potential function we use, we could take $M^{(m)}$ to be any nonzero scaling of F, but to reduce notation we simply assume a scaling of 1. For any $t \in [m]$, if the t'th gate is a rotation, then $M^{(t)}$ defers from $M^{(t-1)}$ in at most two rows, and if the t'th gate is a constant, then $M^{(t)}$ defers from $M^{(t-1)}$ in at most one row.

2.1 Numerical Architecture

The in-place model implicitly assumes representation of a vector in $\mathbb{R}^n$ in memory using n words. A typical computer word represents a coordinate (with respect to some fixed orthogonal basis) in the range $[-1, 1]$ to within some accuracy $\varepsilon = \Theta(1)$.[1] For sake of simplicity, ε should be thought of as 2^{-31} or 2^{-63} in modern computers of 32 or 64 bit words, respectively.

To explain the difficulties in speeding up FFT on computers of fixed precision in the in-place model, we need to understand whether (and in what sense) standard FFT is at all suitable on such machines. First, we must restrict the domain of inputs. Clearly this domain cannot be $\mathbb{R}^n$, because computer words can only represent coordinates in the range $[-1, 1]$, by our convention. We consider input from an n-ball of radius $\Theta(\sqrt{n})$, which we denote $\mathcal{B}(\Theta(\sqrt{n}))$. An n-ball is invariant under orthogonal transformations, and is hence a suitable domain. Encoding a single coordinate of such an input might require $\omega(1)$ bits (an overflow). However, using well known tools from high dimensional geometry, encoding a single coordinate of a *typical* input chosen randomly from $\mathcal{B}(\Theta(\sqrt{n}))$ requires $O(1)$ bits, fitting inside a machine word.[2] We hence take a statistical approach and define a state of overflow as trying to encode, in some fixed memory word (coordinate), a random number of $\omega(1)$ bits in expectation, at a fixed time step in the algorithm. This definition allows us to avoid dealing with accommodation of integers requiring super-constant bits and, in turn, with logical bit-operation complexity. Although the definition might seem impractical at first, it allows us to derive very interesting information vs computational speed tradeoffs. (In the future work Section 7 we shall discuss allowing varying word sizes and its implications on complexity.) By our definition, standard FFT for input drawn uniformly from $\mathcal{B}(\Theta(\sqrt{n}))$ does not overflow at all, because any coordinate of

[1] The range $[-1, 1]$ is immaterial and can be replaced with any range of the form $[-a, a]$ for $a > 0$.

[2] By "encoding" here we simply mean the base-2 representation of the integer $\lfloor x(i)/\varepsilon \rfloor$.

the machine state at any step is tightly concentrated (in absolute value) around $\Theta(1)$. It will be easier however to replace the uniform distribution from the ball with the multivariate Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(0, \Theta(n) \cdot \mathrm{Id})$, which is a good approximation of the former for large n. With this assumption, any coordinate of the standard FFT machine state at any step follows the law $\mathcal{N}(0, \Theta(1))$. By simple integration against the Gaussian measure, one can verify that the expected number of bits required to encode such a random variable (to within fixed accuracy ε) is $\Theta(1)$, hence no overflow occurs. This input assumption together with the no-overflow guarantee **will serve as our benchmark**.

For further discussion on the numerical arhitecture and definition of *overflow* we refer the reader, due to lack of space, to Appendix D.

3 The Matrix Quasi-Entropy Function

The set $\{1, \ldots, q\}$ is denoted by $[q]$. By $\mathbb{R}^{a \times b}$ we formally denote matrices of a rows and b columns. Matrix transpose is denoted by $(\cdot)^T$. We use $(\cdot)^{-T}$ as shorthand for $((\cdot)^{-1})^T = ((\cdot)^T)^{-1}$. If $A \in \mathbb{R}^{a \times b}$ is a matrix and I is a subset of $[b]$, then (borrowing from Matlab syntax) $A(:, I)$ is the submatrix obtained by stacking the columns corresponding to the indices in I side by side and $A(I, :)$ is the submatrix obtained by stacking the rows corresponding to the indices in I one on top of the other. We shall also write, for $i \in [b]$, $A(:, i)$ and $A(i, :)$ as shorthands for $A(:, \{i\})$ and $A(\{i\}, :)$, respectively. All logarithms are base 2.

We slightly abuse notation and extend the definition of the quasi-entropy function $\Phi(M)$ defined on nonsingular matrices M from [2], as follows. Given two matrix arguments $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{a \times b}$ for some $a, b \geq 1$, $\Phi(A, B)$ is defined as

$$\sum_{i=1}^{a} \sum_{j=1}^{b} -A(i,j)B(i,j) \log |A(i,j)B(i,j)| \ .$$

This extends naturally to vectors, namely for $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^a$, $\Phi(u, v)$ is as above by viewing $\mathbb{R}^a$ as $\mathbb{R}^{a \times 1}$. If $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{a \times b}$ and a, b are even, then we define the *complex quasi-entropy* function $\Phi^{\mathbb{C}}(A, B)$ to be:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{a} \sum_{j=1}^{b/2} -(A(i,2j{-}1)B(i,2j{-}1){+}A(i,2j)B(i,2j)) \log |A(i,2j{-}1)B(i,2j{-}1){+}A(i,2j)B(i,2j)| \, .$$

The function $\Phi^{\mathbb{C}}$ can be used for proving our results for the real representation of the complex DFT, which we omit from this manuscript for simplicity. The reason we need this modification to Φ for DFT is explained in the proof of Lemma 61, needed by Theorem 51 below. Elsewhere, we will work (for convenience and brevity) only with Φ. Abusing notation, and following [2], we define for any nonsingular matrix M: $\Phi(M) := \Phi\left(M, M^{-T}\right)$, $\Phi^{\mathbb{C}}(M) := \Phi^{\mathbb{C}}\left(M, M^{-T}\right)$. It is easy to see that $\Phi(F) = n \log n$ for the Walsh-Hadamard transform, because all matrix elements are $\pm 1/\sqrt{n}$. If F is a real representation of the $(n/2)$-DFT,

then clearly $\Phi^{\mathbb{C}}(F) = n\log(n/2)$, because all matrix elements of the (complex representation of the) $(n/2)$-DFT are complex unit roots times $(n/2)^{-1/2}$.

It will be also useful to consider a generalization of the potential of a nonsingular matrix M, by allowing linear operators acting on the rows of M and M^{-T}, respectively. More precisely, we will let $\Phi_{P,Q}(M)$ be shorthand for $\Phi(MP, M^{-T}Q)$, where $P, Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times a}$ are some mappings. (We will only be working with projection matrices P, Q here). Similarly, $\Phi^{\mathbb{C}}_{P,Q}(M, M^{-T}) := \Phi^{C}(MP, M^{-T}Q)$.

Finally, for any matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, let $\sigma_1(A), \ldots, \sigma_n(A)$ denote its singular values, where we use the convention $\sigma_1(A) \geq \cdots \geq \sigma_n(A)$. If A is nonsingular, then the condition number $\kappa(A)$ is defined by $\sigma_1(A)/\sigma_n(A)$. For any matrix A, we let $\|A\|$ denote its spectral norm and $\|A\|_F$ its Frobenius norm. If x is a vector, hence, $\|x\| = \|x\|_2 = \|x\|_F$. Let $\mathcal{B}$ denote the Euclidean unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^n$

4 Genralized Ill Conditioned Bottleneck from Speedup

We show that if an in-place algorithm $\mathcal{A}_n = (M^{(0)} = \mathrm{Id}, \ldots, M^{(m)} = F)$ speeds up FFT by a factor of $b \geq 1$, then for some t $M^{(t)}$ is ill conditioned (in a generalized sense, to be explained). This is a generalization of the main result in [2], with a simpler proof that we provide in Appendix B for the sake of completeness.

Theorem 41 *Fix n, and let $\mathcal{A}_n = \{\mathrm{Id} = M^{(0}, \ldots, M^{(m)}\}$ be an in-place algorithm computing some linear function in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and let $P, Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ be two matrices. For any $t \in [m]$, let $\{i_t, j_t\}$ denote the set of at most two indices that are affected by the t'th gate (if the t'th gate is a constant gate, then $i_t = j_t$, otherwise it's a rotation acting on indices i_t, j_t). Then for any $R \in [\lfloor n/2 \rfloor]$ there exists $t \in [m]$ such that*

$$\sqrt{\left\|(M^{(t)}P)(I_t,:)\right\|_F^2 \left\|((M^{(t)})^{-T}Q)(I_t,:)\right\|_F^2} \geq \frac{R(\Phi_{P,Q}(M^{(m)}) - \Phi_{P,Q}(\mathrm{Id}))}{m\log 2R} \ , \tag{4.1}$$

where $I_t = \bigcup_{t'=t}^{t+R-1}\{i_{t'}, j_{t'}\}$. Additionally, if $R = 1$ then the t'th gate can be assumed to be a rotation.

In particular, if $M^{(m)} = F$ and $m = (n\log n)/b$ for some $b \geq 1$ ("$\mathcal{A}_n$ speeds up FFT by a factor of b") and $P = Q = \mathrm{Id}$, then

$$\sqrt{\left\|(M^{(t)})(I_t,:)\right\|_F^2 \left\|((M^{(t)})^{-T})(I_t,:)\right\|_F^2} \geq \frac{Rb}{\log 2R} \ . \tag{4.2}$$

For the main result in this paper in the next section, we will only need the case $R = 1$ of the theorem. It is worthwhile, however, to state the case of general $R > 1$ because it gives rise to a stronger notion of ill-condition than is typically used. Since this is not the main focus of this work, we omit the details of this discussion. Henceforth, we will only use the theorem with $R = 1$.

We discuss the implication of the theorem, in case $R = 1, P = Q = \mathrm{Id}$. The theorem implies that an algorithm with $m = (n\log n)/b$ must exhibit an

intermediate matrix $M^{(t)}$ and a pair of indices i_t, j_t such that the t'th gate is a rotation acting on i_t, j_t and additionally:

$$\sqrt{\left(\|M^{(t)}(i_t,:)\|^2 + \|M^{(t)}(j_t,:)\|^2\right)\left(\|(M^{(t)})^{-T}(i_t,:)\|^2 + \|(M^{(t)})^{-T}(j_t,:)\|^2\right)} \geq b\,.$$

Hence, either

$$(i) \quad \sqrt{\|M^{(t)}(i_t,:)\|^2 + \|M^{(t)}(j_t,:)\|^2} \geq \sqrt{b} \qquad \textbf{-or-}$$
$$(ii) \quad \sqrt{\|(M^{(t)})^{-T}(i_t,:)\|^2 + \|(M^{(t)})^{-T}(j_t,:)\|^2} \geq \sqrt{b}\,.$$

Case (i). We can assume wlog that

$$\|M^{(t)}(i_t,:)\|^2 \geq b/2\,. \tag{4.3}$$

Let $x_{\text{over}}^T := M^{(t)}(i_t,:)/\|M^{(t)}(i_t,:)\| \in \mathbb{R}^n$ (x_{over} is the normalized i_t'th row of $M^{(t)}$, transposed). Recall that the input x is distributed according to the law $\mathcal{N}(0, \Theta(1)\cdot \text{Id})$. The i_t'th coordinate just before the t'th gate equals $\|M^{(t)}(i_t,:)\|x^T x_{\text{over}}$, and is hence distributed $\mathcal{N}(0, \Theta(\|M^{(t)}(i_t,:)\|^2))$. Using (4.3), this is $\mathcal{N}(0, \Omega(b))$. If $b = b(n) = \omega(1)$, then by our definition we reach overflow.

Note that it is possible as a preprocessing step to replace x with $x - (x^T x_{\text{over}})x_{\text{over}}$ (eliminating the overflow component), and then to reintroduce the offending component by adding $(x^T x_{\text{over}})F x_{\text{over}}$ as a postprocessing step. In the next section, however, we shall show that, in fact, there must be $\Omega(n)$ pairwise orthonormal directions (in input space) that overflow at $\Omega(n)$ different time steps, so such a simple "hack" cannot work.

Case (ii). This scenario, as the reader guesses, should be called *underflow*. In case (ii), wlog

$$\|(M^{(t)})^{-T}(i_t,:)\|^2 \geq b/2\,. \tag{4.4}$$

Now define $x_{\text{under}}^T = (M^{(t)})^{-T}(i_t,:)/\|(M^{(t)})^{-T}(i_t,:)\| \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and consider the orthonormal basis $u_1, \ldots u_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ so that $u_1 = x_{\text{under}}$. For any $t' \in [m]$ (and in particular for $t' = t$):

$$g_1 := x_{\text{under}}^T x = (x_{\text{under}}^T (M^{(t')})^{-1}) \cdot (M^{(t')} x)\,.$$

Now notice that the i_t'th coordinate of $(x_{\text{under}}^T (M^{(t)})^{-1})$ has magnitude at least $\sqrt{b/2}$ by (4.4) and the construction of x_{under}. Also notice that for all $i \neq i_t$, the row $M^{(t)}(i,:)$ is orthogonal to x_{over}, by matrix inverse definition. This means that coordinate $i \neq i_t$ of $M^{(t)}x$ contains no information about g_1. All the information in g_1 is hence contained in $(M^{(t)}x)(i_t)$. More precisely, g_1 is given by $g_1 = ((M^{(t)})^{-T} x_{\text{under}})(i_t) \times (M^{(t)}x)(i_t) - e$, where e is a random variable independent of g_1. But $|((M^{(t)})^{-T} x_{\text{under}})(i_t)| \geq \sqrt{b/2}$, and $(M^{(t)}x)(i_t)$ is known only up to an additive error of ε, due to our assumptions on quantization in the numerical architecture. This means that g_1 can only be known up to an additive error of at least $\varepsilon\sqrt{b/2}$, for *any* value of e. It is important to note that this

uncertainty cannot be "recovered" later by the algorithm, because at any step the machine state contains all the information about the input (aside from the input distribution prior). In other words, any information forgotten at any step cannot be later recalled (see Figure 1 in the Appendix).

Notice that at step 0, the input vector coordinates $x(1), \ldots, x(n)$ are represented in individual words, each of which gives rise to an uncertainty interval of width ε. So merely storing the input in memory in the standard coordinate system implies knowing its location up to an uncertainty n-cube with side ε, and of diameter $\varepsilon\sqrt{n}$.[3] An uncertainty interval of size $\varepsilon\sqrt{b/2} = O(\varepsilon\sqrt{\log n})$ in a single direction is therefore relatively benign. The next section tells us, however, that the problem is amplified $\Omega(n)$-fold.

5 Many Independent Ill Conditioned Botlenecks

Theorem 51 *Fix n, and let $\mathcal{A}_n = \{\mathrm{Id} = M^{(0)}, \ldots, M^{(m)} = F\}$ be an in-place algorithm computing F in time $m = (n \log n)/b$ for some $b \geq 1$. Then one of the following (i)-(ii) must hold:*

(i) (Severe Overflow) There exists an orthonormal system $v_1, \ldots, v_{n'} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, integers $t_1, \ldots, t_{n'} \in [m]$ and $i_1, \ldots, i_{n'} \in [n]$ with $n' = \Omega(n)$ such that for all $j \in [n']$,

$$M^{(t_j)}(i_j, :)P_j = \alpha_j v_j \quad \text{with } \alpha_j = \Omega(\sqrt{b}) \ , \tag{5.1}$$

where P_j is projection onto the space orthogonal to $v_1, \ldots, v_{j-1}$.

(ii) (Severe Underflow) There exists an orthonormal system $u_1, \ldots, u_{n'} \in\subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, integers $t_1, \ldots, t_{n'} \in [m]$ and $i_1, \ldots, i_{n'} \in [n]$ with $n' = \Omega(n)$ such that for all $j \in [n']$,

$$(M^{(t_j)})^{-T}(i_j, :)Q_j = \gamma_j u_j \quad \text{with } \gamma_j = \Omega(\sqrt{b}) \ , \tag{5.2}$$

where Q_j is projection onto the space orthogonal to $u_1, \ldots, u_{j-1}$.

In both cases (i) and (ii), the gates at time $t_1, \ldots t_{n'}$ are rotations, and for all $j \in [n']$ the index i_j is one of the two indices affected by the corresponding rotation. Additionally, the set $\{t_1, \ldots, t_{n'}\}$ is of cardinality at least $n'/2$.

The proof heavily relies on Lemma 61 (Section 6) and is deferred to Appendix E due to lack of space. We discuss its numerical implications, continuing the discussion following Theorem 41. In the severe overflow case, Theorem 51 tells us that there exists an orthonormal collection $v_1, \ldots, v_{n'}$ (with $n' = \Omega(n)$) in input space, such that each v_i behaves like x_{over} from the previous section. This means that, if the speedup factor b is $\omega(1)$, we have overflow caused by a linear number of independent input components, occurring at $\Omega(n)$ different time steps (by the last sentence in the theorem). In the extreme case of speedup

[3] To be precise, we must acknowledge the prior distribution on x which also provides information about its whereabouts.

$b = \Theta(\log n)$ (linear number of gates), this means that in a constant fraction of time steps overflow occurs.

For the severe underflow case we offer a geometric interpretation. The theorem tells us that there exists an orthonormal collection $u_1, \ldots, u_{n'}$ in the input space that is bad in the following sense. For each $j \in [n']$, redefine $g_j = u_j^T x$ to be the input component in direction u_j. Again, the variables $g_1, \ldots, g_{n'}$ are iid $\mathcal{N}(0, \Theta(1))$. The first element in the series, u_1, can be analyzed as x_{under} (from the previous section) whereby it was argued that before the t_1'th step, the component $g_1 = u_1^T x$ can only be known to within an interval of width $\Omega(\gamma_1 \varepsilon)$, independently of information from components orthogonal to u_1. We remind the reader that by this we mean that the *width* of the interval is independent, but the location of the interval depends smoothly (in fact, linearly) on information from orthogonal components of x (see Figure 1 in the appendix).

As for $u_2, \ldots, u_{n'}$: For each $j \in [n']$, let $z_j := (M^{(t_j)})^{-T}(i_j, :)$. Therefore $u_1 = z_1/\|z_1\|$ and by (5.2), for $j > 1$ we can write $z_j = \gamma_j u_j + h_j$, where $h_j \in \text{span}\{u_1, \ldots, u_{j-1}\}$. Treating $z_j/\|z_j\|$ again as x_{under}, we conclude that the component $(z_j/\|z_j\|)^T x$ can only be known to within an interval of size $\Omega(\varepsilon \|z_j\|)$, given any value of the projection of input x onto the space orthogonal to z.

We extend the list of vectors $z_1, \ldots, z_{n'}$, orthonormal vectors $u_1, \ldots, u_{n'}$, numbers $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{n'}$ and projections $Q_1, \ldots, Q_{n'}$ to size n as follows. Having defined z_j, u_j, Q_j, γ_j for some $j \geq n'$, we inductively define Q_{j+1} as projection onto the space orthogonal to $\text{span}\{z_1, \ldots, z_j\} = \text{span}\{u_1, \ldots, u_j\}$ and z_{j+1} to be a standard basis vector such that $\|Q_{j+1} z_{j+1}\|^2 \geq 1 - j/n$. (Such a vector exists because there must exist an index $i_0 \in [n]$ such that $\sum_{j'=1}^{j} u_{j'}(i_0)^2 \leq j/n$, by orthonormality of the collection $u_1, \ldots, u_j$; Now set z_{j+1} to have a unique 1 at coordinate i_0 and 0 at all other coordinates.) We let u_{j+1} be $Q_{j+1} z_{j+1}/\|Q_{j+1} z_{j+1}\|$, that is, a normalized vector pointing to the component of z_{j+1} that is orthogonal to $\text{span}\{z_1, \ldots, z_j\} = \text{span}\{u_1, \ldots, u_j\}$. The number γ_{j+1} is defined as $\|Q_{j+1} z_{j+1}\|$. By construction, $\gamma_{j+1} \geq \sqrt{1 - j/n}$.

The above extends the partial construction arising from the severe underflow to a full basis, with the following property:

Proposition 52 *For any $j \in [n]$, even given exact knowledge of the exact projection $\tilde{x}$ of x onto the space orthogonal to z_j, the quantity $x^T(z_j/\|z_j\|)$ upon termination of the algorithm can only be known to within an interval of the form $[s, s + \varepsilon\|z_j\|]$ where s depends smoothly (in fact, linearly) on $\tilde{x}$.*

The proposition is simply a repetition of the analysis done for x_{under} in the previous section. For $j > n'$ it is a simple consequence of the fact that upon initialization of the algorithm with input x, each coordinate of x (and in particular $x^T z_j$) is stored in a single machine word, while all other machine words store information independent of $x^T z_j$. Hence the uncertainty of width $\varepsilon\|z_j\| = \varepsilon$.

What do we know about x upon termination of the algorithm? As stated earlier, any information that was lost during execution, cannot be later recovered. Let $\mathcal{I}$ denote the set of possible inputs, given the information the we are left with upon termination. Consider the projection Q_2 onto the space orthogonal

to $u_1 = z_1/\|z_1\|$, as a function defined over $\mathcal{I}$. Let $\mathcal{I}_2 = Q_2\mathcal{I}$ denote its image. The preimage of any point $w \in \mathcal{I}_2$ must contain a line segment of length at least $\varepsilon\gamma_1$ parallel to u_1, due to the uncertainty in $x^T u_1$. Hence the volume of $\mathcal{I}$ is at least $\varepsilon\gamma_1$ times the $(n-1)$-volume of $\mathcal{I}_2$.[4] Continuing inductively, we lower bound the $(n-j+1)$-volume of $\mathcal{I}_j := Q_j\mathcal{I} = Q_j\mathcal{I}_{j-1}$ for $j > 2$. Consider the projection Q_j as a function operating on $\mathcal{I}_{j-1}$, and any point w in the image $\mathcal{I}_j$. By definition of Q_j, there exists $\hat{w} \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $Q_j\hat{w} = w$. By proposition 52, the intersection of the line $\mathcal{L} = \{\hat{w} + \eta z_j : \eta \in \mathbb{R}\}$ with $\mathcal{I}$ must contain a segment Δ of size $\varepsilon\|z_j\|$. The projection $Q_j\Delta$ of this segment is contained in the line $Q_j\mathcal{L} = \{w + \eta u_j : \eta \in \mathbb{R}\}$. The size of the segment is $\varepsilon\|Q_j z_j\| = \varepsilon\gamma_j$. This means that the $(n-j+1)$-volume of $\mathcal{I}_{j+1}$ is at least $\varepsilon\gamma_j$ times the $(n-j)$-volume of $\mathcal{I}_{j+1} = Q_{j+1}\mathcal{I}_j$.

Concluding, we get that the volume of $\mathcal{I}$ is at least $\prod_{j=1}^{n}\gamma_j$. From the construction immediately preceding Proposition 52, we get (using the fact that $n' = \Omega(n)$): $\log\frac{\mathrm{vol}(\mathcal{I})}{\varepsilon^n} \geq n'\log\sqrt{b/2} + \sum_{j=n'+1}^{n}\log\sqrt{1-\frac{j-1}{n}} = \Omega(n\log b)$. This tells us that the volume of uncertainty in the input (and hence, the output) of a b-speedup of FFT in the in-place model is at least $b^{\Omega(n)}$ times the volume of uncertainty incurred simply by storing the input in memory.

6 Main Technical Lemma

The following is the most important technical lemma in this work. Roughly speaking, it tells us that application of operators that are close to Id to the rows of F and F^{-T} does not reduce the corresponding potential by much. Similarly, assuming that P, Q are PSD with spectral norm at most 1, applying these transformations to the rows of Id does not increase the corresponding potential by much.

Lemma 61 *Let $P, Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ be two matrices. Let $\hat{P} = \mathrm{Id} - P, \hat{Q} = \mathrm{Id} - Q$. Then*

$$\Phi(FP, F^{-T}Q) \geq n\log n - (\mathrm{tr}\,\hat{P} + \mathrm{tr}\,\hat{Q})\log n - O\left((\|\hat{P}\|_F^2 + \|\hat{Q}\|_F^2)\log n\right) \quad (6.1)$$

If, additionally, P and Q are positive semi-definite contractions, then

$$\Phi_{P,Q}(\mathrm{Id}) = \Phi(P,Q) \leq \mathrm{tr}\,\hat{P} + \mathrm{tr}\,\hat{Q} + O\left((\|\hat{P}\|_F^2 + \|\hat{Q}\|_F^2)\log n\right) . \quad (6.2)$$

The proof, deferred to Appendix C for lack of space, takes advantage of the smoothness of the matrices F and Id (that is, almost all matrix elements have exactly the same magnitude). This is the reason we needed to modify Φ and work with $\Phi^{\mathbb{C}}$ for the complex case: If F were the real representation of the $n/2$-DFT matrix, then it is not smooth in this sense. It does hold though that for any $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [n/2]$: $F(i, 2j-1)^2 + F(i, 2j)^2 = 2/n$, so the matrix is smooth only in the sense that all pairs of adjacent elements have the same norm (viewed as $\mathbb{R}^2$ vectors).

[4] We need to be precise about measurability, but this is a simple technical point from the fact that the interval endpoint depends smoothly on the projection, as claimed in Proposition 52.

7 Future Work

Taking into account bit operation complexity, and using state-of-the-art integer multiplication algorithms [8,9] it can be quite easily shown that both severe overflow and severe underflow could be resolved by allowing flexible word size, accommodating either large numbers (in the overflow case) or increased accuracy (in the underflow case). In fact, allowing $O(\log b)$-bit words at the time steps at which overflow (or underflow) occur, of which there are $\Omega(n)$ many by Theorem 51, suffice. Hence, this work does not rule out the possibility of (in the extreme case of $b = \Theta(\log n)$) a Fourier transform algorithm in the in-place model using a linear number of gates, in bit operation complexity of $\tilde{\Omega}(n \log\log n)$, where $\tilde{O}()$ here hides $\log\log\log n$ factors arising from fast integer multiplication algorithms. We conjecture that such an algorithm does not actually exist, and leave this as the main open problem.

Another problem that was left out in this work is going beyond the in-place model. In the more general model, the algorithm works in space $\mathbb{R}^\ell$ for $\ell > n$, where the $(\ell - n)$ extra coordinates can be assumed to be initialized with 0, and the first n are initialized with the input $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The final matrix $M^{(m)}$ of Fourier transform algorithm $\mathcal{A}_n = \{\mathrm{Id} = M^{(0)}, \ldots, M^{(m)}\}$ contains F as a sub matrix, so that the output Fx can simply be extracted from a subset of n coordinates of $M^{(m)}x$, which can be assumed to be the first. The matrix $M^{(m)}$ (and its inverse-traspose) therefore contains $(\ell - n)$ extra rows. The submatrix defined by the extra rows (namely, the last $\ell - n$) and the first n columns were referred to in [2] as the "garbage" part of the computation. To obtain an $\Omega(n \log n)$ computational lower bound in the model assumed there,[5] it was necessary to show that $\Phi_{P,P}(M^{(m)})P = \Omega(n \log n)$, where $P \in \mathbb{R}^{\ell \times \ell}$ is projection onto the space spanned by the first n standard basis vectors.[6] To that end, it was shown that such a potential lower bound held as long as spectral norm of the "garbage" submatrices was properly upper bounded. That result, in fact, can be deduced as a simple outcome of Lemma 61 that was developed here. What's more interesting is how to generalize Theorem 51 to the non in-place model, and more importantly how to analyze the numerical accuracy implications of overflow and underflow to the non in-place model. Such a generalization is not trivial and is another immediate open problem following this work.

Another interesting possible avenue is to study the complexity of Fourier transform on input x for which some prior knowledge is known. The best example is when Fx is assumed sparse, for which much interesting work on the upper bound side has been recently done by Indyk et al. (see [10] and references therein).

Many algorithms use the Fourier transform as a subroutine. In certain cases (fast polynomial multiplication, fast integer multiplication [8,9], fast Johnson-

[5] In [2], the model simply assumed that all matrices $M^{(t)}$ for $t - 1 \ldots m$ have bounded condition number. Quantifying the effect of ill condition on numerical stability, overflow and underflow, was not done there.

[6] The function $\Phi_{P,Q}(M)$ was not defined in [2], and was only implicitly used.

Lindenstrauss transform for dimensionality reduction [3,4,5,11] and the related restricted isometry property (RIP) matrix construction [14,6,11]) the Fourier transform subroutine is the algorithm's bottleneck. Can we use the techniques developed here to derive lower bounds (or rather, time-accuracy tradeoffs) for those algorithms as well? Moreover, we can ask how the implications of speeding up the Fourier transform subroutine (as derived in this work) affect the numerical outcome of these algorithms, assuming they insist on using Fourier transform as a black box.

References

1. Nir Ailon. A lower bound for fourier transform computation in a linear model over 2x2 unitary gates using matrix entropy. *Chicago J. of Theo. Comp. Sci.*, 2013.
2. Nir Ailon. An $n \log n$ lower bound for fourier transform computation in the well conditioned model. *arXiv:1403.1307*, 2014.
3. Nir Ailon and Bernard Chazelle. The fast johnson–lindenstrauss transform and approximate nearest neighbors. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 39(1):302–322, 2009.
4. Nir Ailon and Edo Liberty. Fast dimension reduction using rademacher series on dual BCH codes. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 42(4):615–630, 2009.
5. Nir Ailon and Edo Liberty. An almost optimal unrestricted fast johnson-lindenstrauss transform. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 9(3):21, 2013.
6. Nir Ailon and Holger Rauhut. Fast and rip-optimal transforms. *Discrete and Comp. Geom. (DCG)*, 2014 (in press).
7. J. W Cooley and J. W Tukey. An algorithm for the machine computation of complex Fourier series. *J. of American Math. Soc.*, pages 297–301, 1964.
8. Anindya De, Piyush P. Kurur, Chandan Saha, and Ramprasad Saptharishi. Fast integer multiplication using modular arithmetic. *SIAM J. on Comp.*, 42, 2013.
9. Martin Fürer. Faster integer multiplication. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-ninth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '07, pages 57–66, 2007.
10. Piotr Indyk, Michael Kapralov, and Eric Price. (Nearly) sample-optimal sparse fourier transform. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2014, Portland, Oregon, USA, January 5-7, 2014*, pages 480–499, 2014.
11. Felix Krahmer and Rachel Ward. New and improved johnson-lindenstrauss embeddings via the restricted isometry property. *SIAM J. Math. Analysis*, 43(3):1269–1281, 2011.
12. Jacques Morgenstern. Note on a lower bound on the linear complexity of the fast Fourier transform. *J. ACM*, 20(2):305–306, April 1973.
13. Christos H. Papadimitriou. Optimality of the fast Fourier transform. *J. ACM*, 26(1):95–102, January 1979.
14. Mark Rudelson and Roman Vershynin. Sampling from large matrices: An approach through geometric functional analysis. *J. ACM*, 54(4), 2007.
15. S. Winograd. On computing the discrete Fourier transform. *Proc. Nat. Assoc. Sci.*, 73(4):1005–1006, 1976.

A Useful Lemmas

Lemma A1 *Let $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^a$ for some integer a, with $\|x\|_2 = \|y\|_2 = 1$. Then $-\log a \leq \Phi(x, y) \leq \log a$.*

The proof is a simple done by a simple analysis of the function $\Phi(x,y)$ under the stated constraints using, say, Lagrange multipliers.

Lemma A2 *Let $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{a\times n}$. Let $U \in R^{a\times a}$ be orthogonal. Then $|\Phi(A,B) - \Phi(UA,UB)| \leq \|A\|_F \|B\|_F \log a$.*

Proof. Let $r_i = \|A(:,i)\|_2, s_i = \|B(:,i)\|_2$. Then

$$\Phi(A,B) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Phi(A(:,i),B(:,i)) \ , \ \Phi(UA,UB) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Phi(UA(:,i),UB(:,i)) \ ,$$

and by the triangle inequality:

$$|\Phi(A,B) - \Phi(UA,UB)| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\Phi(A(:,i),B(:,i)) - \Phi(UA(:,i),UB(:,i))| \ .$$

Fix $i \in [n]$ and let $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^a$ denote $\frac{A(:,i)}{r}$, $\frac{B(:,i)}{s}$, respectively (note that $\|x\|_2 = \|y\|_2 = 1$).

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Phi(A(:,i),B(:,i)) - \Phi(UA(:,i),UB(:,i)) \qquad\qquad (A.1)\\
&= -\sum_{j=1}^{a} rs\cdot x(j)y(j)\log|rs\cdot x(j)y(j)| + \sum_{j=1}^{a} rs\cdot (Ux)(j)(Uy)(j)\log|rs\cdot (Ux)(j)(Uy)(j)|\\
&= (rs\log(rs))\left(-\sum_{j=1}^{a} x(j)y(j) + \sum_{j=1}^{a}(Ux)(j)(Uy)(j)\right) - rs\sum_{j=1}^{a} x(j)y(j)\log|x(j)y(j)|\\
&\qquad\qquad + rs\sum_{j=1}^{a}(Ux)(j)(Uy)(j)\log|(Ux)(j)(Uy)(j)| \ .
\end{aligned}$$

By orthogonality of U, we have that $\sum_{j=1}^{a} x(j)y(j) = \sum_{j=1}^{a}(Ux)(j)(Uy)(j)$. Also for the same reason we have $\|Ux\|_2 = \|Uy\|_2 = 1$. Using Lemma A1, we conclude $|\Phi(A(:,i),B(:,i)) - \Phi(UA(:,i),UB(:,i))| \leq 2rs\cdot\log a$. Summing up over i and applying Cauchy-Schwarz we conclude the result.

Lemma A3 *Let $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{a\times n}$, and let $D \in \mathbb{R}^{a\times a}$ be some nonsingular matrix. Then*

$$\left|\Phi(A,B) - \Phi(DA,D^{-T}B)\right| \leq \left(\|A\|_F\|B\|_F + \|DA\|_F\|D^{-T}B\|_F\right)\log a \qquad (A.2)$$

Proof. Let $U, V \in \mathbb{R}^a$ be orthogonal and $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^a$ diagonal (and nonsingular) so that $D = U\Sigma V$. (Such a composition exists by standard SVD theory.)

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\Phi(A,B) - \Phi(DA,D^{-T}B)\right| &\leq |\Phi(A,B) - \Phi(VA,VB)|\\
&\quad + \left|\Phi(VA,VB) - \Phi(\Sigma VA,\Sigma^{-1}VB)\right|\\
&\quad + \left|\Phi(\Sigma VA,\Sigma^{-1}VB) - \Phi(U\Sigma VA,U\Sigma^{-1}VB)\right|\\
&\leq \|A\|_F\|B\|_F\log a + 0 + \|\Sigma VA\|_F\|\Sigma^{-1}VB\|_F\log a\\
&= \left(\|A\|_F\|B\|_F + \|DA\|_F\|D^{-T}B\|_F\right)\log a \ ,
\end{aligned} \qquad (A.3)$$

as required. (We used Lemma A2 twice in the second inequality, and the orthogonality of U for the last derivation. The reason the middle term in the RHS of the first inequality is null is by properties of Φ that are trivial to check.)

B Proof of Theorem 41

We directly prove the less general (4.2). The more general bound (4.1) is shown similarly, but with more notation. Fix $R \in [\lfloor n/2 \rfloor]$. Let m' be the smallest integer divisible by R satisfying $m' \geq m$. If $m' > m$, then "pad" the algorithm $\mathcal{A}_n$ by defining $M^{(m+1)} \dots M^{(m')} = M^{(m)} = F$. By the triangle inequality,

$$\left|\Phi(M^{(m')}) - \Phi(M^{(0)})\right| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{m'/R} \left|\Phi(M^{(jR)}) - \Phi(M^{((j-1)R)})\right| \ . \tag{B.1}$$

Now note that for each $j \in m'/R$, the matrix $M^{(jR^*)}$ is obtained from $M^{((j-1)R^*)}$ by applying a nonsingular operation acting on the left, affecting at most $2R$ rows. Denote the set of indices of the corresponding set of affected rows by I_j. (If the cardinality of I_j is less than $2R$, then pad it with an arbitrary set of indices.) Using Lemma A3, this implies that for all $j \in [m'/R]$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left|\Phi(M^{(jR)}) - \Phi(M^{((j-1)R)})\right| \\ &\quad \leq \left(\|M^{(jR)}(I_j,:)\|_F \|(M^{(jR)})^{-T}(I_j,:)\|_F + \|M^{((j-1)R)}(I_j,:)\|_F \|(M^{((j-1)R^*)})^{-T}(I_j,:)\|_F\right) \log 2R \ . \end{aligned} \tag{B.2}$$

Combining (B.2) with (B.1), we get

$$\left|\Phi(M^{(L)}) - \Phi(M^{(0)})\right| \leq 2 \left(\sum_{j=0}^{m'/R} \|M^{(jR)}(I_j,:)\|_F \|(M^{(jR)})^{-T}(I_j,:)\|_F\right) \log 2R \ .$$

For any matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and any subset $I \subseteq [n]$, we have $\|A(I,:)\|_F^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{|I|} \sigma_i^2(A)$ (this can be seen e.g. using the SVD theorem). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\Phi(M^{(m')}) - \Phi(M^{(0)})\right| &\leq 2 \left(\sum_{j=0}^{m'/R} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{2R} \sigma_i^2(M^{(jR)}) \sum_{i'=1}^{2R} \sigma_{i'}^2(M^{(jR)})^{-T})}\right) \log 2R \\ &= 2 \left(\sum_{j=0}^{m'/R} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{2R} \sigma_i^2(M^{(jR)}) \sum_{i'=1}^{2R} \sigma_{n-i'+1}^{-2}(M^{(jR)})}\right) \log 2R \ . \end{aligned}$$

But $\Phi(M^{(m')}) = \Phi(F) = n\log n$ and $\Phi(M^{(0)}) = 0$, hence, there must exists $j \in [m'/R]$ with

$$\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{2R}\sigma_i^2(M^{(jR)})\sum_{i'=1}^{2R}\sigma_{n-i'+1}^{-2}(M^{(jR)})} \geq \frac{2Rn\log n}{m'\log 2R} \geq \frac{2Rn\log n}{((n\log n)/b+R)\log 2R}$$
$$\geq \frac{2Rn\log n}{2((n\log n)/b)\log 2R} = \frac{Rb}{\log 2R}\ .$$

C Proof of Lemma 61

We start by proving (6.1). For brevity, we denote $F(i,j)$ by $f_{i,j} \in \{1/\sqrt{n}, -1/\sqrt{n}\}$, $(F\hat{P})(i,j) = \epsilon_{i,j}$, $(F\hat{Q})(i,j) = \delta_{i,j}$. Therefore, $(FP)(i,j) = f_{i,j} - \epsilon_{i,j}$ and $(FQ)(i,j) = f_{i,j} - \delta_{i,j}$. Let $\|\epsilon\|_F = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^n \epsilon_{i,j}^2}$ and $\|\delta\|_F = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{i,j}^2}$. By orthogonality of F, we have that

$$\|\epsilon\|_F = \|\hat{P}\|_F =: \alpha \qquad \|\delta\|_F = \|\hat{Q}\|_F =: \beta \tag{C.1}$$
$$\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^n f_{i,j}\epsilon_{i,j} = \operatorname{tr} F^T F\hat{P} = \operatorname{tr}\hat{P} \qquad \sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^n f_{i,j}\delta_{i,j} = \operatorname{tr} F^T F\hat{Q} = \operatorname{tr}\hat{Q} \tag{C.2}$$

Let $I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4 \subseteq [n]\times[n]$ be defined as

$$I_1 := \{(i,j) : \epsilon_{i,j}^2 < 1/(2n) \text{ and } \delta_{i,j}^2 < 1/(2n)\}\ \ I_2 := \{(i,j) : \epsilon_{i,j}^2 < 1/(2n) \text{ and } \delta_{i,j}^2 \geq 1/(2n)\}$$
$$I_3 := \{(i,j) : \epsilon_{i,j}^2 \geq 1/(2n) \text{ and } \delta_{i,j}^2 < 1/(2n)\}\ \ I_4 := \{(i,j) : \epsilon_{i,j}^2 \geq 1/(2n) \text{ and } \delta_{i,j}^2 \geq 1/(2n)\}\ .$$

Now, we write $\Phi(FP, FQ)$ as $\Phi_1 + \Phi_2 + \Phi_3 + \Phi_4$, where $\forall h = 1,2,3,4$:

$$\Phi_h := -\sum_{(i,j)\in I_h}(f_{i,j} - \epsilon_{i,j})(f_{i,j} - \delta_{i,j})\log|(f_{i,j} - \epsilon_{i,j})(f_{i,j} - \delta_{i,j})|\ .$$

We start by bounding Φ_4. For any $(i,j) \in I_4$,

$$|f_{i,j} - \epsilon_{i,j}| \leq 3|\epsilon_{i,j}|, \quad |f_{i,j} - \delta_{i,j}| \leq 3|\delta_{i,j}|\ . \tag{C.3}$$

Write $I_{4.1} \cup I_{4.2}$, where $I_{4.1} = \{(i,j) : 9|\epsilon_{i,j}\delta_{i,j}| \leq 1/e\}$ and $I_{4.2} = I_4 \setminus I_{4.1}$. Accordingly, for $r = 1,2$: $\Phi_{4.r} := -\sum_{(i,j)\in I_{4.r}}|(f_{i,j} - \epsilon_{i,j})(f_{i,j} - \delta_{i,j})|\log|(f_{i,j} - \epsilon_{i,j})(f_{i,j} - \delta_{i,j})|$. Using (C.3)-(C.3) and the monotonicity (increasing) of $-x\log x$ in the range $x \in [0, 1/e]$, we conclude

$$|\Phi_{4.1}| \leq -\sum_{(i,j)\in I_4} 9|\epsilon_{i,j}\delta_{i,j}|\log 9|\epsilon_{i,j}\delta_{i,j}| = -\sum_{(i,j)\in I_4} 9\|\epsilon\|\|\delta\|\left|\frac{\epsilon_{i,j}\delta_{i,j}}{\|\epsilon\|\|\delta\|}\right|\log 9\|\epsilon\|\|\delta\|\left|\frac{\epsilon_{i,j}\delta_{i,j}}{\|\epsilon\|\|\delta\|}\right|$$
$$= -\sum_{(i,j)\in I_4} 9\|\epsilon\|\|\delta\|\left|\frac{\epsilon_{i,j}\delta_{i,j}}{\|\epsilon\|\|\delta\|}\right|\log 9\|\epsilon\|\|\delta\| - \sum_{(i,j)\in I_4} 9\|\epsilon\|\|\delta\|\left|\frac{\epsilon_{i,j}\delta_{i,j}}{\|\epsilon\|\|\delta\|}\right|\log\left|\frac{\epsilon_{i,j}\delta_{i,j}}{\|\epsilon\|\|\delta\|}\right|$$
$$\leq 9\alpha\beta\log 9\alpha\beta + 18\alpha\beta\log n \leq 27\alpha\beta\log n + 9\alpha\beta\log 9\ .$$

where the second inequality used (C.1), Lemma A1 and Cauchy-Schwarz. To bound $|\Phi_{4.2}|$, note that by Cauchy-Schwarz $\sum_{(i,j)\in I_{4.2}} |\epsilon_{i,j}\delta_{i,j}| \le \alpha\beta$, and hence $|I_{4.2}| \le 9e\alpha\beta \le 27\alpha\beta$. This implies that $|\Phi_{4.2}| \le 27\alpha\beta$. Combining, we conclude

$$|\Phi_4| \le |\Phi_{4.1}| + |\Phi_{4.2}| \le 27\alpha\beta\log n + 63\alpha\beta \le (\alpha^2+\beta^2)(63+27\log n)\ . \quad \text{(C.4)}$$

We now bound $|\Phi_3|$. For all $(i,j) \in I_3$, (C.3) holds. Again we need to consider two cases, by defining $I_{3.1} := \{(i,j) \in I_3 : 3|\epsilon_{i,j}| \le 1/e\}$ and $I_{3.2} = I_3 \setminus I_{3.2}$ and, as above, $\Phi_{3.1}$ and $\Phi_{3.2}$ in an obvious way. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Phi_{3.1}| &\le -3 \sum_{(i,j)\in I_{3.1}} |\epsilon_{i,j}||f_{i,j}-\delta_{i,j}| \log(3|\epsilon_{i,j}||f_{i,j}-\delta_{i,j}|) \\
&= -3 \sum_{(i,j)\in I_{3.1}} |\epsilon_{i,j}||f_{i,j}-\delta_{i,j}| \log 3|\epsilon_{i,j}||f_{i,j}| - 3 \sum_{(i,j)\in I_{3.1}} |\epsilon_{i,j}||f_{i,j}-\delta_{i,j}| \log|1-\delta_{i,j}/f_{i,j}| \\
&\le 3 \sum_{(i,j)\in I_{3.1}} |\epsilon_{i,j}||f_{i,j}-\delta_{i,j}| \log n + 3 \sum_{(i,j)\in I_{3.1}} |\epsilon_{i,j}||f_{i,j}-\delta_{i,j}||\delta_{i,j}/f_{i,j}| \\
&\le 3 \sum_{(i,j)\in I_{3.1}} |\epsilon_{i,j}| \frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}} \log n + 3 \sum_{(i,j)\in I_{3.1}} |\epsilon_{i,j}|/(2\sqrt{2n})\ . \qquad \text{(C.5)}
\end{aligned}$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz, $\sum_{(i,j)\in I_{3.1}} |\epsilon_{i,j}| \le \sqrt{|I_{3.1}|}\sqrt{\sum_{(i,j)\in I_{3.1}} \epsilon_{i,j}^2} \le \sqrt{|I_3|}\|\epsilon\| = \sqrt{|I_3|}\alpha$. But by (C.1) and definition of I_3, we have $|I_3| \le 2\alpha^2 n$. Combining with (C.5), we get

$$|\Phi_{3.1}| \le 3\alpha^2 \log n + 3\alpha^2\ . \quad \text{(C.6)}$$

To bound $|\Phi_{3.2}|$, note that by (C.1) and by definition of $I_{3.2}$, $|I_{3.2}| \le 9e^2\alpha^2 \le 81\alpha^2$. But clearly $|\Phi_{3.2}| \le |I_{3.2}|$, hence $|\Phi_{3.2}| \le 81\alpha^2$. Combining with (C.6), we conclude

$$|\Phi_3| \le 3\alpha^2 \log n + 84\alpha^2\ . \quad \text{(C.7)}$$

By symmetry, we also have:

$$|\Phi_2| \le 3\beta^2 \log n + 84\beta^2\ . \quad \text{(C.8)}$$

We now turn to approximate Φ_1.

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_1 = &- \sum_{(i,j)\in I_1} f_{i,j}^2 \log f_{i,j}^2 - \underbrace{\sum_{(i,j)\in I_1} f_{i,j}^2 \log((1-\epsilon_{i,j}/f_{i,j})(1-\delta_{i,j}/f_{i,j}))}_{A} \\
&+ \underbrace{\sum_{(i,j)\in I_1} f_{i,j}(\epsilon_{i,j}+\delta_{i,j}) \log((f_{i,j}-\epsilon_{i,j})(f_{i,j}-\delta_{i,j}))}_{B} - \underbrace{\sum_{(i,j)\in I_1} \epsilon_{i,j}\delta_{i,j} \log((f_{i,j}-\epsilon_{i,j})(f_{i,j}-\delta_{i,j}))}_{C}\ .
\end{aligned}$$

Subtracting $n\log n = -\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n f_{i,j}^2 \log f_{i,j}^2$ from both sides gives:

$$\Phi_1 - n\log = \underbrace{\sum_{(i,j)\notin I_1} f_{i,j}^2 \log f_{i,j}^2}_{D} - A + B - C\ .$$

By (C.1), the number of pairs $(i,j) \in [n] \times [n]$ for which $\epsilon_{i,j}^2 \geq 1/(2n)$ is at most $2\alpha^2 n$. Similarly, the number of pairs (i,j) for which $\delta_{i,j}^2 \geq 1/(2n)$ is at most $2\beta^2 n$. Hence, $|([n]\times[n]) \setminus I_1| \leq 2(\alpha^2+\beta^2)n$. Therefore, $|D| \leq 2(\alpha^2+\beta^2)n(1/n)\log n = 2(\alpha^2+\beta^2)\log n$. For A, we just need to notice that $A \leq 0$. As for B,

$$\begin{aligned} B &= \sum_{(i,j)\in I_1} f_{i,j}(\epsilon_{i,j}+\delta_{i,j})\log f_{i,j}^2 + \sum_{(i,j)\in I_1} f_{i,j}(\epsilon_{i,j}+\delta_{i,j})\log(1-\epsilon_{i,j}/f_{i,j})(1-\delta_{i,j}/f_{i,j}) \\ &= -\sum_{(i,j)\in I_1} f_{i,j}(\epsilon_{i,j}+\delta_{i,j})\log n + \sum_{(i,j)\in I_1} f_{i,j}(\epsilon_{i,j}+\delta_{i,j})\log(1-\epsilon_{i,j}/f_{i,j})(1-\delta_{i,j}/f_{i,j}) \end{aligned}$$

Adding $\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n f_{i,j}(\epsilon_{i,j}+\delta_{i,j})\log n = (\operatorname{tr}\hat{P}+\operatorname{tr}\hat{Q})\log n$ (see (C.2)) to both sides, taking absolute value on both sides, using the triangle inequality and the estimate $\log(1-\alpha) \leq |\alpha|$ for all $|\alpha| \leq 1/\sqrt{2}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \left|B + (\operatorname{tr}\hat{P}+\operatorname{tr}\hat{Q})\log n\right| &\leq \sum_{(i,j)\notin I_1} |f_{i,j}|(|\epsilon_{i,j}|+|\delta_{i,j}|)\log n + \sum_{(i,j)\in I_1} (\epsilon_{i,j}^2+\delta_{i,j}^2+2|\epsilon_{i,j}||\delta_{i,j}|) \\ &\leq \sum_{(i,j)\notin I_1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}((|\epsilon_{i,j}|+|\delta_{i,j}|)\log n) + 3(\alpha^2+\beta^2) \\ &\leq 2(\alpha^2+\beta^2)\log n + 3(\alpha^2+\beta^2)\ . \end{aligned}$$

Where the second inequality used Cauchy-Schwarz, and the third used Cauchy-Schwarz to obtain $\sum_{(i,j)\neq I_1} |\varepsilon_{i,j}| \leq \sqrt{n^2-|I_1|}\alpha$ together with the estimate $(n^2-|I_1|) \leq 2n\alpha^2$ (from the definition of I_1 and α), and a similar step for bounding $\sum_{(i,j)\neq I_1}|\delta_{i,j}|$. To bound $|C|$, note that $|\log((f_{i,j}-\epsilon_{i,j})(f_{i,j}-\delta_{i,j}))| \leq 4\log n$ for all $(i,j) \in I_1$. Hence, using Cauchy-Schwarz, $|C| \leq 4\sum_{(i,j)\in I_1}|\epsilon_{i,j}||\delta_{i,j}|\log n \leq 4\alpha\beta\log n \leq 4(\alpha^2+\beta^2)\log n$. Combining our upper bound for A and estimates for $B, |C|$ and $|D|$, we conclude:

$$\Phi_1 \geq n\log n - (\operatorname{tr}\hat{P}+\operatorname{tr}\hat{Q})\log n - (\alpha^2+\beta^2)(6+8\log n)\ . \tag{C.9}$$

Finally, by combining (C.4), (C.7), (C.8), (C.9), we conclude

$$\Phi(FP,FQ) \geq n\log n - (\operatorname{tr}\hat{P}+\operatorname{tr}\hat{Q})\log n - (\alpha^2+\beta^2)(147+30\log n)\ .$$

This concludes the proof of (6.1).

We now prove (6.2), whence we assume that P, Q are PSD contractions (as are $\hat{P}, \hat{Q}$). We decompose $\Phi_{P,Q}(\mathrm{Id},\mathrm{Id})$ as two sums, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{\mathrm{diag}} &= -\sum_{i=1}^n P(i,i)Q(i,i)\log|P(i,i)Q(i,i)| \\ \Phi_{\mathrm{off}} &= -\sum_{i\neq j} P(i,j)Q(i,j)\log|P(i,j)Q(i,j)|\ . \end{aligned}$$

We start by bounding Φ_{diag}. Define η as:

$$\eta := \sum_{i=1}^n P(i,i)Q(i,i) = \sum_{i=1}^n (1-\hat{P}(i,i))(1-\hat{Q}(i,i))\ .$$

Notice that $\eta \geq n - \operatorname{tr}\hat{P} - \operatorname{tr}\hat{Q}$, and that $0 \leq P(i,i)Q(i,i) \leq 1$ for all $i \in [n]$ by the contraction property. Using standard tools (e.g. Lagrange multipliers), it can be shown that the function $-\sum y_i \log y_i$ under the constraints $0 \leq y_i \leq 1, \sum y_i = \eta$ obtains its maximum when $\forall i \in [n] : y_i = 1/\eta$, at which case its value is $-\eta \log(\eta/n)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_{\text{diag}} \leq -\eta \log(\eta/n) &\leq -(n - \operatorname{tr}\hat{P} - \operatorname{tr}\hat{Q}) \log(1 - \operatorname{tr}\hat{P}/n - \operatorname{tr}\hat{Q}/n) \\
&\leq -n \log(1 - \operatorname{tr}\hat{P}/n - \operatorname{tr}\hat{Q}/n) \\
&\leq n(\operatorname{tr}\hat{P}/n + \operatorname{tr}\hat{Q}/n + (\operatorname{tr}\hat{P} + \operatorname{tr}\hat{Q})^2/n^2) \\
&= \operatorname{tr}\hat{P} + \operatorname{tr}\hat{Q} + (\operatorname{tr}\hat{P} + \operatorname{tr}\hat{Q})^2/n \\
&\leq \operatorname{tr}\hat{P} + \operatorname{tr}\hat{Q} + \|\hat{P} + \hat{Q}\|_F^2 \\
&\leq \operatorname{tr}\hat{P} + \operatorname{tr}\hat{Q} + \|\hat{P}\|_F^2 + \|\hat{Q}\|_F^2 \ . \qquad \text{(C.10)}
\end{aligned}$$

(we used twice the assumption that $n - \operatorname{tr}\hat{P} - \operatorname{tr}\hat{Q} \geq n/e$, for otherwise $\|\hat{P}\|_F^2 + \|\hat{Q}\|_F^2 = \Omega(n)$ and (6.2) is trivial.)

We now turn to bound Φ_{off}. Let $\mu_P = \sum_{i \neq j} P(i,j)^2, \mu_Q = \sum_{i \neq j} Q(i,j)^2$. If $\mu_P \mu_Q \leq 1$ then without loss of generality $\mu_P \leq 1$, implying $\|\hat{P}\|_F = \Omega(n)$, and therefore (6.2) is trivial. Hence we assume $\mu_P \mu_Q \geq 1$. Using Lemma A1 (define x to be the $n(n-1)$-dimensional vector with $x_{ij} = P(i,j)/\sqrt{\mu_P}$ for $i \neq j$, and similarly define y using Q):

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_{\text{off}} &\leq \sqrt{\mu_P \mu_Q} \log n(n-1) - \sum_{i \neq j} P(i,j)Q(i,j) \log \sqrt{\mu_P \mu_Q} \\
&\leq 2\sqrt{\mu_P \mu_Q} \log n \leq (\mu_P + \mu_Q) \log n \ ,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the AMGM inequality in the last step. But now notice that $\mu_P \leq \|\hat{P}\|_F^2, \mu_Q \leq \|\hat{Q}\|_F^2$. Combining this with our bound of Φ_{diag} completes the proof.

D Further Discussion on Numerical Architecture and Overflow Definition

1. Our definition of overflow is counterintuitive, because we are used to thinking about overflow as an offending machine state at a particular step of the algorithm execution for a particular input, while our definition is stochastic. The reason we use this definition is from the combination of (a) our desire to work with a spherically symmetric input and (b) avoiding measuring complexity in the granularity of logical bit operations, stemming from the varying word length typically arising even in the standard FFT benchmark. It is possible to somewhat practically justify the stochastic definition of overflow by thinking of running FFT on a large number L of iid inputs, which can be thought of as being stacked as columns of an input matrix X. The larger L is, the more concentrated the total number of bits required to encode each *row* of the matrix around $\Theta(L)$ will be. For L polynomial in n, the

probability of requiring more than $\Theta(L)$ bits per row becomes exponentially small at any step of standard FFT.

2. We are ignoring the fact that the machine state after t steps on input x in any computer is not only a result of quantizing the vector $M^{(t)}x$. Rather, errors are accumulated from the effects of quantizing at earlier steps. Taking accumulated errors into account should affect the numerical accuracy of both the benchmark and of any speed-up, but quantifying this effect seems extremely difficult. We take an information theoretical approach by saying that the machine state after t steps contains *at most* the information in the quantization of the coordinates of $M^{(t)}x$, and whatever information lost (due to this quantization) cannot be later recovered because the machine state encodes everything that is known about the input (and output) at any given step.

E Proof of Theorem 51

Let $V = \{v_1, \ldots, v_k\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be an orthonormal set satisfying the properties described in case (i) of the theorem. Similarly, let $U = \{u_1, \ldots, u_\ell\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be an orthonormal set satisfying the properties described in case (ii) of the theorem. We show that as long as $k + \ell$ is at most $O(n)$, then we can extend one of the two sets by one element.

Let P denote the projection onto $(\operatorname{span} V)^\perp$ and Q the projection onto $(\operatorname{span} U)^\perp$. Using Lemma 61, we have that

$$\Phi_{P,Q}(F) - \Phi_{P,Q}(\mathrm{Id}) \geq n \log n - (\operatorname{tr} \hat{P} + \operatorname{tr} \hat{Q})(1 + \log n) - C(\|\hat{P}\|_F^2 + \|\hat{Q}\|_F^2) \log n \ ,$$

for some global $C > 0$, where $\hat{P} = \mathrm{Id} - P, \hat{Q} = \mathrm{Id} - Q$ (the orthogonal projections). By known properties of projection matrices, $\operatorname{tr} \hat{P} = \|\hat{P}\|_F^2 = k, \operatorname{tr} \hat{Q} = \|\hat{Q}\|_F^2 = \ell$. Therefore,

$$\Phi_{P,Q}(F) - \Phi_{P,Q}(\mathrm{Id}) \geq n \log n - C'(k + \ell) \log n,$$

for some global $C' > 0$. This implies, using Theorem 41 (with $R = 1$) that for some $t \in \{0, \ldots, m\}$ and $i \in [n]$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|M^{(t)} P(i,:)\| \cdot \|(M^{(t)})^{-T} Q(i,:)\| &\geq \frac{n \log n - C'(k + \ell) \log n}{m} \\ &= \frac{(n \log n - C'(k + \ell) \log n) b}{n \log n} \ . \end{aligned}$$

Hence, as long as $k + \ell \leq n/(2C')$:

$$\|M^{(t)} P(i,:)\| \cdot \|(M^{(t)})^{-T} Q(i,:)\| \geq b/2 \ . \tag{E.1}$$

This implies that either $\|M^{(t)} P_\perp(i,:)\| \geq \sqrt{b/2}$ or that $\|(M^{(t)})^{-T} Q_\perp(i,:)\| \geq \sqrt{b/2}$. In the former case we can extend the set V by adding $v_{k+1} = M^{(t)} P(i,:$

$)/\|M^{(t)}P(i,:)\|$, which is orthogonal to $v_1,\ldots,v_k$ by construction. In the latter case we can extend the set U by adding $u_{k+1} = (M^{(t)})^{-T}Q(i,:)/\|(M^{(t)})^{-T}Q(i,:)\|$ which is again, orthogonal to $u_1,\ldots,u_\ell$ by construction.

This process of augmenting V and U can continue until $k+\ell \geq n/2C'$, which implies that either $k \geq n/4C'$ (establishing extreme overflow of the theorem) or $\ell \geq n/4C'$ (establishing extreme underflow).

Assume $k \geq n/4C'$ and let $n' = k$. For $j \in [n']$ let t_j denote the time step of the overflow corresponding to direction $v_j \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and let i_j denote the coordinate at which the overflow occurs. It is clear from the construction that i_j is one of the at most two coordinates affected by the t_j'th step. We show that there exist no $1 \leq j < j' \leq n'$ such that $(t_j, i_j) = (t_{j'}, i_{j'})$. Indeed, note that $M^{(t_j)}P_{j'}(i_j,:)$ must be null by construction, contradicting the fact that $\|M^{(t_j)}P_{j'}(i_j,:)\| = \|M^{(t_{j'})}P_{j'}(i_{j'},:)\| = \Omega(\sqrt{b})$. The conclusion is that for any $t \in [m]$ there can be at most two indices $j, j' \in [n']$ such that $t_j = t_{j'} = t$, and therefore the cardinality of the set $\{t_1,\ldots,t_{n'}\}$ is at least $n/2$. A similar argument is done for the extreme underflow case, concluding the proof.

F An Illustrative Figure




Fig. 1. The uncertainty interval in g_1 as a function of e, given the representation of $M^{(t)}x(i_t)$ in a computer word. The random variable e contains only information from components of the input that are orthogonal to x_{under}.